United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—*Thursday, April 30, 2015*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Peter Milner, chaplain of the North Carolina Senate in Raleigh, NC.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Heavenly Father, You have been our dwelling place for all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, You were God. So we bow our heads and our hearts before You, and we seek Your guidance as a nation. We are crippled without Your help and helpless without Your steadfast love. Come to our assistance. Make haste to help us. Forgive us of our sin, O Lord, and wipe away the tears from our eyes.

We are so grateful for this day. We come boldly to Your throne of grace, and we bring our weaknesses, we bring our doubts and our requests, and we submit our pleas before You, a holy and a good God. Have compassion on the lonely, and grant peace to the brokenhearted.

Hear all these prayers, O Lord, and bless all of those Members assembled here. Pour out the oil of Your gladness down upon this Nation, upon these proceedings, upon this government, and towards every one of these hard-working representatives of Your people.

It is in Jesus's Name we pray. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The Senator from North Carolina.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to welcome to this body a friend and a fellow North Carolinian, Peter Milner. Chaplain Milner serves the North Carolina General Assembly as the State's senate chaplain.

A fellow Demon Deacon and an alumna of Wake Forest, he received his undergraduate degree in sociology and religion. While at Wake Forest, Chaplain Milner was instrumental in the creation of the Wake Forest Volunteer Service Corps, which engages hundreds of students, faculty, and staff to participate in community-based organizations.

After completing his undergraduate work at Wake Forest, he went on to earn his master's in secondary social studies education to become a high school teacher. Called to the ministry after his first year of teaching, he attended Duke Divinity School, where he thrived in his role as resident coordinator of Emmaus House in Raleigh, which provides safe, affordable housing for working homeless men recovering from substance dependency. Chaplain Milner's devotion to and passion for helping the homeless is unwavering and very clear. I saw it for myself when I first met Peter a few years ago at a homeless center in Raleigh, NC.

Besides his tireless work on behalf of the homeless, Chaplain Milner has been instrumental in improving the lives of students, medical patients, and—a cause very important to North Carolinians, including me—our Nation's veterans. Because of his work as an outreach specialist for veterans at StepUp Ministry, Chaplain Milner established an important link between veterans in need and the business community. His hard work continues to help struggling veterans achieve stable lives through employment counseling and life skills training.

The North Carolina General Assembly is blessed to have a man who has devoted his life to causes much larger than himself. But of all that he has accomplished in life so far, he says his greatest accomplishment is being a husband to his bride of 13 years, Anna, and a father to their two beautiful children, Silas and Josie, who are all with us today.

Chaplain Milner, I thank you for leading our Chamber in prayer today, and I welcome you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I thank Chaplain Milner for being here.

I want to talk about a friend. He is somebody who blessed our legislature during the time I was speaker of the house.

I will not repeat all of the things Peter has done for the community. I want to speak specifically about what he has done for the State chamber and the general assembly, the part where I was speaker. He was a calm presence in an otherwise chaotic environment called the legislative body—not unlike the one we have here. He is always somebody you can look to for guidance, support, and for inspiration, and for that, I thank him.

I will also say—you notice he is a little bit tall. He played basketball at Wake.

We have this rivalry with South Carolina. We play basketball every year. We get together and we either travel down to South Carolina or the legislature comes here. I played on that basketball team for 4 years. In each of those 4 years, we were hopeful that Peter would play with us, but for some reason he didn't. Now, the only thing that I see differently—he is playing this year, since my departure.

I hope your decision to play isn't because of my exit, Peter.

I thank you for being here and for your contribution to the community. I welcome your family, who I believe is in the Chamber today. I hope you enjoy today.

On behalf of all Members who benefit from your guidance and your spiritual presence and guidance in the State of North Carolina and the general assembly, thank you, and welcome.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

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

PACQUIAO-MAYWEATHER FIGHT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as some know, I fought a little bit. I was in the minor leagues for a couple of years.

As the Presiding Officer knows, in Nevada, on Saturday night, in Las Vegas, there is going to be a stunning athletic event, one of the most significant athletic events, actually, in the last 50 years. It is a wonderful occasion for Nevada to host the fight between Manny Pacquiao—I should say Congressman Pacquiao, who is a member of the Philippine Congress—and Floyd Mayweather. They will be battling for three separate titles. They are fighting for the 147-pound weight class—for all the people who think that is small, that is the class that—we have had some of our great fighters of all time who have fought that same weight level.

These are two great athletes. The winner of the match will be crowned as the greatest pound for pound fighter in the world, and they will go down as two of the finest fighters ever in the history of the world. So regardless of who wins, this bout is projected to shatter boxing records for not only being a significant boxing match—the focus of the world will be on this fight. People all over the world will be watching this fight.

They don't really know how many pay-per-view purchases are expected, but I made one last night. I was planning on going to the fight, but, as my friend the Presiding Officer knows, things have changed over the years. If we want to get one of those good seats, we have to pay for it. I have been willing to do that in the past, but the traffic was a little too heavy there, so I decided to watch it here with some of my family. But I am so happy that the pay-per-view purchases are expected to exceed 3 million people, and they won't get it any cheaper than I did—$99.95. So it is wonderful that all previous records will be broken as to revenue.

The only thing I don't like about it is the fight doesn't start back here until 9 o'clock and usually they don't end until midnight. I wish they would start a little earlier, but, as I have learned with my baseball, they just start them later back here.

I am very excited about this unforgettable fight. There is nothing like a championship fight. There is nothing like one that has all this attention.

After I started practicing law, I started judging fights. I was on the Nevada fight commission, and I judged fights. I judged lots of fights. I can remember the first big fight I went to. Oh, it was a big fight. I walked in there, and I couldn't imagine there would be that much attention on anything. Of course, there were thousands of people there. I was excited. I was going to judge one of the preliminary fights. It was stunning. You see ringside all of these glamorous, important people. These fights catch the enthusiasm of sports fans all over the world.

The eagerness that I have of watching this fight goes far beyond the sport of boxing or the spectacle of a marquis matchup. I am thrilled for Nevada. This fight will inject hundreds of millions of dollars into the State's economy. It will benefit Nevadans all—fighters and their teams, of course, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, limousine drivers, parking valets, maids will get bigger tips than they usually get. It will be a great time for Nevada.

So I have done everything I can within my power here as a Member of the legislature to help in any way that I can. I have interceded on a couple of occasions to help make this fight move forward, and I was very happy to do so.

I love this sport. Some of my most prized possessions in my home are fight pictures. I have one picture of the great Joe Louis and Max Schmeling, and they both signed that picture before they died. I had the good fortune, when Joe Louis spent so much time at Caesars Palace, to have met him. I have pictures hanging on my wall of my dear father-in-law, who worked with fighters. I have a picture on the wall—they are all together—of him with Jack Dempsey, with Primo Carnera, who was 6 foot 7, a huge man—my father-in-law was about 5 foot 5—Sugar Ray Robinson. All these—not all of them, but many great fighters are there with my father-in-law. I love that picture, and it reminds me of my minor league experience in boxing.

I am very excited about watching this fight.

Las Vegas has been the entertainment capital of the world for a long time, and we are happy that, in fact, is the case. But a few short years ago, as the Presiding Officer knows, we were hit very hard. The debacle that took place on Wall Street hurt Nevada more than any other place. We have been recovering. We haven't recovered totally, but we have recovered significantly.

The 2008 economic collapse took a heavy toll on Nevada. A quarter of Nevadans are employed in the tourism and hospitality industry, and when the recession hit, they got hurt, as did all working classes—construction workers; everybody got hurt—but we fought our way back.

Last year, we welcomed to Las Vegas 41 million people—little Las Vegas, 41 million people. It is not so little, but the Presiding Officer and I remember when it was a little place. But now it is a community with a metropolitan area of over 2 million people. Forty-one million people have come to Las Vegas and produced an economic impact of more than $50 billion. We shattered previous records by attracting 1.4 million more visitors than we did in 2014. So it is only going to get better, and the Pacquiao-Mayweather fight will keep that momentum going for Nevada.

I am not picking a winner. I wish both men the best of luck. But, admittedly, I am a little biased because of my relationship with Manny Pacquiao.

As the Presiding Officer will remember, one of my real campaigners in one of my difficult races was Manny Pacquiao. He campaigned for me. He broke training to come out of L.A., flew in for a big event I had one night. So you have to remember that kind of stuff. So I have a very good relationship with Manny Pacquiao. Certainly, I don't have a bad one with Floyd Mayweather, but I know Manny Pacquiao much better than I know Floyd Mayweather. He stood in my corner in the past, and he will always have my support.

Regardless, though, of which fighter reigns supreme on that Saturday night—and one of them will. They are alone. Nobody is there with them. Regardless of who leaves the arena with that big belt, Nevada's hard-working economy will have won the fight.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate will soon resume consideration of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. I expect we will consider several amendments today, and I continue to encourage Senators to come to the floor and offer them.

The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is bipartisan legislation that will ensure that Congress and the American people have a chance to review any comprehensive agreement reached with Iran, and it ensures they will be able to do so before congressional sanctions are lifted.

Here is why that is critical. First, these sanctions are a big reason why America was able even to bring Iran to the table in the first place. We shouldn't be giving up that leverage now without the American people, through the Members of Congress they elect, having a chance to weigh in. Quite simply, the American people expect us to have an opportunity to evaluate this agreement or not.

Second, Iran wouldn't just use the funds derived from sanctions relief to rebuild its economy. It is certain to use that money to fund proxy forces such as Hezbollah and to prop up the Assad regime. What is clear is that Iran is determined to use every tool—to use every tool—at its disposal to expand aggressively its sphere of influence across the greater Middle East.

The regime's belligerent behavior in the Strait of Hormuz was just another reminder of that fact. But it reminds

us of something else, too—our need to invest in the naval and seaborne expeditionary capabilities in the Persian Gulf, which will be necessary not just to retain dominance at sea but to contain Iran's military and irregular forces, as well.

Today, though—today—we are focused on one point above all else—that the American people and Congress deserve a say before any congressional sanctions are lifted. At the very least, sanctions should not be lifted before the Iranians fully disclose all aspects of research and development as it relates to the potential military dimensions of their nuclear program. Yet the interim agreement, as it has been explained to Congress, would bestow international recognition to Iran's research and development program, along with an international blessing for Iran to become a nuclear threshold state poised at the edge of developing a nuclear weapon. It is frightening to think what Iran might be able to achieve covertly in that context.

Now, to a lot of Americans this all sounds quite different from what they were led to believe a deal with Iran would actually be about—preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons and dismantling Iran's enrichment capability. But that apparently has already been given away. So the American people deserve a say through their Members of Congress. The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act will ensure Congress gets a vote either to approve or disapprove of the comprehensive agreement.

Just as President Obama's successor will need to modernize our military to deal with the challenges posed by Iran's aggression, so will the President's successor want to consider Congress's view of any comprehensive deal. A failed resolution of approval, as the bill before us would permit, would send an unmistakable signal about congressional opposition to lifting sanctions. Let me say that again. A failed resolution of approval, permitted under this bill, would send an unmistakable signal about congressional opposition to lifting sanctions.

So now is the time for Congress to invest in the capabilities President Obama's successor may need to use to end Iran's nuclear weapons program if the Iranians covertly pursue a weapon or violate the terms of the ultimate agreement. And now is the time for Congress to pass the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

THE BUDGET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, on a different matter, Mr. President, I was glad to see yesterday's announcement of a budget conference agreement. That means Congress is now one step closer to passing a balanced budget that supports a healthy economy, funds national defense, strengthens Medicare, and begins to tackle our debt problems without taking more money from hardworking Americans.

It is a balanced budget that could help lead to more than 1 million additional jobs and boost our economy by nearly half a trillion dollars, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. In short, it is a balanced budget that is all about the future. That is also why it provides a tool for the Senate majority to repeal a failed policy of the past—ObamaCare—so we can start over with real patient-centered health reform.

This is a good balanced budget every Senator should want to support, and I look forward to the Senate taking up the budget agreement next week.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1191, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1140, in the nature of a substitute.

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1179 (to amendment No. 1140), to require submission of all Persian text included in the agreement.

Blunt amendment No. 1155 (to amendment No. 1140), to extend the requirement for annual Department of Defense reports on the military power of Iran.

Vitter modified amendment No. 1186 (to amendment No. 1179), to require an assessment of inadequacies in the international monitoring and verification system as they relate to a nuclear agreement with Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 1149 to declare that any agreement reached by the President relating to the nuclear program of Iran is a congressional-executive agreement to be considered under the expedited procedure in both Houses of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARDIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, we have been proceeding now for about a week. We have had a good debate on issues. Many Members are working with Senator CORKER and me to clear their amendments so they are consistent with the overall objective that was supported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a 19-to-0 vote, and we are going to continue to work on that process in the orderly consideration of amendments.

For that reason, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Perhaps if the Senator from Maryland will listen to my explanation of what this amendment does, he will withdraw his objection.

During our debate on Tuesday, when I offered an amendment to deem the agreement between Iran and America—well, actually and the world—a treaty subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, the Senator from Maryland spoke about one of the objections to the treaty. He said:

Secondly, I don't know how we are going to explain it to our colleagues in the House of Representatives. The Presiding Officer served in the House. I served in the House. Senator Menendez served in the House. The last time I checked, we imposed these sanctions because the bill passed both the Senate and the House, and now we are saying that the approval process is going to ignore the House of Representatives, solely going to be a matter for the U.S. Senate on a ratification of a treaty? That does not seem like a workable solution.

Now, Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Maryland did not object to my raising my first amendment to deem it a treaty. And of course this body then voted on that, and I appreciate that fact. And I accept the verdict of this Chamber that they did not want to deem this agreement a treaty—fair enough.

But I would like to quote, in addition to the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Tennessee in arguing against deeming this a treaty. The Senator from Tennessee said: ''We think the President has the ability to negotiate things.''

Well, first off all, I agree with that. Article II, section 2 states: ''He [The President] shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur. . . .''

So that actually is the constitutional method for making agreements between nations—having the President negotiate that. I completely agree. We can't have 535 negotiators. But we certainly should have this body involved in those agreements. We should have a role. We should have a robust role. And, of course, I believe it is so important, that this has such an effect and that it risks so much for this Nation, that I believe it should be a treaty. But again, fair enough—this body deemed it would not be a treaty. The Senator from Tennessee went on to say:

We had no idea this President would consider suspending these sanctions ad infinitum, forever—no idea. I think even people on the other side of the aisle were shocked.

We were shocked. Yes, we granted those waivers for national security. We did not believe those waivers would be abused the way they are being abused right now.

The Senator from Tennessee also went on to say: ''This is one of the biggest geopolitical issues that will potentially happen if an agreement is reached in our lifetime here in the Senate.''

Once again, I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. This is a huge geopolitical issue. And right now this administration deems that agreement on its own authority, an executive agreement, and really, at this point in time, we have no role. There is no involvement. The Senator from Tennessee went on to say: ''Look, I have strong agreement with the sentiment of our Senator from Wisconsin.'' Again, he is agreeing with the fact that this really should rise to the level of a treaty.

He also went on to say: ''Without the bill that is on the floor, the American people will never see it.''

Think of that. Think of an agreement between Iran, as it is being described—and, as I say, nobody really knows yet, but what I believe is being described to us—puts Iran on a path for a nuclear weapon. How many years has it been that Presidents from both parties and Members of Congress from both parties have stood and said very forcefully that we simply cannot allow Iran to have a nuclear weapon? Now we may be facing an agreement between this country, other nations of the world, and Iran that actually puts Iran on a path for a nuclear agreement.

The Senator from Tennessee is correct. I hope he is not correct, but I think he may be correct that right now this President has no duty to bring that agreement to the American people. I do happen to believe that public pressure would be so great that the American people would not tolerate that level of brazenness, that level of arrogance on the part of any administration or any President to do a deal, to make an agreement of such import that before implementing that agreement the President of the United States would not bring that agreement to the American people and subject it to, in some shape or form, the advice and consent of either this Chamber or Congress as a whole.

The final quote from the Senator from Tennessee is this. He said:

Now, look, if I could wave a magic wand or all of a sudden donkeys flew around the Capitol, I would love for us to have the ability to deem this a treaty. I really would.

Well, if the agreement that President Obama is talking about in its current framework is agreed to between this administration and the other negotiating partners and Iran, we better all hope that donkeys start flying around the Capitol, because that agreement, as it is being described to us, would put Iran on the path to be a nuclear power. That would destabilize not only the region, but it would destabilize the world. It would lead to an enormous amount of nuclear proliferation within the region. It is a very bad deal. It is very risky for this Nation. It affects this Nation.

Let me just go through the three forms of international agreements. There are no set criteria in terms of what is a treaty, what is a congressional-executive agreement or what is simply an executive agreement. There are considerations. There is precedent.

I go to the Foreign Affairs Manual at the State Department, and they lay out the considerations; what should be considered in determining what an agreement is—a treaty, a congressional-executive agreement or just an executive agreement. The first consideration is the extent to which the agreement involves commitments or risks affecting the Nation as a whole.

The third consideration is whether the agreement can be given effect without the enactment of subsequent legislation by Congress.

Well, the fact that we have this bill proves the fact that it needs subsequent legislation by Congress.

The fifth consideration is the preference of the Congress as to a particular type of agreement. Well, that is what we are talking about here—the Congress weighing in, in the form of my amendment, to say we want a role, we want a more robust role than is currently offered in this bill.

The seventh is the proposed duration of the agreement. We are going to be living with the impact, the effect, the results, the collateral damage of this agreement between Iran and the other negotiating parties for a very, very, very long time. So based on those considerations, based on the fact that in the State Department's own Foreign Affairs Manual in determining whether something is a treaty or an executive agreement or a congressional executive agreement, there should be consultation with Congress. I consider this amendment consultation with Congress.

Again, all I am asking in this amendment is to provide a minimal—a minimal constitutional threshold, a minimum constitutional role for Congress in affirmatively approving a deal between Iran and the rest of the world and America.

So all this amendment really does, in effect, is just asks the President to bring the agreement before the American people, before this Congress, allow us to have input, to affirmatively approve this in both Chambers, both the House and the Senate, with a mere majority vote of both Chambers. Because what is currently on the floor in this bill—and, again, I have a great deal of respect for the Senator from Tennessee. I know in his heart he believes this Senate, this Congress, should have a far more robust role and involvement in such a consequential agreement, but I also realize the challenge he has had dealing with our friends on the other side of the aisle and how very little involvement they are willing to agree to for this Senate and for this Congress.

If the bill is passed, we need to clarify what that means in terms of approval. Probably the best way for me to point that out is I had a third amendment I tried to offer. It was an amendment that was going to specifically describe what this bill does with a vote of disapproval, what that threshold really means in terms of approval of this very consequential deal. So I offered an amendment: I called it a very low threshold for approval of a congressional-executive agreement. It would have allowed the agreement between Iran and the rest of the world to be approved by this body, by this Congress, with a majority vote in the House and a vote of only 34 Senators in this body.

Now, very appropriately, that amendment was ruled out of order. It was ruled unconstitutional by the Parliamentarian, as it should have been, because that is not approval of a process. That is not the way Congress should weigh in, have input, be involved in such a consequential agreement. But that is exactly—in a very convoluted process of votes of disapproval, that would have to be, first of all, voted on by 60 Senators. Then, of course, if that is vetoed, we would have to override that veto with 67 Senators and two-thirds majority in the House.

Again, what this bill does, it will allow a very bad deal—potentially very bad deal—between Iran and the rest of the world and America to be approved with a majority vote in the House and a vote of only 34 Senators in this Chamber.

Again, with that reality, with that clarity of what this bill does, the minimum role, the minimum role that this bill allows, I would urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment that provides for what should be the minimum involvement of Congress: a majority vote, an affirmative vote of approval in both the House and the Senate to any deal this administration concludes with Iran.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his great service on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I think he knows there is another amendment offered by another Senator, the Senator from Texas, that I think is very similar to this, and we

are working right now with the other side to try to bring that up.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORKER. Sure.

Mr. JOHNSON. The difference between the two, as I understand them, is the amendment of the Senator from Texas would actually have a higher threshold. I think it would rise to a 60-vote threshold. I am not asking that. I am actually asking something less than that, to again clarify what this bill allows in terms of approval by this Chamber.

So even though we discussed this earlier, I don't believe I can combine the two because I think it is important to clarify the issue with an amendment that requires what I really do believe—truly believe—should be the minimum, the minimum role, the minimum affirmative approval of disagreement: a mere majority vote in both Chambers. That is so reasonable. That is the minimum role the American people ought to have in terms of having a say in this.

I have never insisted on an amendment in 4 years in the Senate. I feel so deeply about this that I really ask both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Tennessee, please, just allow a vote on this one amendment.

Mr. CORKER. If I could, Mr. President, the Senator is right; he doesn't offer many amendments, nor do I. But the very first amendment we voted on was the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

We had a conversation yesterday which I thought led to us considering combining this request with the request from Senator CRUZ, and I know we are working on that particular issue. But I understand, and we are trying to process these. I think he knows we are trying to process votes, and the very first one we processed was the one from the Senator from Wisconsin.

I do appreciate his concerns. I think he knows I share his concerns about this agreement. I am trying to get done what is possible. Again, if I could wave a wand and cause the national security waivers that Senator JOHNSON, myself, Senator CARDIN, and others voted for years ago when we put the sanctions in place—if I could wave a wand and those would go away, then we would be in a position where we would actually need to have an affirmative vote.

But I do appreciate his concerns. I think he knows we are trying to work through amendments down here, and I appreciate his patience as we do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I join Senator CORKER. Senator JOHNSON is a very valued member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I enjoy working with him on U.N. issues. The two of us are the Senate representatives to the United Nations this year and I know his passion on these issues, but I just want to underscore a couple points.

Right now, as of last night, there were 66 amendments that had been filed to this bill that came out of the committee 19 to 0. The number of Republican amendments were 66; the number of Democratic amendments were zero.

I point that out because we are trying to maintain the bipartisan cooperation we have had through this process so the Senate can speak with a united voice, because that gives us the strongest possible message as to the congressional role.

I must state, this is a delicate balance how we brought this bill forward. I don't think I am underestimating the surprise we received from our colleagues when they heard there was a 19-to-0 vote in our committee.

There are so many Members who are working with us who have filed amendments—and I thank each one of them—trying to find areas where we, as we worked in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, can find a common spot to be able to advance those amendments. I am optimistic and Senator CORKER is optimistic that we are going to be able to deal with many of the issues the Republican Members have brought up and the amendments they have filed.

But in direct response to Senator JOHNSON, let me point out, the sanctions were imposed by the U.S. Congress, by votes of the House and the Senate, and the signature of the President. What is being negotiated between our negotiating partners, the United States, and Iran, is an agreement—if they are successful, if the deal is struck—that will prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state and will provide, over time, relief from Iran from the international and U.S. sanctions that have been imposed. That is the framework.

We know the sanctions brought them to the table. We all understand that, and we are very proud of the role we played, but it is Congress, and only Congress, that can permanently change or modify that sanctions regime.

We are going to have to act. So I just take exception with Senator JOHNSON's view that we are not going to act. We are going to act because only we can permanently change the regime. But what this bill gives us is an orderly way to consider the congressional review of this agreement or deal when it is finally reached.

I just wish my colleagues would not prejudge this. I have heard so many people say something is going to happen. We don't know what the agreement is going to be. We don't even know if they are going to be able to come in with an agreement, but I will say this about the Obama administration. When they came out with the framework agreement, there were many Members of this Chamber who said Iran will never live up to the commitments in the framework agreement; that they would break out, they would not pull back, as they are committed to doing, and the sanctions regime would not be able to stay in effect. And guess what. A year later they have complied with the framework agreement, and they have in fact—the sanction regime has held tight during this period of time with our negotiating partners.

Do I share many of the concerns of my friend from Wisconsin? I do. I do share those concerns. I am concerned as to whether the agreement will, in fact, be strong enough to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state. That is what we are going to look at in our committee, if we can pass this bill in the same bipartisan manner in which we did in committee—if we can do that, the Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman, the ranking member, all of us in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are going to get all the documents, we are going to have time to review it and be able to answer those questions. The vote we are having on the floor this week is whether we are going to have that opportunity.

I know these amendments are well intended. I understand that. I understand the deep feelings each Member has. But the bottom line, if the amendment my friend is talking about got on the bill, we are not going to get that review, we are not going to have that orderly process. That is the fact.

So I think the debate on the floor is critically important. We have been debating this bill for a week. We started last Thursday, 19-to-0 vote in committee, not a single Democratic amendment. We think it is time to move this bill forward to the United States House of Representatives.

And, yes, Senator CORKER and I are going to accommodate the suggestions that have been made by Members. We are finding a way to do that, and we are going to continue to work that path. But at the end of the day, this is a very serious issue, and I agree completely with Senator GRAHAM and the comments he has made. This is an extremely important issue. It has to rise above our individual desires so, collectively, we can achieve something for the American people. That is what they want us to do. We have it in our grasps.

I applaud the leadership of Senator CORKER. He has to work with all the Republican amendments that have been filed. Believe me, there is a lot of frustration on the Democratic caucus, also as to why this bill is still on the floor and hasn't passed by now. But if we get everybody's patience, I am confident Senator CORKER and I will be

able to work together so we can accommodate the reasonable requests of our Members and get this bill moving to the United States House of Representatives.

But let us maintain the balance that the Senator Foreign Relations Committee did, and let us do what the American people want us to do and that is to listen to each other. We have different views. I understand that. But the way we can reach common ground is to listen to each other and reach a reasonable compromise that doesn't compromise the principles of what we are trying to achieve. That is exactly what the Senate Foreign Relations Committee bill does. I urge my colleagues to exercise some restraint. Let's get this bill to the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I wish to respond to the point frequently made by the supporters of this bill that this is the only way—the only way—that this body, the Congress, the Senate and the House, will receive the details of the deal. What the Senator from Maryland is saying is that this President, our Commander in Chief, will be so brazen, so arrogant as to negotiate and conclude an agreement of such import, of such consequence, and he would then keep it secret from the American people in this Congress. I hope that is not so. But if that is truly the belief, I would be happy to modify my amendment to require that same disclosure of the information of the details of the agreement. I would be happy to do that. I would be happy to work with the other side to do so. But barring that agreement, I am still urging my colleagues and I am urging this body to allow a vote on my amendment, to clarify what this bill is and what it is not. It is not advice and consent. It is the minimum—the minimum—threshold, the minimum involvement, the minimum input on the part of the American people through their elected representatives to pass judgment to approve affirmatively such a consequential agreement with a mere majority of votes of both Chambers of Congress. Is that asking so much?

It is true that we passed this bill out of the Foreign Relations Committee with a unanimous vote, because we were granted assurances. I realize this is a delicate negotiation. I realize our friends on the other side of the aisle simply refuse to have what I consider a minimum involvement.

Again, I appreciate and applaud Senator CORKER for doing a bipartisan agreement, for reaching that agreement. But our understanding was that this would be a completely open amendment process.

The Senator from Maryland points out that there are 66 amendments to 1. Let's start voting on them. We will vote on the one Democratic amendment. Let's start voting on ours. Eventually, we will tire. Eventually, we will have made our points. Eventually, we will convey to the American public what this bill is and what it is not.

Again, let me say, for a final time, what this bill provides. If passed, sure, we get the information which we should get, regardless, but it sets up a process—a very convoluted process—of votes of disapproval which would require 60 votes in this Chamber to pass. We assume it would be vetoed. Then it would require 67 votes in this Chamber to override the veto and two-thirds of a vote in the House to override that veto.

In effect—let me clarify one last time—instead of requiring the bare minimum of an affirmative vote of a majority of Members of both Chambers of Congress, this bill would allow approval of this agreement by a simple majority in the House and only 34 Senators providing that rubber stamp of approval to a bill that could be incredibly consequential and of which we will live with the consequences—the results—for many, many years to come.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, again, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin and appreciate his service and his support of this bill. I agree with him, and I wish it were different than it is. The fact is that we will have a right to vote whether to approve or disapprove the lifting in the normal way, but that will occur 4 or 5 years down the road. I think most of us want to weigh in now before the sanctions regime totally dissipates.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business in order to introduce a bill.

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

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1141 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 1140 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk, one for my own and one on behalf of Senator RUBIO of Florida.

Mr. President, I have said time and again——

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, has there been a unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The quorum call has been vitiated.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have said time and again that a nuclear-armed Iran is the greatest threat this country faces. I have said time and again that the Senate needs to have votes on the merits of this agreement.

The President has taken us down a very dangerous path. The President has backtracked on his own words. He said that Iran needed to live up to all of its obligations under international law. Yet Iran still has not disclosed the past military dimensions of its nuclear program.

The President said, after this negotiating process began in December of 2013, that Iran has no need for a fortified underground military bunker in Fordow. Yet our negotiators have conceded the existence, with centrifuge cascades, of that underground military bunker.

The President has said we have to have fully verifiable, anywhere, anytime access to all sites in Iran to ensure they are not cheating on any agreement—to include their military sites. Yet the leaders of Iran continue to say that we won't be able to access their military sites. There will be no intrusive inspections.

I and the Senator from Florida, as well as many other Senators, have submitted multiple amendments to ask for votes on these points. We have been consistently blocked from bringing up these amendments for a vote.

It is fine if you want to vote no. If you think Iran should keep an underground fortified military bunker with centrifuge cascades. It is fine if you don't think they should have to disclose the past military dimensions of their nuclear program, but we need to vote. We need to vote now.

It is even fine if you agree with those points and that you think this is a delicate agreement that has to be prevented from being amended in any way. But we need to vote.

If you don't want to vote, you shouldn't have come to the Senate. If you are in the Senate and you don't want to vote, you should leave. As the Senator from Florida said yesterday, be a talk show host, be a columnist. It is time we have a vote at a simple majority threshold on all of these critical points.

We are talking about a nuclear Iran, the most dangerous threat to our national security.

So the amendment I am offering first would simply take the language of the bill that came out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and add those three points. First, that Iran shouldn't keep its nuclear facility before it gets sanctions relief; that Iran can't get sanctions relief until they disclose the past military dimensions of their nuclear program. They can't get sanctions relief until they accept a fully verifiable inspections regime.

We deserve a vote on this.

AMENDMENT NO. 1197

(Purpose: Amendment of a perfecting nature)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1197 at the desk to the text proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. COTTON] proposes an amendment numbered 1197 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140.

Mr. COTTON. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 1198 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1197

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I also call up for Senator RUBIO a second-degree amendment, amendment No. 1198 to amendment No. 1197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. COTTON], for Mr. RUBIO, proposes an amendment numbered 1198 to amendment No. 1197.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a certification that Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state)

On page 3, line 20, of the amendment, strike ''purpose.'' and insert the following: ''purpose; and

''(iii) the President determines Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, again, these amendments would do two very simple things: First, they would require a vote on whether Iran should get sanctions relief before it discloses past military dimensions of its nuclear program, before it closes its underground fortified bunker at Fordow, and before it submits to a fully verifiable, anytime, anywhere, no-notice inspections regime. Second, they would require Iran to acknowledge Israel's right to exist as a Jewish democratic state before they get nuclear weapons because they continue to say that Israel would be wiped off the map, and if they get nuclear weapons, they will have the means to do so.

It is my intent to insist upon a recorded vote on these amendments at a simple-majority threshold. The Senate needs to vote. If you disagree with these policies, vote no. If you agree with these policies and you think this will upset a delicate compromise, then vote no and explain that. But we need to vote, and we should start voting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me point out a couple things. There are now 67 amendments, all of which have been filed by Republicans, none by Democrats.

This bill passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 19 to 0. Senator CORKER and I have been working with Republicans who have filed amendments to try to accommodate them, and we have been making progress. We have been trying to schedule additional votes. I thank Senator CORKER and those who are cooperating with us in a way that we can try to move this bill forward.

We are prepared to have votes, but I think some of the tactics that are now being deployed are going to make it much more difficult for us to be able to proceed in an orderly way. It is every Member's right to take whatever actions they want to take, but I want to tell you that for those of us who want to get this bill to the finish line, it gets a little frustrating.

We will continue to focus on a way forward on this legislation. But I want to make it clear that we have been prepared to find an orderly way to proceed with votes and to deal with the issues Members have been concerned about, but at times it becomes difficult with the procedures that are being used.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member and the ranking member's staff. I thank the minority leader's office for working with us on what was going to be a series of votes, tough votes. I have a sense that the context of this has just changed, and I regret that.

I have been working with numbers of Senators on some really controversial votes that we were willing to make, as we already have. As a matter of fact, the only two votes we have had thus far were considered poison pill votes. My friend from Maryland was willing to have more poison pill votes—if you want to call them that—tough votes, but I sense the context of this may have just changed.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, let's talk about poison pill amendments. I would say these aren't poison pills; these are vitamin pills. They are designed to strengthen this legislation and to strengthen the U.S. negotiating position.

Who could object that Israel has a right to exist as a Jewish state and that Iran should not be allowed a nuclear weapon if they won't recognize that right? The President himself said they should close their underground fortified military bunker before they get sanctions relief. We are simply asking for a vote on what the President himself has said.

If the Senator from Maryland wants to talk about procedural tactics, let's be perfectly clear what has happened here. The very first amendment brought to the floor on this bill was designed to stop any other amendments from being offered.

For those of you watching, you should know that the only thing that amendment says is that any final agreement must be submitted in Farsi as well as English. That is a noncontroversial proposal which I am sure we could adopt by voice vote and move on in an orderly fashion to any other amendments. Yet, they continue to object to unanimous consent to bring up any other amendments, designed to stop the Senate from having to cast these votes.

The amendments we have offered are no more of a procedural tactic than what the Senator from Maryland himself is doing—an amendment that could have been offered in committee, an amendment that could have been voted on easily on Tuesday when it was offered but is being used to block consideration of any other amendment.

These are not tough votes. These should be easy votes. Again, if you want to vote no, vote no. If you want to vote no and say it is designed to protect a compromise, do that. But we should be voting.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I know the Senator from Arkansas knows I have no issue with taking tough votes, and I would take them all day long.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, under the previous order, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the veto message.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

(The text of the President's veto message is printed on page 4750 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, 2015.)

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the joint resolution.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment that I plan to submit. It is amendment No. 1173. It is my intention to work with the managers of the Iran bill to get this amendment filed and voted on soon. What I wanted to do is to talk about this amendment for a little bit.

I want to begin by complimenting Senator CORKER, Senator CARDIN, and others who have worked hard on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. It is a good start to a critically important issue for all of us and for the American people. The amendment that I am proposing and that I am offering today will make that bill stronger, will give leverage to our negotiators, and will make our country more secure. That is our No. 1 priority. That is what this amendment will help us do.

The simple question this amendment proposes is this. Should the United States—our government, we, this body—allow sanctions to be lifted on a country that our own State Department has designated a state sponsor of terrorism? It is a simple, straightforward question.

In my view, the answer is also simple. The answer is no. Sanctions should not be lifted on a state sponsor of terrorism, especially one with a track record like Iran.

My amendment requires the President of the United States to declare that Iran is no longer a sponsor of state terrorism before lifting sanctions and allowing billions of dollars to flood into that country's economy. It is that simple. We should not allow, facilitate or encourage billions of dollars to go to a country that sponsors terrorism, because I fear that we have been inured to the issue of state sponsor of terrorism. I would like to focus on what that means a little bit.

Let's first start with the states that are on the list: Yemen, Syria, Sudan, Iran. These countries are all on the list because governments in each state facilitate international terrorism. We are not talking about rogue elements within a country that are killing people within their own borders. We are talking about governments themselves, the bodies in charge of a country, the bodies making and enforcing a country's laws, supporting acts of international terrorism, including against our own citizens.

Why is Iran on the list? Since its founding in 1979, the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the government have been sponsoring terrorism. In fact, our State Department has called Iran the world's most active sponsor of terrorism. Since 1979, Iran has been responsible for taking American hostages, for bombing our and our allies' embassies, and for horrible acts of murder across the globe.

Here is the key point. It has not stopped. According to the State Department, Iran continues to support terrorism—Palestinian terrorist groups—and is actively fostering instability throughout the Middle East right now, today. Last month, March 2015, a U.S. Federal judge found Iran complicit in the 2000 bombing of the USS *Cole*, the deadliest attack on a U.S. Navy vessel since 1987.

Let's talk about Iran's involvement in Iraq. I am a Marine Corps Reserve officer. In 2005, I was recalled to Active Duty for a year and a half, serving as a staff officer to the commanding general of the U.S. Central Command, John Abizaid. During that time, I deployed to many parts of the CENTCOM area of responsibility. One of the biggest concerns—perhaps the biggest concern—that we saw in Iraq during that time was the increasing threat to our troops of improvised explosive devices, especially what was referred to as explosively formed projectiles, EFPs, the most deadly and sophisticated IEDs on the battlefield.

Almost every time I was in Iraq with General Abizaid, he and his staff were briefed on the details of this threat, showing captured weapons systems, the twisted, charred remains of military vehicles that had been hit by EFPs. Those EFPs killed more American troops per attack than any other roadside bombs. They blasted through tanks, humvees or anything they hit. They were deadly. They killed and maimed thousands of our troops.

I still remember the courage and trepidation I saw in the eyes of our brave military members who had to face this threat on a daily basis, even some members of this body. To this day, I deeply distrust the leadership of the regime that was responsible for these EFPs.

Make no mistake, that country was Iran. That much was confirmed by our intelligence agencies and the State Department. But Iran has never taken responsibility for these deaths, and it has not said that it will stop this kind of terrorism.

Let me provide an example. In 2007, CENTCOM and intelligence officials provided very detailed briefings on the fact that these EFPs were coming from Iran. At the same time, Iran's U.N. Ambassador wrote an op-ed in the New York Times and said that such charges and evidence were being fabricated by the United States. That was the U.N. Ambassador from Iran, Ambassador Zarif. In that op-ed he was telling a lie to the American people.

Why is that important? He is now the Foreign Minister of Iran. He is now in charge of negotiating this nuclear deal. He is certainly not a trustworthy man.

If sanctions are lifted, billions of dollars are going to flow from companies and banks from around the world to the economy and government of Iran. They are going to invest in businesses. They are going to invest in the oil and gas sector. They are going to invest in banks.

What will the Iranian leadership likely do with that money? Do we trust them to invest in schools and infrastructure and health clinics so they can provide their citizens better lives?

Let's use history as our guide. Everything about that country's leadership and everything about that country's history tells us that that money—billions—is likely to be used to pump up their terror machine around the world and target American citizens.

I know what we have heard from the administration: Do not worry. If there is a violation of this agreement, these sanctions will snap back into place. They will snap back—no problem, piece of cake.

After serving on Active Duty for that time I mentioned, I served as a U.S. Assistant Secretary of State. I helped lead the effort in the Bush Administration to isolate economically Iran, to go

to our allies and say you have to divest out of the Iranian oil and gas sector, the Iranian financial sector.

There was no snap here. This was a slog. It took years to get companies to divest. Yet now this administration is talking that we will snap back. No problem, we will divest in a couple of days. It is a fantasy. The Administration knows it. They should stop using the term ''snapback'' because it is not accurate. It is not accurate.

What is the alternative? The alternative is simple. Before lifting sanctions on Iran, Iran needs to take the steps to get off the list of countries that sponsor terrorism around the world. These are not insurmountable steps. These would include having a clear record for 6 months. That is it, 6 months—not decades, not years—6 months of not sponsoring state terrorism.

It would also require Iran to renounce terrorism. Simple, don't engage in terrorism. Do not try to kill our citizens or the citizens of our allies. Do not send your forces around the world to blow things up or take hostages. Then we will consider lifting the sanctions. You do not have to be our ally. You do not have to like us. We do not have to like you. You do not have to change even the structure of your government. You just should not target our citizens for murder the way you are doing now as one of the biggest—the biggest—state sponsors of terrorism in the world.

It has been said that such a requirement and an amendment such as this would be a poison pill, meaning that if this amendment is added to the Corker-Menendez bill, it will somehow signify the death of the bill. I have thought long and hard about that. Do I want to be a Member of this body who introduces a poison pill? Am I being unreasonable with this amendment?

What I came to is this. It is our job—the most important job we have in this body—to do everything we can to keep our citizens safe and to enact good policy. Sometimes that means taking difficult positions, and sometimes it means taking very reasonable positions, even though the political process might make it seem as if this were a complicated and difficult issue. This is not complicated. This is not difficult. This amendment is a simple amendment. It is not difficult.

I wish to conclude with the question I began with. Is it good policy for the United States of America to allow or even encourage countries and corporations to do business with a state sponsor of terrorism, particularly one that has a history of targeting and killing our citizens? Is that good policy?

I believe the vast majority of the American people—Democrat, Republican, any State in the Union—would say no, that is not good policy. I believe that if the question were posed directly to the American people, they would not consider this some kind of poison pill. They might even consider this some kind of vitamin pill, one that will make us stronger. It is a supplement to strengthen our negotiators' position.

Right now there is confusion. It is in the press. The Iranians are saying we have a deal that lifts sanctions immediately. The President has said no, that is not necessarily clear. We have to be creative on how this is going to happen.

This amendment will give the President and Secretary Kerry the leverage to solve this critical issue, one that the President and the Secretary of State should use and welcome to strengthen our position in the negotiations and not view it as some kind of poison pill.

Again, it is a simple amendment. Before sanctions are lifted, the President and the State Department need to make sure Iran is off the list of states that sponsor terrorism. Iran could take the simple steps to make that possible and the world would be a much safer place.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

FDA TOBACCO DEEMING REGULATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, a number of my colleagues came to the floor yesterday to speak about the FDA's failure to release the tobacco deeming rule and the delays that have occurred with respect to that rule.

As difficult as the American people may find it to understand why there are these delays in issuing a rule that protects our citizens against tobacco use—most particularly our children—we should all understand that these rules have real-life consequences.

Tobacco, in fact, is the leading cause of preventable death. In this Nation, tobacco use kills more than half a million people every year. Most smokers and tobacco users begin as children, many under the age of 10. Each day, more than 3,200 people younger than 18 years old smoke their first cigarette, and the consequences are inevitable. Thousands of them will die early in life.

Cigarettes are the only product in the world that, when used as the manufacturer intends it, kills the customer. If smoking continues at the current rate among U.S. youth, 5.6 million of them are expected to die prematurely from smoking-related illness.

Tobacco use is a path to addiction and disease, and it is a public health epidemic. Yet laws that protect the public, laws that forbid marketing to children, laws that are designed to uphold the public trust have been unimplemented.

My fight against Big Tobacco began in the 1990s, when I was attorney general of the State of Connecticut. I helped to lead a lawsuit against tobacco companies for marketing to children. We succeeded in restricting tobacco companies from selling to and targeting children in their ads through sporting events, magazines, and point of sale methods. We helped reimburse the States for the enormous amount of taxpayer dollars spent on tobacco-related diseases, and those payments continue today. They are supposed to be used for prevention and cessation activities, but unfortunately and tragically, much of that money is now used to fill gaps in State budgets.

I have continued my fight against the tobacco companies in the Senate, alongside dedicated colleagues such as Senator MERKLEY and Senator DURBIN, who spoke yesterday, in urging the FDA to seek relief, to strive to do its job with the tobacco deeming rule in order to protect children and families from tobacco.

The Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act of 2009 gave the FDA significant power and responsibility to achieve this goal. Now it is the FDA's responsibility to implement that law to prevent young people from becoming nicotine addicts, damaging their health, risking their lives, and costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions—in fact, billions—of dollars.

Six years have passed since that law was passed. The FDA has yet to implement it, and the reason is that it has yet to issue those regulations. It wasn't until last year, April 2014—5 years after the measure passed—that the FDA took the first step, issuing draft regulations known as the deeming rule that would formalize this authority. The rule would allow the FDA to control the regulation and sale—in particular, the sale to minors—of e-cigarettes, as well as dangerous combustible products, such as hookah, pipe tobacco, and cigars.

This past Saturday, April 25, was the 1-year anniversary of the release of the proposed rule. Over the past year, youth use of unregulated tobacco products, such as e-cigarettes and the hookah, has skyrocketed. E-cigarette use has tripled among 11- to 18-year-olds, while hookah use has almost doubled.

There is clear data, absolutely irrefutable evidence that the rate of use of these products has increased even as

some of the use of tobacco products has diminished, and this chart illustrates that evidence. It indicates that use of the regulated products has diminished, while use of unregulated products has increased. So laws work. Rules have an effect. People can be saved from addiction and disease. And these products—cigars, pipes, hookahs, e-cigarettes—lead to tobacco use in cigarettes and addiction to nicotine. They create the same kind of public health menace that tobacco products do.

We know that nicotine addiction is surging through e-cigarette use, which is a disastrous tribute to the ingenuity of Big Tobacco. In fact, many of the big tobacco companies have bought the e-cigarette companies because they know they can use the e-cigarettes as a gateway nicotine-delivery device, addicting children so that they will then shift to cigarette tobacco.

I am joining my colleagues in urging that the FDA act as quickly as possible to implement these rules, to finalize the regulations, to get them out of the regulatory apparatus, the morass in which they are now trapped, and make sure that our children and our citizens are protected against the marketing and other abuses that are involved in the current sale of these nicotine-delivery devices marketed to children.

I am also proud to be introducing today a new measure, the Tobacco Tax and Enforcement Reform Act, which is supported by Senators DURBIN, REED, and BOXER. I am very grateful to them for their leadership not only on this measure but over many years in fighting this battle against nicotine addiction and tobacco use.

Congress has a continuing responsibility to combat cigarette smoking directly. Right now, there are a number of areas where loopholes and gaps exist in the enforcement structure. We need to do more to fight illegal tobacco trafficking. We need to eliminate the tax disparities between different tobacco products. These gaps in our laws and law enforcement failures create opportunities and incentives for violations of those laws, at great cost to the State with regard to illegal trafficking.

Similar to the changes outlined in the President's budget proposal, this bill would also increase the Federal tax rate on tobacco products. In fact, these reforms would help the Federal Government and States collect nearly $100 billion at a time when our States are strapped fiscally and our Federal Government needs that revenue as well. These revenues would not only reduce tobacco consumption, they would also aid the fiscal well-being of our State and local governments.

Most importantly from the standpoint of law enforcement, it would force criminals who engage in illegal trafficking to comply with the law. It would combat those criminals who profit from the illegal sale of these products and trafficking across State lines, who are selling illicitly and gaining huge numbers of dollars from that legal noncompliance.

Economic research confirms that raising the price of tobacco reduces use among young people, who are particularly sensitive to pricing. They are sensitive to price increases because they have less disposable income and know they have fewer dollars to spend. They are more price-sensitive. In fact, every 10 percent increase in the real price of cigarettes will reduce the prevalence of adult smoking by 5 percent and youth smoking by 7 percent. Adults are price-sensitive, too. Increasing the cost of cigarettes makes people more likely to want to quit and to pursue tobacco cessation, to break the nicotine habit and seek help through quit lines, the nicotine patch, and other pharmaceutical measures.

The current tobacco tax code has many loopholes that enable even the least creative manufacturers to exploit them and incentivizes many manufacturers to manipulate products so they can be classified in a lower tax category. These tax incentives and loopholes not only sharply reduce Federal revenues, but they increase the overall use of tobacco and tobacco-related harms. Eliminating these tax disparities, along with the price, is one of the goals of the measure I am introducing today. By taxing all products at the same level as cigarettes, we can make progress against nicotine addiction and the illnesses and diseases associated with tobacco use.

The increase in tax rate on cigarettes by 94 percent per pack and setting the rates for other tobacco products to an equivalent amount would help people who are now addicted and would also help America because at the end of the day the real cost of cigarettes is not only to people who are addicted and who endure the suffering and the pain of cancer, lung disease, and heart problems, it is to their families and to all taxpayers. All of us—literally, all of us—pay for the diseases that result from tobacco use through our insurance policies and through Medicare and Medicaid. We are the ones who bear the financial burden.

Due to these current tax inequities, the GAO has projected $615 million to $1.1 billion in losses to Federal tax revenue right now, and tobacco-related health problems cost the country almost $170 billion a year in direct medical costs. We can save money and save lives through this measure. I hope my colleagues will support it.

Every day that goes by without FDA regulation harms children. It hurts people who become addicted. It hurts all of America. Every day that tax disparities exist, every day that illegal trafficking continues is a day when America pays in the casualties, human suffering, loss of productivity, and loss of revenue.

I hope my colleagues will support these efforts.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Thank you, Madam President.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

I rise today to discuss the negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program. Many of my colleagues have spoken at length about some of their concerns, which I share. Today, however, I would like to discuss my concern about the administration's increasing reliance on the idea that sanctions can be snapped back into place in the event that Iran violates an agreement.

In its press release on the framework agreed upon earlier this month, the White House stated:

> If at any time Iran fails to fulfill its commitments, these sanctions will snap back into place.

On April 11, 2015, President Obama stated:

> We are preserving the capacity to snap back sanctions in the event they are breaking any deal. . . . And if . . . we don't have the capacity to snap back sanctions when we see a potential violation, then we're probably not going to get a deal.

A week later, at a press conference with the Italian Prime Minister, President Obama played down the question of whether Iran would receive immediate sanctions relief and insisted snapback provisions were more important. He said:

> Our main concern here is making sure that if Iran doesn't abide by its agreement, that we don't have to jump through a whole bunch of hoops in order to reinstate sanctions. That is our main concern.

I agree with President Obama's goal. Who wouldn't want harsh measures reinstated the moment Iran fails to comply with this agreement? The problem is that reality is far more complicated than the simple phrase ''snapback'' suggests.

In a Washington Post column last week, former CIA Director Michael Hayden, former Deputy Director General of the IAEA Olli Heinonen, and Middle East expert Dr. Ray Takeyh laid out the long and circuitous path that any action to reinstate sanctions on Iran would have to take. Their conclusion? That it could take an entire year or even longer to simply confirm that Iran has actually violated its obligations and navigate the bureaucratic process necessary to restore the sanctions on Iran.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal by Henry Kissinger and George Shultz made a similar point. In it, they write:

> Restoring the most effective sanctions would require coordinated international action. In countries that had reluctantly joined in previous rounds, the demands of public and commercial opinion will militate

against automatic or even prompt ''snapback.''

Some may argue that past history is irrelevant and that the negotiations will produce a new process, allowing for a quick restoration of the sanctions regime. Such a process would still be far from automatic since significant time would be required to confirm Iran's violation, but recent comments by Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov made clear that this idea is not in the cards. Speaking last week on the idea of snapping back sanctions, he stated: ''This process should not in any way be automatic.'' He went on to say that decisions on this matter should be taken in accordance with the procedures of the U.N. Security Council through voting in the Council and through the adoption of the appropriate resolutions. We must also bear in mind that sanctions take time to have effect.

The United States has had sanctions on Iran since 1979. One could argue that the heavy sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table—they began back in 2010. But even in that case it took years to create enough economic pressure for Iran to even sit down with negotiators. The idea that we will be able to swiftly reimpose sanctions and that those sanctions are going to swiftly cripple the Iranian economy and that they are going to force Iran to change its behavior—I believe that is simply implausible.

The point is the practical reality of this issue is much more complicated than the talking points suggest. To me, this underscores the importance of getting a good deal with Iran. It demonstrates why a bad deal is so much worse than no deal at all. It took many years to build the global sanctions regime that brought Iran to the negotiating table. The fact is that it can be dismantled much faster than it can be rebuilt.

We cannot afford to overlook key provisions or pretend that the precise terms of this agreement are of lesser importance. Of all the tools we can use to influence Iran, sanctions relief is the most important. It should only be provided as part of a deal that is clearly in American interests. The security of our country, our families, and the possibility of a nuclear Middle East hangs in the balance.

There will be no simple snapback if this agreement does not hold. We need to be honest with the American people and not rely on unrealistic notions to justify any deal with them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak for a few minutes on the bill we are debating to provide some congressional oversight over a potential—though not yet signed—deal with Iran.

I wish to start simply with what we all agree on. We all agree we need to do whatever we can to ensure that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. I have no doubt that 100 Members of the Senate would agree with that proposition. That is our guiding principle, and it should be our North Star. We may disagree on the best way to achieve a nuclear weapons-free Iran, but we can all agree on our goal.

So how do we get there is the question we are debating. I happen to be a member of the camp who believes our best hope of achieving this goal is through diplomacy, through a negotiated settlement that dramatically rolls back Iran's nuclear program in a transparent and verifiable way. While our negotiations still have a long way to go to get to that agreement, we are closer now than we have been in decades.

I, and many of my colleagues, strongly believe we should give our negotiators the space to do their jobs and to see if a deal is ultimately possible.

That is really what this bill does. It postpones a congressional vote on these negotiations, appropriately, until the negotiations are finished. That makes sense, right? There is no use on voting on a deal when we don't have a deal. And then it sets up time constraints for Congress's review of that potential deal, basically, about 30 days. That is a reasonable period of time for us to debate the agreement, and, if there is one, there is some certainty over our process to those who are at the negotiating table.

The President's critics seem to fall into two often overlapping camps. One strain of argument holds that this framework agreement we have right now is just too weak and that our side should walk away from the table, reimpose sanctions, and hold out for a better deal.

The second strain of argument—evidenced, frankly, by many of the amendments that have been filed to the underlying bill—holds that our negotiations shouldn't be just about Iran's nuclear program, that we should also be negotiating over all of the other bad things Iran does and supports.

Now, I don't think it is worth getting into a defense of a framework today since we are months away from a final deal. But to my mind, if the final deal does look demonstrably like the framework, we would be fools to reject it. Does it allow Iran to do nuclear research? Yes, it does. Does it allow them to keep some centrifuges? Yes. But anybody who thought we were going to sign a deal that would effectively be an unconditional surrender was living in a fantasyland. The framework accomplishes our goal of protecting Israel, the region, and the United States from a quick nuclear breakout. The plutonium pathway at Arak is ended. Their enriched stores basically go down to zero. Fordow and Natanz stay open, but they can no longer do substantial enrichment, and they are going to have international scientists and inspectors crawling all over their capacity. Inspections, on the entire nuclear supply chain, will be at a scale that is totally, completely unprecedented in the history of the nuclear age.

It is a good framework. But even if you don't believe this, I just think it belies common sense to think that walking away from the table now would get you a better deal. Yes, we could reinstitute sanctions, the United States could. Perhaps some of our partners would go along, but they would be weaker than before because lots of countries that think this is a good framework wouldn't go along with this. Just look at what Russia and China have announced in the past few weeks. They basically have telegraphed that they are looking to do business with the Iranians, notwithstanding what happens at the negotiating table. We know what happens when we apply weak sanctions against Iran, alongside a policy of isolating. They get stronger.

How do we know this? Because in 2002 we had a chance to cap Iran's centrifuges at a few hundred. Instead, after years of relatively weak sanctions and international isolation, Iran built 20,000 centrifuges and put in place a secret nuclear facility.

Now, our most recent round of tough international sanctions—in part because of the policies of this Congress—worked to get to the table, to the negotiating table, but only because there was a credible offer of a negotiated solution. We know exactly what happens, what sanctions and isolation get us, because we tried it for years. It gets us 20,000 centrifuges, no international inspections, and an increasingly hardline and inward-looking regime.

This last point and result is important because the people of Iran actually don't think like their Supreme Leader. His grasp on power isn't absolute, in large part because Iranians are much more moderate, much more internationalist, and much more pro-American than their leader, generally.

Khamenei knows this, and that is why, when Iranian voters elected a moderate, Western-oriented President, the Supreme Leader allowed his team the space to negotiate this framework.

Now, no one can be certain, but it is certainly plausible to believe that moderate forces inside Iran are winning and that our policy toward Iran

should consider whether our actions help the moderates or help the hard-liners. We don't want another hard-line administration, but we are going to get one if we walk away from these negotiations now, when thousands of Iranians are cheering the opening of relations with the West. If we walk away, moderate voters are going to feel abandoned. Hard-liners will be proven right. The two groups will be merged. Politics inside Iran will shift inward and extreme again. For all of my Republican colleagues who were so forceful in their criticism of the administration, saying President Obama didn't do enough to support the Green Revolution, you would do far more damage to this cause by ending reformers' hopes of rapprochement with the West right now.

Now, for the second argument—that we should settle all of our grievances with Iran in one fell swoop right now, that this agreement is somehow illegitimate unless Iran renounces Hamas and Hezbollah, unless they get right with Israel, unless they end their other nonnuclear weapons programs, unless they release political prisoners, and so on and so on.

First, there is not a single person here who agrees with Iran's support for terrorism or its inflammatory rhetoric toward Israel. No one is pleased with the Iranian regime's record on human rights or its funding of Hezbollah.

But let's agree that an Iran that pursues these policies and has a nuclear weapon is a far worse outcome, one that should be avoided at all costs. The truth is that adding these issues into the nuclear agreement would mean no deal is possible.

In America, we are strong enough to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We can negotiate with an enemy or adversary on one issue and reserve the right to fight another day or simultaneously on other issues. For evidence of this, I would ask my Republican friends to simply look to their great, romanticized hero, President Ronald Reagan. When he was negotiating a nuclear weapons deal with the Soviet Union, he did not simultaneously try to address the USSR's support for proxies in Central America or the Middle East or their provocative naval activities in the Pacific Ocean, he knew that by taking one issue off the table it would make America and the world safer, even if it didn't address all of our grievances at once. He knew if he did put everything on the table all at once, then there would be no progress.

Just as a little kid can't eat a hot dog all in one bite no matter how hard he tries, we all have to make progress one bite at a time. That is often how life and, in fact, negotiations tend to work.

So I hope my colleagues will oppose these well-meaning amendments that are being offered. They have laudable goals, but in the real world they are simply unrealistic within the confines of these negotiations, and they will have the effect of killing the deal entirely.

On a broader scale, I hope when this debate is done, we can also ask ourselves some bigger questions. Diplomacy is power. It is not weakness. Talking to your enemies has been part of our national security toolbox for as long as we have existed as a nation.

This country is tired. It is weary of war for good reason. Ten years of conflict in Iraq didn't make us any safer, and a lot of people—heroes—died in the process.

But when we spend all of this time—the majority of this Congress—engaged in detailed oversight over the President's diplomatic endeavors and absolutely no time engaged in detailed oversight over a war in Iraq and Syria that is still, months and months later, unauthorized and extraconstitutional, then we send a bad message to America and to the rest of the world. We seem to have a developing double standard when it comes to oversight. We are all over the President when he talks to our adversaries, but we stand down when he fights them—lots of oversight over peace, very little over war.

That is not where the American people are. They want their President to take extraordinary steps to avoid war. They don't want us to get dragged back into a ground war in the Middle East.

I am supporting this bill today because I will be first in line to reassert Congress's power to set foreign policy right alongside the President, but I don't support Congress sending a message that diplomacy is somehow more worthy of rigorous oversight than military action.

I don't think this is where the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is coming from, but there are certainly some Members of his caucus who view power solely through a military lens. That is dangerous because, as we saw in Iraq, large-scale military operations kill a lot of terrorists, they kill a lot of bad guys, but they often create two for every one they kill.

In the end, it is nonkinetic intervention that solves extremism, building inclusive governments, lifting people out of destitution and poverty, countering radical propaganda, and showing an America that backs up all of its talk about American civil liberties with action.

I am so thankful to Chairman CORKER for taking the time to work on this bill with Senator CARDIN, Senator MENENDEZ, and others to make it something we can truly rally around today. That takes guts to show patience, to give ground, and to talk to people whom you don't agree with.

It is actually diplomacy that wins the day here more often than not. It is our guiding value as a body, as an institution. It is what makes this place work when it works, and we are best when we recognize that the value of diplomacy and the results we get from it do not expire at the edges of this Chamber.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we are finally seeing the Senate do what we were elected to do, and that is the people's work. I am glad to see there have been some reports in the press saying the 114th Congress and the new majority are actually following through and keeping our promises by passing important legislation that helps make the American people's lives just a little bit better.

One of the actions we have taken is the House and the Senate have now met in a conference committee to agree on a budget. This is, unfortunately, an unusual event in recent history. It was 2009 when the last budget was passed by the U.S. Congress. That is a little embarrassing. It is actually very embarrassing. It is a scandal, really. But now we are finally getting back on track. I am glad to report, as the Presiding Officer knows, that this is a budget that balances in roughly 9 years. I wish it were sooner, but that is what it is. There are no tax increases. It also meets our obligation to keep the country safe and the American people secure by plussing up some of the defense accounts, which I believe is important. All of our colleagues on our side of the aisle believe this should be our No. 1 priority. There are some things that only the Federal Government can do, and national security is at the very top of that list.

So we will have a vote—perhaps as early as next Tuesday—on the budget conference report.

UNITED STATES-JAPAN ALLIANCE AND TRADE

Mr. President, yesterday, we had a joint meeting of Congress, and we heard from the leader of one of America's greatest allies, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe of Japan. I had a chance to meet the Prime Minister briefly before his comments, and I told him: Mr. Prime Minister, I actually graduated from high school in Japan. My dad was in the U.S. Air Force and was stationed at Tachikawa Air Force Base, and that is where I attended my senior year in high school.

It was an honor for all of us to listen to the Prime Minister. As were many of my colleagues, I was very encouraged to hear about his unwavering support for the U.S.-Japan alliance. This

is one of the most important alliances the United States has in the world.

The Prime Minister spent a good amount of time talking about our shared values. He noted our mutual and unflinching commitment to democracy and freedom and our common goal of peace and prosperity.

One of the issues I was particularly glad to hear the Prime Minister speak about was the shared values of freedom and democracy and why the Trans-Pacific Partnership is so important not just to the United States, not just to Japan, but to all, I believe, 12 different countries that are negotiating this important trade agreement.

I couldn't agree more about the importance of trade. Texas is the No. 1 exporting State in the Nation, and that is one of the reasons we are doing relatively well compared to the rest of the country economically. I know the Presiding Officer comes from an oil-producing and gas-producing State that is booming as well. But one of the reasons my State is doing so well is because we figured out that the more people we can sell goods and services to that we grow or we raise or we make, the more jobs we have at home, the better our economy is, and the better our people are.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership fits right into that formulation because the United States occupies roughly 5 percent of the planet and we represent about 20 percent of the purchasing power of the planet. So that should tell us that 80 percent of the purchasing power lies outside and beyond our shores, and why in the world wouldn't we want to trade with those other countries and sell goods and services to consumers in Japan and all around the world, including the region of Asia on which the Pacific partnership is particularly focused?

The Prime Minister eloquently articulated that the Trans-Pacific Partnership promotes the spread of our values by reducing economic barriers. It has been observed by smarter people than I that countries that actually trade together are much less likely to go to war against each other. That just seems to be the way it works. And the more people we can improve our economic ties to around the world—it improves not only prosperity, it also improves the peace.

Prime Minister Abe understands how important this agreement is not only for the 12 nations that make up the TPP but for the entire global economy. This is at least in part because the 12 Asia-Pacific countries involved in the partnership make up 40 percent of the world economy. Thankfully, the Prime Minister assured us that he will continue to work with the United States to ensure the success of these negotiations.

In a short time—perhaps maybe next week or the week after—we will have an opportunity to take up trade promotion authority. This is congressionally conferred authority to the executive branch to engage in negotiations and sets the parameters for those negotiations—very clear congressional direction for the President's negotiators, including Ambassador Froman, in negotiating this Trans-Pacific Partnership. Once the negotiations are concluded, then it will have to lie in public for up to 60 days, I believe the timeframe is, so the American people can read it, to be completely transparent, and I think that is a very important part of the process.

I would be remiss, as I suggested earlier, if I did not point out the important role of trade not only to the United States but also to my State of Texas. About $1.5 trillion of GDP is attributable to the State of Texas. If we were an independent nation—which we once were for 9 years; from independence to the time we were annexed to the United States in 1845—if we were still an independent nation, we would represent the 12th largest economy in the world. It would put us ahead of even robust economies such as those in Mexico and South Korea. It is primarily because of the role of exports.

Energy is an incredibly important part of our economy, but it is not all of our economy. If we could do what the Presiding Officer and others have advocated, which is to accelerate the export of liquefied natural gas and perhaps reconsider the ban on exporting crude under some appropriate circumstances, I think we could do even better.

According to a report released earlier this month by the Department of Commerce and the U.S. Trade Representative, Texas was far and away the leader of goods exported in 2014, with $289 billion of goods exported—$289 billion. So, not to brag—well, Texans have been known to brag a little bit—but just to state the facts—let me put it that way. The State of California—the State with the second most goods exported by value—exported a sizable $174 billion worth. Now, that is a lot, $174 billion for California, but it is still $115 billion less than the No. 1 State of Texas. The same report revealed that Texas also boasts some 41,000 companies—many small- and medium-sized businesses—that export goods globally.

For years, this impressive amount of trade has helped our economy continue to grow, while providing jobs for Texans across the State. In fact, more than 1 million jobs in Texas are supported by global exports. So why wouldn't we want to do more and create more jobs and more prosperity and more opportunity?

I agree with Prime Minister Abe that the Trans-Pacific Partnership deal is vitally important to the United States, particularly at a time, as we learned—I guess it was yesterday, maybe the day before—that the gross domestic product of the United States had grown by an anemic .2 percent in the last quarter, essentially saying our economy has flatlined. That is dangerous, and it is also painful for the families of people who are out of work or who are looking for work or those who have simply dropped out of the workforce. We need to do better by growing our economy and creating those jobs so people can find work and provide for their families.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would help Texas businesses. It would also help our farmers and ranchers, both big and small. Obviously, the agricultural exports and particularly the beef and poultry and pork exports to a country such as Japan would be very important.

As the President said the other day, if we don't enter into this Trans-Pacific Partnership deal where we will be setting the rules, along with these 12 countries—if we don't do this, what will happen is that China will, in essence, be setting the rules for Asia. That is a circumstance we should not sit by and let happen.

Increasing trade in the region will also provide a way forward for 21st-century industries that have made a home in Texas, including electronics and machinery. We are not as well known for electronics manufacturing and machinery as we are for the energy business or farming and ranching and agriculture. But, importantly, as Prime Minister Abe mentioned yesterday, the TPP goes far beyond just economic benefits; it also provides the United States an opportunity for greater influence in the region and in the process promotes not only prosperity, as I said earlier, but also stability and security.

Just last week, the Dallas Morning News made this point well by saying that TPP is ''not just about exports and imports; it's also about enhancing America's role among Pacific nations and standing strong against an assertive China.'' President Obama made that point as well, and I happen to think in this case he is absolutely right.

Texas and our entire country stands to gain a lot from this pending trade deal. I am happy to see the President is promoting this among some members of his own party, who are a little bit divided on this issue. I think it is fair to say that on this side of the aisle we are a little more unified on this issue. This is not, though, an objective we are going to be able to get done unless the President steps up and delivers votes from that side of the aisle from members of his own political party, and I hope he will roll up his sleeves and he will dive right in and engage and produce those votes. We can't produce those votes on that side of the aisle; only the President, the leader of his party, can do that.

So I am happy to see that this Chamber, this U.S. Senate, has continued in

a spirit of bipartisanship by passing trade promotion authority out of the Senate Finance Committee, and I hope we will take it up here as a body very soon.

In conclusion, this legislation will open up American goods and services to American markets, which is good for our economy, good for jobs, and good for better wages for hard-working Americans, including Texas families.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act that is before the Senate today. I thank Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN for their incredible work bringing people together on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill as written. We must move forward to pass this legislation as quickly as possible to ensure that Congress has a role in reviewing any proposed nuclear agreement with Iran.

This is a critically important bill at a critically important time. Preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is one of the most important objectives of our national security policy, and I strongly supported the sanctions every step of the way that brought Iran to the negotiating table.

I have also supported the diplomatic efforts to address the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program. The framework that was reached in Switzerland earlier this month is a positive step forward, but I think we all know that this process is far from complete.

There are so many unanswered questions on the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program, on how its uranium stockpile would be handled, under what circumstances any sanctions relief would be provided, and the timing of that relief.

It is clear that there are still differences between Iran and the rest of the international community on these issues. I believe it is important that negotiations continue to pursue a final agreement by June 30 that comprehensively addresses the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program. Again, one of the most important objectives of the U.S. national security policy is to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

The bipartisan legislation before us today will set up a process for Congress to review any final nuclear agreement with Iran. It ensures that Congress, which through its actions brought Iran to the table, will have access to all the final details of the agreement. It preserves our right to have a final say in the potential lifting of the sanctions that we led on. That is how we were involved in compelling Iran to negotiate in terms of these sanctions.

Senators CORKER and CARDIN worked so hard to strike a careful balance between the Executive's prerogative to pursue the negotiations and Congress's role in reviewing any nuclear agreement. Their negotiations were a success, as I said. The bill passed the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously, 19 to 0, 2 weeks ago. That is a committee with a number of Senators with a broad range of views on every issue, including foreign relations and including these negotiations.

The President, who had long threatened to veto any such bill, has agreed to sign it. This is a significant victory for the Senate and also for congressional oversight of foreign policy, something many of us have been pushing for.

Any nuclear agreement with Iran will have significant long-term implications for the United States, for Israel, and for our allies in the region. So it is critical that Congress have the opportunity to review it.

This bill ensures that we have that opportunity. That is why it is so important that we act now to pass this legislation without delay and without amendments that undercut the bipartisan agreement on this bill.

Right now, I understand there are negotiations over a number of amendments that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to offer. I think we know that a number of these amendments appear to be written in a way that would undermine the bipartisan support for the bill or would somehow make this bill much more difficult in terms of having a process.

All this bill is, from my mind, is a process to review. Instead of having a haphazard process, this actually gives Congress something for which we have been asking for a long time. It has given us that ability to review this agreement and have a vote on it. I don't know how many times I have heard my colleagues from the other side of the aisle talk about it—and my colleagues on this side of the aisle. We finally have a bipartisan way to do it. So I think we need to be very careful when moving forward and look at some of these amendments.

I certainly share my colleagues' deep mistrust and skepticism of the Iranian regime. I am appalled by the continuing human rights abuses, the unjustified detention of American citizens—everyone, from the Washington Post reporter to a former marine to a Christian pastor. I abhor the vicious threats we are hearing against Israel and against Israeli leaders, the track record supporting anti-Semitism and the Holocaust denial. I am deeply concerned about the destabilizing actions in the region, including Iran's efforts to obtain more advanced missiles, and the support for militant forces and terrorists.

I think we all know the issues that are going on here. It is incredibly important that we work to address these issues, but there must be a recognition of the fact that what we are talking about here is a nuclear agreement. I think every Senator is going to want to look at that agreement and say: Does this make things safer or not? What effect does this have on Israel? Is it safer to have Iran have nuclear capabilities when they have shown the propensity to do all of these other things that I have just mentioned? I think many of us come down on the side that we want to see this agreement but we are pleased these negotiations are going on. We are particularly thankful that Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN were able to come to an agreement on a process and to get that agreement through a highly diverse committee in terms of their political views and to get that agreement through on a 19-to-0 vote.

Also, I might add that we don't want to revive the threat of a Presidential veto here. I know many of these amendments sound appealing to many of us but not if they are going to be used as a way to bring down this process, the review agreement, and that is essentially what would happen.

We do not want to be damaging our own ability to ensure that sanctions relief will only come from a strong agreement that prevents Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. I would think that outcome would certainly be fine with the Iranians, if that is what happens. As our Republican colleague from South Carolina, LINDSEY GRAHAM, pointed out recently, ''Anybody who offers an amendment that will break this agreement apart . . . the beneficiary will be the Iranians.''

So let's not give the Iranians a victory. Let's pass this bill on a strong bipartisan vote, and let's do it now so it is clear that Congress stands united and we want the ability to review this agreement. Our foreign policy is more effective when we speak with one voice. It may be simplistic to say that politics should stop at the water's edge, but when it comes to Iran, the fact is, we have been unified. The past three votes in favor of major sanctions legislation in 2010, 2011, and 2012 have been unanimous—99 to 0, 100 to 0, and 94 to 0 respectively. And now the Iranians are at the table negotiating a nuclear agreement. That is because we stood together across party lines.

We have stood together and been strong and unified as a country. The time has come to show we are serious again—serious about ensuring that a

final agreement is strong and enforceable and, most importantly, blocks Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. We may not agree on everything, but we must certainly agree on something that so many of us have been talking about—a role for the Congress, a role for the Senate in having a say over this agreement. That is all this bill is about. Passing this bill will show our commitment to our country's security and the security of our allies and our partners. It transcends partisan politics, and that is something that, when it comes to foreign relations and when it comes to dealing with a country such as Iran, must stop at the water's edge.

I thank our colleagues, Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN, for working so hard to negotiate this agreement—simply a process of review—so that we can finally have a say, and I ask my colleagues to support this.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, sometimes when I travel, people ask me what I do, and I tell them I am a retired Navy captain. And then they say: Well, what do you do now? And I tell them I am a recovering Governor. Then they say: Well, now that you are recovering, what do you do? I tell them I am a servant.

Once, one guy said to me on an airplane: What do you mean you are a servant?

I said: I serve the people of Delaware.

He said: Are you like a butler?

And I said: No, not really, but I do serve.

But I still think like a retired recovering Governor. I am proud to be able to serve here. I loved being in the Navy. But at heart, I still think and act a good deal like a retired Governor. Those others who serve here in this body who have served as the chief executive of their State sometimes feel the same way about how they approach their job. I love doing that. I feel really lucky to have that choice. I feel very lucky to be here to serve Delaware, the First State, in this capacity.

One of the key takeaways from my time as the chief executive of my State was that when we had to negotiate deals, whether with our neighboring States or with the Federal Government or actually with folks who were thinking of starting a business in Delaware or growing a business in Delaware, we had to do so with one unified voice in order to be effective.

Now, we were trying to bring AstraZeneca, one of the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world, and convince them to put their North American headquarters in Delaware. We didn't have the whole legislature to negotiate that deal. My cabinet and I were involved in that negotiation, and we got a signoff from the legislature, at least indirectly. We just couldn't have competing messages coming from all the various elected officials, State senators, State representatives, and so forth. The reason is that this would have undermined in some cases very sensitive negotiations and hindered our ability to work through some already tough issues. While I would consult with Delaware's other State and local officials, as appropriate—and I valued their insight and their opinions, even when I didn't necessarily agree with all of them any more than they agreed with me—at the end of the day, as chief executive of our State, I had to be the final decisionmaker in a lot of cases in negotiating or advocating on behalf of Delaware.

Now, as a U.S. Senator, I take really a very similar approach to negotiating on many issues, including matters of foreign policy. I support the idea that when the United States conducts diplomacy with foreign governments, the United States should speak to that government with a unified voice.

Our system is set up so that we do not have 535 Members of Congress serving as negotiators and diplomats—and for good reason. That is the case with trade deals—the kind of deal we are trying to negotiate today with 11 other countries that come from this hemisphere all the way over to Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, Japan, and Vietnam. But if we fail to speak with a unified voice in most of those negotiations, including the one I just mentioned, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, then forging international agreements with other countries is going to be really tough and in some cases just about impossible.

When it comes to the negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program—the negotiations that involve not just Iran, not just us, but the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and Germany as well—I have been a strong proponent of giving the President and his negotiating team the flexibility they need to achieve the best deal for our Nation.

I know many of our colleagues have strong views on the need for Congress to play a direct role in the negotiations and to make sure their voices are heard in this process. I understand that position, and I respect that position as well.

There are also some in the Senate who believe that the best deal with Iran is, frankly, no deal at all, and they are trying to maximize their ability to kill the nuclear deal with Iran before it is ever finalized.

Another key lesson I learned as Governor—and I am constantly reminded of it in the Senate—is that forging compromise is no easy task. Bridging the divide of competing interests is never easy, especially on issues as important as negotiations over nuclear weapons and Iran. But that is what my colleagues—our colleagues—in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently did.

Specifically, Senators CORKER of Tennessee and CARDIN of Maryland, one a Republican and one a Democrat, worked to forge a compromise that identifies an appropriate role for Congress in these nuclear talks. This compromise will enable the President to maintain his prerogative as our Nation's Chief Executive and Commander in Chief to negotiate on behalf of the United States, while also ensuring that Congress is able to weigh in on the final product of those negotiations should they come to fruition. In my mind, that is a reasonable compromise that we should all support regardless of our opinion on the prospect of the President reaching an acceptable deal with Iran.

Let me explain why. First of all, Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN's compromise satisfies one of my key goals of not undermining our negotiating team before any final deal can be reached with the Iranians.

Second, for those who insist that Congress be given a chance to weigh in on a final nuclear deal with Iran, this bill that we are debating today and will probably debate a little more next week will empower Members of Congress to cast a vote for or against any final deal before it is implemented.

Finally, for those Members who think that no deal is the best deal, this bill gives those Members the opportunity to make their case to our respective colleagues at an appropriate time.

Now, Senators CORKER and CARDIN should be commended for their tireless work to strike a compromise that should satisfy many of our colleagues—not all, but many. I know they worked with the White House to craft a bill that does not cut the legs out from underneath our negotiators as they work to finalize a deal with Iran, and I want to thank them for preserving the administration's ability to negotiate and the Congress's ability to weigh in on the final deal.

As we cast our votes on amendments and final passage of this bill, I would encourage us to consider the delicate nature of the compromise that Senators CORKER and CARDIN have struck.

Too often in Washington we focus on what divides us rather than what unites us. That is unfortunate and sometimes counterproductive for our country—not just on this issue but on a host of important policy matters. Compromise should not be a rare occurrence in our Nation's Capital. Rather, it should be one of our guiding principles.

We should seize this opportunity, colleagues, to advance a compromise that meets the needs of many of our colleagues, the President, and our Nation. I urge our colleagues to join me in supporting Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN's legislation.

Some of my colleagues have heard me say before, whenever I meet people who have been married for a long time, I love to ask those who have been married 50, 60, 70 years: What is the secret for being married 50, 60 or 70 years? I get a lot of different answers, as you might imagine. Some of them are very funny, and some are quite poignant.

Some of my favorites include a couple married over 50 years. I asked them not long ago: What is the secret to being married 50 years?

The wife said of her husband: He could be right or he could be happy, but he cannot be both.

More recently, with a couple who has been married over 60 years, I asked the husband and wife: What is the secret to being married over 60 years? And each of them gave a different answer. The wife said patience, and her husband of 60 years said a good sense of humor. That is pretty good advice as well.

I have asked this question hundreds of times over the years, but the best advice I have ever heard in asking that question is years ago from the answers of a couple who had been married 65 years or so.

I said: What is the secret of being married 65 years?

They both said almost at the same time: The two C's.

The two C's. I had never heard that one before.

I said: What are the two C's?

One of them said: Communicate.

That is good.

The other one said: Compromise.

Those are two pretty good C's.

Since then, I have invoked their words any number of times, including on this floor and here in Washington, DC, and in my own State of Delaware.

Over the years, I have added a third C to it. The third C is collaborate—collaborate. If you think about it, those two C's or those three C's—communicate, compromise, and collaborate—are not just the secret for a vibrant and long marriage between two people; they are also the secret to a vibrant democracy.

As one of the Members of this body, I wish to again express my thanks to Senators CORKER and CARDIN for communicating, for compromising, and for collaborating in a way that could bring about a better future for my kids, your kids, our grandchildren, and hopefully for the people of Iran and hopefully for the people of Israel and a lot of other nations that have a real interest in this issue—as we say in Delaware, a dog in this fight.

As I close, I thank you for this opportunity to speak today. I hope when we vote next week we will reward the efforts of those Senators with the two C's—CARDIN and CORKER—and further embrace the three C's—communicating, compromising, and collaborating—embrace their efforts with an ''aye'' vote.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FDA TOBACCO DEEMING REGULATIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, technology can be transformative. The black rotary phones have given way to iPhones. Sunlight and wind have become electricity. Camera tripods have begotten selfie sticks. There are certain things, however, that do not need to be reimagined, repurposed or redesigned. There are items that serve no societal benefit whatsoever.

Example No. 1, the cigarette. Yet new cigarettes have exploded into the marketplace, known as everything from e-cigs to advanced nicotine delivery systems, to vaporizers. Similar to many emerging technologies, these products are designed to appeal to young people, are more accessible to young people, and are explicitly marketed to young people, and because of this, we are being forced to write another dark chapter in the history books.

After more than four decades of research, there are several incontrovertible facts. Nicotine is addictive. It affects brain development, and in combination with tobacco, it is responsible for claiming millions of lives. These facts are true and were true decades ago, at the same time that Big Tobacco willfully, consistently, publicly, and falsely denied them.

Today, e-cigarette sales in the United States alone top $1 billion. The use of e-cigarettes among middle and high school students tripled from 2013 to 2014, accounting for upward of 13 percent of high school students. New data reports that nearly 2.5 million American young people currently use e-cigarettes.

This data is not at all surprising when we consider the way these nicotine delivery products are targeted at young people and how these products are available in a myriad of flavors from cotton candy to vanilla cupcakes, to Coca-Cola. Strawberry-flavored vape liquid can contain just as much nicotine, and sometimes more, as a traditional cigarette.

We know from years of research that flavors attract young people, and the younger a person is when they start tobacco use, the more difficult it will be for them to quit. That is why Congress explicitly banned the use of cigarettes with flavors like cherry and bubble gum because of their appeal to young people.

Over the past decade, we have made great strides educating children and teens about the dangers of smoking. We cannot allow e-cigarettes to snuff out the progress we have made preventing nicotine addiction and its deadly consequences.

E-cigarette use is growing as fast as the students who are using them, and we need to put in place the rules to ensure that we stop it. First, we need to ban the marketing of e-cigarettes to young people in the United States. Second, we need to ban the use of flavorings. The use of fruit- and candy-based flavors is clearly meant to attract children. Cherry Crush e-cigarettes pose the same addiction risk as the minty Kools of the 1970s. Third, we should ban online sales of e-cigarettes. The FDA should prevent online sales of these devices to keep the product out of the hands of children. Finally, last week marked 1 year since the FDA proposed long-overdue regulations to govern e-cigarettes. This is the first step to making sure children and teens can be protected from the harms of these devices. But 1 year later, these rules still have not been finalized. Until they are, new cigarettes will continue to target young people with appealing marketing, advertising, and product flavoring. Every day the FDA fails to act is another day young Americans can fall prey to harmful products pushed by the tobacco industry.

Last year, at a commerce committee hearing, I asked several e-cigarette company leaders to commit to ceasing the sale of these types of flavored products, and a few of them agreed, but the vast majority have not and will not stop this marketing campaign.

Today's electronic cigarettes are no better than the Joe Camels of the past because e-cigarettes, children, and teens do not mix. Young people are getting addicted to nicotine and putting their health and their futures at grave risk. It is time for the FDA to step in and stop the sale of these candy-flavored poisons, especially to the children of the United States.

My father started smoking two packs of Camels when he was 13 years of age. It was the cool thing to do. My father died from lung cancer. The tobacco industry denied that there was any linkage between tobacco and smoking and cancer and death. My father died from it. He started smoking at age 13 because it was the cool thing to do. Once you are addicted at the age of 13, 14 or 15 and smoking two packs of Joe Camels a day, it is hard to stop.

Here is something else we know: If a young person doesn't start to smoke until they are 19, they are highly unlikely to start at all because they have reached beyond the point where it is

attractive to them from a peer pressure perspective. So what do these companies have to do? These companies have to find a way to market to young people by giving them flavored e-cigarettes and making it appealing to them because they have to get them when they are 13, 14, 15, and 16 years old. That is the marketing plan.

It has always been the marketing plan since my father started smoking when he was 13. He would say to me: Eddie, you have no idea how hard it is to stop. You have no idea how much I need to smoke and how much I need the nicotine. You could see it. He started when he was a kid, and that is the way it begins because people don't start smoking when they are 20 years of age. We all know that. Everyone listening to me knows that, and that is why this marketing campaign is so invidious. That is why what they are doing plays right into what we have known for a century is the business plan of the tobacco industry.

I urge the FDA to act. I urge the Members of this body to rise up to ensure that we do not have another generation that suffers the same fate as the previous generations have, in fact, had to live with, which is this addiction that was given to them at a very young age.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to speak this afternoon, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I echo the voices of my friends and colleagues, the Senators from Oregon, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Rhode Island in calling on the FDA to act with all possible speed to issue final rules on regulating e-cigarettes. I want to thank especially my friend from Oregon, Senator MERKLEY, and my friend from California, Senator BOXER, who have been real leaders on this issue.

The Federal Government has an imperative to protect the public from dangerous products with commonsense restrictions. E-cigarettes are no exception. Their use among middle schoolers and high schoolers has skyrocketed—tripled among high schoolers according to a recent National Youth Tobacco Survey—and their risks are numerous.

E-cigarettes contain liquid nicotine, an addictive chemical which can impede brain development when consumed at a young age.

And these liquid nicotine containers are often sold without child protection caps in many parts of the country—and there have been far too many tragedies already of young children accidentally ingesting liquid nicotine. In Fort Plain, in upstate New York, a toddler of 18 months lost his life in such an accident—a terrible tragedy for two young parents. It is what propelled my home State to pass a requirement that all these liquid nicotine bottles be sold with child protection caps.

But, as my colleagues pointed out, the companies that sell these e-cigarettes are largely unregulated at the Federal level. In terms of Federal policy, e-cigarette companies are not even barred from selling to minors under the age of 18. So they market to children—on TV and on billboards and with child-friendly labels and flavors. According to a 2014 study, e-cigarette marketing exposure to children from 12 to 17 years old increased by 256 percent between 2011 and 2013. The FDA needs to be the adult in the room and put an end to these cynical marketing ploys. The FDA, including the new commissioner, seem ready and eager to use the Tobacco Deeming Rule to regulate e-cigarettes under the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. We strongly support their posture, but we need them to strengthen and finalize these rules. It is time for the FDA to put our children first and promulgate these rules.

Just yesterday, 31 prominent national organizations including, Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, Trust for America's Health, the American Lung Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics, sent a letter to the President asking the FDA to finalize these regulations. Cigarette use has drastically declined in the last decade and we have made great strides in educating children about their harmful effects. E-cigarettes, with their misleading and trendy marketing, are threatening to set back that progress. Now it is time to snuff out the tactics that try to put kids on the path to smoking.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. GORDON J. CHRISTENSEN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is an honor today to pay tribute to a renowned educator and a highly regarded prosthodontist, Dr. Gordon J. Christensen. Dr. Christensen has had a meaningful impact on dentistry across the Nation, and he continues to influence the field today through his wide-reaching publications.

Appropriately, the board of directors of the CR Foundation will be honoring Dr. Christensen for his contributions to the field at its upcoming 40th Anniversary Celebration on May 8, 2015.

Born on November 10, 1936, Gordon Christensen completed predental studies at Utah State University in 1956 and received a DDS degree at the University of Southern California in 1960. He completed a master's degree in restorative dentistry at the University of Washington in 1963 and earned a PhD in higher education and psychology at the University of Denver in 1972. Dr. Christensen has also received honorary doctorate degrees from Utah State University and Utah Valley University.

In 1976, Dr. Christensen and his wife, Dr. Rella Christensen—a well-respected dental consultant—started Clinical Research Associates, now known as the CR Foundation. He is presently serving as CR's chief executive officer and is a member of the board of directors. Dr. Christensen and his wife volunteer full-time for CR to conduct research in all areas of dentistry.

The Christensens publish the findings of their research in the Gordon J. Christensen Clinicians Report, a publication of the CR Foundation. The Clinicians Report is translated in 7 languages and distributed to more than 100,000 dentists across 92 countries. The Christensens have developed an expansive readership, and their groundbreaking research has positively impacted the dental health of hundreds of thousands of patients worldwide. Dental professionals who subscribe to Clinicians Report are unreserved in their praise of Dr. Christensen. I would like to share some of the appreciation Dr. Christensen recently received from three dental professionals. Richard K. Dimsdale, DDS, wrote: ''Dentistry would never have made the advances it has over many years without the help, guidance, & research you have contributed!'' Ted Cross, DDS, wrote: ''The Gordon J. Christensen Clinicians Report has not only saved me tens of thousands of dollars of purchasing mistakes, but has also immeasurably improved the care my staff and I offer our patients.'' And Bob Dolan, DDS, wrote: ''I recently retired after 54 years of practice. I believe I have been in contact with Gordon for 20 or 30 or more years and have really appreciated the great-unbiased information. Thank you Gordon (and your dear wife) for all you have done for me and for dentistry these many years.''

Dr. Christensen also founded and directs Practical Clinical Courses, PCC, in Utah, an international continuing education organization providing courses and videos for dental professionals. In connection with PCC, he has

presented over 45,000 hours of continuing education throughout the world.

As a frequent contributor to professional journals, Dr. Christensen holds editorial positions with 10 dental publications. He is also the recipient of many fellowships, masterships, and diplomas from various dental specialties and organizations worldwide.

Early in his career, Dr. Christensen helped initiate the University of Kentucky and the University of Colorado Dental Schools. He also taught dentistry courses at the University of Washington.

For the Christensens, dentistry seems to run in the family. Both of Dr. Christensen's sons work in the field: William is a prosthodontist and Michael is a general dentist. The Christensen's lovely daughter, Carlene, is making her own contributions as a teacher.

After more than 55 years in private practice, Dr. Christensen remains active in treating patients. He continues to influence dentistry across the world through his continuing education lectures and the Clinicians Report. He is truly one of dentistry's great leaders, and it is with great respect, gratitude, admiration, and affection that I pay tribute to Dr. Gordon J. Christensen.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEVADA APPEAL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the Nevada Appeal newspaper.

May 16, 2015, marks 150 years since E.F. McElwain, J. Barrett, Marshall Robinson, and editor Henry Rust Mighels published the first issue of the Carson Daily Appeal in Nevada's State capital, Carson City. Nevada had recently joined the Union, and the Daily Appeal soon began reporting on the important issues facing the newly established State.

For 150 years, the paper has demonstrated its resilience and withstood a number of name changes and owners. One notable owner was Henry Mighels' widow, Nellie Verrill Mighels, who inherited the publication following Henry's death in 1879. Covering local politics and a popular boxing match, Nellie earned her place among the Appeal's journalists. Though her ownership of the paper was short-lived, she propelled the paper forward during her tenure.

Today, the Appeal remains the longest continually running newspaper in Nevada and is among the oldest businesses in Carson City. Decades of committed staff and dedicated local readers have kept this important publication and piece of Nevada history alive. I applaud the Nevada Appeal on its 150 years of quality journalism and wish the paper much continued success for years to come.

REMEMBERING REX CARR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to pay my respects to a man who championed the underdogs of Metro East, IL. Rex Carr passed away on Monday at the age of 88. For over one-half century, people who were out of luck or injured could call on Rex Carr to be their champion. He did it with a style and grace that made him a legend in the community.

Rex grew up in my hometown of East St. Louis. He was the second youngest of five boys. His mother was a teacher and father was a firefighter with the Illinois Central Railroad. His family could not afford much and often had to move when they could not pay the rent. When Rex graduated from East St. Louis High School, he joined the Navy and served in the Pacific Theater during World War II.

Rex would go on to attend college and law school at the University of Illinois. During summers, he worked filling freight cars with ice and hitched a ride back and forth between home and the University of Illinois.

In 1949, Rex finished law school and started practicing in East St. Louis. He was so poor that his first office was in the chambers of a friendly judge, where he could only work when the judge was busy in court. He earned $500 his first year of practice. But he would keep an office in East St. Louis for the rest of his life.

In Harper Lee's To Kill a Mocking Bird, Atticus Finch defined courage, ''When you know you're licked before you begin but you begin anyway and you see it through no matter what. You rarely win, but sometimes you do.'' Rex did not win all his cases, but he won quite a few and always tried to see things to their end. Rex had that courage that Atticus Finch described.

During the 1960s and 1970s, Rex earned a reputation as a civil rights and labor attorney. He fiercely fought for equal rights for African Americans and represented teachers in East St. Louis.

By the end of the 1970s, Rex's practice had turned toward personal injury, and he became a legend. He won national acclaim as the best-prepared lawyer in Metro East and even made it into the Guinness Book of Records for three categories: the longest civil jury trial; the largest personal injury verdict at the time; and the largest libel verdict.

The longest trial also was one of his proudest moments of his career. A tanker car carrying wood preservative with a dioxin contaminant spilled in Sturgeon, MO, injuring many of the town's residents. He represented 65 of them. All but one of the parties settled with the residents. Chemical giant Monsanto, manufacturer of the dioxin, refused, and Rex took them to court.

Rex fought for three and a half years in the case. There were 182 witnesses, 6,000 separate exhibits, and over 100,000 pages in transcript. Rex's skill was on full display. He cross-examined a witness for 6 months and then another witness for 5 months. The jury awarded the plaintiffs $16 million. An appeals court would disappoint him and the residents by reducing the award to $1 million.

Rex went on to win many cases and mentor many young lawyers in Metro East. His career was about holding corporations responsible and ensuring his clients' rights. Rex's cross-examinations were the stuff of folklore. At 88 years old, he was still working out of his Missouri Avenue office in East St. Louis. It's where he was from, and he wanted people to be able to come to him for help.

Rex was a giant in Metro East. My thoughts and prayers go out to his four sons, Rex G. Carr of Vermont, Bruce Carr of Valparaiso, IN, Eric Reeve of Mack's Creek, MO, and Glenn Carr of Columbia, IL; a daughter, Kathryn Marie Wheeler of Los Angeles, CA; 16 grandchildren; and 20 great-grandchildren.

THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Last week, the Senate considered a very important amendment to S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. Senator COLLINS and I offered amendment No. 290, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, which was cosponsored by Senators AYOTTE, MURKOWSKI, BALDWIN, HEITKAMP, SHAHEEN, BENNET, MURPHY, MERKLEY, SCHATZ, KLOBUCHAR, and BOOKER.

As we crafted this legislation, Senator COLLINS and I listened to the stories of survivors of human trafficking and the service providers who help them rebuild their lives. So many of these stories began with a homeless or runaway teen, scared and alone, and in need of a safe place to sleep. These young people were completely vulnerable, and traffickers preyed upon their desperation. Survivors and service providers underscored the importance of preventing human trafficking from happening in the first place by reauthorizing the critical programs funded by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

With their feedback in mind, we crafted S. 262, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. We made important updates to ensure that homeless youth service providers are specifically trained to recognize victims of trafficking, address their unique traumas, and refer them to appropriate and caring services.

Our bill will improve services for these vulnerable children in several ways. We lengthen the time that youth can stay in shelters from 21 days to 30

days, so they are better able to find stable housing. Kids who are forced out of shelters and back onto the streets before they are ready are more likely to become victims of exploitation. Our bill prioritizes suicide prevention services and family reunification efforts and expands aftercare services. Providers know that such measures save children's lives and help them build a more stable future with families and trusted adults. Under our bill, service providers will collect data on the demographics of youth who are served by their shelters to help understand their needs and refine their services. It encourages grantees to examine the connection between youth who are victims of trafficking and any previous involvement in the foster care system or juvenile justice system in order to address the causes of youth homelessness. It further requires staff training on how to help youth apply for Federal student loans to help make college possible for youth so they can build a more stable future.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act also includes a crucial nondiscrimination provision that would prevent discrimination against youth based on their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation or disability. We offered this important legislation as amendment No. 290 to the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

We were very disappointed that it received only 56 votes and failed to garner the 60 votes necessary for passage, but we are encouraged that it received a strong bipartisan vote from a majority of the Senate. I want to thank the 54 other Senators who voted for this legislation: Senators AYOTTE, BALDWIN, BENNET, BLUMENTHAL, BOOKER, BOXER, BROWN, CANTWELL, CAPITO, CARDIN, CARPER, CASEY, COONS, DONNELLY, DURBIN, FEINSTEIN, FRANKEN, GILLIBRAND, HEINRICH, HEITKAMP, HELLER, HIRONO, KAINE, KING, KIRK, KLOBUCHAR, MANCHIN, MARKEY, MCCASKILL, MENENDEZ, MERKLEY, MIKULSKI, MURKOWSKI, MURPHY, MURRAY, NELSON, PAUL, PETERS, PORTMAN, REED, REID, SANDERS, SCHATZ, SCHUMER, SHAHEEN, STABENOW, SULLIVAN, TESTER, TOOMEY, UDALL, WARNER, WARREN, WHITEHOUSE, and WYDEN. We appreciate their support and their dedication to working to prevent vulnerable youth from becoming victims of human trafficking.

I especially applaud Senators COLLINS, HEITKAMP, AYOTTE, and MURKOWSKI for their help fighting to get a vote on this amendment. Their leadership on this issue is exceptional, and the Senate is better for having them as Members.

I also want to thank the tireless advocates who have worked so hard to help us improve the bill and urge support for the effort: Darla Bardine, with National Network for Youth; Jennifer Pike and David Stacy, with Human Rights Campaign; Cyndi Lauper and Gregory Lewis, with the True Colors Fund; Bridget Petruczok and Laura Durso, with the Center for American Progress; Melysa Sperber, with the Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking; Holly Austin Smith, Jayne Bigelsen, and Kevin Ryan, with Covenant House; Calvin Smith and Kreig Pinkham, with the Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs; Erin Albright, with Give Way to Freedom; Griselda Vega, with Safe Horizon; Susan Burton, with the United Methodist Church; and the many others who provided us with their feedback as we drafted this important legislation. They are the true experts in this field and their insights and contributions were invaluable.

This is not the end for the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. As I have said time and again, we must protect the most vulnerable among us, and we must do everything we can to prevent the heinous crime of human trafficking from occurring. It is vital that we update and reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. We will continue to fight to see the passage of the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act.

THANKING AMERICAN DIPLOMATS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to take a moment to honor the American diplomats who serve our country. Specifically, I want to thank the American diplomats who have been on the front lines working for America throughout the Iran nuclear P5+1 negotiations. They address so many vital issues on a daily basis, some of which we hear about in the news but many of which never reach the headlines.

The Corker-Cardin bill is now on the floor, addressing the role of Congress in a final deal with Iran. I hope there will be deliberative, thorough debate around this important issue. I want to put aside the partisan bellowing and grandstanding, some of which has regrettably stooped to impugn our diplomats, and rather take a moment to recognize our diplomats for their efforts to find peaceful solutions to the Iranian nuclear menace that threatens the world.

For 2 years, America's diplomats have labored quietly, with no aspiration for personal accolade, to represent our Nation's best interests and build the foundation for a possible P5+1 agreement with Iran. The United States has had little contact with Iran since 1979, but their shrewdness and duplicity at the negotiating table is well known. It has been a huge task with no certainty of outcome. There have been innumerable hurdles. There have been many setbacks, and there will be more. But our diplomats have stayed steady, focused on the task at hand.

Diplomacy is about understanding strategic motivations, applying fact and science to argument, and maintaining an unwavering commitment to American values and interests throughout complex talks with an untrustworthy and difficult foe. America's diplomats have done so with focus and integrity.

During the negotiations, American diplomats have also been supported and informed by a tremendous cadre of American experts: scientists, intelligence professionals, civilian experts, members of the military and academics. This process has been a collective effort that has drawn on the country's best and brightest.

There was once a time when politics ended at the water's edge, but in recent years we have seen the erosion of that principle and, instead, a rise in the practice of subsuming the interests of the country to tactical political objectives. The leadership of our diplomats is critical and needed now more than ever, and I want them to know—we value and appreciate you. Regardless of what you might think of the talks in the first place, the dedication of America's diplomats has made us all proud. For that, I thank them.

TRIBUTE TO MEAGHAN MCCARTHY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a devoted public servant and tireless friend of the people of Washington State as she moves on from the staff of the United States Senate. Meaghan McCarthy has dedicated nearly 13 years in service to the Appropriations Committee and is widely recognized for her expertise in housing policy. I know that back in Washington State, here in the Senate, and across the country—Ms. McCarthy's important work has helped so many people find affordable housing and get back on their feet. I know so many will miss her compassionate advocacy on behalf of those facing housing challenges, from veterans requiring supportive housing, to working-class families that need a helping hand to remain in safe and affordable homes, and so many more.

A Massachusetts native and graduate of Notre Dame and Johns Hopkins University, Ms. McCarthy began her career in public policy as an advocate for children, working at the Children's Defense Fund. She then joined the Appropriations Committee as professional staff, where she developed a keen understanding of complex Federal housing policy. As a top staff member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, Ms. McCarthy has overseen and helped fund key affordable housing supports that make sure millions of people across the

country have access to high-quality affordable housing. From tenant vouchers provided through the section 8 program to homeless assistance grants, supportive HUD-VASH vouchers for our veterans, and public housing funds, Ms. McCarthy has worked hand-in-hand with housing officials in my State to make sure Washington State families receive the resources they need.

It is so clear to me that Washington State has benefited from Ms. McCarthy's hard work, vast knowledge, and compassion for people and families fighting to make ends meet. During my time as the subcommittee's chair, I was always thankful that she was working on my State's behalf. Many of our housing advocates and authorities have reached out to my office to express their appreciation for her work. They have called her a ''critical bridge between Washington state's communities and our nation's big-picture, broad-stroke policy and budget machinery,'' someone who translated real-world neighborhood needs into action in a complex Federal bureaucracy.

Ms. McCarthy's work has had real and measurable impacts in Washington State communities. Stephen Norman, the executive director of the King County Housing Authority, was kind enough to share an anecdote wherein Ms. McCarthy pioneered a program to fund community facilities adjacent to public housing, which he called ''a cross-cutting initiative that recognized the importance of education success for low income children and the opportunities created by partnering schools and Housing Authorities.'' When HUD's draft rules effectively excluded suburban communities, which require a network of smaller facilities, Ms. McCarthy did what she does best: she went to work to solve the problem and change the rules. And change them she did. Now, King County has a network of 14 youth facilities, serving some of the poorest families in the region and helping children to reach their potential and to realize their dreams.

Today I join with others throughout the country, the State of Washington, and this body in thanking Ms. McCarthy for her years of service. I congratulate her on all of her accomplishments and wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

WORLD PRESS FREEDOM DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I commemorate World Press Freedom Day 2015 on May 3, 2015—a day reserved to celebrate the value of freedom of press and the critical role it serves in creating a more free and open society. In its highest forms, the press does not simply inform, but brings attention to atrocities around the world, provides checks on authoritarian governments, and catalyzes better governance.

The United States has recognized the great value of freedom of the press from its inception and in its Declaration of Universal Rights, the United Nations acknowledged the profound role of this fundamental right. On May 3, 1991, in the Windhoek Declaration, the U.N. recommitted itself to this important cause with a call to arms to protect the right of the press ''to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.''

A pluralistic and free press is essential to the development and maintenance of democracy as well as economic development. According to Freedom House's 2014 Freedom of the Press Index, only 14 percent of the world's citizens live in countries that enjoy a free press. In every other corner of the world, freedom of the press is threatened by governments that want to restrict freedom of expression and association by harassing and intimidating journalists. According to Reporters Without Borders, 69 journalists and 19 citizen journalists were killed in 2014 in connection with their collection and dissemination of news and information, and the Committee to Protect Journalists, found that in that same year the 3 deadliest countries for journalists on assignment were Syria, Ukraine, and Iraq. Today we honor all journalists who have been imprisoned or killed while seeking to tell a story that deserves to be told and needs to be heard.

The weekend of April 25 marked the 1-year anniversary of the arrest of three independent journalists and six bloggers in Ethiopia known as the ''Zone 9 bloggers.'' The reporters, who published articles criticizing the government, have been charged under Ethiopia's Anti-Terrorism Proclamation, seemingly in connection with their writings. They remain in jail to this day, their trial once again postponed until after the Ethiopian elections. Unfortunately, this sort of imprisonment is not an isolated incident in Ethiopia. According to Human Rights Watch, Ethiopia has the second largest number of journalists in exile and the largest number of imprisoned journalists and bloggers in all of sub-Saharan Africa.

I and a number of my colleagues wrote Secretary Kerry in March about our ongoing concern with efforts by the Ethiopian government to restrict freedom of speech and association in Ethiopia. In recent months numerous media publications have closed amid widespread harassment, and the Ethiopian government continues to control most television and radio broadcasting content. Today, I again urge the Ethiopian government to respect freedom of expression and freedom of the press—especially in advance of the May 24 elections. Anti-terrorism laws must not be used for political gain or to stifle the expression of dissenting political views.

The continued imprisonment of Washington Post reporter Jason Rezaian, who remains in Iran on alleged espionage charges, is another example of the immense duress that journalists around the world endure. Mr. Rezaian, an esteemed and respected professional journalist, has been imprisoned in Tehran since July 22. As the United States and Iran continue to negotiate a nuclear agreement, it is important that we not forget about Jason Rezaian, an Iranian-American who deserves to be free.

And, finally, the world will never forget the brutal and barbaric murder of American reporter James Foley by the Islamic State this past summer. His death reminds us that it is not only oppressive governments that threaten journalists, but terrorist organizations as well. Foley's life's work chronicling the war torn countries of Afghanistan and Syria speaks to a deep commitment to the truth, a desire to tell the story of the world's most vulnerable and the right to freedom of the press even in the gravest of circumstances. This is what freedom of the press is all about.

As witnesses to the good that free press provides to society and the threat that it faces, we have a responsibility to stand against injustice, to tell the stories of these brave journalists and others in the hopes of securing their freedom and preventing future tragedies from occurring. As George Mason said in 1776, ''The freedom of the press is one of the greatest bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic governments.'' On World Press Freedom Day 2015, the United States and governments around the world must recommit themselves to protecting press freedom in order to enable democracy to flourish and good governance to prevail.

NATIONAL OUTDOOR LEADERSHIP SCHOOL 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this year we commemorate the 50th anniversary of NOLS, the National Outdoor Leadership School. What started in Wyoming has now grown to 14 locations worldwide on six continents. NOLS locations stretch from the fjords of Norway and the Indian Himalayas to the Yukon and east Africa.

In the last 50 years there have been over 250,000 graduates ranging in ages from 14 to over 70 years old. They come from all walks of life, from all 50 States, and numerous countries around the world. They come to learn mountaineering, kayaking, horse packing, sailing, backcountry skiing, caving, and wilderness medicine skills, just to name a few.

As a doctor, I appreciate the importance NOLS places on outdoor medicine. The Wyss Wilderness Medicine Campus was designed and located to

create an optimal learning environment for students of wilderness medicine. At the campus, classroom experience extends to the outdoors with real-life simulations in wild and realistic terrain.

I find it very appropriate NOLS has its beginning in Wyoming. Like Wyoming, NOLS supports a diverse economic portfolio that benefits from energy, agriculture, hunting and fishing, tourism, and outdoor recreation and education. Wyoming and NOLS both work towards a balanced approach to natural resource management that provides opportunities for a diversified energy portfolio while caring for Wyoming's world-class wildlife and wild places.

One need not look any further than Lander, WY, for an example of balanced natural resource management. Lander is home to NOLS and gateway to the Wind River Range. At times, Lander has been a steel town and a supply hub during the gold boom. Today, Lander continues to be rich with energy and agricultural production.

Wyoming and NOLS have shared strong leaders who work to find pragmatic and inclusive solutions to land management challenges. John Gans is one of those leaders. John has successfully carried on the tradition established by Paul Petzoldt, the founder of NOLS. After 20 years at the helm, he is the longest serving executive director of NOLS. Under John Gans' leadership, NOLS has been recognized nine times as one of the best places to work for. In 2012, he was recognized as a White House Champion of Change for his commitment to youth, wilderness and leadership.

While NOLS' international programs have grown immensely during his time, John values the connections that exist between the town of Lander, NOLS staff, and graduates. Phil Nicholas, Marc Randolph, and Tori McClure are just a few examples of many graduates who have gone on to become successful businesspeople, educators, and leaders in the community and the Nation. Phil Nicholas is the current Wyoming Senate president and a former NOLS instructor. Tori McClure was the first woman to row solo across the Atlantic Ocean and the first woman to ski to the South Pole. Marc Randolph is a Cofounder of Netflix.

One of the things that make NOLS alumni so successful is they have learned how to make decisions and face adversity. NOLS students suffer through extreme heat and cold and all types of weather conditions. NOLS students make decisions with consequences, and they apply these lessons to their lives. They come home with a new perspective on the world around them and their role within it.

In this day and age of selfies and instant gratification, we need more people—and especially the youth—to realize they may not be the center of the universe. A perspective of hard work, sacrifice, and an appreciation and respect for nature needs to be taught and needs to be learned. In previous generations, this perspective was provided on family farms and ranches across the country. Gratefully, thanks to all the hard work and dedication of the NOLS staff, NOLS courses continue to provide this perspective to future leaders. I am confident in the future leadership of our communities and Nation because I know tomorrow's leaders are receiving NOLS instruction and experience today.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the National Outdoor Leadership School on their 50th anniversary. We are looking forward to another 50 years of success.

RECOGNIZING FUTURE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor 423 high school seniors in 8 Northeast Ohio counties for their decision to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces. Of these 423 seniors from 120 high schools in 105 towns and cities, 97 will enter the Army, 127 will enter the Marine Corps, 42 will enter the Navy, 24 will enter the Air Force, 3 will enter the Coast Guard, 123 will enter our Ohio Army National Guard, and 7 will enter the Ohio Air National Guard. In the presence of their parents/guardians, high school counselors, military leaders, and city and business leaders, all 423 will be recognized on May 6, 2015, by Our Community Salutes of Northeast Ohio.

In a few short weeks, these young men and women will join with many of their classmates in celebration of their high school graduation. At a time when many of their peers are looking forward to pursuing vocational training or college degrees, or are uncertain about their future, these young men and women instead have chosen to dedicate themselves to military service in defense of our rights, our freedoms, and our country. They should know that they have the full support of this Senate Chamber and the American people, who are with them in whatever challenges may lie ahead.

These 423 young men and women are the cornerstone of our liberties. It is thanks to their dedication and the dedication of an untold number of patriots just like them that we are able to meet here today, in the Senate, and openly debate the best solutions to the many diverse problems that confront our country. It is thanks to their sacrifices that the United States of America remains a beacon of hope and freedom in a dangerous world. We are grateful to them, and we are grateful to their parents and their communities for instilling in them not only the mental and physical abilities our Armed Forces require, but also the character, the values, and the discipline that lead someone to put service to our Nation over self.

I would like to personally thank these 423 graduating seniors for volunteering to risk their lives in defense of our Nation. We owe them, along with all those who serve our country, a deep debt of gratitude.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of the 423 high school seniors.

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

UNITED STATES ARMY—97

Abrams—Cleveland; Apathy—Brook Park; Ashford—Maple Heights; Axford—Elyria; Ballew—Akron; Barnett—Akron; Barton—Ravenna; Bate-Keck—Garfield Heights; Beckwith—Madison; Berry—Strongsville; Best—Bay Village; Black—Cleveland; Bodi—Parma; Borkowski—Akron; Brown—Elyria; Bures—Medina; Chesek—North Royalton; Colon—Parma; Corcino—Lorain; Currence—Geneva; Daley—Olmsted Township; Farmer—Cleveland; Fernandez—Bay Village; Fields—Ravenna; Forcier—Mantua; Garcia-Kilrain—Elyria; Gargasz—Amherst; Gerez—Garretsville; Gibson—Conneaut; Goan—Lakewood; Griffie—Brook Park; Gronowski—Parma; Grzelak—Barberton; Guest—Elyria; Hadden—Garfield Heights; Hathaway—Ravenna; Haught—Lorain; Heiser—Strongsville; Hill—Norton; Johnson—Akron; Jordan—Maple Heights; Kaur—Solon; Kerestly—Seville; Kessler—Wadsworth; Klimavicius—Garfield Heights; Lacey—Aurora; Lambert—Medina; Lemasters—Diamond; Leon Gonzalez—Lorain; Lindsey—Lyndhurst.

Loughridge—Brunswick; Lyons—Ravenna; Madeja—Cleveland; Marizek—Painesville; Mcgaha—Ravenna; Meacham—Akron; Miller—Parma; Mitchell—Brooklyn; Mitchell—Ravenna; Montas Correa—Elyria; Murphy—Painesville; Olavarria—Ashtabula; Palmer—Grafton; Privara—Barberton; Ray—Akron; Razo—Painesville; Reese—Cuyahoga Falls; Reinhardt—Amherst; Rhinehardt—Twinsburg; Rigda—North Olmsted; Rubsam—Brook Park; Ryman—Akron; Salvage—Strongsville; Sams—Wellington; Schoen—Medina; Shahan—Mantua; Sherrill—Elyria; Shorter—Wadsworth; Shumaker—Wellington; Simmons—Berea; Slusher—Mentor; Smiley—Cleveland; Steele—Cleveland; Storey—Chesterland; Szabo—Elryia; Torres—Cleveland; Tryon—Copley; Turley—Cleveland; Van Horn—Cleveland; Vong—Elyria; West—Cleveland; Wiley—Lorain; Williams—Solon; Wilson—Olmsted Falls; Winston—North Olmsted; Witherspoon—Olmsted Township; Zurowski—Macedonia.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS—127

Abbenhaus—Brook Park; Angeles-Ballesteros—Solon; Bish—Streetsboro; Bodjanac—Stow; Boesken—Olmsted Falls; Brown—Cleveland; Brown—Lorain; Caraballo—Berea; Casey—Geneva; Choby—Concord Township; Christoff—Stow; Cook—Middlefield; Cool—Wadsworth; Cooney—Geneva; Cooper—Akron; Criddle—Akron; Cummings—Bedford; Curtis—Aurora; Dabney—Cleveland; Dautartus—Parma; Davis—Cleveland; Dean—Vermilion; Denton—Brunswick; Dolly—Kent; Douangpanya—Akron; Drope—Garfield Heights; Dudley—Akron;

Estremera—Strongsville; Fatica—Willoughby; Faupelcresong—Uniontown; Fleshman—Akron; Folley—Lorain; Forester—Akron; Fox—Grafton; Garrett—Akron; Garrow—Columbia Station.

Geiss—Brunswick; Gilbert—Painesville; Gingell—Cleveland; Grimmett—Akron; Gump—Elyria; Haas—Copley; Hamilton—Hudson; Hathaway—Akron; Hawkins—Doylestown; Headen—Stow; Herrlinger—Akron; Hoover—Brunswick; Hopkins—Brunswick; Howes—Vermilion; Huff—Elyria; Huff—Solon; Huston—Brooklyn; Jackson—Chardon; Jennings—Hartville; Jerse—Cleveland; Johnson—Bedford Heights; Jones—Westlake; Jorgensen—South Euclid; Kellogg—Brunswick; Kelly—Medina; Kerestesy—Jefferson; Kinds—Cleveland Heights; Kravchuk—Mayfield; Ksajikyan—Parma; Lahtonen—Tallmadge; Lamatrice—Garfield Heights; Larson—Lakewood; Llamas—Painesville; Lowry—Eastlake; Lundmark—Bay Village; Lunsford—Cuyahoga Falls; Mariner—Parma; Marks—Geneva; Matejovich—Solon; McKenna—Elyria; Mencke—Austinburg; Midkiff—Amherst; Moore—Cleveland; Myers—Shaker Heights.

Nowak—Brunswick; Nystrom—Euclid; Oberstar III—Ashtabula; O'Donnell—Lakewood; O'Keefe—Solon; O'Neill—Elyria; Payne—Parma; Peterson—Independence; Pilar—Homerville; Prosen—Peninsula; Rahe—Westlake; Rakovec—Painesville; Rall—Cleveland; Rios—Vermilion; Robishaw—Seville; Rosado—Cleveland; Sabo—Akron; Salyer—Chagrin Falls; Santi—Lakewood; Scott—Euclid; Seditz—Brook Park; Seredich—Strongsville; Smiechowski—Wadsworth; Smith—Cuyahoga Falls; Smith—Uniontown; Solon—Brook Park; Sprague—Mentor; Stergar—Lakewood; Stewart—Wellington; Susakheil—Parma; Swails—Painesville; Sylvester—Westlake; Tinch—Barberton; Trevino—Akron; Turkovich—Geneva; Turner—Mayfield; Van Pelt—Painesville; Vasquez—Lorain; Walters—Wellington; Weimer—Lodi; Whitney—Norton; Willett—Strongsville; Williams—Shaker Heights; Woodruff—North Olmsted; Wright—Rome; Zindash—Jefferson; Zuchowsky—Wadsworth.

UNITED STATES NAVY—42

Adorno, W.—Lorain; Adorno, Z.—Westlake; Ainsworth—North Ridgeville; Beebe—Ashtabula; Botez—Hartville; Cassity—Painesville; Darby—Cleveland; DeJesus—Northfield; Eddleman—Akron; Elliot—Uniontown; Esparza—Tallmadge; Giddens—Cleveland; Green—Cleveland; Hanna—Ashtabula; Hennessey—Bloomfield; Hutchinson—Cleveland; Johnson—Akron; Kobernik—Jefferson; Krendick—North Canton; Kusar—Kirtland; Maillis—Copley; Malon—Chardon; Marrero—Cleveland; Mayberry—Ashtabula; Miller—Elyria; Moore—Lorain; Morey—Solon; Morgan—Conneaut; Morrison—Akron; Navarro—Cleveland; Panteloukas—Cleveland; Pasko—Ashtabula; Patterson—Wadsworth; Pechatsko—Eastlake; Quaider—Medina; Root—Conneaut; Sayre—Akron; Scheier—Brunswick; Sutton—Orwell; Wallish—Northfield; Winters—Roaming Shores; Zahorai—Brunswick.

UNITES STATES AIR FORCE—24

Burgess—Cleveland; Butcher—Madison; Dolan—Elyria; Duffield—Westlake; Dunstan—Elyria; Ewing—Elyria; Fitzgerald—Medina; Hill—South Euclid; Lewis—Mentor; Loper—Parma; Lunato, Jr.—Grafton; Merriweather—Wickliffe; Miranda—Elyria; Moran—Medina; Paalz—Berea; Richter—Eastlake; Rivera—Berea; Ryder—Strongsville; Searight—Bedford; Smith—Bedford; Smith—Kirtland; Thomas—Madison; Washington—Berea; Yehl—Chardon.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD—3

Chiyam—Fairview Park; Mullis—Akron; Tryon—Eastlake.

OHIO ARMY NATIONAL GUARD—123

Abrams—Ashtabula; Alicea—Cleveland; Bascomb—Cleveland; Becker—Dorset; Bernardo—Ashtabula; Blackburn—Beachwood; Boston—Hartville; Brown—Shaker Heights; Brown—Ashtabula; Brown, Jr—New Franklin; Burgos—Cleveland; Burks—Chagrin Falls; Camera—Wakeman; Cavett—Cleveland; Christian—Elyria; Collins—Richmond Heights; Crider—Maple Heights; Cronan—Hudson; Dean—Akron; Dennis—Twinsburg; Denson, Jr.—Barberton; Drawkulich—Springfield; Dvorak—Chagrin Falls; Eckenrode—Madison; Endsley—Amherst; Eshelman—Chagrin Falls; Evans—Richmond Heights; Flowers—Wakeman; Friend—Wellington; Frolo—North Royalton; Funk—Akron; Gautschi—Geneva; Gonzalez—Lorain; Gray—Lakewood; Greene—Twinsburg; Gruszka—Northfield; Guardo—Chardon; Guerra—Lakewood; Hammond—Berea; Hancock—Canton; Hensal—Clinton; Hernandez—Cleveland; Hernandez—Parma; Hodges—Strongsville; Hunt—Brooklyn; Hurtt—Cleveland; Jancik—Lakewood.

Johnson—Stow; Kirby—Mentor-on-the-Lake; Ladow Ferguson—Akron; Leski—Avon; Lewis—Windham; Locklear—Cleveland; Losey—Painesville; Lostetter—Cuyahoga Falls; Maldonado—Cleveland; Mallory—Rome; Marino—South Euclid; Mason—Cleveland Heights; McEntee—Valley View; McGraw—Tallmadge; McMullen—LaGrange; Miller—Conneaut; Miller—Grafton; Miller—Wadsworth; Minor—Hudson; Mollick—Ashtabula; Moore—Barberton; Moore—Cleveland; Moore—Uniontown; Moreno—Cleveland; Mullins—Cleveland; Myers—Akron; Ness—Painesville; Novah-Avila—Brooklyn Heights; Novello—Burton; Ogden—Barberton; Panar, Jr.—Akron; Parsons—Elyria; Patterson—Elyria; Perkins—Jefferson; Plants—Ashtabula; Player—Cleveland.

Powers—Cleveland; Prater—Medina; Priem—Orwell; Pruitt—Garfield Heights; Raser—Mentor; Reinhart—Uniontown; Rinas—Olmsted Township; Rivers—Akron; Rondeau—North Olmsted; Rose—Elyria; Rowe—Hartville; Ruyf—Olmsted Falls; Sanders, Jr.—Akron; Semak—Painesville Township; Shiner—Kent; Singh—Brooklyn; Smith—Akron; Somerville—Stow; Sporcich, Jr.—Ashtabula; Stallworth—Copley; Starling—Barberton; Stokes—Lakewood; Sturgill—Valley City; Sudyk—Painesville; Sundman—Rock Creek; Tabler—Cuyahoga Falls; Taylor, G.—Cleveland; Taylor, J.—Cleveland; Tester—Elyria; Thompson—Akron; Thompson—Cleveland; Turner—Cleveland; VanHorn—Elyria; Vaughn—Hudson; Wadesisi—Cleveland; Walls—Euclid; Weigel—Painesville; Wheeler—Hiram; Whitten—Lorain; Woodward—Akron.

OHIO AIR GUARD—7

Allen—Middleburg Heights; Birchler—Navarre; Day—Norton; Handwerk II—Medina; Little—Norwalk; Wehrmeyer—Ryan; Wooley—Boardman.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING JOANNE FARRIS

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate COL Joanne Farris on her recent selection as the first female brigade commander in the history of the Nevada National Guard. Colonel Farris assumed command of the 991st Multi-Functional Brigade, overseeing more than 700 soldiers, including the Nevada Army Guard's aviation assets. It gives me great pleasure to recognize her achievement in this historic moment.

Colonel Farris joined the Guard over 25 years ago as a private first class and was later commissioned from the University of Nevada, Reno ROTC Program in 1991. She then continued her studies and earned her master's from Clayton College in 2004, the same year she graduated from the Commander and General Staff College. She is currently working towards completion of her second year of War College and is scheduled to graduate this summer.

Colonel Farris formerly commanded the 1–69th Press Camp Headquarters, which deployed to Bosnia in 1999. She also served as command information officer for the State of Nevada, 1–421st Regional Training Institute executive officer, Joint Force Headquarters commander, and as the Nevada Guard State family program director. In 2011, she deployed to Afghanistan with the 401st Army Field Support Brigade.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Colonel Farris for her courageous contributions to the United States of America. Her unwavering dedication to her career is commendable, and she stands as a role model to future generations of heroes. Colonel Farris' service to her country and her bravery earn her a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. Equally as important, it is crucial that female servicemembers and veterans have access to their specific health care needs. There are countless distinguished women who have made sacrifices beyond measure and deserve nothing but the best treatment. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation and will continue to fight until this becomes a reality.

During her tenure, Colonel Farris has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the Nevada Guard. I am both humbled and honored by her service and am proud to call her a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Colonel Joanne Farris for all of her accomplishments and wish her well in all of her future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO JODY SHERVANICK

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize Jody Shervanick for her tireless efforts in supporting Nevada's veterans, active military members, and their families. Ms. Shervanick volunteers 7 days a week to give back to the brave men and women who defend our freedom and their families. She has contributed greatly to the Las Vegas military community and to the greater good of the Silver State.

Having grown up as a military child, Ms. Shervanick understands the trials of a military family. She stands as a shining example of someone who has devoted her life to the betterment of others, selflessly serving to bring happiness to our Nation's heroes each day. It is important to thank not only the men and women serving this great Nation, but also their families who make so many sacrifices. Her service to these families is invaluable.

Ms. Shervanick helps with care for veterans and military members with mental illness, such as post-traumatic stress, and aids in times of uncertainty for military families, providing food, financial aid, and childcare. She hosts special events for families stationed at Creech and Nellis Air Force Bases. Ms. Shervanick coordinates the ''World's Largest Baby Shower,'' for wives of active military or female members stationed at Creech and Nellis Air Force Bases, puts on multiple Christmas parties for the children at Nellis Air Force Base, spearheads an annual Easter party for the children at Nellis Air Force Base, and will be putting on a ''Mom''ster and Son Halloween bash in October. I have had the opportunity to attend one of Ms. Shervanick's Operation Showers of Appreciation Military Baby Showers in Las Vegas, and I know firsthand the positive impact her efforts have on military families. She works with volunteers to make pillow slips for deployed military members with pictures of their children. Her commitment to these families is without limit. She is truly a role model to all Nevadans.

Ms. Shervanick's hard work has not gone without notice. She received ''Citizen of the Month'' from Mayor Carolyn Goodman of the city of Las Vegas in December 2014, a plaque recognizing her service from Governor Brian Sandoval, and has been recognized by News 3 KSNV, 8 News Now KLAS, and FOX 5 KVVU for her service to veterans and military families. I extend my deepest gratitude to Ms. Shervanick for her noble contributions to the Las Vegas military community. Her service to Nevada places her among the outstanding men and women of the State and her accolades are well deserved.

Today, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing Ms. Shervanick and her work with active military members, veterans, and their families. Her efforts are both honorable and necessary. I wish her the best of luck in all of her future endeavors.•

RECOGNIZING LOUISIANA'S LEMONADE DAY

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, Saturday, May 2, 2015, marks the fifth annual Louisiana Lemonade Day during which thousands of children across the Pelican State will start their own small business—a lemonade stand. This free, statewide program is dedicated to teaching children how to start, own, and operate their own business, and in the last 5 years, Lemonade Day has provided more than 50,000 children across Louisiana with the opportunity to become entrepreneurs.

On Lemonade Day, thousands of children will open their own lemonade stands and learn the crucial lessons of salesmanship, competition, and marketing. They will be introduced to crucial business skills, like supply and demand, critical thinking and problem solving, and civic responsibility. Lemonade Day encourages young entrepreneurs to save one-third of their profits, share one-third of their profits, and spend one-third of their profits. They are even urged to open a youth savings account. These simple, yet important lessons will shape future generations of business leaders, and hopefully, instill some good money-managing practices that will help them later in life.

The secret to America's success lies within the innovation and creativity of American entrepreneurs. Urging our Nation's youth to develop their big ideas is critical for securing the future of our country's economic stability. On its fifth anniversary, I would like to recognize Louisiana's Lemonade Day and the role it plays in fostering entrepreneurial spirits in the lives of our Nation's youths.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS SUPPORTING THE UNDERLYING OBJECTIVES OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION (THE ''COMMISSION'')—PM 15

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

My Administration fully supports the underlying objectives of the recommendations that the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (the ''Commission'') offered in January. These recommendations represent an important step forward in protecting the long-term viability of the All-Volunteer Force, improving quality-of-life for service members and their families, and ensuring the fiscal sustainability of the military compensation and retirement systems.

As I directed in my letter of March 30, my team has worked with the Commission to further analyze the recommendations and identify areas of agreement. At this time I am prepared to support specific proposals for 10 of the Commission's 15 recommendations, either as proposed or with modifications that have been discussed among the Department of Defense, other agencies, and the Commission. These include the following:

Survivor Benefit Plan
Financial Education
Medical Personnel Readiness
Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Collaboration
Child Care
Service Member Education
Transition Assistance
Nutritional Financial Assistance
Dependent Space-Available Travel
Report on Military Connected Dependents

In some instances, the Department of Defense is already taking actions to implement these recommendations, and I will direct the Department to develop plans to complete this implementation. In those areas where legislation is required, I expect the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the Congress on my behalf the relevant legislative proposals, which I recommend be enacted without delay.

With respect to the remaining recommendations, given their complexity and our solemn responsibility to ensure that any changes further the objectives above, we will continue working with the Commission to understand how the following proposals would affect the All-Volunteer Force:

Blended Retirement System

Reserve Component Duty Statuses

Exceptional Family Member's Support

Commissary and Exchange Consolidation

I believe there is merit in all of these recommendations and that they deserve careful consideration and study. I will ensure that the Congress is kept apprised of this ongoing work.

Finally, I agree with the Commission that we need to continue to improve the military health care system. The health care reforms proposed in my Fiscal Year 2016 Budget are a good first step and offer service members, retirees, and their families more control and choice over their health care decisions. This remains a critical issue, and my Administration will work with the Commission and interested Members of Congress in the coming months to develop additional reform proposals for consideration as part of my Fiscal Year 2017 Budget.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 30, 2015.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:27 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office''.

At 4:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds, the rotunda of the Capitol, and Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for official Congressional events surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–1498. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Kenneth E. Floyd, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1499. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Department of Energy Process to Consider LNG Export Applications''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1500. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0519); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1501. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0517); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1502. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–142); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1503. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Phenol, 2-(2H-benzotriazol-2-yl)-6-dodecyl-4-methyl-; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9925–78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1504. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9926–24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1505. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Permits and Permits by Rule for the Federal Minor New Source Review Program in Indian Country for Five Source Categories'' ((RIN2060–AQ95) (FRL No. 9919–85–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1506. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designate Facilities and Pollutants; Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, New Mexico, and the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incinerator Units'' (FRL No. 9927–00–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1507. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Stage I Regulations'' (FRL No. 99247–10–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1508. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Arkansas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Fee Regulations'' (FRL No. 9926–91–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1509. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)'' (FRL No. 9926–81–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–19. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota urging the United States Congress to call for a constitutional convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires a balanced federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3015

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States mandates that upon the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the states, Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments; and

Whereas, this application is to be considered as covering the balanced budget amendment language of the presently outstanding balanced budget applications from other states; and

Whereas, this application shall be aggregated for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds necessary to require the calling of a convention for proposing a balanced budget amendment, but shall not be aggregated with any applications on any other subject; and

Whereas, this application is a continuing application until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the states have made applications on the same subject; and

Whereas, the North Dakota Legislative Assembly deems an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring a balanced federal budget to be necessary for the good of the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota, the Senate Concurring therein:

That the Sixty-fourth Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states limited to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that in the absence of a national emergency the total of all federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the

total of all estimated federal revenues for that fiscal year, together with any related and appropriate fiscal restraints; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the Senate and the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to each member of the United States Congressional Delegation, and also to transmit copies to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the United States, requesting their cooperation.

POM–20. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho urging the United States Congress to expedite appropriation of funds to significantly enhance dreissenid monitoring and prevention efforts and to implement the intent of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 101

Whereas, maintaining a healthy suite of economic, environmental and social ecosystem services in aquatic systems is integral to the quality of life in the State of Idaho; and

Whereas, healthy aquatic habitats provide clean drinking water, flood control, transportation, recreation, purification of human and industrial wastes, power generation, habitat for native plants and animals, production of their foods, marketable goods, and cultural benefits; and

Whereas, aquatic invasive species, including mussels such as dreissenids, cause irreparable ecological damage to many waters in the United States; and

Whereas, dreissenids have not yet been detected in the Pacific North-West. The estimated cost to address established populations of dreissenids in the Pacific North-West Economic Region is almost $500 million annually; and

Whereas, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act was signed in June 2014 and authorizes $20 million for Columbia River Basin dreissenid efforts through the Secretary of the Army: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the member of the First Regular Session of the Sixty-third Idaho Legislature, the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring therein, that we respectfully request Congress expedite appropriation of these funds to significantly enhance monitoring and prevention efforts and to implement the intent of the Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the United States Barack Obama, the United States Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM–21. A resolution approved by the Electors of the City of Watertown, Wisconsin, calling for reclaiming the expansion of the rights of artificial legal entities and the corrupting influence of unregulated political spending; and supporting an amendment to the United States Constitution, stating: only human beings—not corporations, unions, nonprofits, or similar associations—are endowed with constitutional rights, and that money is not speech, and therefore regulating political contributions and spending is not equivalent to limiting political speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 993. A bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 1177. An original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Peter Levine, of Maryland, to be Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

Army nomination of Col. Raymond S. Dingle, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Ron. J. MacLaren, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Herman A. Shelanski, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Joseph Anderson, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. James J. Burks, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. James C. Balserak and ending with Brig. Gen. Carol A. Timmons, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Air Force nomination of Col. Kyle W. Robinson, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Robert D. Carlson and ending with Col. Tracy L. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Army nomination of Chaplain (Col.) Thomas L. Solhjem, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Danelle M. Barrett, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Ronald C. Copley, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. David L. Goldfein, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Timothy M. Ray, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Darryl L. Roberson, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Eric C. Bush, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Alan R. Lynn, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Jill K. Faris, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Gary H. Cheek, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Christian A. Rofrano, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Nora W. Tyson, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Mark A. Brilakis, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert S. Walsh, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Troy S. Thomas, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Linell A. Letendre, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Bamidele A. Adetunji and ending with Keri L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Travis M. Allen and ending with Jeromy James Wells, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Richard S. Beyea III and ending with Travis C. Yelton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Keith L. Clark and ending with Jennie Leigh L. Stoddart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Talib Y. Ali and ending with Gabriel Zimmerer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nomination of John W. Heck, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Anna Hamm, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Jermal M. Scarbrough, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Cynthia A. Rutherford and ending with Angela Scevola-Dattoli, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nomination of Susan I. Pangelinan, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Bryan K. Anderson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Mark A. Endsley, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Arpana Jain and ending with Rama Krishna, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 25, 2015.

Army nomination of James J. Raftery, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of David A. Harper, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Steven R. Ansley, Jr. and ending with Karen S. Hanson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Army nomination of Rita A. Kostecke, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Schawn B. Branch and ending with Frank A. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Marine Corps nomination of Joshua B. Roberts, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Dawn R. Alonso and ending with Vincent J. Yasaki, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Nawaz K. A. Hack and ending with Robert P. Rutter, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 25, 2015.

Navy nomination of Brian L. Tichenor, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Cheryl Gotzinger, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of John P. O'Brien, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Carolyn A. Winningham and ending with Sara M. Bustamante, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Mark Scarano, of New Hampshire, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Northern Border Regional Commission.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1139. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1140. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1142. A bill to clarify that noncommercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not in interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1143. A bill to make the authority of States of Washington, Oregon, and California to manage Dungeness crab fishery permanent and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1144. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a corporate responsibility investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1145. A bill to improve compliance with mine safety and health laws, empower miners to raise safety concerns, prevent future mine tragedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1146. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit further reductions in sodium levels and to reinstate the grain-rich requirements applicable to the national school lunch and breakfast programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1147. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the ''J. Waties Waring Judicial Center''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1148. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1149. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require reporting of certain data by providers and suppliers of air ambulance services for purposes of reforming reimbursements for such services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. REED, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1150. A bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1151. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise the operations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1152. A bill to make permanent the extended period of protections for members of uniformed services relating to mortgages, mortgage foreclosure, and eviction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 1153. A bill to provide legal certainty to property owners along the Red River in Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1154. A bill to reverse the designation by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture of certain communities in the State of Alaska as nonrural; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1155. A bill to promote the mapping and development of United States geothermal resources by establishing a direct loan program for high risk geothermal exploration wells, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve geothermal energy technology and demonstrate the use of geothermal energy in large scale thermal applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1156. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1157. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to consider Brunswick County, North Carolina to be part of the same metropolitan statistical area as Wilmington, North Carolina; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1158. A bill to ensure the privacy and security of sensitive personal information, to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to provide notice of security breaches involving sensitive personal information, and to enhance law enforcement assistance and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personal information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1160. A bill to amend the Public Land Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1161. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to provide increased protection for horses participating in shows, exhibitions, or sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 1162. A bill to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure

their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1163. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1164. A bill to protect consumers from discriminatory State taxes on motor vehicle rentals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1165. A bill to provide consumer protections for students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1166. A bill to establish a pilot grant program to support career and technical education exploration programs in middle schools and high schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1167. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Pole Creek Wilderness, the Owyhee River Wilderness, and the North Fork Owyhee Wilderness and to authorize the continued use of motorized vehicles for livestock monitoring, herding, and grazing in certain wilderness areas in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1168. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rehabilitation innovation centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1169. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1170. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1171. A bill to establish a moratorium on oil and gas-related seismic activities off the coastline of the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1172. A bill to improve the process of presidential transition; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1173. A bill to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the rental of motor vehicles that contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 1174. A bill to deregulate interstate commerce with respect to parimutuel wagering on horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1175. A bill to improve the safety of hazardous materials rail transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 1176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 1177. An original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1178. A bill to prohibit implementation of a proposed rule relating to the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'' under the Clean Water Act, or any substantially similar rule, until a Supplemental Scientific Review Panel and Ephemeral and Intermittent Streams Advisory Committee produce certain reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 156. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to childhood stroke and recognizing May 2015 as ''National Pediatric Stroke Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. Res. 157. A resolution recognizing the economic, cultural, and political contributions of the Southeast-Asian American community on the 40th anniversaries of the beginning of Khmer Rouge control over Cambodia and the beginning of the Cambodian Genocide and the end of the Vietnam War and the ''Secret War'' in the Kingdom of Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 158. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historic significance of the Cinco de Mayo holiday; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 159. A resolution designating April 2015, as ''National 9–1–1 Education Month''; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TESTER, Mr. COONS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 160. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 161. A resolution designating April 2015 as ''Financial Literacy Month''; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. HELLER):

S. Res. 162. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Alcohol Responsibility Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. Res. 163. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the humanitarian catastrophe caused by the April 25, 2015, earthquake in Nepal; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 164. A resolution designating April 30, 2015, as Dia de los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. Res. 165. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. Con. Res. 14. A concurrent resolution providing that the President may not provide sanctions relief to Iran until certain United States citizens are released from Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 282

At the request of Mr. PAUL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 282, a bill to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and

areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 327

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 327, a bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 386, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Attorney General of persons required to register as sex offenders.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 469

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 469, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 492

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 492, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 507

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 507, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to pay higher wages to their employees.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to safeguard data stored abroad from improper government access, and for other purposes.

S. 517

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 517, a bill to extend the secure rural schools and community self-determination program, to restore mandatory funding status to the payment in lieu of taxes program, and for other purposes.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 608

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 608, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property.

S. 753

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 776

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 776, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 860, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 884

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 884, a bill to improve access to emergency medical services, and for other purposes.

S. 898

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 898, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 939

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 939, a bill to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs within the Department of Energy.

S. 976

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to promote the development of a United States commercial space resource exploration and utilization industry and to increase the exploration and utilization of resources in outer space.

S. 981

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 981, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a repatriation holiday, to increase funding to the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1014

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1032, a bill to expand the

use of E-Verify, to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1088

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for voter registration through the Internet, and for other purposes.

S. 1116

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1117

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1117, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to remove senior executives of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct to include removal of certain other employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1127, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill relating to the modernization of C–130 aircraft to meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1147

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1147 proposed to H.R. 1191, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1140. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last week, I spoke on the floor about a new report by the Bipartisan Policy Center. This report talked about the great progress we have made so far in this Congress, as far as getting things done in a bipartisan way. I believe that is good news. Republicans in the Senate are committed to continuing our progress and to holding more votes on areas of bipartisan agreement. So I want to speak about something Senators on both sides of the aisle agree we can do to protect America's navigable waters.

Our rivers, lakes and other waterways are among America's most treasured resources. In my home State of Wyoming, we have some of the most beautiful rivers in the world: the Snake River, the Wind River, dozens of others.

The people of Wyoming are devoted to keeping these waterways safe and pristine for our children and our grandchildren. They understand there is a right way and a wrong way to do that. It is possible to have reasonable regulations to help preserve our waterways, while at the same time allowing it to be used as natural resources.

We have done it for years under the Clean Water Act. That is the right way to do it. The wrong way to do it is for Washington bureaucrats—bureaucrats—unelectable, unaccountable, to write harsh and inflexible rules that could block any use of water or even use of land in much of the country. The Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers have proposed a new rule, a new rule that would expand the Clean Water Act in what I believe is a dangerous new direction.

The rule is an attempt to change the definition of what the law calls waters of the United States. Under the rule, this term could include ditches, it would include dry areas where water only flows for a short time after it rains. Federal regulations have never before listed ditches and other manmade features as waters of the United States.

What the administration is proposing now simply makes no sense. Under this new rule, the new rule they are proposing, isolated ponds could be regulated as waters of the United States. This is the kind of pond that might form in a low-lying piece of land with no connection to a river or a stream. It could be in someone's back yard.

An isolated pond is not navigable water. That is not what the law was designed to protect. This is bipartisan, and there is bipartisan agreement that Washington bureaucrats have no business, none at all, regulating an isolated pond as a water of the United States. Under this newly proposed rule, agriculture water management systems could be regulated as waters of the United States.

We are talking about irrigation ditches. An irrigation ditch is not navigable water. These are manmade ditches that people dig to move water from one place to another to grow crops. This kind of agriculture water is not what the law was designed to protect. There is bipartisan agreement that Washington bureaucrats have no business regulating an irrigation ditch as waters of the United States.

Under this outrageously broad new rule, Washington bureaucrats would now have a say in how farmers and ranchers and families use their own property. It would allow the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate private property just based on things such as whether it is used by animals or birds or even insects. It could regulate any water that moves over land or infiltrates into the ground.

Well, this is an ominously far-reaching definition. It is the wrong way—the wrong way—to protect America 's precious water resources. This rule is not designed to protect the traditional waters of the United States, it is designed to expand the power of Washington bureaucrats.

Now, there is a better way to protect America's water, and there is bipartisan support for it in this body. Today, I have introduced the Federal Water Quality Protection Act, along with Senators DONNELLY, INHOFE, HEITKAMP, ROBERTS, MANCHIN, SULLIVAN, ROUNDS, BLUNT, MCCONNELL, CAPITO, and FISCHER. That is bipartisan. It is a bipartisan agreement that says we need a different approach.

This bill says yes to clean water and no to extreme bureaucracy. It will give the Environmental Protection Agency the direction it needs, the direction to

write a strong and reasonable rule that truly protects America's waterways, one that keeps Washington's hands off things such as irrigation ditches, isolated ponds, and groundwater, one that does not allow the determination to be based on plants and insects, one that protects streams that could carry dangerous pollutants to navigable waters or wetlands that protect those waters from pollutants.

It would make sure Washington bureaucrats comply, comply with other laws and Executive orders that, well, they have been avoiding. They would have to do an economic analysis and conduct reviews to protect small businesses, to protect ranchers, to protect farmers. They would have to consult with the States. They have to make sure, by consulting with the States, that we have the approach that works best everywhere, not just the approach Washington likes best.

The Environmental Protection Agency says our concerns are overblown. The administration says there is a lot of misunderstanding about what their regulation covers. It says the Agency has no intention of regulating things like I have just described. The key word there is ''intention.'' This bill would help to make sure the rules are crystal clear.

It gives certainty and clarity to farmers, to ranchers, and to small business owners and their families. People would be able to use their property without fear of Washington bureaucrats knocking on their door. We would also be able to enjoy the beautiful rivers and the lakes that should be preserved and protected. This bipartisan bill does nothing to block legitimate protection of the true waters of the United States. It simply restores Washington's attention to the traditional waters that were always the focus before.

That is what this law should protect. This bill is one easy thing we can do to protect Americans from runaway bureaucracy. The Senate has been very productive so far this year. We are going to keep going. We are going to go with more ideas that have bipartisan support. The Federal Water Quality Protection Act is one of them. I want to thank some of the many cosponsors.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act of 2015. I am very pleased to be joined by my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CASEY, in introducing this bipartisan bill.

I know it will come as no surprise to the Presiding Officer that small businesses are our Nation's job creators. Firms with fewer than 500 employees generate about 50 percent of our Nation's GDP, account for more than 99 percent of employers, and employ nearly half of all workers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, small businesses generated 63 percent of the net new jobs that were created between 1993 and 2013.

Even the smallest firms have a notable effect on our economy. The Small Business Administration's data indicates that businesses with fewer than 20 employees accounted for 18 percent of all private sector jobs in 2013. Our bill allows small businesses to plan for capital investments that are vital to expansion and job creation. It eases complex accounting rules for the smallest businesses and it reduces the tax burden on newly formed ventures.

Recent studies by the National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, indicate that taxes are the No. 1 concern of small business owners and that constant change in the Tax Code is among their chief concerns, and that is certainly the case in the State of Maine. When I talk with employers across the State, they constantly tell me the uncertainty in our Tax Code and in the regulations that are coming out of Washington make it very difficult for them to plan, to hire new workers, and to know what is going to be coming their way.

A key feature of our bill is that it provides the certainty that small businesses need to create and implement long-term capital investment plans that are vital to their growth. I will give an example. Section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code allows small businesses to deduct the costs of acquired assets more rapidly. The amount of the maximum allowable deduction has changed three times in the past 8 years. Making matters worse, it is usually not addressed until it is part of a huge package of extenders passed at the end of the year, making this tax benefit unpredictable from year to year and, therefore, difficult for small businesses to take full advantage of in their long-range planning. They essentially have to gamble that the tax incentive is going to be extended and that it is going to be made retroactive to the 1st of the year.

Just recently, I spoke with Patrick Schrader from Arundel Machine, a small business in Maine. He told me that the uncertainty surrounding section 179 has hindered his ability to make sound business decisions. The high-tech equipment that he needs requires months of lead time. For a small business like Patrick's, it is very risky to increase spending to expand and create new jobs when the deductibility of the machinery that helps to make those jobs possible remains unknown until late December. For business planning, this is information that is vital to have at the beginning of the year, not at the end of the year. This uncertainty has a direct impact on hiring decisions and the ability to take advantage of business opportunities.

Our bill permanently sets the maximum allowable deduction under section 179 at $500,000, indexed for inflation, and it is also structured in such a way that it is really targeted to our smaller businesses.

Our bill will also permanently extend the ability of restaurants, retailers, and certain businesses that lease their space to depreciate the costs of property improvements over 15 years rather than over 39 years. Think about that. What restaurant is going to be able to wait 39 years before doing upgrades and improvements? What we are trying to do is to better match the depreciation schedule with the need to update a restaurant or a retail space.

The Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act also allows more companies to use the cash method of accounting by permanently doubling the threshold at which the more complex accrual method is required from $5 million in gross receipts to $10 million. This includes an expansion in the ability of small businesses to use simplified methods of accounting for inventories.

Our legislation also eases the tax burden on a new startup business by permanently doubling the deduction for those initial expenses from $5,000 to $10,000, and for a very small business, that is really important. Similar to section 179, this benefit is limited to small businesses and the deduction phases out for total expenses exceeding $60,000.

Our legislation extends for 1 year a provision that provides benefits to businesses of all sizes, the so-called bonus depreciation.

Let me make clear that I continue to believe Congress should undertake comprehensive tax reform, with three major goals. It should result in a Tax Code that is more progrowth, that is fairer, and that is simpler. I urge the Senate to undertake such a reform, but in the meantime, the provisions of our bill would make a real difference in the ability of our Nation's small businesses to keep and create jobs.

I will give another real-life example of what the small business expensing provisions can mean. I am proud to say Maine is known for its delicious craft beers. Dan Kleban founded Maine Beer Company with his brother in 2009. In 6 short years, the company has added 21 good-paying jobs with generous health and retirement benefits. They plan to hire at least three more workers shortly. Dan noted that his company's business decisions were directly affected by section 179 expensing.

Here is why. This provision allowed them to expand by reinvesting their capital in new equipment to produce

more beer and hire more Mainers. Those are both good outcomes. In the last 3 years, they have taken the maximum deduction allowed under section 179 to acquire the equipment they needed to expand their business. This year, they hope to use the provision to finance the cost of a solar project that will offset nearly 50 percent of their energy consumption.

If their business had been forced to spread these deductions over many years, its owners would not have been able to grow the business as they have done nor create those good jobs. This economic benefit is multiplied when we consider the effect of the investment by Maine Beer Company and Maine's many other craft brewers on the equipment manufacturers, the transportation companies needed to haul the new equipment to their breweries, the increased inventory in their breweries, and the suppliers of the materials needed to brew the additional beer. So it has a ripple effect that benefits many other businesses and allows them to create more jobs as well.

In February, NFIB released new research that backs up this claim with hard numbers. They found that simply extending section 179 permanently at the 2014 level could increase employment by as much as 197,000 jobs during the 10-year window following implementation. U.S. real output could also increase by as much as $18.6 billion over the same period.

In light of the positive effects this bill would have on small businesses, on job creation, and on our economy, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act. I would note that the bill has been endorsed by NFIB, the leading voice for small business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of endorsement from the NFIB be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: on behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I write in support of your Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act, which would provide certainty and permanency with regard to several important tax provisions for small businesses.

The most important source of financing for small business is their earnings, i.e. cash flow. In fact, cash flow is ranked 13th out of 75 potential business problems in NFIB's Small Business and Priorities. This is why NFIB is particularly pleased to see the inclusion of reformed Section 179 expensing and expanded eligibility for cash accounting in your legislation.

Expensing provides small businesses with an immediate source of capital recovery and improved cash flow. Unfortunately, small business expensing levels have only been increased on a temporary basis, and at the beginning of this year the limit reverted back to $25,000, which is highly inadequate for the needs of small businesses. Unless Congress acts, this lower expensing limit will mean that only 30 percent of NFIB members will receive the full benefit of small business expensing in 2015. A 2015 NFIB Research Foundation study shows that a permanent expansion of the expensing deduction allowance limit to $500,000 could increase employment by as much as 197,000 jobs. NFIB supports permanently increasing expensing limits to $500,000 as well as permitting taxpayers to expense the cost of some improvements to real property. We appreciate you accomplishing these goals in your legislation while also permanently indexing this provision to inflation.

Furthermore, small businesses would benefit from the greater ability to use cash accounting for tax purposes. This simplified accounting process would alleviate some of the complexity of the tax code, which currently makes it very difficult for small business owners to plan future investments, hire new workers and grow their businesses. Expanded cash accounting would help business owners manage cash flow while better reflecting their ability to pay taxes.

Thank you for introducing this important legislation. We look forward to working with you to provide tax relief for small businesses in the 114th Congress.

Sincerely,

AMANDA AUSTIN,
Vice President, Public Policy.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. REED, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1150. A bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont is among only 22 States in the Nation with a minimum wage higher than that of the Federal minimum wage. The Green Mountain State has long recognized the importance of paying workers a fair and livable wage, and it is past time for Congress to catch up with the daily struggles of working American families.

That is why today I am proud to join as a cosponsor of Senator MURRAY's Raise the Wage Act, to increase the Federal minimum wage to $12 by 2020. The Raise the Wage Act will help more 38 million Americans and thousands of Vermonters who yearn for financial security, for the sound footing to build their lives, and the lives of their children.

The Federal minimum wage has not kept up with inflation. In fact, it has lost more than 30 percent of its value since 1968. Over that same time, productivity has doubled, and low-wage workers today bring more experience and education to the workforce. American workers are being asked to work more for less. It is past time to adjust this disparity.

In Vermont, 64,000 workers would see their wages improve if we raised the minimum wage to $12. That is roughly $141 million in added income for families in Vermont—families who could spend these earnings at the store down the street, multiplying the economic impact to resonate through our local economies and downtown businesses.

Today, nearly two-thirds of Americans who earn the minimum wage or less are women; the Raise the Wage Act will improve the hard-earned wages of more than 21 million American women.

No one who works hard in a full-time job should live in poverty in our land, and raising the minimum wage should not be a question; it is commonsense, it is fair, and it is right. It is the right step to take to help ensure that workers can earn wages that support their families.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 1153. A bill to provide legal certainty to property owners along the Red River in Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1153

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Red River Private Property Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. DISCLAIMER AND OUTDATED SURVEYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary hereby disclaims any right, title, and interest to all land located south of the South Bank boundary line of the Red River in the affected area.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF PRIOR SURVEYS.—Previous surveys conducted by the Bureau of Land Management shall have no force or effect in determining the current South Bank boundary line.

SEC. 3. IDENTIFICATION OF CURRENT BOUNDARY.

(a) BOUNDARY IDENTIFICATION.—To identify the current South Bank boundary line along the affected area, the Secretary shall commission a new survey that—

(1) adheres to the gradient boundary survey method;

(2) spans the entire length of the affected area;

(3) is conducted by Licensed State Land Surveyors chosen by the Texas General Land Office; and

(4) is completed not later than 2years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPROVAL OF THE SURVEY.—The Secretary shall submit the survey conducted under this Act to the Texas General Land Office for approval. State approval of the completed survey shall satisfy the requirements under this Act.

SEC. 4. APPEAL.

Not later than 1 year after the survey is completed and approved pursuant to section 3, a private property owner who holds right, title, or interest in the affected area may appeal public domain claims by the Secretary to an Administrative Law Judge.

SEC. 5. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

The Secretary shall ensure that no parcels of land in the affected area are treated as Federal land for the purpose of any resource management plan until the survey has been completed and approved and the Secretary ensures that the parcel is not subject to further appeal pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 6. CONSTRUCTION.

This Act does not change or affect in any manner the interest of the States or sovereignty rights of federally recognized Indian tribes over lands located to the north of the South Bank boundary line of the Red River as established by this Act.

SEC. 7. SALE OF REMAINING RED RIVER SURFACE RIGHTS.

(a) COMPETITIVE SALE OF IDENTIFIED FEDERAL LANDS.—After the survey has been completed and approved and the Secretary ensures that a parcel is not subject to further appeal under this Act, the Secretary shall offer any and all such remaining identified Federal lands for disposal by competitive sale for not less than fair market value as determined by an appraisal conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(b) EXISTING RIGHTS.—The sale of identified Federal lands under this section shall be subject to valid existing tribal, State, and local rights.

(c) PROCEEDS OF SALE OF LANDS.—Net proceeds from the sale of identified Federal lands under this section shall be used to offset any costs associated with this Act.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a list of any identified Federal lands that have not been sold under subsection (a) and the reasons such lands were not sold.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) AFFECTED AREA.—The term ''affected area'' means lands along the approximately 116-mile stretch of the Red River from its confluence with the North Fork of the Red River on the west to the 98th meridian on the east between the States of Texas and Oklahoma.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of Bureau of Land Management.

(3) SOUTH BANK.—The term ''South Bank'' means the water-washed and relatively permanent elevation or acclivity, commonly called a cut bank, along the southerly or right side of the Red River which separates its bed from the adjacent upland, whether valley or hill, and usually serves to confine the waters within the bed and to preserve the course of the river; as specified in the fifth paragraph of the decree rendered March 12, 1923, in *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U. S. 340, 43 S. Ct. 376, 67 L. Ed. 687.

(4) SOUTH BANK BOUNDARY LINE.—The term ''South Bank boundary line'' means the boundary between Texas and Oklahoma identified through the gradient boundary survey method ; as specified in the sixth and seventh paragraphs of the decree rendered March 12, 1923, in *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U. S. 340, 43 S. Ct. 376, 67 L. Ed. 687.

(5) GRADIENT BOUNDARY SURVEY METHOD.—The term ''gradient boundary survey method'' means the measurement technique used to locate the South Bank boundary line under the methodology established by the United States Supreme Court which recognizes that the boundary line between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the Red River is subject to such changes as have been or may be wrought by the natural and gradual processes known as erosion and accretion as specified in the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of the decree rendered March 12, 1923, in *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U. S. 340, 43 S. Ct. 376, 67 L. Ed. 687.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1156. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Protecting Employees and Retirees in Business Bankruptcies Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Business bankruptcies have increased sharply in recent years and remain at high levels. These bankruptcies include several of the largest business bankruptcy filings in history. As the use of bankruptcy has expanded, job preservation and retirement security are placed at greater risk.

(2) Laws enacted to improve recoveries for employees and retirees and limit their losses in bankruptcy cases have not kept pace with the increasing and broader use of bankruptcy by businesses in all sectors of the economy. However, while protections for employees and retirees in bankruptcy cases have eroded, management compensation plans devised for those in charge of troubled businesses have become more prevalent and are escaping adequate scrutiny.

(3) Changes in the law regarding these matters are urgently needed as bankruptcy is used to address increasingly more complex and diverse conditions affecting troubled businesses and industries.

TITLE I—IMPROVING RECOVERIES FOR EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES

SEC. 101. INCREASED WAGE PRIORITY.

Section 507(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''$10,000'' and inserting ''$20,000'';

(B) by striking ''within 180 days''; and

(C) by striking ''or the date of the cessation of the debtor's business, whichever occurs first,'';

(2) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking—

(A) ''within 180 days''; and

(B) ''or the date of the cessation of the debtor's business, whichever occurs first''; and

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) for each such plan, to the extent of the number of employees covered by each such plan, multiplied by $20,000.''.

SEC. 102. CLAIM FOR STOCK VALUE LOSSES IN DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLANS.

Section 101(5) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) right or interest in equity securities of the debtor, or an affiliate of the debtor, held in a defined contribution plan (within the meaning of section 3(34) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(34))) for the benefit of an individual who is not an insider, a senior executive officer, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor (if 1 or more are not insiders), if such securities were attributable to either employer contributions by the debtor or an affiliate of the debtor, or elective deferrals (within the meaning of section 402(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), and any earnings thereon, if an employer or plan sponsor who has commenced a case under this title has committed fraud with respect to such plan or

has otherwise breached a duty to the participant that has proximately caused the loss of value.''.

SEC. 103. PRIORITY FOR SEVERANCE PAY.

Section 503(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8)(B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) severance pay owed to employees of the debtor (other than to an insider, other senior management, or a consultant retained to provide services to the debtor), under a plan, program, or policy generally applicable to employees of the debtor (but not under an individual contract of employment), or owed pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, for layoff or termination on or after the date of the filing of the petition, which pay shall be deemed earned in full upon such layoff or termination of employment; and''.

SEC. 104. FINANCIAL RETURNS FOR EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES.

Section 1129(a) of title 11, United States Code is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

''(17) The plan provides for recovery of damages payable for the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement, or for other financial returns as negotiated by the debtor and the authorized representative under section 1113 (to the extent that such returns are paid under, rather than outside of, a plan).''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (13) and inserting the following:

''(13) With respect to retiree benefits, as that term is defined in section 1114(a), the plan—

''(A) provides for the continuation after its effective date of payment of all retiree benefits at the level established pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B) or (g) of section 1114 at any time before the date of confirmation of the plan, for the duration of the period for which the debtor has obligated itself to provide such benefits, or if no modifications are made before confirmation of the plan, the continuation of all such retiree benefits maintained or established in whole or in part by the debtor before the date of the filing of the petition; and

''(B) provides for recovery of claims arising from the modification of retiree benefits or for other financial returns, as negotiated by the debtor and the authorized representative (to the extent that such returns are paid under, rather than outside of, a plan).''.

SEC. 105. PRIORITY FOR WARN ACT DAMAGES.

Section 503(b)(1)(A)(ii) of title 11, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

''(ii) wages and benefits awarded pursuant to a judicial proceeding or a proceeding of the National Labor Relations Board as back pay or damages attributable to any period of time occurring after the date of commencement of the case under this title, as a result of a violation of Federal or State law by the debtor, without regard to the time of the occurrence of unlawful conduct on which the award is based or to whether any services were rendered on or after the commencement of the case, including an award by a court under section 2901 of title 29, United States Code, of up to 60 days' pay and benefits following a layoff that occurred or commenced at a time when such award period includes a period on or after the commencement of the case, if the court determines that payment of wages and benefits by reason of the operation of this clause will not substantially increase the probability of layoff or termination of current employees or of nonpayment of domestic support obligations during the case under this title;''.

TITLE II—REDUCING EMPLOYEES' AND RETIREES' LOSSES

SEC. 201. REJECTION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.

Section 1113 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (a) through (f) and inserting the following:

''(a) The debtor in possession, or the trustee if one has been appointed under this chapter, other than a trustee in a case covered by subchapter IV of this chapter and by title I of the Railway Labor Act, may reject a collective bargaining agreement only in accordance with this section. In this section, a reference to the trustee includes the debtor in possession.

''(b) No provision of this title shall be construed to permit the trustee to unilaterally terminate or alter any provision of a collective bargaining agreement before complying with this section. The trustee shall timely pay all monetary obligations arising under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement. Any such payment required to be made before a plan confirmed under section 1129 is effective has the status of an allowed administrative expense under section 503.

''(c)(1) If the trustee seeks modification of a collective bargaining agreement, the trustee shall provide notice to the labor organization representing the employees covered by the agreement that modifications are being proposed under this section, and shall promptly provide an initial proposal for modifications to the agreement. Thereafter, the trustee shall confer in good faith with the labor organization, at reasonable times and for a reasonable period in light of the complexity of the case, in attempting to reach mutually acceptable modifications of such agreement.

''(2) The initial proposal and subsequent proposals by the trustee for modification of a collective bargaining agreement shall be based upon a business plan for the reorganization of the debtor, and shall reflect the most complete and reliable information available. The trustee shall provide to the labor organization all information that is relevant for negotiations. The court may enter a protective order to prevent the disclosure of information if disclosure could compromise the debtor's position with respect to its competitors in the industry, subject to the needs of the labor organization to evaluate the trustee's proposals and any application for rejection of the agreement or for interim relief pursuant to this section.

''(3) In consideration of Federal policy encouraging the practice and process of collective bargaining and in recognition of the bargained-for expectations of the employees covered by the agreement, modifications proposed by the trustee—

''(A) shall be proposed only as part of a program of workforce and nonworkforce cost savings devised for the reorganization of the debtor, including savings in management personnel costs;

''(B) shall be limited to modifications designed to achieve a specified aggregate financial contribution for the employees covered by the agreement (taking into consideration any labor cost savings negotiated within the 12-month period before the filing of the petition), and shall be not more than the minimum savings essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by the liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or any successor to the debtor) in the short term; and

''(C) shall not be disproportionate or overly burden the employees covered by the agreement, either in the amount of the cost savings sought from such employees or the nature of the modifications.

''(d)(1) If, after a period of negotiations, the trustee and the labor organization have not reached an agreement over mutually satisfactory modifications, and further negotiations are not likely to produce mutually satisfactory modifications, the trustee may file a motion seeking rejection of the collective bargaining agreement after notice and a hearing. Absent agreement of the parties, no such hearing shall be held before the expiration of the 21-day period beginning on the date on which notice of the hearing is provided to the labor organization representing the employees covered by the agreement. Only the debtor and the labor organization may appear and be heard at such hearing. An application for rejection shall seek rejection effective upon the entry of an order granting the relief.

''(2) In consideration of Federal policy encouraging the practice and process of collective bargaining and in recognition of the bargained-for expectations of the employees covered by the agreement, the court may grant a motion seeking rejection of a collective bargaining agreement only if, based on clear and convincing evidence—

''(A) the court finds that the trustee has complied with the requirements of subsection (c);

''(B) the court has considered alternative proposals by the labor organization and has concluded that such proposals do not meet the requirements of paragraph (3)(B) of subsection (c);

''(C) the court finds that further negotiations regarding the trustee's proposal or an alternative proposal by the labor organization are not likely to produce an agreement;

''(D) the court finds that implementation of the trustee's proposal shall not—

''(i) cause a material diminution in the purchasing power of the employees covered by the agreement;

''(ii) adversely affect the ability of the debtor to retain an experienced and qualified workforce; or

''(iii) impair the debtor's labor relations such that the ability to achieve a feasible reorganization would be compromised; and

''(E) the court concludes that rejection of the agreement and immediate implementation of the trustee's proposal is essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or any successor to the debtor) in the short term.

''(3) If the trustee has implemented a program of incentive pay, bonuses, or other financial returns for insiders, senior executive officers, or the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor during the bankruptcy, or such a program was implemented within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition, the court shall presume that the trustee has failed to satisfy the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(C).

''(4) In no case shall the court enter an order rejecting a collective bargaining agreement that would result in modifications to a level lower than the level proposed by the trustee in the proposal found by the court to have complied with the requirements of this section.

''(5) At any time after the date on which an order rejecting a collective bargaining agreement is entered, or in the case of an agreement entered into between the trustee and the labor organization providing mutually satisfactory modifications, at any time after such agreement has been entered into, the labor organization may apply to the court for an order seeking an increase in the level of wages or benefits, or relief from working conditions, based upon changed circumstances. The court shall grant the request only if the increase or other relief is not inconsistent with the standard set forth in paragraph (2)(E).

''(e) During a period in which a collective bargaining agreement at issue under this section continues in effect, and if essential to the continuation of the debtor's business or in order to avoid irreparable damage to the estate, the court, after notice and a hearing, may authorize the trustee to implement interim changes in the terms, conditions, wages, benefits, or work rules provided by the collective bargaining agreement. Any hearing under this subsection shall be scheduled in accordance with the needs of the trustee. The implementation of such interim changes shall not render the application for rejection moot.

''(f)(1) Rejection of a collective bargaining agreement constitutes a breach of the agreement, and shall be effective no earlier than the entry of an order granting such relief.

''(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), solely for purposes of determining and allowing a claim arising from the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement, rejection shall be treated as rejection of an executory contract under section 365(g) and shall be allowed or disallowed in accordance with section 502(g)(1). No claim for rejection damages shall be limited by section 502(b)(7). Economic self-help by a labor organization shall be permitted upon a court order granting a motion to reject a collective bargaining agreement under subsection (d) or pursuant to subsection (e), and no provision of this title or of any other provision of Federal or State law may be construed to the contrary.

''(g) The trustee shall provide for the reasonable fees and costs incurred by a labor organization under this section, upon request and after notice and a hearing.

''(h) A collective bargaining agreement that is assumed shall be assumed in accordance with section 365.''.

SEC. 202. PAYMENT OF INSURANCE BENEFITS TO RETIRED EMPLOYEES.

Section 1114 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting '', without regard to whether the debtor asserts a right to unilaterally modify such payments under such plan, fund, or program'' before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting after ''section'' the following: '', and a labor organization serving as the authorized representative under subsection (c)(1),'';

(3) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f)(1) If a trustee seeks modification of retiree benefits, the trustee shall provide a notice to the authorized representative that modifications are being proposed pursuant to this section, and shall promptly provide an initial proposal. Thereafter, the trustee shall confer in good faith with the authorized representative at reasonable times and for a reasonable period in light of the complexity of the case in attempting to reach mutually satisfactory modifications.

''(2) The initial proposal and subsequent proposals by the trustee shall be based upon a business plan for the reorganization of the debtor and shall reflect the most complete and reliable information available. The trustee shall provide to the authorized representative all information that is relevant for the negotiations. The court may enter a protective order to prevent the disclosure of information if disclosure could compromise the debtor's position with respect to its competitors in the industry, subject to the needs of the authorized representative to evaluate the trustee's proposals and an application pursuant to subsection (g) or (h).

''(3) Modifications proposed by the trustee—

''(A) shall be proposed only as part of a program of workforce and nonworkforce cost savings devised for the reorganization of the debtor, including savings in management personnel costs;

''(B) shall be limited to modifications that are designed to achieve a specified aggregate financial contribution for the retiree group represented by the authorized representative (taking into consideration any cost savings implemented within the 12-month period before the date of filing of the petition with respect to the retiree group), and shall be no more than the minimum savings essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by the liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or any successor to the debtor) in the short term; and

''(C) shall not be disproportionate or overly burden the retiree group, either in the amount of the cost savings sought from such group or the nature of the modifications.'';

(4) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking ''(g)'' and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(g)(1) If, after a period of negotiations, the trustee and the authorized representative have not reached agreement over mutually satisfactory modifications and further negotiations are not likely to produce mutually satisfactory modifications, the trustee may file a motion seeking modifications in the payment of retiree benefits after notice and a hearing. Absent agreement of the parties, no such hearing shall be held before the expiration of the 21-day period beginning on the date on which notice of the hearing is provided to the authorized representative. Only the debtor and the authorized representative may appear and be heard at such hearing.

''(2) The court may grant a motion to modify the payment of retiree benefits only if, based on clear and convincing evidence—

''(A) the court finds that the trustee has complied with the requirements of subsection (f);

''(B) the court has considered alternative proposals by the authorized representative and has determined that such proposals do not meet the requirements of subsection (f)(3)(B);

''(C) the court finds that further negotiations regarding the trustee's proposal or an alternative proposal by the authorized representative are not likely to produce a mutually satisfactory agreement;

''(D) the court finds that implementation of the proposal shall not cause irreparable harm to the affected retirees; and

''(E) the court concludes that an order granting the motion and immediate implementation of the trustee's proposal is essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or a successor to the debtor) in the short term.

''(3) If a trustee has implemented a program of incentive pay, bonuses, or other financial returns for insiders, senior executive officers, or the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor during the bankruptcy, or such a program was implemented within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition, the court shall presume that the trustee has failed to satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (f)(3)(C).''; and

(B) by striking ''except that in no case'' and inserting the following:

''(4) In no case''; and

(5) by striking subsection (k) and redesignating subsections (l) and (m) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively.

SEC. 203. PROTECTION OF EMPLOYEE BENEFITS IN A SALE OF ASSETS.

Section 363(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In approving a sale under this subsection, the court shall consider the extent to which a bidder has offered to maintain existing jobs, preserve terms and conditions of employment, and assume or match pension and retiree health benefit obligations in determining whether an offer constitutes the highest or best offer for such property.''.

SEC. 204. CLAIM FOR PENSION LOSSES.

Section 502 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) The court shall allow a claim asserted by an active or retired participant, or by a labor organization representing such participants, in a defined benefit plan terminated under section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, for any shortfall in pension benefits accrued as of the effective date of the termination of such pension plan as a result of the termination of the plan and limitations upon the payment of benefits imposed pursuant to section 4022 of such Act, notwithstanding any claim asserted and collected by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation with respect to such termination.

''(m) The court shall allow a claim of a kind described in section 101(5)(C) by an active or retired participant in a defined contribution plan (within the meaning of section 3(34) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(34))), or by a labor organization representing such participants. The amount of such claim shall be measured by the market value of the stock at the time of contribution to, or purchase by, the plan and the value as of the commencement of the case.''.

SEC. 205. PAYMENTS BY SECURED LENDER.

Section 506(c) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''If employees have not received wages, accrued vacation, severance, or other benefits owed under the policies and practices of the debtor, or pursuant to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement, for services rendered on and after the date of the commencement of the case, such unpaid obligations shall be deemed necessary costs and expenses of preserving, or disposing of, property securing an allowed secured claim and shall be recovered even if the trustee has otherwise waived the provisions of this subsection under an agreement with the holder of the allowed secured claim or a successor or predecessor in interest.''.

SEC. 206. PRESERVATION OF JOBS AND BENEFITS.

Chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting before section 1101 the following:

''§ 1100. Statement of purpose

''A debtor commencing a case under this chapter shall have as its principal purpose the reorganization of its business to preserve going concern value to the maximum extent possible through the productive use of its assets and the preservation of jobs that will sustain productive economic activity.'';

(2) in section 1129(a), as amended by section 104, by adding at the end the following:

''(18) The debtor has demonstrated that the reorganization preserves going concern value to the maximum extent possible through the productive use of the debtor's assets and preserves jobs that sustain productive economic activity.'';

(3) in section 1129(c)—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(c)''; and

(B) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following:

''(2) If the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) are met with respect to more than 1 plan, the court shall, in determining which plan to confirm—

''(A) consider the extent to which each plan would preserve going concern value through the productive use of the debtor's assets and the preservation of jobs that sustain productive economic activity; and

''(B) confirm the plan that better serves such interests.

''(3) A plan that incorporates the terms of a settlement with a labor organization representing employees of the debtor shall presumptively constitute the plan that satisfies this subsection.''; and

(4) in the table of sections, by inserting before the item relating to section 1101 the following:

''1100. Statement of purpose.''.

SEC. 207. TERMINATION OF EXCLUSIVITY.

Section 1121(d) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, cause for reducing the 120-day period or the 180-day period includes the following:

''(A) The filing of a motion pursuant to section 1113 seeking rejection of a collective bargaining agreement if a plan based upon an alternative proposal by the labor organization is reasonably likely to be confirmed within a reasonable time.

''(B) The proposed filing of a plan by a proponent other than the debtor, which incorporates the terms of a settlement with a labor organization if such plan is reasonably likely to be confirmed within a reasonable time.''.

SEC. 208. CLAIM FOR WITHDRAWAL LIABILITY.

Section 503(b) of title 11, United States Code, as amended by section 103 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(11) with respect to withdrawal liability owed to a multiemployer pension plan for a complete or partial withdrawal pursuant to section 4201 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1381) where such withdrawal occurs on or after the commencement of the case, an amount equal to the amount of vested benefits payable from such pension plan that accrued as a result of employees' services rendered to the debtor during the period beginning on the date of commencement of the case and ending on the date of the withdrawal from the plan.''.

TITLE III—RESTRICTING EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION UPON EXIT FROM BANKRUPTCY.

Section 1129(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: ''Except for compensation subject to review under paragraph (5), payments or other distributions under the plan to or for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, and any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor, shall not be approved except as part of a program of payments or distributions generally applicable to employees of the debtor, and only to the extent that the court determines that such payments are not excessive or disproportionate compared to distributions to the debtor's nonmanagement workforce.''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the compensation disclosed pursuant to subparagraph (B) has been approved by, or is subject to the approval of, the court as reasonable when compared to individuals holding comparable positions at comparable companies in the same industry and not disproportionate in light of economic concessions by the debtor's nonmanagement workforce during the case.''.

SEC. 302. LIMITATIONS ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION ENHANCEMENTS.

Section 503(c) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting '', a senior executive officer, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants'' after ''an insider'';

(B) by inserting ''or for the payment of performance or incentive compensation, or a bonus of any kind, or other financial returns designed to replace or enhance incentive, stock, or other compensation in effect before the date of the commencement of the case,'' after ''remain with the debtor's business,'';

and

(C) by inserting ''clear and convincing'' before ''evidence in the record''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) other transfers or obligations, to or for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, managers, or consultants providing services to the debtor, in the absence of a finding by the court, based upon clear and convincing evidence, and without deference to the debtor's request for such payments, that such transfers or obligations are essential to the survival of the debtor's business or (in the case of a liquidation of some or all of the debtor's assets) essential to the orderly liquidation and maximization of value of the assets of the debtor, in either case, because of the essential nature of the services provided, and then only to the extent that the court finds such transfers or obligations are reasonable compared to individuals holding comparable positions at comparable companies in the same industry and not disproportionate in light of economic concessions by the debtor's nonmanagement workforce during the case.''.

SEC. 303. ASSUMPTION OF EXECUTIVE BENEFIT PLANS.

Section 365 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''and (d)'' and inserting ''(d), (q), and (r)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(q) No deferred compensation arrangement for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor shall be assumed if a defined benefit plan for employees of the debtor has been terminated pursuant to section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, on or after the date of the commencement of the case or within 180 days before the date of the commencement of the case.

''(r) No plan, fund, program, or contract to provide retiree benefits for insiders, senior executive officers, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor shall be assumed if the debtor has obtained relief under subsection (g) or (h) of section 1114 to impose reductions in retiree benefits or under subsection (d) or (e) of section 1113 to impose reductions in the health benefits of active employees of the debtor, or reduced or eliminated health benefits for active or retired employees within 180 days before the date of the commencement of the case.''.

SEC. 304. RECOVERY OF EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 562 the following:

''§ 563. Recovery of executive compensation

''(a) If a debtor has obtained relief under subsection (d) of section 1113, or subsection (g) of section 1114, by which the debtor reduces the cost of its obligations under a collective bargaining agreement or a plan, fund, or program for retiree benefits as defined in section 1114(a), the court, in granting relief, shall determine the percentage diminution in the value of the obligations when compared to the debtor's obligations under the collective bargaining agreement, or with respect to retiree benefits, as of the date of the commencement of the case under this title before granting such relief. In making its determination, the court shall include reductions in benefits, if any, as a result of the termination pursuant to section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, of a defined benefit plan administered by the debtor, or for which the debtor is a contributing employer, effective at any time on or after 180 days before the date of the commencement of a case under this title. The court shall not take into account pension benefits paid or payable under such Act as a result of any such termination.

''(b) If a defined benefit pension plan administered by the debtor, or for which the debtor is a contributing employer, has been terminated pursuant to section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, effective at any time on or after 180 days before the date of the commencement of a case under this title, but a debtor has not obtained relief under subsection (d) of section 1113, or subsection (g) of section 1114, the court, upon motion of a party in interest, shall determine the percentage diminution in the value of benefit obligations when compared to the total benefit liabilities before such termination. The court shall not take into account pension benefits paid or payable under title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 as a result of any such termination.

''(c) Upon the determination of the percentage diminution in value under subsection (a) or (b), the estate shall have a claim for the return of the same percentage of the compensation paid, directly or indirectly (including any transfer to a self-settled trust or similar device, or to a nonqualified deferred compensation plan under

section 409A(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) to any officer of the debtor serving as member of the board of directors of the debtor within the year before the date of the commencement of the case, and any individual serving as chairman or lead director of the board of directors at the time of the granting of relief under section 1113 or 1114 or, if no such relief has been granted, the termination of the defined benefit plan.

''(d) The trustee or a committee appointed pursuant to section 1102 may commence an action to recover such claims, except that if neither the trustee nor such committee commences an action to recover such claim by the first date set for the hearing on the confirmation of plan under section 1129, any party in interest may apply to the court for authority to recover such claim for the benefit of the estate. The costs of recovery shall be borne by the estate.

''(e) The court shall not award postpetition compensation under section 503(c) or otherwise to any person subject to subsection (c) if there is a reasonable likelihood that such compensation is intended to reimburse or replace compensation recovered by the estate under this section.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 562 the following:

''563. Recovery of executive compensation.''.

SEC. 305. PREFERENTIAL COMPENSATION TRANSFER.

Section 547 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j)(1) The trustee may avoid a transfer—

''(A) made—

''(i) to or for the benefit of an insider (including an obligation incurred for the benefit of an insider under an employment contract) made in anticipation of bankruptcy; or

''(ii) in anticipation of bankruptcy to a consultant who is formerly an insider and who is retained to provide services to an entity that becomes a debtor (including an obligation under a contract to provide services to such entity or to a debtor); and

''(B) made or incurred on or within 1 year before the filing of the petition.

''(2) No provision of subsection (c) shall constitute a defense against the recovery of a transfer described in paragraph (1).

''(3) The trustee or a committee appointed pursuant to section 1102 may commence an action to recover such transfer, except that, if neither the trustee nor such committee commences an action to recover such transfer by the time of the commencement of a hearing on the confirmation of a plan under section 1129, any party in interest may apply to the court for authority to recover the claims for the benefit of the estate. The costs of recovery shall be borne by the estate.''.

TITLE IV—OTHER PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. UNION PROOF OF CLAIM.

Section 501(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', including a labor organization,'' after ''A creditor''.

SEC. 402. EXCEPTION FROM AUTOMATIC STAY.

Section 362(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(29) of the commencement or continuation of a grievance, arbitration, or similar dispute resolution proceeding established by a collective bargaining agreement that was or could have been commenced against the debtor before the filing of a case under this title, or the payment or enforcement of an award or settlement under such proceeding.''.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1158. A bill to ensure the privacy and security of sensitive personal information, to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to provide notice of security breaches involving sensitive personal information, and to enhance law enforcement assistance and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personal information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Consumer Privacy Protection Act of 2015. This comprehensive legislation will help ensure that the corporations Americans entrust with their most personal information are taking steps to keep it secure. Data breaches continue to plague American businesses and compromise the privacy of millions of consumers. At the same time, the amount of information we share with corporations who are the target of these breaches is growing. Corporations collect and store our social security numbers, our bank account information, and our email addresses. They collect information about our private health and medical conditions. They know what routes we take to and from work and where we drop our kids off at school. They can replicate our fingerprints. We even trust them with private photographs that we store in the cloud.

Corporations benefit financially from our personal information, and they should be obligated to take steps to keep it safe. Too often, however, private information falls into the hands of those who would do us harm and we are not even told. Last year, in what is commonly referred to as the ''Year of the Data Breach,'' breaches at corporations, including Home Depot, Neiman Marcus, and Sony Pictures, as well as many others, demonstrated how vulnerable our corporations are to hackers and cyber criminals. In some cases these breaches exposed credit card data, social security numbers, or bank account information that left millions at risk of financial fraud or identity theft, and in other cases they exposed personal and private information to the public that led to embarrassment and reputational harm.

The Consumer Privacy Protection Act I am introducing today seeks to protect the vast amount of information that we now share with corporations each and every day, and it builds and expands on data security legislation that I have introduced every Congress since 2005. In today's modern world, data security is no longer just about protecting our identities and our bank accounts; it is about protecting our privacy. Americans want to know when someone has had unauthorized access to their emails, to their bank accounts, and to their private family pictures, but they do not just want to be notified of yet another data breach. Americans want to know that the corporations who are profiting from their information are actually doing something to prevent the next data breach. Consumers should not have to settle for mere notice of data breaches. American consumers deserve protection. This legislation would accomplish that.

The Consumer Privacy Protection Act requires that corporations meet certain privacy and data security standards to keep information they store about their customers safe, and requires that corporations notify the customer in the event of a breach. This legislation protects broad categories of data, including, social security numbers and other government-issued identification numbers; financial account information, including credit card numbers and bank accounts; online usernames and passwords, including email names and passwords; unique biometric data, including fingerprints; information about a person's physical and mental health; information about geolocation; and access to private digital photographs and videos.

I understand that not every breach can be prevented. Cyber criminals are determined and constantly looking for new ways to pierce the most sophisticated security systems. But just as we expect a bank to put a lock on the front door and an alarm on the vault to protect its customers' money, we expect corporations to take reasonable measures to protect the personal information they collect from us. Unfortunately, many of the corporations that profit from the very information that we entrust them to protect, have woefully inadequate measures to secure this information. For others, security is simply not a priority. American consumers deserve better.

This legislation creates civil penalties for corporations that fail to meet the required privacy and data security standards established in the bill or fail to notify customers when a breach occurs. The Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the State Attorneys General each have a role in enforcement. This legislation also requires corporations to inform Federal law enforcement, such as the Secret Service and the FBI, of all large data breaches, as well as breaches that could impact the federal government. Such notification is necessary to help law enforcement bring these cyber criminals to justice and identify patterns that help protect against future attacks.

Many Americans understandably assume Federal law already protects this sensitive information—common sense tells us that it should. Unfortunately, the reality is that it does not. States provide a patchwork of protection, and while some laws are strong, others are not. For example, 47 States and the District of Columbia require some form of data breach notification, but only 12 States have passed data security requirements designed to prevent data breaches. My home state of Vermont has a strong data breach notification law that has been in effect since 2007.

In crafting Federal law, we must be careful not to override the strong State laws that took years to accomplish with weaker Federal protections, but we also need to ensure that all Americans, regardless of where they live, have their privacy protected. To this end, the Consumer Privacy Protection Act preempts State law relating to data security and data breach notification only to the extent that the protections under those laws are weaker than those provided for in this bill. We must ensure that consumers do not lose privacy protections they currently enjoy. Since this bill is modeled after those States with the strongest consumer protections, however, I believe it will improve protections for consumers in nearly every State.

I am joined today by Senators FRANKEN, WARREN, BLUMENTHAL, WYDEN, and MARKEY in introducing this legislation. These Senators have long shared my commitment to protecting consumer privacy. This legislation also has the support of leading consumer privacy advocates, including: Center for Democracy and Technology, Consumers Union, National Consumers League, New America's Open Technology Institute, Consumer Federation of America, and Privacy Rights Clearinghouse.

Millions of Americans who have had their personal information compromised or stolen as a result of a data breach consider this issue to be of critical importance and a priority for the Senate. Protecting privacy rights should be important to all of us, regardless of party or ideology. I hope that all Senators will support this measure to better protect Americans' privacy.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1169. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Reauthorization Act of 2015. Senator WHITEHOUSE is joining me in this effort.

This measure would improve our Nation's response to juvenile offenders in the criminal justice system.

For the last 40 or so years, the Federal Government, through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, or JJDPA, has provided guidelines and resources to help States serve troubled adolescents.

This 1974 law provides juvenile justice dollars to States and sets four core requirements for States that choose to accept these Federal funds. The law also created the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention at the Justice Department.

A centerpiece of the current statute is its standards for the treatment of at-risk youth who come into contact with our criminal justice system. But these standards have not been updated since 2002, and the law's authorization has expired.

Since Congress last extended the law more than a dozen years ago, evidence has emerged that some of the JJDPA's provisions need to be improved or strengthened to reflect the latest research on adolescent development.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have made this law's renewal a priority. The bill I am introducing would extend the statute for 5 years and update its provisions to reflect the latest research on what works with troubled adolescents.

The bill also would continue Congress's commitment to help State and local jurisdictions improve their juvenile justice systems through a program of formula grants. At the same time, the bill would improve the oversight and accountability of this grant program in several key ways.

Such accountability measures are vitally needed to ensure the grant program's integrity.

The Senate Judiciary Committee heard testimony from whistleblowers last week that the Justice Department is failing to hold participating States accountable for meeting the JJDPA's four core requirements.

After I wrote several letters concerning these whistleblower allegations, the Justice Department admitted to having a flawed compliance monitoring policy in place since 1997. This policy allowed States to receive JJDPA formula grants in violation of the law's funding requirements.

Witnesses at last week's Senate Judiciary hearing recounted violations of law, mismanagement, and waste of limited juvenile justice grant funds, in addition to retaliation against whistleblowers.

This is an injustice not only to the taxpayers but also to the youth who face inadequate juvenile justice systems. It is also an injustice to the children who end up in the justice system as a result of poor experience in the foster care system.

Shortcomings in the juvenile justice system will not be solved overnight. But I look forward to taking the lead on legislation in the 114th Congress that will make measurable improvements.

In closing, numerous organizations have worked with us on the development of this bill, and I thank them for their contributions. I also thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his cosponsorship of the legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1170. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to reauthorize the Breast Cancer Research Stamp for 4 more years.

Without Congressional action, this important and effective way of raising additional funds for critical research will expire at the end of this year. These stamps are sold for a little more than the cost of first class postage, so customers can choose to donate in a simple and easy way.

Since 1998, more than 986 million breast cancer research stamps have been sold, raising over $80.4 million for breast cancer research. The funds have gone to support breast cancer research at both the National Institutes of Health, NIH, and the Department of Defense.

For example, the National Institutes of Health has used proceeds from the Breast Cancer Research Stamp to fund the Maternal Pregnancy Factors and Breast Cancer Risk Study. This study was designed to identify possible connections between various conditions during pregnancy and breast cancer risk. After comparing information from women who delivered babies and were later diagnosed with breast cancer to women who delivered babies and were not diagnosed with breast cancer, researchers found that factors like preeclampsia or carrying twins may increase cancer risk. Knowing these risk factors helps both doctors and patients be vigilant about early screening.

Thanks to breakthroughs in cancer research, more and more breast cancer patients are becoming survivors. Nearly all patients with breast cancer caught in the early stages now survive. That is incredible, and a testament to how important this research has been.

Though despite our great successes, the need for continued research and improved screening and treatments remains high.

Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women in the U.S. and the second leading cause of

cancer deaths. One in eight women will be diagnosed, and more than 40,000 die from the disease each year.

Though male breast cancer is less common, an estimated 2,350 men will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year.

The Breast Cancer Research Stamp provides a simple, convenient way for Americans to contribute toward this vitally important research. It also provides a symbol of hope for those affected by this disease.

I thank Senator ENZI for joining me to support this bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to join us and ensure the stamp continues for another 4 years.

This bill is supported by organizations including: the American Association of Cancer Research, AACR, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, ACS CAN, American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, ACOG, American College of Surgeons, Are You Defense Advocacy, Breast Cancer Fund, Breast Cancer Research Foundation, Center for Women Policy Studies, Susan G. Komen, and the Tigerlily Foundation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 156—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO CHILDHOOD STROKE AND RECOGNIZING MAY 2015 AS ''NATIONAL PEDIATRIC STROKE AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 156

Whereas a stroke, also known as cerebrovascular disease, is an acute neurologic injury that occurs when the blood supply to a part of the brain is interrupted by a clot in the artery or a burst of the artery;

Whereas a stroke is a medical emergency that can cause permanent neurologic damage or even death if not promptly diagnosed and treated;

Whereas a stroke occurs in approximately 1 out of every 3,500 live births, and 4.6 out of 100,000 children ages 19 and under experience a stroke each year;

Whereas a stroke can occur before birth;

Whereas stroke is among the top 12 causes of death for children between the ages of 1 and 14 in the United States;

Whereas 20 to 40 percent of children who have suffered a stroke die as a result;

Whereas a stroke recurs within 5 years in 10 percent of children who have had an ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke;

Whereas the death rate for children who experience a stroke before the age of 1 is the highest out of all child age groups;

Whereas there are no approved therapies for the treatment of acute stroke in infants and children;

Whereas approximately 60 percent of infants and children who have a pediatric stroke will have serious, permanent neurological disabilities, including paralysis, seizures, speech and vision problems, and attention, learning, and behavioral difficulties;

Whereas such disabilities may require ongoing physical therapy and surgeries;

Whereas the permanent health concerns of and treatments for strokes that occur during childhood and young adulthood have considerable impacts on children, families, and society;

Whereas more information is necessary regarding the cause, treatment, and prevention of pediatric strokes;

Whereas medical research is the only means by which the people of the United States can identify and develop effective treatment and prevention strategies for pediatric strokes; and

Whereas early diagnosis and treatment of pediatric strokes greatly improves the chances that an affected child will recover and not experience a recurrence of a stroke: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes May 2015 as ''National Pediatric Stroke Awareness Month'';

(2) urges the people of the United States to support the efforts, programs, services, and organizations that enhance public awareness of pediatric stroke;

(3) supports the work of the National Institutes of Health in pursuit of medical progress on pediatric stroke; and

(4) urges continued coordination and cooperation between the Federal Government, State and local governments, researchers, families, and the public to improve treatments and prognoses for children who suffer from strokes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 157—RECOGNIZING THE ECONOMIC, CULTURAL, AND POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SOUTHEAST-ASIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARIES OF THE BEGINNING OF KHMER ROUGE CONTROL OVER CAMBODIA AND THE BEGINNING OF THE CAMBODIAN GENOCIDE AND THE END OF THE VIETNAM WAR AND THE ''SECRET WAR'' IN THE KINGDOM OF LAOS

Ms. HIRONO submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 157

Whereas April 17, 2015, marks the 40th anniversary of the beginning of Khmer Rouge control over Cambodia and the beginning of the Cambodian Genocide;

Whereas April 30, 2015, marks the 40th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War;

Whereas December 2, 2015, marks the 40th anniversary of the end of the ''Secret War'' in which Communists declared victory over the Kingdom of Laos and established a Communist regime in that country;

Whereas those historic events led to the forced migration to the United States, after 1975, of over 1,000,000 refugees from Cambodia, the Kingdom of Laos, and Vietnam;

Whereas over 600,000 Vietnamese refugees were resettled in the United States, many of whom had worked with the United States Government as translators and civil servants during the Vietnam War and were paroled into the United States after the enactment of the Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1975 (Public Law 94–23), and in the 1990s, over 30,000 survivors of Communist reeducation camps and 150,000 family members of those survivors were resettled in the United States;

Whereas approximately 250,000 refugees from the Kingdom of Laos were resettled in the United States, many of whom assisted the war effort of the United States during the ''Secret War'' in Laos, including 35,000 individuals who served as Special Guerrilla Unit fighters in the surrogate army for the United States and others who served as civil servants;

Whereas at least 115,000 Cambodian refugees were resettled in the United States after 1 of the worst genocides of the 20th century, during which about 20 percent of the Cambodian population perished;

Whereas the exodus of refugees from Southeast Asia prompted the United States to enact the Refugee Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–212) and establish the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which established the first formal refugee resettlement system in the United States;

Whereas the Office of Refugee Resettlement recognized the critical importance of Southeast Asian American Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs) with the establishment in 1980 of a special grant program that lay the groundwork for a strong network of Southeast-Asian American community-based organizations in the United States;

Whereas, as of April 2015, over 2,500,000 Southeast-Asian Americans trace their heritage to Cambodia, the Kingdom of Laos, and Vietnam;

Whereas Southeast-Asian Americans include a broad diversity of ethnic groups, including—

(1) Cham, Khmer, and Khmer Loeu from Cambodia;

(2) Hmong, Iu-Mien, Khmu, Taidam, and Lao Theung from the Kingdom of Laos; and

(3) ethnic Khmer, Montagnards, and Vietnamese from Vietnam; and

Whereas Southeast-Asian Americans—

(1) have blazed trails to own small businesses, lead community-based organizations, serve in public office, and nurture emerging leaders;

(2) carry on a rich cultural tradition of music and dance, and pioneer hybrid art forms such as spoken word poetry and hip-hop;

(3) continue to face significant challenges to full economic and social empowerment, such as low rates of high school completion, high rates of poverty, and disproportionate rates of arrest and incarceration; and

(4) remain resilient, rooted both in Southeast-Asian heritage and in the society of the United States, and rising toward a hopeful, equitable future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of the 40th anniversaries of—

(A) the beginning of the Khmer Rouge rule in Cambodia and the Cambodian Genocide;

(B) the end of the Vietnam War and the ''Secret War'' in Laos;

(C) the humanitarian response of the people and Government of the United States to receive over 1,000,000 refugees from Southeast Asia; and

(D) the beginning of the Southeast-Asian American community in the United States; and

(2) recognizes the ongoing contributions of the Southeast-Asian American community to the economic, cultural, and political vitality of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 158—RECOGNIZING THE CULTURAL AND HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CINCO DE MAYO HOLIDAY

Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 158

Whereas May 5, or ''Cinco de Mayo'' in Spanish, is celebrated each year as a date of importance by Mexican and Mexican-American communities;

Whereas the Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates May 5, 1862, the date on which Mexicans defeated the French at the Battle of Puebla, one of the many battles that the Mexican people won in their long and brave fight for independence, freedom, and democracy;

Whereas the victory of Mexico over France at Puebla represented a historic triumph for the Mexican government during the Franco-Mexican war of 1861–1867 and bolstered the resistance movement;

Whereas the success of Mexico at the Battle of Puebla reinvigorated the spirits of the Mexican people and provided a renewed sense of unity and strength;

Whereas the French army, which had not experienced defeat against any of the finest troops of Europe in more than half a century, sustained a disastrous loss at the hands of an outnumbered and ill-equipped, but highly spirited and courageous, Mexican army;

Whereas the courageous spirit that Mexican General Ignacio Zaragoza and his men displayed during that historic battle can never be forgotten;

Whereas, in a larger sense, Cinco de Mayo symbolizes the right of a free people to self-determination, just as Benito Juarez, the president of Mexico during the Battle of Puebla, once said, ''El respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz'', meaning ''respect for the rights of others is peace'';

Whereas the sacrifice of Mexican fighters was instrumental in keeping Mexico from falling under European domination while, in the United States, the Union Army battled Confederate forces in the Civil War;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder that the foundation of the United States was built by people from many countries and diverse cultures who were willing to fight and die for freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo also serves as a reminder of the close ties between the people of Mexico and the people of the United States;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo encourages the celebration of a legacy of strong leaders and a sense of vibrancy in communities; and

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder to provide more opportunity for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historic struggle of the people of Mexico for independence and freedom, which Cinco de Mayo commemorates; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe Cinco de Mayo with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 159—DESIGNATING APRIL 2015, AS ''NATIONAL 9-1-1 EDUCATION MONTH''

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 159

Whereas 9-1-1 is recognized throughout the United States as the number to call in an emergency to receive immediate help from police, fire, emergency medical services, or other appropriate emergency response entities;

Whereas, in 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended that a ''single number should be established'' nationwide for reporting emergency situations, and various Federal Government agencies and governmental officials supported and encouraged the recommendation;

Whereas, in 1968, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (commonly known as ''AT&T'') announced that it would establish the digits 9-1-1 as the emergency code throughout the United States;

Whereas Congress designated 9-1-1 as the national emergency call number in the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–81; 113 Stat. 1286);

Whereas section 102 of the ENHANCE 911 Act of 2004 (47 U.S.C. 942 note) declared an enhanced 9-1-1 system to be ''a high national priority'' and part of ''our Nation's homeland security and public safety'';

Whereas it is important that policy makers at all levels of government understand the importance of 9-1-1, how the 9-1-1 system works, and the steps that are needed to modernize the 9-1-1 system;

Whereas the 9-1-1 system is the connection between the eyes and ears of the public and the emergency response system in the United States and is often the first place emergencies of all magnitudes are reported, making 9-1-1 a significant homeland security asset;

Whereas more than 6,000 9-1-1 public safety answering points serve more than 3,000 counties and parishes throughout the United States;

Whereas telecommunicators at public safety answering points answer more than 200,000,000 9-1-1 calls each year in the United States;

Whereas a growing number of 9-1-1 calls are made using wireless and Internet Protocol-based communications services;

Whereas a growing segment of the population of the United States, including individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf-blind, or have speech disabilities, is increasingly communicating with nontraditional text, video, and instant messaging communications services and expects those services to be able to connect directly to 9-1-1;

Whereas the growth and variety of means of communication, including mobile and Internet Protocol-based systems, impose challenges for accessing 9-1-1 and implementing an enhanced 9-1-1 system and require increased education and awareness about the capabilities of different means of communication;

Whereas numerous other ''N-1-1'' and 800 number services exist for nonemergency situations, including 2-1-1, 3-1-1, 5-1-1, 7-1-1, 8-1-1, poison control centers, and mental health hotlines, and the public needs to be educated on when to use those services in addition to or instead of 9-1-1;

Whereas international visitors and immigrants make up an increasing percentage of the population of the United States each year, and visitors and immigrants may have limited knowledge of the emergency calling system in the United States;

Whereas people of all ages use 9-1-1 and it is critical to educate people on the proper use of 9-1-1;

Whereas senior citizens are highly likely to need to access 9-1-1 and many senior citizens are learning to use new technology;

Whereas thousands of 9-1-1 calls are made every year by children properly trained in the use of 9-1-1, which saves lives and underscores the critical importance of training children early in life about 9-1-1;

Whereas the 9-1-1 system is often misused, including by the placement of prank and nonemergency calls;

Whereas misuse of the 9-1-1 system results in costly and inefficient use of 9-1-1 and emergency response resources and needs to be reduced;

Whereas parents, teachers, and all other caregivers need to play an active role in 9-1-1 education for children, but can do so only after first being educated themselves;

Whereas there are many avenues for 9-1-1 public education, including safety fairs, school presentations, libraries, churches, businesses, public safety answering point tours or open houses, civic organizations, and senior citizen centers;

Whereas children, parents, teachers, and the National Parent Teacher Association make vital contributions to the education of children about the importance of 9-1-1 through targeted outreach efforts to public and private school systems;

Whereas the United States should strive to host at least 1 educational event regarding the proper use of 9-1-1 in every school in the country every year;

Whereas programs to promote proper use of 9-1-1 during National 9-1-1 Education Month could include—

(1) public awareness events, including conferences, media outreach, and training activities for parents, teachers, school administrators, other caregivers, and businesses;

(2) educational events in schools and other appropriate venues; and

(3) production and distribution of information about the 9-1-1 system designed to educate people of all ages on the importance and proper use of 9-1-1; and

Whereas the people of the United States deserve the best education regarding the use of 9-1-1: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2015 as ''National 9-1-1 Education Month''; and

(2) urges governmental officials, parents, teachers, school administrators, caregivers, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies, training events, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 160—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT PUBLIC SERVANTS SHOULD BE COMMENDED FOR THEIR DEDICATION AND CONTINUED SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES DURING PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TESTER, Mr. COONS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. BALDWIN,

Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 160

Whereas the week of May 3 through 9, 2015 has been designated as ''Public Service Recognition Week'' to honor employees of the Federal Government and State and local governments and members of the uniformed services;

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week provides an opportunity to recognize and promote the important contributions of public servants and honor the diverse men and women who meet the needs of the United States through work at all levels of government and as members of the uniformed services;

Whereas millions of individuals work in government service, and as members of the uniformed services, in every State, county, and city across the United States and in hundreds of cities abroad;

Whereas public service is a noble calling involving a variety of challenging and rewarding professions;

Whereas the ability of the Federal Government and State and local governments to be responsive, innovative, and effective depends on outstanding performance of dedicated public servants;

Whereas the United States is a great and prosperous country, and public service employees contribute significantly to that greatness and prosperity;

Whereas the United States benefits daily from the knowledge and skills of the highly-trained individuals who work in public service;

Whereas public servants—

(1) defend the freedom of the people of the United States and advance the interests of the United States around the world;

(2) provide vital strategic support functions to the Armed Forces and serve in the National Guard and Reserves;

(3) fight crime and fires;

(4) ensure equal access to secure, efficient, and affordable mail service;

(5) deliver benefits under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), including benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

(6) fight disease and promote better health;

(7) protect the environment and the parks of the United States;

(8) enforce laws guaranteeing equal employment opportunity and healthy working conditions;

(9) defend and secure critical infrastructure;

(10) help the people of the United States recover from natural disasters and terrorist attacks;

(11) teach and work in schools and libraries;

(12) develop new technologies and explore the Earth, the Moon, and space to help improve knowledge on how the world changes;

(13) improve and secure transportation systems;

(14) promote economic growth; and

(15) assist veterans of the Armed Forces;

Whereas members of the uniformed services and civilian employees at all levels of government make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States, and are on the front lines in the fight to defeat terrorism and maintain homeland security;

Whereas public servants work in a professional manner to build relationships with other countries and cultures in order to better represent the interests and promote the ideals of the United States;

Whereas public servants alert Congress and the public to government waste, fraud, and abuse, and of dangers to public health;

Whereas the individuals serving in the uniformed services, as well as the skilled trade and craft employees of the Federal Government who provide support to their efforts, are committed to doing their jobs regardless of the circumstances, and contribute greatly to the security of the United States and the world;

Whereas public servants have bravely fought in armed conflicts in the defense of the United States and its ideals, and deserve the care and benefits they have earned through their honorable service;

Whereas public servants have much to offer, as demonstrated by their expertise and innovative ideas, and serve as examples by passing on institutional knowledge to train the next generation of public servants; and

Whereas the week of May 3 through 9, 2015 marks the 31st anniversary of Public Service Recognition Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the week of May 3 through 9, 2015 as ''Public Service Recognition Week'';

(2) commends public servants for their outstanding contributions to this great country during Public Service Recognition Week and throughout the year;

(3) salutes government employees, and members of the uniformed services, for their unyielding dedication to and enthusiasm for public service;

(4) honors government employees and members of the uniformed services who have given their lives in service to their country;

(5) calls upon a new generation to consider a career in public service as an honorable profession; and

(6) encourages efforts to promote public service careers at all levels of government.

SENATE RESOLUTION 161—DESIGNATING APRIL 2015 AS ''FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH''

Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 161

Whereas according to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (referred to in this preamble as the ''FDIC''), at least 27.7 percent of households in the United States, or nearly 34,400,000 households with approximately 67,600,000 adults, are unbanked or underbanked and therefore have not had the opportunity to access savings, lending, and other basic financial services;

Whereas according to the FDIC, approximately 30 percent of banks reported in 2011 that consumers lacked understanding of the financial products and services banks offered;

Whereas according to the 2014 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling—

(1) approximately 41 percent of adults in the United States gave themselves a grade of C, D, or F on their knowledge of personal finance, and 73 percent of adults acknowledged that they could benefit from additional advice and answers to everyday financial questions from a professional;

(2) 24 percent of adults in the United States, or approximately 56,300,000 individuals, admitted to not paying their bills on time;

(3) only 39 percent of adults in the United States reported keeping close track of their spending, a percentage that has held steady since 2007; and

(4) 16 percent of adults in the United States, or over 37,500,000 individuals, said not having enough ''rainy day'' savings for an emergency is their greatest financial concern, while the same percentage said that their greatest financial concern is not having enough money set aside for retirement;

Whereas the 2014 Retirement Confidence Survey conducted by the Employee Benefit Research Institute found that only 18 percent of workers were ''very confident'' about having enough money for a comfortable retirement, which is a sharp decline in worker confidence from the 27 percent of workers who were ''very confident'' in 2007, while approximately 56 percent of workers say they or their spouses have not calculated the amount of money they need to save for retirement;

Whereas according to a 2015 ''Flow of Funds'' report by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, outstanding household debt in the United States was $13,500,000,000,000 at the end of the fourth quarter of 2014;

Whereas according to the 2014 Survey of the States: Economic and Personal Finance Education in Our Nation's Schools, a biennial report by the Council for Economic Education—

(1) only 24 States require students to take an economics course as a high school graduation requirement; and

(2) only 17 States require students to take a personal finance course either independently or as part of an economics course as a high school graduation requirement;

Whereas according to the Gallup-Operation HOPE Financial Literacy Index, only 58 percent of students in the United States have money in a bank or credit union account;

Whereas expanding access to the safe, mainstream financial system will provide individuals with less expensive and more secure options for managing finances and building wealth;

Whereas quality personal financial education is essential to ensure that individuals are prepared to manage money, credit, and debt, and to become responsible workers, heads of household, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens;

Whereas increased financial literacy empowers individuals to make wise financial decisions and reduces the confusion caused by an increasingly complex economy;

Whereas a greater understanding of, and familiarity with, financial markets and institutions will lead to increased economic activity and growth;

Whereas in 2003, Congress determined that coordinating Federal financial literacy efforts and formulating a national strategy is important; and

Whereas in light of that determination, Congress passed the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9701 et seq.), establishing the Financial Literacy and Education Commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2015 as ''Financial Literacy Month'' to raise public awareness about—

(A) the importance of personal financial education in the United States; and

(B) the serious consequences that may result from a lack of understanding about personal finances; and

(2) calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the people of the United States to observe Financial Literacy Month with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 162—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF ALCOHOL RESPONSIBILITY MONTH

Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. HELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 162

Whereas, in 2013, an estimated 10,076 people were killed in the United States in drunk driving crashes involving a driver with a blood alcohol content of .08 or greater, impacting countless family members, friends, and communities;

Whereas, in 2013, 1 person died in a drunk driving crash every 52 minutes, on average;

Whereas, in 2013, approximately 8,700,000 people of the United States between the ages of 12 and 20, or nearly 23 percent of the age group for whom alcohol consumption is illegal, reported consuming alcohol during the preceding 30 days;

Whereas research shows that a lifetime of conversations between parents and their children about alcohol, beginning at an early age, can help prevent underage drinking and alcohol abuse;

Whereas the potential danger for young people to be involved in alcohol-related crashes escalates during prom and graduation season;

Whereas many State attorneys general are launching underage drinking prevention messages and programs in their States and communities; and

Whereas April has been dedicated to alcohol awareness for the last 28 years, and more than awareness is needed to further reduce drunk driving and underage drinking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) declares April to be Alcohol Responsibility Month and supports the goal of encouraging responsible decision-making regarding beverage alcohol;

(2) encourages parents to be responsible role models and to have ongoing conversations with their children throughout their childhood, adolescence, and early adulthood about the dangers of alcohol abuse;

(3) condemns the pervasiveness of alcohol-impaired driving and resulting tragedies; and

(4) promotes the responsible consumption of alcohol by adults in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 163—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE HUMANITARIAN CATASTROPHE CAUSED BY THE APRIL 25, 2015, EARTHQUAKE IN NEPAL

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 163

Whereas, on April 25, 2015, an earthquake measuring 7.8 on the Richter scale and the aftershocks of the earthquake devastated Kathmandu, Nepal and the surrounding areas, killing thousands, injuring thousands more people, and leaving many thousands of people homeless;

Whereas the earthquake also resulted in the loss of life and destruction of property in India, Bangladesh, and the Tibetan Autonomous Region of China;

Whereas United States citizens were also killed in the wide-scale destruction caused by the earthquake;

Whereas Nepal, which is one of the poorest countries in the world, has an estimated 25 percent of the population living on less than $1.25 a day, has an estimated 46 percent unemployment rate with a majority of the population engaged in subsistence agriculture, and has one of the slowest economic growth rates in the region;

Whereas years of civil conflict in Nepal led to a massive influx of people into urban areas despite the absence of appropriate facilities, roads, housing, and infrastructure to support the people;

Whereas, since the end of hostilities, political gridlock among the leadership of Nepal to finalize a constitution has stymied growth and development;

Whereas the loss of infrastructure will further inhibit economic growth in the impoverished country of Nepal;

Whereas the United States Government has worked with the Government of Nepal on disaster risk reduction and earthquake preparedness for years, which certainly saved many lives and accelerated the ability of the Government and people of Nepal to respond to disasters and earthquakes;

Whereas the United States Government and the international community are mounting a large-scale response and recovery effort; and

Whereas the United States Agency for International Development is leading the response of the United States by providing a Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART), funding, and Urban Search and Rescue experts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses profound sympathy to, and unwavering support for, the people of Nepal, India, Bangladesh, and the Tibetan Autonomous Region of China, who have always shown resilience and now face catastrophic conditions in the aftermath of the April 25, 2015, earthquake, and sympathy for the families of the citizens of the United States who perished in the disaster;

(2) applauds the rapid and concerted mobilization by President Barack Obama to provide immediate emergency humanitarian assistance to Nepal, and the hard work and dedication of the people at the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense in quickly marshaling United States Government resources to address both the short- and long-term needs in Nepal;

(3) urges that all appropriate efforts be made to secure the safety of orphans in Nepal;

(4) urges that all appropriate efforts be made to sustain recovery assistance to Nepal beyond the immediate humanitarian crisis to support the people of Nepal with appropriate humanitarian, developmental, and infrastructure assistance needed to overcome the effects of the earthquake;

(5) expresses appreciation for the ongoing and renewed commitment of the international community to the recovery and development of Nepal;

(6) urges all countries to commit to assisting the people of Nepal with their long-term needs;

(7) calls on the Government of Nepal to take all necessary actions to enable a faster and more sustainable recovery; and

(8) expresses support for the United States Embassy team in Kathmandu, DART members, other Federal agencies, and the non governmental organization community in the United States, who are valiantly working to assist thousands of people in Nepal under extremely adverse conditions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 164—DESIGNATING APRIL 30, 2015, AS DIA DE LOS NINOS: CELEBRATING YOUNG AMERICANS

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 164

Whereas each year, people in many countries throughout the world, and especially in the Western Hemisphere, celebrate Día de los Niños, or Day of the Children, on April 30th in recognition and celebration of the future of their country—their children;

Whereas children represent the hopes and dreams of the people of the United States, and the well-being of children remains one of the top priorities of the United States;

Whereas the people of the United States must nurture and invest in children to preserve and enhance economic prosperity, democracy, and the spirit of the United States;

Whereas in 2013, the Census Bureau estimated that approximately 17,800,000 of the nearly 54,000,000 individuals of Hispanic descent living in the United States are children under 18 years of age, representing ⅓ of the total Hispanic population residing in the United States and roughly ¼ of the total population of children in the United States;

Whereas Hispanic Americans, the youngest and largest racial or ethnic minority group in the United States, celebrate the tradition of honoring their children on Día de los Niños and wish to share this custom with all people of the United States;

Whereas, as the United States becomes more culturally and ethnically diverse, the people of the United States must strive to create opportunities that provide dignity and upward mobility for all children;

Whereas the primary teachers of family values, morality, and culture are parents and family members, and children are responsible for passing on family values, morality, and culture to future generations;

Whereas the importance of literacy and education is most often communicated to children through family members;

Whereas the latest data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicates that Latino students continue to

score lower than the national average on reading assessments conducted at the elementary school, middle school, and high school levels—an achievement gap that has persisted for decades;

Whereas the most recent data by NAEP demonstrates that 81 percent of Latino fourth graders in public schools are not proficient in reading;

Whereas Latino authors and Latino protagonists remain underrepresented in literature for children, and less than 3 percent of books for children are written by Latino authors, illustrated by Latino book creators, or feature significant Latino cultural content, even though ¼ of all public school children are Latino;

Whereas research has shown that culturally relevant literature can increase student engagement and reading comprehension, yet some Latino students may go their entire educational experience without seeing themselves portrayed positively in the books that they read and the stories that they hear;

Whereas increasing the number and proportion of multicultural authors in literature for children elevates the voices of the growing diverse communities in the United States and can serve as an effective strategy for closing the reading proficiency achievement gap;

Whereas addressing the widening disparities that still exist among children is of paramount importance to the economic prosperity of the United States;

Whereas the designation of a day to honor the children of the United States will help affirm the significance of family, education, and community among the people of the United States;

Whereas the designation of a day of special recognition for the children of the United States will provide an opportunity for children to reflect on their futures, articulate their aspirations, and find comfort and security in the support of their family members and communities;

Whereas families should be encouraged to engage in family and community activities that include extended and elderly family members and encourage children to explore and develop confidence;

Whereas the National Latino Children's Institute (NLCI), serving as a voice for children, has worked with cities throughout the United States to declare April 30, 2015, as Día de los Niños: Celebrating Young Americans, a day to bring together Latinos and communities across the United States to celebrate and uplift children; and

Whereas the people of the United States should be encouraged to celebrate the gifts of children to society and invest in future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 30, 2015, as Día de los Niños: Celebrating Young Americans; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to join with all children, families, organizations, communities, churches, cities, and States across the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies, including activities that—

(A) center around children and are free or minimal in cost so as to encourage and facilitate the participation of all people;

(B) are positive and uplifting, and help children express their hopes and dreams;

(C) provide opportunities for children of all backgrounds to learn about each other's cultures and share ideas;

(D) include all family members, especially extended and elderly family members, so as to promote greater communication among the generations within families, which will enable children to appreciate and benefit from the experiences and wisdom of elderly family members;

(E) provide opportunities for families within a community to build relationships; and

(F) provide children with the support they need to develop skills and confidence, and to find the inner strength, will, and fire of the human spirit to make their dreams come true.

SENATE RESOLUTION 165—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORLD MALARIA DAY

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 165

Whereas April 25th of each year is recognized internationally as World Malaria Day;

Whereas malaria is a leading cause of death and disease in many developing countries, despite being preventable and treatable;

Whereas fighting malaria is in the national interest of the United States, as reducing the risk of malaria protects members of the Armed Forces of the United States and other people of the United States serving overseas in malaria-endemic regions, and reducing malaria deaths helps to lower risks of instability in less developed countries;

Whereas support for efforts to fight malaria is in the diplomatic and moral interest of the United States, as that support generates goodwill toward the United States and highlights the values of the people of the United States through the work of governmental, nongovernmental, and faith-based organizations of the United States;

Whereas efforts to fight malaria are in the long-term economic interest of the United States because those efforts help developing countries—

(1) identify at-risk populations;

(2) provide a framework for critical emergency disease treatment;

(3) provide better health services;

(4) increase local governance needed to address substandard and counterfeit medicines that exacerbate malaria resistance;

(5) produce healthier and more productive workforces;

(6) advance economic development; and

(7) promote stronger trading partners;

Whereas malaria transmission occurred in 97 countries and territories in 2014, and an estimated 3,200,000,000 people are at risk for malaria, the majority of whom are in sub-Saharan Africa, which accounts for 90 percent of malaria deaths in the world;

Whereas young children and pregnant women are particularly vulnerable to and disproportionately affected by malaria;

Whereas malaria greatly affects the health of children, as children under the age of 5 account for an estimated 78 percent of malaria deaths each year;

Whereas malaria poses great risks to maternal and neonatal health, causing complications during delivery, anemia, and low birth weights, and estimates indicate that malaria infection causes approximately 400,000 cases of severe maternal anemia and between 75,000 and 200,000 infant deaths annually in sub-Saharan Africa;

Whereas heightened national, regional, and international efforts to prevent and treat malaria during recent years have made significant progress and helped save hundreds of thousands of lives;

Whereas the World Malaria Report 2014 by the World Health Organization states that in 2013, approximately 49 percent of households in sub-Saharan Africa owned at least one insecticide-treated mosquito net, and household surveys indicated that 90 percent of people used an insecticide-treated mosquito net if one was available in the household;

Whereas, in 2013, approximately 123,000,000 people were protected by indoor residual spraying;

Whereas the World Malaria Report 2014 further states that between 2000 and 2013—

(1) malaria mortality rates decreased by 47 percent around the world;

(2) in the African Region of the World Health Organization, malaria mortality rates decreased by 54 percent; and

(3) an estimated 4,300,000 malaria deaths were averted globally, primarily as a result of increased interventions;

Whereas the World Malaria Report 2014 further states that out of 97 countries with ongoing transmission of malaria in 2014—

(1) 10 countries are classified as being in the pre-elimination phase;

(2) 9 countries are classified as being in the elimination phase; and

(3) 7 countries are classified as being in the prevention of malaria reintroduction phase of malaria control;

Whereas continued national, regional, and international investment in efforts to eliminate malaria, including prevention and treatment efforts, the development of a vaccine to immunize children from the malaria parasite, and advancements in insecticides, are critical in order to continue to reduce malaria deaths, prevent backsliding in areas where progress has been made, and equip the United States and the global community with the tools necessary to fight malaria and other global health threats;

Whereas the United States Government has played a leading role in the recent progress made toward reducing the global burden of malaria, particularly through the President's Malaria Initiative (referred to in this preamble as the ''PMI'') and the contribution of the United States to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria;

Whereas, in May 2011, an independent, external evaluation, prepared by Boston University, examining 6 objectives of the PMI, found the PMI to be a successful, well-led program that has ''earned and deserves the task of sustaining and expanding the United States Government's response to global malaria control efforts'';

Whereas the United States Government is pursuing a comprehensive approach to ending malaria deaths through the PMI, which is led by the United States Agency for International Development and implemented with assistance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of State, the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, and private sector entities;

Whereas the PMI focuses on helping partner countries achieve major improvements in overall health outcomes through improved access to, and quality of, healthcare services in locations with limited resources; and

Whereas the PMI, recognizing the burden of malaria on many partner countries, has

set a target by 2020 of reducing malaria mortality by ⅓ from 2015 levels in PMI-supported countries, achieving a greater than 80 percent reduction from original 2000 baseline levels set by the PMI, reducing malaria morbidity in PMI-supported countries by 40 percent from 2015 levels, and assisting at least 5 PMI-supported countries to meet the criteria of the World Health Organization for national or sub-national pre-elimination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day;

(2) recognizes the importance of reducing malaria prevalence and deaths to improve overall child and maternal health, especially in sub-Saharan Africa;

(3) commends the recent progress made toward reducing global malaria morbidity, mortality, and prevalence, particularly through the efforts of the President's Malaria Initiative and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria;

(4) welcomes ongoing public-private partnerships to research and develop more effective and affordable tools for malaria diagnosis, treatment, and vaccination;

(5) recognizes the goals, priorities, and authorities to combat malaria set forth in the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–293; 122 Stat. 2918);

(6) supports continued leadership by the United States in bilateral, multilateral, and private sector efforts to combat malaria and to work with developing countries to create long-term strategies to increase ownership over malaria programs; and

(7) encourages other members of the international community to sustain and increase their support for and financial contributions to efforts to combat malaria worldwide.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14—PROVIDING THAT THE PRESIDENT MAY NOT PROVIDE SANCTIONS RELIEF TO IRAN UNTIL CERTAIN UNITED STATES CITIZENS ARE RELEASED FROM IRAN

Mr. RISCH submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 14

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement with Iran relating to Iran's nuclear program until the Government of Iran releases to the United States the following United States citizens:

(1) Saeed Abedini of Idaho, who has been detained in Iran on charges related to his religious beliefs since September 2012.

(2) Amir Hekmati of Michigan, who has been imprisoned in Iran on false espionage charges since August 2011.

(3) Jason Rezaian of California, who, as an Iranian government credentialed reporter for the Washington Post, has been unjustly held in Iran on vague charges since July 2014.

(4) Robert Levinson of Florida, who was abducted on Kish Island in March 2007.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1196. Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1197. Mr. COTTON proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1191, supra.

SA 1198. Mr. COTTON (for Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1197 proposed by Mr. COTTON to the bill H.R. 1191, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1196. Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 11, strike line 16 and all that follows through ''significant breach'' on page 12, line 4, and insert the following:

''(2) POTENTIAL BREACHES AND COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS.—The President shall, within 10 calendar days of receiving credible information relating to a potential breach or potentially significant compliance incident by Iran with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a), submit such information to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

''(3) MATERIAL BREACH REPORT.—Not later than 30 calendar days after submitting information about a potential breach or potentially significant compliance incident pursuant to paragraph (2), the President shall make a determination whether such potential breach

SA 1197. Mr. COTTON proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, strike line 3 and all that follows through ''this section'' on page 4, line7, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN RELATING TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 134 the following new section:

''SEC. 135. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.

''(a) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN AND VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT WITH RESPECT TO SUCH AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS.—Not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership—

''(A) the agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1), including all related materials and annexes;

''(B) a verification assessment report of the Secretary of State prepared under paragraph (2) with respect to the agreement; and

''(C) a certification that—

''(i) the agreement includes the appropriate terms, conditions, and duration of the agreement's requirements with respect to Iran's nuclear activities and provisions describing any sanctions to be waived, suspended, or otherwise reduced by the United States, and any other nation or entity, including the United Nations; and

''(ii) the President determines the agreement meets United States non-proliferation objectives, does not jeopardize the common defense and security, provides an adequate framework to ensure that Iran's nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and ensures that Iran's nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose.

''(2) VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall prepare, with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), a report assessing—

''(i) the extent to which the Secretary will be able to verify that Iran is complying with its obligations and commitments under the agreement;

''(ii) the adequacy of the safeguards and other control mechanisms and other assurances contained in the agreement with respect to Iran's nuclear program to ensure Iran's activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose; and

''(iii) the capacity and capability of the International Atomic Energy Agency to effectively implement the verification regime required by or related to the agreement, including whether the International Atomic Energy Agency will have sufficient access to investigate suspicious sites or allegations of covert nuclear-related activities and whether it has the required funding, manpower, and authority to undertake the verification regime required by or related to the agreement.

''(B) ASSUMPTIONS.—In preparing a report under subparagraph (A) with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assume that Iran could—

''(i) use all measures not expressly prohibited by the agreement to conceal activities that violate its obligations and commitments under the agreement; and

''(ii) alter or deviate from standard practices in order to impede efforts to verify that Iran is complying with those obligations and commitments.

''(C) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—A report under subparagraph (A) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but shall include a classified annex prepared in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information.

''(3) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Neither the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1), nor subsections (b) through (g) of this section, shall apply to an agreement described in subsection (h)(5) or to the EU–Iran Joint Statement made on April 2, 2015.

''(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any agreement as defined in subsection (h)(1) and any related materials, whether concluded before or after the date of the enactment of this section, shall not be subject to the exception in subparagraph (A).

''(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 30 calendar day period following transmittal by the President of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a)—

''(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold briefings and hearings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review such agreement;

''(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold briefings and hearings on the compliance and verification mechanisms of such agreement;

''(C) the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold briefings and hearings on the military significance of such agreement; and

''(D) the Committee on Banking and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold briefings and hearings on the relief of sanctions provided under the agreement.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) shall be 60 calendar days if an agreement, including all materials required to be transmitted to Congress pursuant to subsection (a)(1), is transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) between July 10, 2015, and September 7, 2015.

''(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), prior to and during the period for transmission of an agreement in subsection (a)(1) and during the period for congressional review provided in paragraph (1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a).

''(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 12 calendar days following the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

''(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, and the President vetoes such joint resolution, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 10 calendar days following the date of the President's veto.

''(6) EXCEPTION.—The prohibitions under paragraphs (3) through (5) do not apply to any new deferral, waiver, or other suspension of statutory sanctions pursuant to the Joint Plan of Action if that deferral, waiver, or other suspension is made—

''(A) consistent with the law in effect on the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; and

''(B) not later than 45 calendar days before the transmission by the President of an agreement, assessment report, and certification under subsection (a).

''(7) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS BASED ON INSPECTIONS AND TRANSPARENCY.—The President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and any other Executive branch officer or agency may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described under subsection (a) until the President makes the following certifications:

''(A) The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will have access anytime without notice to all of Iran's nuclear facilities, including to Iran's enrichment facility at Natanz and its former enrichment facility at Fordow, and all of Iran's military facilities, and including the use of the most up-to-date, modern monitoring technologies.

''(B) Inspectors will have access to the supply chain that supports Iran's nuclear program. The new transparency and inspections mechanisms will closely monitor materials and components to prevent diversion to a secret program.

''(C) Inspectors will have access to uranium mines and continuous surveillance at uranium mills, where Iran produces yellowcake, for 25 years.

''(D) Inspectors will have continuous surveillance of Iran's centrifuge rotors and bellows production and storage facilities for 20 years, and Iran's centrifuge manufacturing base will be frozen and under continuous surveillance.

''(E) All centrifuges and enrichment infrastructure removed from Fordow and Natanz will be placed under continuous monitoring by the IAEA.

''(F) As an additional transparency measure, a dedicated procurement channel for Iran's nuclear program will be established to monitor and approve, on a case by case basis, the supply, sale, or transfer to Iran of certain nuclear-related and dual use materials and technology.

''(G) Iran has agreed to implement the Additional Protocol of the IAEA, providing the IAEA much greater access and information regarding Iran's nuclear program, including both declared and undeclared facilities.

''(H) Iran will be required to grant access to the IAEA to investigate suspicious sites or allegations of a covert enrichment facility, conversion facility, centrifuge production facility, or yellowcake production facility anywhere in the country.

''(I) Iran has agreed to implement Modified Code 3.1 requiring early notification of construction of new facilities.

''(8) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS BASED ON THE POSSIBLE MILITARY DIMENSIONS OF IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM.—The President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and any other Executive branch officer or agency may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described under subsection (a) until the President has certified to Congress that the Government of Iran has fully and verifiably disclosed all of Iran's Possible Military Dimensions associated with the Iranian nuclear program.

''(9) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS BASED ON THE STATUS OF HARDENED UNDERGROUND ENRICHMENT FACILITIES.—The President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and any other Executive branch officer or agency may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described under subsection (a) until the President has certified to Congress that the Government of Iran has permanently closed or rendered inoperable all of its hardened underground facilities associated with the Iranian nuclear program.

''(c) EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

''(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(A) the sanctions regime imposed on Iran by Congress is primarily responsible for bringing Iran to the table to negotiate on its nuclear program;

''(B) these negotiations are a critically important matter of national security and foreign policy for the United States and its closest allies;

''(C) this section does not require a vote by Congress for the agreement to commence;

''(D) this section provides for congressional review, including, as appropriate, for approval, disapproval, or no action on statutory sanctions relief under an agreement; and

''(E) even though the agreement may commence, because the sanctions regime was imposed by Congress and only Congress can permanently modify or eliminate that regime, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity, in an orderly and deliberative manner, to consider and, as appropriate, take action affecting the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

''(2) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to an agreement subject to subsection (a) or the Joint Plan of Action—

''(A) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does favor the agreement;

''(B) may not be taken if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the agreement; or

''(C) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action,

if, following the period for review provided in subsection (b), there is not enacted any such joint resolution.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase 'action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States' shall include waiver, suspension, reduction, or other effort to provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to, Iran under any provision of law or any other effort to refrain from applying any such sanctions.

''(d) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF IRANIAN COMPLIANCE WITH NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of all aspects of Iranian compliance with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a).

''(2) POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT BREACHES AND COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS.—The President shall, within 10 calendar days of receiving credible and accurate information relating to a potentially significant breach or compliance incident by Iran with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a), submit such information to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

''(3) MATERIAL BREACH REPORT.—Not later than 30 calendar days after submitting information about a potentially significant breach or compliance incident pursuant to paragraph (2), the President shall make a determination whether such potentially significant breach or compliance issue constitutes a material breach and, if there is such a material breach, whether Iran has cured such material breach, and shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership such determination, accompanied by, as appropriate, a report on the action or failure to act by Iran that led to the material breach, actions necessary for Iran to cure the breach, and the status of Iran's efforts to cure the breach.

''(4) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 calendar days after entering into an agreement described in subsection (a), and not less frequently than once every 180 calendar days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on Iran's nuclear program and the compliance of Iran with the agreement during the period covered by the report, including the following elements:

''(A) Any action or failure to act by Iran that breached the agreement or is in noncompliance with the terms of the agreement.

''(B) Any delay by Iran of more than one week in providing inspectors access to facilities, people, and documents in Iran as required by the agreement.

''(C) Any progress made by Iran to resolve concerns by the International Atomic Energy Agency about possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program.

''(D) Any procurement by Iran of materials in violation of the agreement or which could otherwise significantly advance Iran's ability to obtain a nuclear weapon.

''(E) Any centrifuge research and development conducted by Iran that—

''(i) is not in compliance with the agreement; or

''(ii) may substantially enhance the breakout time of acquisition of a nuclear weapon by Iran, if deployed.

''(F) Any diversion by Iran of uranium, carbon-fiber, or other materials for use in Iran's nuclear program in violation of the agreement.

''(G) Any covert nuclear activities undertaken by Iran, including any covert nuclear weapons-related or covert fissile material activities or research and development.

''(H) An assessment of whether any Iranian financial institutions are engaged in money laundering or terrorist finance activities, including names of specific financial institutions if applicable.

''(I) Iran's advances in its ballistic missile program, including developments related to its long-range and inter-continental ballistic missile programs.

''(J) An assessment of—

''(i) whether Iran directly supported, financed, planned, or carried out an act of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

''(ii) whether, and the extent to which, Iran supported acts of terrorism, including acts of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

''(iii) all actions, including in international fora, being taken by the United States to stop, counter, and condemn acts by Iran to directly or indirectly carry out acts of terrorism against the United States and United States persons;

''(iv) the impact on the national security of the United States and the safety of United States citizens as a result of any Iranian actions reported under this paragraph; and

''(v) all of the sanctions relief provided to Iran, pursuant to the agreement, and a description of the relationship between each sanction waived, suspended, or deferred and Iran's nuclear weapon's program.

''(K) An assessment of whether violations of internationally recognized human rights in Iran have changed, increased, or decreased, as compared to the prior 180-day period.

''(5) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—

''(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Following submission of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, the Department of State, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense shall, upon the request of any of those committees or leadership, promptly furnish to those committees or leadership their views as to whether the safeguards and other controls contained in the agreement with respect to Iran's nuclear program provide an adequate framework to ensure that Iran's activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

''(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON NUCLEAR INITIATIVES WITH IRAN.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of any initiative or negotiations with Iran relating to Iran's nuclear program, including any new or amended agreement.

''(6) COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION.—After the review period provided in subsection (b), the President shall, not less than every 90 calendar days—

''(A) determine whether the President is able to certify that—

''(i) Iran is transparently, verifiably, and fully implementing the agreement, including all related technical or additional agreements;

''(ii) Iran has not committed a material breach with respect to the agreement or, if Iran has committed a material breach, Iran has cured the material breach;

''(iii) Iran has not taken any action, including covert action, that could significantly advance its nuclear weapons program; and

''(iv) suspension of sanctions related to Iran pursuant to the agreement is—

''(I) appropriate and proportionate to the specific and verifiable measures taken by Iran with respect to terminating its illicit nuclear program; and

''(II) vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

''(B) if the President determines he is able to make the certification described in subparagraph (A), make such certification to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

''(7) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(A) United States sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1);

''(B) issues not addressed by an agreement on the nuclear program of Iran, including fair and appropriate compensation for Americans who were terrorized and subjected to torture while held in captivity for 444 days after the seizure of the United States Embassy in Tehran, Iran, in 1979 and their families, the freedom of Americans held in Iran, the human rights abuses of the Government of Iran against its own people, and the continued support of terrorism worldwide by the Government of Iran, are matters critical to ensure justice and the national security of the United States, and should be expeditiously addressed;

''(C) the President should determine the agreement in no way compromises the commitment of the United States to Israel's security, nor its support for Israel's right to exist; and

''(D) in order to responsibly implement any long-term agreement reached between the P5+1 countries and Iran, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity to review any agreement and, as necessary, take action to modify the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

''(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event the President does not submit a certification pursuant to subsection (d)(6) or has determined pursuant to subsection (d)(3) that Iran has materially breached an agreement subject to subsection (a) and the material breach has not been cured, Congress may initiate within 60 calendar days expedited consideration of qualifying legislation pursuant to this subsection.

''(2) QUALIFYING LEGISLATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualifying legislation' means only a bill of either House of Congress—

''(A) the title of which is as follows: 'A bill reinstating statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.'; and

''(B) the matter after the enacting clause of which is: 'Any statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran pursuant to _____ that were waived, suspended, reduced, or otherwise relieved pursuant to an agreement submitted pursuant to section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 are hereby reinstated and any action by the United States Government to facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to such agreement, or provide any further waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief pursuant to such agreement is hereby prohibited.', with the blank space being filled in with the law or laws under which sanctions are to be reinstated.

''(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the 60-calendar day period provided for in paragraph (1), qualifying legislation may be introduced—

''(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

''(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

''(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House to which qualifying legislation has been referred has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 legislative days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration thereof.

''(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which qualifying legislation has been referred reports it to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the qualifying legislation in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the qualifying legislation with regard to the same agreement. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(C) CONSIDERATION.—The qualifying legislation shall be considered as read. All points of order against the qualifying legislation and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the qualifying legislation to final passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the qualifying legislation (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the qualifying legislation shall not be in order.

''(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

''(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—Qualifying legislation introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

''(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the Committee on Foreign Relations has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 session days after the date of referral of such legislation, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such legislation and the qualifying legislation shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

''(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the committee authorized to consider qualifying legislation reports it to the Senate or has been discharged from its consideration (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of qualifying legislation, and all points of order against qualifying legislation (and against consideration of the qualifying legislation) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the qualifying legislation is agreed to, the qualifying legislation shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

''(D) DEBATE.—Debate on qualifying legislation, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the qualifying legislation is not in order.

''(E) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the qualifying legislation and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate, if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

''(F) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to qualifying legislation shall be decided without debate.

''(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to qualifying legislation, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such qualifying legislation, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

''(6) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of qualifying legislation of that House, that House receives qualifying legislation from the other House, then the following procedures shall apply:

''(i) The qualifying legislation of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(ii) With respect to qualifying legislation of the House receiving the legislation—

''(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no qualifying legislation had been received from the other House; but

''(II) the vote on passage shall be on the qualifying legislation of the other House.

''(B) TREATMENT OF A BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce qualifying legislation under this section, the qualifying legislation of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

''(C) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the qualifying legislation in the Senate, the Senate then receives a companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

''(D) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to qualifying legislation which is a revenue measure.

''(f) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (e) is enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of legislation described in those sections, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(g) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the section shall be construed as—

''(1) modifying, or having any other impact on, the President's authority to negotiate, enter into, or implement appropriate executive agreements, other than the restrictions on implementation of the agreements specifically covered by this section;

''(2) allowing any new waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief from statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law, or allowing the President to refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) during the period for review provided in subsection (b);

''(3) revoking or terminating any statutory sanctions imposed on Iran; or

''(4) authorizing the use of military force against Iran.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AGREEMENT.—The term 'agreement' means an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future.

''(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

''(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees and leadership' means the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

''(4) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'Iranian financial institution' has the meaning given the term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

''(5) JOINT PLAN OF ACTION.—The term 'Joint Plan of Action' means the Joint Plan of Action, signed at Geneva November 24, 2013, by Iran and by France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Plan of Action, including the technical understandings

reached on January 12, 2014, the extension thereto agreed to on July 18, 2014, the extension agreed to on November 24, 2014, and any materially identical extension that is agreed to on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015.

''(6) EU-IRAN JOINT STATEMENT.—The term 'EU-Iran Joint Statement' means only the Joint Statement by EU High Representative Federica Mogherini and Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif made on April 2, 2015, at Lausanne, Switzerland.

''(7) MATERIAL BREACH.—The term 'material breach' means, with respect to an agreement described in subsection (a), any breach of the agreement, or in the case of non-binding commitments, any failure to perform those commitments, that substantially—

''(A) benefits Iran's nuclear program;

''(B) decreases the amount of time required by Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon; or

''(C) deviates from or undermines the purposes of such agreement.

''(8) NONCOMPLIANCE DEFINED.—The term 'noncompliance' means any departure from the terms of an agreement described in subsection (a) that is not a material breach.

''(9) P5+1 COUNTRIES.—The term 'P5+1 countries' means the United States, France, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and Germany.

''(10) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term 'United States person' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8511).''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by section 2

SA 1198. Mr. COTTON (for Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1197 proposed by Mr. COTTON to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

On page 3, line 20, of the amendment, strike ''purpose.'' and insert the following: ''purpose; and

''(iii) the President determines Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND INVESTMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examining Insurance Capital Rules and FSOC Process.''

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

RAFAEL RAMOS AND WENJIAN LIU NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT OF 2015

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, S. 665.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 665) to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 665) was passed, as follows:

S. 665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COORDINATOR.—The term ''Coordinator'' means the Blue Alert Coordinator of the Department of Justice designated under section 4(a).

(2) BLUE ALERT.—The term ''Blue Alert'' means information sent through the network relating to—

(A) the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer in the line of duty;

(B) an officer who is missing in connection with the officer's official duties; or

(C) an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer.

(3) BLUE ALERT PLAN.—The term ''Blue Alert plan'' means the plan of a State, unit of local government, or Federal agency participating in the network for the dissemination of information received as a Blue Alert.

(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''law enforcement officer'' shall have the same meaning as in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b).

(5) NETWORK.—The term ''network'' means the Blue Alert communications network established by the Attorney General under section 3.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 3. BLUE ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

The Attorney General shall establish a national Blue Alert communications network within the Department of Justice to issue Blue Alerts through the initiation, facilitation, and promotion of Blue Alert plans, in coordination with States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other appropriate entities.

SEC. 4. BLUE ALERT COORDINATOR; GUIDELINES.

(a) COORDINATION WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—The Attorney General shall assign an existing officer of the Department of Justice to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert communications network.

(b) DUTIES OF THE COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator shall—

(1) provide assistance to States and units of local government that are using Blue Alert plans;

(2) establish voluntary guidelines for States and units of local government to use in developing Blue Alert plans that will promote compatible and integrated Blue Alert plans throughout the United States, including—

(A) a list of the resources necessary to establish a Blue Alert plan;

(B) criteria for evaluating whether a situation warrants issuing a Blue Alert;

(C) guidelines to protect the privacy, dignity, independence, and autonomy of any law enforcement officer who may be the subject of a Blue Alert and the family of the law enforcement officer;

(D) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) the law enforcement agency involved—

(I) confirms—

(aa) the death or serious injury of the law enforcement officer; or

(bb) the attack on the law enforcement officer and that there is an indication of the death or serious injury of the officer; or

(II) concludes that the law enforcement officer is missing in connection with the officer's official duties;

(ii) there is an indication of serious injury to or death of the law enforcement officer;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(E) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a threat to cause death or serious injury to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) a law enforcement agency involved confirms that the threat is imminent and credible;

(ii) at the time of receipt of the threat, the suspect is wanted by a law enforcement agency;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(F) guidelines—

(i) that information should be provided to the National Crime Information Center database operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 534 of title 28, United States Code, and any relevant crime information repository of the State involved, relating to—

(I) a law enforcement officer who is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty; or

(II) an imminent and credible threat to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer;

(ii) that a Blue Alert should, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local governments), be limited to the geographic areas most likely to facilitate the apprehension of the suspect involved or which the suspect could reasonably reach, which should not be limited to State lines;

(iii) for law enforcement agencies of States or units of local government to develop plans to communicate information to neighboring States to provide for seamless communication of a Blue Alert; and

(iv) providing that a Blue Alert should be suspended when the suspect involved is apprehended or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective; and

(G) guidelines for—

(i) the issuance of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(ii) the extent of the dissemination of alerts issued through the network;

(3) develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects that address activities during the period beginning at the time of the initial notification of a law enforcement agency that a suspect has not been apprehended and ending at the time of apprehension of a suspect or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective, including protocols regulating—

(A) the use of public safety communications;

(B) command center operations; and

(C) incident review, evaluation, debriefing, and public information procedures;

(4) work with States to ensure appropriate regional coordination of various elements of the network;

(5) establish an advisory group to assist States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other entities involved in the network with initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alert plans, which shall include—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, representation from the various geographic regions of the United States; and

(B) members who are—

(i) representatives of a law enforcement organization representing rank-and-file officers;

(ii) representatives of other law enforcement agencies and public safety communications;

(iii) broadcasters, first responders, dispatchers, and radio station personnel; and

(iv) representatives of any other individuals or organizations that the Coordinator determines are necessary to the success of the network;

(6) act as the nationwide point of contact for—

(A) the development of the network; and

(B) regional coordination of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(7) determine—

(A) what procedures and practices are in use for notifying law enforcement and the public when—

(i) a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty;

(ii) a law enforcement officer is missing in connection with the officer's official duties; and

(iii) an imminent and credible threat to kill or seriously injure a law enforcement officer is received; and

(B) which of the procedures and practices are effective and that do not require the expenditure of additional resources to implement.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2), protocols developed under subsection (b)(3), and other programs established under subsection (b), shall not be mandatory.

(2) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2) shall, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government), provide that appropriate information relating to a Blue Alert is disseminated to the appropriate officials of law enforcement agencies, public health agencies, and other agencies.

(3) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS.—The guidelines established under subsection (b) shall—

(A) provide mechanisms that ensure that Blue Alerts comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations; and

(B) include standards that specifically provide for the protection of the civil liberties, including the privacy, of law enforcement officers who are seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or who are threatened with death or serious injury, and the families of the officers.

(d) COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The Coordinator shall cooperate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and appropriate offices of the Department of Justice in carrying out activities under this Act.

(e) RESTRICTIONS ON COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator may not—

(1) perform any official travel for the sole purpose of carrying out the duties of the Coordinator;

(2) lobby any officer of a State regarding the funding or implementation of a Blue Alert plan; or

(3) host a conference focused solely on the Blue Alert program that requires the expenditure of Federal funds.

(f) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Coordinator shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Coordinator and the effectiveness and status of the Blue Alert plans that are in effect or being developed.

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 1, 2015, AS ''SILVER STAR SERVICE BANNER DAY''

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 136.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 136) expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2015, as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day.''

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 136) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 16, 2015, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 158, Cinco de Mayo; S.

Res. 159, National 9–1–1 Education Month; S. Res. 160, Public Service Recognition Week; S. Res. 161, Financial Literacy Month; S. Res. 162, Alcohol Responsibility Month; S. Res. 163, earthquake in Nepal; S. Res. 164, Dia de los Ninos; and S. Res. 165, World Malaria Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 84 through 94, and 96 through 106, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army Medical Service Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 3064:

To be brigadier general

Col. Raymond S. Dingle

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Ron. J. MacLaren

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Herman A. Shelanski

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Joseph Anderson

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be brigadier general

Col. James J. Burks

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. James C. Balserak
Brig. Gen. Steven J. Berryhill
Brig. Gen. Kevin W. Bradley
Brig. Gen. Peter J. Byrne
Brig. Gen. Gretchen S. Dunkelberger
Brig. Gen. Richard J. Evans, III
Brig. Gen. Robert M. Ginnetti
Brig. Gen. Jeffrey W. Hauser
Brig. Gen. William O. Hill
Brig. Gen. Joseph K. Kim
Brig. Gen. Jerome P. Limoge, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Paul C. Maas, Jr.
Brig. Gen. John P. McGoff
Brig. Gen. Brian C. Newby
Brig. Gen. Marc H. Sasseville
Brig. Gen. Michael E. Stencel
Brig. Gen. Carol A. Timmons

The following named office for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Kyle W. Robinson

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Robert D. Carlson
Brig. Gen. Daniel J. Dire
Brig. Gen. Mary E. Link
Brig. Gen. Hugh C. Van Roosen

To be brigadier general

Col. Vincent B. Barker
Col. Lisa L. Doumont
Col. Robert D. Harter
Col. John F. Hussey
Col. Scott R. Morcomb
Col. Gerard L. Schwartz
Col. Richard K. Sele
Col. Tracy L. Smith

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army as a Chaplain under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 3064:

To be brigadier general

Chaplain (Col.) Thomas L. Solhjem

IN THE NAVY

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Danelle M. Barrett

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Ronald C. Copley

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Timothy M. Ray

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Darryl L. Roberson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Eric C. Bush

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Alan R. Lynn

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Jill K. Faris

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Gary H. Cheek

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Christian A. Rofrano

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Nora W. Tyson

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Mark A. Brilakis

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert S. Walsh

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN355 AIR FORCE nomination of Troy S. Thomas, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN356 AIR FORCE nomination of Linell A. Letendre, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN386 AIR FORCE nominations (115) beginning BAMIDELE A. ADETUNJI, and ending KERI L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN387 AIR FORCE nominations (20) beginning TRAVIS M. ALLEN, and ending JEROMY JAMES WELLS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN388 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning RICHARD S. BEYEA, III, and ending TRAVIS C. YELTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN389 AIR FORCE nominations (9) beginning KEITH L. CLARK, and ending JENNIE LEIGH L. STODDART, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN390 AIR FORCE nominations (54) beginning TALIB Y. ALI, and ending GABRIEL ZIMMERER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN391 AIR FORCE nomination of John W. Heck, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN392 AIR FORCE nomination of Anna Hamm, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN393 AIR FORCE nomination of Jermal M. Scarbrough, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN394 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning CYNTHIA A. RUTHERFORD, and ending ANGELA SCEVOLA-DATTOLI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN395 AIR FORCE nomination of Susan I. Pangelinan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

IN THE ARMY

PN25 ARMY nomination of Bryan K. Anderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 7, 2015.

PN252 ARMY nomination of Mark A. Endsley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2015.

PN319 ARMY nominations (3) beginning ARPANA JAIN, and ending RAMA KRISHNA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 25, 2015.

PN357 ARMY nomination of James J. Raftery, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN358 ARMY nomination of David A. Harper, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN359 ARMY nominations (2) beginning STEVEN R. ANSLEY, JR., and ending KAREN S. HANSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN396 ARMY nomination of Rita A. Kostecke, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN397 ARMY nominations (2) beginning SCHAWN B. BRANCH, and ending FRANK A. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN77 MARINE CORPS nomination of Joshua B. Roberts, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN125 MARINE CORPS nominations (69) beginning DAWN R. ALONSO, and ending VINCENT J. YASAKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

PN320 NAVY nominations (2) beginning NAWAZ K. A. HACK, and ending ROBERT P. RUTTER, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 25, 2015.

PN360 NAVY nomination of Brian L. Tichenor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN361 NAVY nomination of Cheryl Gotzinger, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN398 NAVY nomination of John P. O'Brien, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN404 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CAROLYN A. WINNINGHAM, and ending SARA M. BUSTAMANTE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 4, 2015

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 4; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, Senators should expect a vote in relation to the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8 at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 4, 2015, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:07 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 4, 2015, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

PATRICIA NELSON LIMERICK, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018, VICE ROBERT S. MARTIN, TERM EXPIRED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

GAYLE SMITH, OF OHIO, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE RAJIV J. SHAH, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

JULIE HELENE BECKER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE HERBERT BLALOCK DIXON, JR., RETIRED.

STEVEN M. WELLNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE KAYE K. CHRISTIAN, RETIRED.

WILLIAM WARD NOOTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE A. FRANKLIN BURGESS, RETIRED.

ROBERT A. SALERNO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE ROBERT ISAAC RICHTER, RETIRED.

TODD SUNHWAE KIM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE KATHRYN A. OBERLY, RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSHUA D. BURGESS
JAMES R. CANTU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL I. ETAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ERIK D. MASICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

MUHAMMAD R. KHAWAJA

MUHAMMAD S. MUNIR
NIKALESH REDDY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

RICHARD A. BRAUNBECK III
KENNETH J. BROWN, JR.
GRANT GORTON
ANTHONY K. JARAMILLO
WESLEY J. JOSHWAY
MICHAEL H. MCCURDY
JEFFREY J. PRONESTI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

THURRAYA S. KENT
JASON P. SALATA
WENDY L. SNYDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL E. BIERY
DANIEL C. HEDRICK
JAMES A. MCMULLIN III
TONY S. W. PARK
MATTHEW D. TURNER
RICKY M. URSERY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

NEIL T. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER J. STERBIS
WENDY A. TOWLE
DOMINICK A. VINCENT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JASON B. BABCOCK
JAMES L. CAROLAND
PATRICK A. COUNT
JOEL D. DAVIS
JOSEPH E. DUPRE
CLARENCE FRANKLIN, JR.
KURTIS A. MOLE
DANNY L. NOLES
DONOVAN I. OUBRE
CESAR G. RIOS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER P. SLATTERY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

NICHOLAS E. ANDREWS
RODNEY J. BURLEY
JOAQUIN S. CORREIA
GEORGE D. DAVIS III
ANDREW D. GAINER
JAMES B. GATEAU
JODY H. GRADY
BOBBY L. HAND, JR.
DAMEN O. HOFHEINZ
EDWARD A. KRUK
SHAWN A. ROBERTS
VINCENT S. TIONQUIAO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

SOWON S. AHN
ANDREW N. COREY
ROBERT F. HIGHT, JR.
JEFFREY J. JAKUBOSKI
SEAN R. KENTCH
MADELENE E. MEANS
JAMES F. SCARCELLI
BENJAMIN A. SNELL
HENRY A. STEPHENSON
SCOTT R. WHALEY
CRAIG M. WHITTINGHILL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

STEVEN W. CONNELL
JON C. GRANT
JACKIE D. KNICK
ROSARIO D. MCWHORTER
JAMES D. RHOADS
DANIEL M. ROSSLER
JAMES P. TURNER
MICHAEL A. WHITT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

ANTHONY S. ARDITO
RYAN L. BIRKELBACH
ROBERT E. BREISCH III
JOSHUA L. BROADBENT
DANIEL P. BURBA
ADAM R. CAMPBELL
RICHARD E. CAMPBELL, JR.
TIMOTHY B. CLARK
KEENAN L. COLEMAN
JEFFREY A. CORNIELLE
GRAIG T. DIEFENDERFER
CHASE H. DILLARD
LEWIS R. EMERY
MATTHEW R. FURTADO
DANIEL E. GARDNER
SEAN A. GENIS
SEAN F. GLASS
JASON A. GOELLER
BRANDON C. HARDIN
ERIC E. HAYES
EVAN E. HENTSCHEL
RYAN P. HILGER
MICHAEL C. HUGHES
ROBERT B. INMAN
MASON P. JONES
JAMES M. KAUFMAN
ROBERT E. KELLER
JOSEPH J. KIMOCK, JR.
JEFFREY R. KINGSLAND
SAMUEL G. LEHNER
CHRISTOPHER A. LINDAHL
BENJAMIN S. MACNEIL
TYLER V. MARSHBURN
JASON L. MCKEOWN
DAVID P. MOSES
WILLIAM P. MURPHY
JUSTIN M. NEFF
DAVID D. NOVOTNEY
FELIX PEREZ
TRAVIS L. RAINEY
CHRISTOPHER J. ROGERS
MATTHEW G. SHIPMAN
DAVID A. SMITH
PHILIP S. SMITH
TIMOTHY S. SMITH
JAMES A. STANKE
DAMON Y. TURNER
JEREMY W. WHEELIS
MARVIN L. WILSON
RODERICK D. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CHRISTINE J. CASTON
MELANIE R. N. HAO
JOHN D. HUDSON
ELENA P. INGRAM
PATRICK S. MARTIN
STEVEN M. MILINKOVICH
KATHERINE J. SCHULLIAN
KAREN L. SRAY
JAMES V. WALSH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL A. HURNI
PAUL J. LING III
JAMES C. RENTFROW
DAVID M. RUTH
ELIZABETH R. SANABIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ROBERT C. BANDY
ROBERT E. BEBERMEYER
VINCENT S. CHERNESKY
KENNETH A. EBERT
JONATHAN C. GARCIA
DAVID T. HART
PETER A. LASHOMB
ELIZABETH S. OKANO
CAREY M. PANTLING
FRANCIS D. ROCHFORD
RONALD J. RUTAN
STEPHEN F. SARAR
DJUENO S. SEARLES
NEIL G. SEXTON
KENNETH S. SHEPARD
PETER D. SMALL
GODFREY D. WEEKES
DOUGLAS L. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DOMINIC S. CARONELLO
JEFFREY J. CARTY
JOSEPH A. CASCIO
DANIEL P. COVELLI
MATTHEW W. EDWARDS
THOMAS H. HOOVER
DANIEL L. MACKIN
RICHARD M. MASICA
PAUL J. MITCHELL
VERNON J. RED
KERRY D. SMITH
MICHAEL J. SUPKO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

GARRETT T. PANKOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

WILLIAM M. WALKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER C. MEYER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

JEFFREY G. BENTSON
PAUL N. PORENSKY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

KEVIN D. CLARIDA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRIANNA E. JACKSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JARED M. SPILKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

FRANCINE SEGOVIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

TODD W. MALLORY

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30, 2015:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S. C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. RAYMOND S. DINGLE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RON. J. MACLAREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. HERMAN A. SHELANSKI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOSEPH ANDERSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES J. BURKS

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES C. BALSERAK
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN J. BERRYHILL
BRIG. GEN. KEVIN W. BRADLEY
BRIG. GEN. PETER J. BYRNE
BRIG. GEN. GRETCHEN S. DUNKELBERGER
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD J. EVANS III
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT M. GINNETTI
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY W. HAUSER
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM O. HILL
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH K. KIM
BRIG. GEN. JEROME P. LIMOGE, JR.
BRIG. GEN. PAUL C. MAAS, JR.
BRIG. GEN. JOHN P. MCGOFF
BRIG. GEN. BRIAN C. NEWBY
BRIG. GEN. MARC H. SASSEVILLE
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL E. STENCEL
BRIG. GEN. CAROL A. TIMMONS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. KYLE W. ROBINSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT D. CARLSON
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL J. DIRE
BRIG. GEN. MARY E. LINK
BRIG. GEN. HUGH C. VAN ROOSEN

To be brigadier general

COL. VINCENT B. BARKER
COL. LISA L. DOUMONT
COL. ROBERT D. HARTER
COL. JOHN F. HUSSEY
COL. SCOTT R. MORCOMB
COL. GERARD L. SCHWARTZ
COL. RICHARD K. SELE
COL. TRACY L. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

CHAPLAIN (COL.) THOMAS L. SOLHJEM

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DANELLE M. BARRETT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RONALD C. COPLEY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. TIMOTHY M. RAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DARRYL L. ROBERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES Q. BROWN, JR.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ERIC C. BUSH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ALAN R. LYNN

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JILL K. FARIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GARY H. CHEEK

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTIAN A. ROFRANO

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. NORA W. TYSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MARK A. BRILAKIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT S. WALSH

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF TROY S. THOMAS, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LINELL A. LETENDRE, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BAMIDELE A. ADETUNJI AND ENDING WITH KERI L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TRAVIS M. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH JEROMY JAMES WELLS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD S. BEYEA III AND ENDING WITH TRAVIS C. YELTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEITH L. CLARK AND ENDING WITH JENNIE LEIGH L. STODDART, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TALIB Y. ALI AND ENDING WITH GABRIEL ZIMMERER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOHN W. HECK, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ANNA HAMM, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JERMAL M. SCARBROUGH, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CYNTHIA A. RUTHERFORD AND ENDING WITH ANGELA SCEVOLA–DATTOLI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF SUSAN I. PANGELINAN, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRYAN K. ANDERSON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARK A. ENDSLEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARPANA JAIN AND ENDING WITH RAMA KRISHNA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 25, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAMES J. RAFTERY, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID A. HARPER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN R. ANSLEY, JR. AND ENDING WITH KAREN S. HANSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 13, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RITA A. KOSTECKE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCHAWN B. BRANCH AND ENDING WITH FRANK A. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JOSHUA B. ROBERTS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAWN R. ALONSO AND ENDING WITH VINCENT J. YASAKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NAWAZ K. A. HACK AND ENDING WITH ROBERT P. RUTTER, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 25, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRIAN L. TICHENOR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHERYL GOTZINGER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOHN P. O'BRIEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CAROLYN A. WINNINGHAM AND ENDING WITH SARA M. BUSTAMANTE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 30, 2015*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 30, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL L. CARTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IT IS TIME TO STOP STALLING ON THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, a looming deadline, the highway trust fund extension expires. I actually could have dusted off the speech I gave last summer, arguing against this ill-advised measure to slide it into this spring.

As I pointed out then, we will be right back in the same spot. We will be stuck. We won't have a long-term proposal. We won't have a short-term proposal. We will look at another extension.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to stop the stalling. Everyone ought to make a commitment that this will be the last extension that we take before we give America what it needs, a robust 6-year reauthorization of the critical highway trust fund.

Please focus on making sure this does not slide beyond the end of this Federal fiscal year because Congress doesn't act absent some sort of deadline, and do instead what we do best: stall, study, and sidestep.

If we would actually start working now, the 5 months until the expiration of this Federal fiscal year, we can actually give the people legislation they deserve. It is not that hard; except if you never start, if you don't know how big the program is going to be, if you don't get down to business, it is difficult.

Now, I hear that the simplest approach, the most direct approach—raising the gas tax for the first time in 22 years—is somehow too hard, too difficult for Congress. It has been pronounced dead on arrival. It is off the table, according to our distinguished majority leader and the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Why exactly is it off the table? Why is this too hard for Congress? If it was good enough for Dwight Eisenhower to start the Interstate Highway System, if it was good enough for Ronald Reagan to call Congress to come back during his Thanksgiving Day speech, November 29, 1982, to more than double the gas tax, if it is good enough for 19 States—including, this year, five Republican States—to raise the gas tax, why is it too hard for us? Maybe it is because we have never given the people who care deeply about this a chance to make their case.

The Republicans have been in charge for 52 months. We have not had a single hearing on Ways and Means on transportation finance. What if we allowed the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL–CIO, the American Trucking Association, contractors, local governments, engineers, environmentalists, mayors to come in and make the case why they support raising the gas tax?

Maybe if Congress did its job, if it listened to the people, if it allowed the broadest coalition you have seen on Capitol Hill on any major idea to come in, take a couple days, work with Congress, explain the issues, dive into the details, actually show politicians that even the public supports it, maybe we could do our job, maybe we could have a 6-year reauthorization, maybe we could put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs all across America, making our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

Deadline, September 30—get down to work; have some hearings; do our job; produce the bill, and America will be better off.

SALUTING LAW ENFORCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a matter that is, frankly, getting out of hand. It is more than a matter; it is a problem. This is a problem that has expanded beyond the borders of individual American cities and into the international spotlight. It is a problem that is no longer a localized issue, but a national one that is spiraling out of control.

This week, we watched in horror as Baltimore burned. We watched in disgust as lowlifes destroyed their own communities as local government helplessly stood by. We watched in anger that some could even think to justify this sort of behavior. I applaud President Obama for calling those responsible for the destruction who they really are, criminals and thugs.

Mr. Speaker, everyone has the right to participate in peaceful demonstrations, and I thank and respect those in Baltimore who exercised their constitutionally granted right, but, when the actions of a few infringe on the rights of others, we have a problem. When the actions of a few violent protesters dominate the 24-hour news cycle, it takes away from the importance of the message, and it tears apart already fragile communities.

When businesses are trashed, those responsible must be brought to justice. When a national chain pharmacy is set aflame, we ask if they will ever risk doing business in that community ever again.

As a businessowner, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it would take a whole lot of convincing to get me to invest my sweat, energy, and treasure in a city that has demonstrated the type of lawlessness we have seen in recent days, and that is a tragedy. It is a tragedy because these communities so desperately need structure, stability, support, and jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is law enforcement that will help reassure businesses that they will be able to safely operate in these communities. It is law enforcement that will reduce the risk that is currently holding back job creators from setting up shop. Mr. Speaker, communities must have law and order to succeed and prosper. I applaud those in law enforcement who have worked so hard to ensure that.

In God we trust.

PUT A WOMAN ON THE TWENTY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, what would it be like if the Chamber and this government reflected the diversity of the American people? There would be a lot more portraits of women alongside all the portraits of committee chairmen of the past decades.

In 2015, it wouldn't be newsworthy when a competent, intelligent person who happens to be African American is hired for a job for which she is supremely qualified, which happened this week when Loretta Lynch was sworn in as our 83rd Attorney General. We wouldn't still be talking about unequal pay for equal work.

I believe that, if there is a country that truly believes in equality, that it is time to put our money where our mouths are, literally, and express that sense of justice on the most widely used currency in international transaction.

Last week, I introduced the Put a Woman on the Twenty Act to build on the grassroots campaign known as Women on 20s, working to bring gender equality to our currency. Their public campaign has garnered more than half a million votes in support of putting a woman on a $20 bill. I loved the idea, and it was brought to me by a smart, young woman on my staff, Kate Johnson. To me, this isn't just a women's issue; it is an American issue.

My bill simply directs the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to solicit recommendations from the public for a woman to be placed on the $20 bill. Women have inspired generations of Americans for their courage by challenging this Nation to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

Women have advocated for voting rights and equal protection under the law and for programs that serve the most vulnerable members of our communities. Women led us out of slavery on the Underground Railroad, taught us what the phrase ''all men are created equal'' really means by fighting for women's suffrage and civil rights and have led in all sectors in society.

When I go to the bank, when I use an ATM, when I travel overseas, the $20 bill is already widely used and in the purses and wallets of hundreds of millions of Americans. We all know that the almighty dollar speaks; but what if it had a woman's voice?

Consider for a moment the powerful message that would be sent to a young girl in Chicago if she saw a portrait celebrating Rosa Parks or Harriet Tubman when she reached into her wallet to make a purchase. What about the young man in a country far away who maybe is still hearing damaging messages about the role of women in his country?

The portrait of Wilma Mankiller or Eleanor Roosevelt on the United States bill that represents power and success to him provides a new opportunity to show our common values about equality and inclusion in faraway places.

The organization Women on 20s has put forward four exceptional female leaders for this honor: Rosa Parks, Wilma Mankiller, Harriet Tubman, and Eleanor Roosevelt. That is a great list, but there is no reason to stop there. The initiative has sparked conversations about the many great women who have contributed in significant ways to strengthening our Nation.

I have certainly benefited from the passionate advocacy of women who have fought for civil rights and equality, as have my daughters and constituents in Chicago, many of whom are debating and weighing in on the candidates for this incredible honor.

Roosevelt University in Chicago has launched a campuswide campaign to champion Eleanor Roosevelt for the honor and not just because they were named after her. As a result of the campaign, students are participating in a national dialogue about her work advocating for child labor laws to protect kids and all workers from unsafe conditions and long hours, for gender equality, and safe housing.

Now, I don't know who will be chosen. She could be one of the women suggested already or any one of many other talented, impressive women in our country's history. My mother, who is an amazing woman, would probably get my personal vote, but she is out of the running because, thankfully, she is still alive.

I believe the time has come to have our currency represent the contributions of women throughout our history. A woman's place is in the boardroom, chairing the committee, in the laboratory, in the Oval Office, and, yes, even on our currency.

□ 1015

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is said that, when the plan for the ancient city of Alexandria was presented to the great Alexander, his master builder pointed with pride to an ingenious way to honor the city's namesake. All of the city's water supply would be channeled to one great central fountain featuring a giant statue of Alexander and then flow from it to the surrounding city.

When Alexander seemed unimpressed, his architect explained the symbolism. Water, the life's blood of the city, would flow from Alexander to Alexandria. Alexander replied, ''But water is not the life's blood of a city. Commerce is the life's blood of a city.'' The statue of Alexander was placed, instead, at the entrance to the port.

As it is with city-states, it is with nation-states. Every nation that engages in trade prospers from it; every nation that fails to trade, fails to prosper.

Today, international trade agreements are the means by which nations establish the terms of their commerce. This often requires intricate negotiations with trading partners, and our trading partners must be confident that the United States is bargaining in good faith and that what is decided at the bargaining table will not be revoked or redefined later at a congressional table.

The Constitution gives Congress the authority to regulate commerce with other nations. Congress, thus, has the final say over any trade agreement, but trading partners have to have confidence that, once the agreement has been reached, it represents the last best offer of both sides, a meeting of the minds that won't be repeatedly altered after the fact.

That is why, since the 1930s, Congress has chosen to exercise its responsibility by establishing the broad terms of the agreement that it seeks and then giving explicit instructions to our negotiators at the beginning of the process. If—and only if—these objectives are advanced in the agreement, Congress will then consider it as a whole package and either approve it or reject it.

That process is called trade promotion authority. It stood the test of time. It has been used to the great benefit of our Nation in the past and has never been controversial until now.

From the left, opposition comes from protectionist special interests. They fail to learn from the painful lessons of history. Protectionism is the fastest way to destroy an economy, as this Nation has learned repeatedly, including during the Jefferson administration and, again, in the Hoover administration.

From the right, opposition comes from a mistrust of this President's judgment and competence, a mistrust I completely and unequivocally share. It is precisely because of this mistrust that the trade promotion authority sets forth some 150 objectives that must be advanced before Congress will even consider the resulting agreement. Once those objectives are attained, a majority of the Congress must still approve it.

This measure does not empower the President to do his own thing; it binds the President to faithfully execute the will of Congress. Trade promotion authority simply continues a time-proven process through which Congress exercises its authority to regulate commerce at the beginning of negotiations so trading partners can have a reasonable expectation that their painstaking negotiations, compromises, and concessions won't be ripped asunder and reopened when Congress acts.

Indeed, the successful Base Closure and Realignment Commission process worked on exactly the same principle.

Let me repeat, this gives the President no new authority. It binds him to Congress' will at the outset of negotiations and promises only that, if the objectives set by Congress are advanced, will the Congress agree, not necessarily to approve the agreement, but simply to vote on it without opening new issues or causing unnecessary delays.

The statue at one of our greatest ports is not of a person, but of an ideal, liberty. It is freedom that produces prosperity, the free exchange of goods between people for their mutual betterment—the greater the freedom, the greater the prosperity. Trade promotion authority is the means by which this freedom is advanced among nations.

Mr. Speaker, freedom works. It is time that we put it back to work.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE PEOPLE OF NEPAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, along with a good many of my colleagues, are on a mission of mercy.

Mr. Speaker, we have a circumstance that has impacted the people of Nepal. A 7.8 magnitude earthquake has hit this country. It happened on April 25. More than 5,000 people have lost their lives; 10,000 have been injured; 2.8 million people are displaced, and 8 million people have been affected. Four Americans are confirmed dead.

There is a little bit of good news. The United States of America has committed $12.5 million in relief for the country of Nepal, but that is not enough. I believe we can do more because $415 million will be needed for humanitarian purposes alone, Mr. Speaker.

I am proud to say that a good many organizations are pitching in. One such organization is in my district in Houston, Texas, the Nepalese Association of Houston. The chairperson and president of that association, Mr. Ghimirey, has called a meeting; and I was honored to be in attendance, along with the secretary Mr. Nepal, and about 100 or more other people.

They are doing what they can to make sure they do their share to help in this time of need, and I want you to know that we in the Congress want to make sure that we do our share to help in this time of need.

Yesterday, we heard from the Prime Minister of Japan. One of the things that he said that stuck in my mind is that America provides hope for the world. America is emblematic of hope for people who are hopeless, help for those who are helpless.

America is always there for the rest of the world. We cannot allow this situation to become anything less than what America has always been for the rest of the world.

To have the hope that they need, help has to be on the way. There has to be the help that can engender the hope that people so desperately need. To give them the hope they need, there is a bill that we have filed in the Congress of the United States of America, H.R. 2033.

This bill provides temporary protected status for the people of Nepal who happen to be in the United States of America under a legal status. If they are here legally, they will be allowed to stay for an additional 18 months. They won't be sent back to harm's way in a time of crisis.

This is what America can do. This is to provide hope. By providing help and allowing those people to stay in this country, they can continue to work. They can continue to send money home. We have found from our research that $248 million in remittances were sent to Nepal in 2014. That is $248 million.

We need to allow the Nepalese people to continue to work in this country and send that money back to their countrymen and women. America can do this. This is not a heavy lift. This is not immigration reform. This is something that we have done before.

We did it in 1998, under the Clinton administration, for the people of Montserrat after the volcanic eruption. We did it in 1998, under the Clinton administration, for the people of Honduras and Nicaragua after the hurricane. We did it in 2001, under the Bush administration, for the people of El Salvador after two earthquakes. We did it in 2010, under the Obama administration, for the people of Haiti after a 7.0 magnitude earthquake. We can do it for the people of Nepal.

This is not a heavy lift. It does not give anyone any kind of permanent immigration status. It does not change the law as it relates to immigration. It only says we will do what we can to help people acquire the hope that they need by allowing people here to continue to work, send money back to their home country, and not put them back there in harm's way, having to live in the circumstances that might be detrimental to them.

The United States has sent in many relief teams. These relief teams are bringing with them some temporary housing, which is important; this is important, but the real hope that we can help provide would be to pass H.R. 2033, so that people who are here can continue to stay.

THOMAS FRANK JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of an important man of America's Greatest Generation, Dr. Thomas Frank Johnson. He faced life's challenges head on, and, throughout all of this vast change, he always saw America's promise above all else.

Dr. Johnson, a military veteran and influential economist, passed away last December at the age of 94 and was recently buried at Arlington National Cemetery. He served as a lieutenant commander in the Navy in the Pacific from 1943 to 1945 and remained in the Navy Reserve until 1980.

He was born September 27, 1920, in Lynchburg, Virginia, and was a child of the Great Depression, which affected his economic and personal outlook. His philosophy was simple—as he would tell his children—time marches on, so must we.

Dr. Johnson was extremely proud of his military service. However, as a humble man, he only displayed one picture of himself, on his patrol craft 1191 in the Pacific, escorting aircraft carriers and destroyers into battle. After the war, he remained in the Navy, traveling by train, bringing soldiers and sailors home—some to their families, some to hospitals, and some to their final resting places.

While very proud of his service, he rarely ever spoke of his time there. He simply moved on to the next phase of his life in post-World War II America. After concluding Active Duty, Dr. Johnson completed studies in economics at the University of Virginia and was a member of the Thomas Jefferson Society.

He moved to Washington, D.C., in 1949 and began his professional career at the Department of Agriculture, specializing in the sugar beet industry, followed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In the mid-1950s, he served as the assistant commissioner of the Federal Housing Authority, in charge of research and legislation. He concluded his tenure at the Federal Housing Authority as acting commissioner. He then joined the American Enterprise Institute, where he influenced economic thought and public policy for another three decades.

For those three decades, Dr. Johnson held senior leadership roles at the American Enterprise Institute, including director of economic policy studies. In his last year, he was the acting CEO.

A man who did not seek the limelight, he had an uncanny ability to recruit and cultivate the foremost economic thinkers of our Nation. Dr. Johnson fostered the talent of at least three Nobel Prize winners in economics, including Milton Friedman, Jim Buchanan, and Gary Becker.

Dr. Johnson influenced economic policy during seven Presidential administrations. He established a lunchtime

forum for informal discussions with Cabinet Secretaries, financial leaders, and ambassadors. Even President George H.W. Bush would attend the forum.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Johnson was a humble and very forward-looking man. While engaging with many world leaders and policymakers, he was always a very private person, seldom talking about himself. He also taught economics nearly his entire professional life at the University of Virginia, George Mason University, and George Washington University.

Throughout his career, Dr. Johnson was active in professional societies such as the National Association of Business Economists, serving as chapter president in 1971; Institute for Social Science Research; Royal Economic Society; National Tax Association; American Finance Association; Southern Economic Association; and the Cosmos Club here in Washington, where he often took his children to meet important policymakers and leading economists of the Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Johnson was also deeply engaged in his local community, serving on the Alexandria Hospital board of directors, including a term as its president. He also proudly served on the Alexandria school board and the vestry for St. Paul's Episcopal Church and Immanuel Church-on-the-Hill Episcopal Church in Alexandria.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with his wife of 63 years, Margaret Ann; three children, Thomas, William, and the Reverend Sarah Nelson; and seven grandchildren.

Dr. Thomas Frank Johnson will surely be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD an additional account of Dr. Johnson's life.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of an important man in American life. Dr. Thomas Frank Johnson was part of the ''Greatest Generation'', a time now referred to as the ''American Century''. He, like other nonagenarians, saw so much change during his life and faced life's challenges head on. He witnessed a World War, a dozen presidents, the beginnings of commercial aviation and lunar landings, the construction and collapse of the Berlin Wall, the rise of China and India as world powers and other wonders. Throughout all of this vast change, he always saw above all else, America's promise.

We commend Dr. Johnson—an influential economist shaping this nation's public policy and a veteran—who died December 28, 2014, at 94 years of age. He served as a Lt. Commander in the Navy in the Pacific from 1943 to 1945. He remained in the Navy Reserve until 1980.

For nearly 30 years, Dr. Johnson held senior leadership roles at the American Enterprise Institute (1958–87), including director of economic policy studies and in his last year Acting CEO. A man who did not seek the limelight, he had an uncanny ability to recruit and cultivate the foremost economic thinkers. Dr. Johnson mentored numerous AEI scholars—providing the ideas and discourse—and then editing the publications of the nation's preeminent economists and public policy planners including Jean Kirkpatrick, Carla Hills, Irving Krystal, Herb Stein, and Murray Wiedenbaum. Dr. Johnson fostered the talent of at least three Nobel Prize winners in Economics including Milton Friedman, Jim Buchanan, and Gary Becker—well-known members of the Chicago School of Economic Thought. Because of Dr. Johnson's guidance and mentoring, other colleagues and assistants have also gone onto remarkable careers.

Dr. Johnson was known as the ''Dean of AEI'' and influenced economic policy during seven presidential administrations—John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard M. Nixon, Gerald R. Ford, Ronald W. Reagan and George H.W. Bush. Dr. Johnson established the AEI cafeteria, a lunchtime forum for informal discussions with cabinet secretaries, financial leaders, and ambassadors. George Herbert Walker Bush was a regular.

Dr. Johnson published numerous articles of his own in professional journals and books such as Renewing America's Cities. He served on the commission for urban renewal under three Virginia Governors—Linwood Holton, Miles Godwin and Bob Dalton. In 1980, Virginia enacted a law that implemented most of commission's work with a $150 million appropriation—an enormous sum at the time—to renew Virginia's cities.

He was a humble and very forward-looking man. While engaging with many world leaders and policymakers, he was always a very private person seldom talking about himself. He mused why anyone would want to know about his past. He and his generation just didn't boast—they just faced life every day and moved into the future.

Over 94 years, Dr. Johnson achieved significant professional, community, and personal accomplishments. He was born Sept 27, 1920, in Lynchburg, Virginia, and was a child of the Great Depression which affected his economic and personnel outlook. His family had several reversals of fortune, including the loss of their tobacco farm near Farmville, Virginia. As a result, he didn't believe in debt and paid cash for everything, including his home. His philosophy was simple. As he would tell his children, ''time marches on, so must we.''

Dr. Johnson was extremely proud of his military service to our nation. However, as a humble man, he only displayed one picture of himself—on his ''Patrol Craft 1191'' in the Pacific escorting aircraft carriers and destroyers into battle. After the war, he remained in the U.S. Navy travelling by train bringing soldiers and sailors home: some to their families; some to hospitals; and some to their final resting places. While very proud of his service, he rarely ever spoke of that time. He simply moved onto his next Phase—the post World War II America.

His generation witnessed terrible tragedies and atrocities. Because of these experiences, Dr. Johnson respected people of all origins recognizing their fate could have easily been his. He often told his children about friends and colleagues who experienced incredible war-time escapes and journeys from Eastern Europe and Asia to America. He helped many of these immigrants, refugees go onto successful lives in the United States. These harrowing experiences are why he never lost sight of America's promise.

After concluding active duty, Dr. Johnson completed studies in economics at the University of Virginia (B.A. 1943, M.A. 1947, and Ph.D. 1949) and was a member of the Thomas Jefferson Society. He also attended Lynchburg College (1939–41).

Dr. Johnson moved to Washington, D.C. in 1949 and began his professional career at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (1949–51)—specializing in the sugar industry—followed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (1951–54). In the mid-1950s, he served as Assistant Commissioner of the Federal Housing Authority (1954–58) in charge of research and legislation during the implementation of the urban renewal provisions of the National Housing Act of 1954. He concluded his tenure at the Federal Housing Authority as Acting Commissioner. This was a time of incredible American renewal in which he played such an important role in shaping. He then joined AEI where he influenced economic thought and public policy for another three decades.

Dr. Johnson taught economics nearly his entire professional life at the University of Virginia, George Mason University, and George Washington University. He also lectured at dozens of campuses throughout the country. He was responsible for bringing scholars to George Mason and helping to establish its economics and law schools.

Throughout his career, Dr. Johnson was active in professional societies such as the National Association of Business Economists, serving as chapter president in 1971, Institute for Social Science Research, Royal Economic Society (U.K.), National Tax Association, American Finance Association and the Cosmos Club in Washington, D.C., where he often took his children to meet important policymakers and leading economists.

Dr. Johnson was also deeply engaged in the local community serving on the Alexandria Hospital Board of Directors from 1965 to 1971, including a term as its president (1970–1971). As a patient, he never mentioned his leadership on the hospital board—even when getting a new pacemaker on his 90th birthday! He also proudly served on the Alexandria School Board (1974–1976) and the vestry for St. Paul's Episcopal Church and Emmanuel Church on the Hill Episcopal Church in Alexandria.

As we remember Dr. Johnson, with his family present today in the Well of the House Chamber, it was this humble member of the Greatest Generation and his contributions that made the American Century possible. He is survived by his wife of 63 years Margaret Ann (Emhardt); three children Thomas Emhardt (Julianne Mueller), William Harrison (Tracy Schario), and the Rev. Sarah Nelson; and seven grandchildren—Gaelen, Caleb, Eliza, Keegan, and Maren Nelson and Natalie and Garret Johnson.

We owe Dr. Johnson and his peers deep gratitude for their achievements and their courage—facing down incredible challenges. We live in the greatest country in the world because of men like Dr. Johnson—ones that

always believed in America's promise for the future.

ECONOMIC CLIMATE IN BLACK AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus will present eight or nine speakers on the Democratic side in just a few minutes. I am the first of many who will be speaking.

We come to the floor today to express our deepest sympathy and support to the family of Freddie Gray and to the citizens of Baltimore, Maryland.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, the events in Baltimore are not just about police misconduct. It is about pervasive poverty. It is about unemployment, lack of opportunity, hopelessness, and despair.

Since the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson nearly 9 months ago, more than 25 bills have been introduced by members of the CBC that address the need for law enforcement accountability. Today, I call on my House and Senate colleagues to put aside partisanship and take up some or all of these bills. This issue has an impact on all of us.

We must address economic disparities that face Black communities all across the Nation. Baltimore, Mr. Speaker, is not unique.

The economic climate in Black America and the divide that has persisted for generations is due largely to our country's history of disparate treatment of African Americans and lack of opportunity.

While much of the country has experienced an economic recovery over the last 6 years, it has not reached the African American community.

Recently, the CBC and the Joint Economic Committee released a report on the economic challenges facing African Americans. African Americans are struggling and continue to face high rates of persistent poverty, unemployment, long-term unemployment, as well as significantly lower incomes and slower wealth accumulation.

More than 400 counties in the United States suffer poverty rates greater than 20 percent. These rates have persisted now for more than 30 years. The median income of African American households is $34,000, $24,000 less than the median income of households. The median net worth of White households is 13 times the level for Black households. Black Americans are almost three times more likely to live in poverty.

At 10.1 percent, the current unemployment rate for Black Americans is double the rate for White Americans. Black Americans currently face an unemployment rate higher than the national unemployment rate reached during the recession.

African Americans are less likely to obtain education beyond high school than White students. They are less likely to earn a college degree. Even among college graduates, Blacks face worse job prospects than Whites. The unemployment rate for Black workers with at least a bachelor's degree is 5.2 percent, compared to 2.9 percent for White workers.

Forty-four percent of Black Americans own a home, compared to 74 percent of Whites.

In my home State of North Carolina, the unemployment rate for African Americans is 9.9 percent, based on an unemployment rate of 3.2 percent for Whites. The poverty rate for African Americans is 27.5 percent, while for Whites it is 12.6.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, in the District of Columbia, the median household income for African Americans is $38,300 for Blacks and $115,900 for Whites, a gap of $77,000. The D.C. poverty rate is 27.4 percent for African Americans, compared to 7.6 percent for Whites.

Colleagues, these statistics tell the story. These numbers are staggering, troubling, and problematic. It is time for a renewed focus on Blacks in America and a need for real solutions on issues that have persistently plagued our communities.

I will end, Mr. Speaker, by quoting some excerpts from President Johnson's 1964 State of the Union Speech. And he said: ''Unfortunately, many Americans live on the outskirts of hope—some because of their poverty, and some because of their color, all too many because of both. Our task is to help replace their despair with opportunity.

''This administration today,'' he said, ''here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America. I urge this Congress and all Americans to join with me in that effort,'' he said.

''It will not be a short or easy struggle, no single weapon or strategy will suffice, but we shall not rest until that war is won.''

President Johnson said: ''The richest Nation on Earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it. One thousand dollars invested in salvaging an unemployable youth today can return $40,000 or more in his lifetime.''

President Johnson said: ''Poverty is a national problem, requiring improved national organization and support. But this attack, to be effective, must also be organized at the State and local level and must be supported and directed by State and local efforts.''

He said: ''For the war against poverty will not be won here in Washington. It must be won in the field, in every private home, in every public office, from the courthouse to the White House.

''The program I shall propose,'' he said, ''will emphasize this cooperative approach to help that one-fifth of all American families with incomes too small to even meet their basic needs.''

President Lyndon Baines Johnson, January 8, 1964, from this Chamber.

IT IS SILLY SEASON IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is silly season again in Washington. It is that time of year when we have our annual budget debates and when we realize that only in Washington can an increase actually be considered a decrease.

Later today, we will vote on a bill to fund the Department of Veterans Affairs. That bill increases the Department's funding in real dollars from last year by 5.6 percent, and yet, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim it is a decrease, when, in fact, it is the highest level of VA funding ever provided to the Department.

But even worse, we have a Secretary of Veterans Affairs who is peddling this same intellectually dishonest line as well, the Secretary of a department in which negligence in the past year contributed to the deaths of veterans. Those are the words confirmed by the Office of the Inspector General.

And yet, despite the failure of the Department, the Secretary, earlier this week, had the audacity to go behind closed doors with members of only one party and claim that somehow the 6 percent increase being provided by our committee will, in fact, further the VA's failures of the past.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary has exhibited a level of audacity only seen in Washington. If we are honest, it is an audacity that reflects a style of leadership likely to fail—fail the VA, but most importantly, it is going to fail veterans across the United States because, you see, here is the real story.

We still have hundreds of thousands of veterans waiting for health care and for benefits. We know there is malfeasance in VA construction, and we know the VA continues to declare veterans and dependents dead when they are, in fact, alive. But here is the most important and the most offensive part of the Secretary's messaging: in the midst of all this, this body has actually continued to trust the Secretary.

You see, when the VA Secretary came before our subcommittee, I asked him, point blank: What will it take to clear the veterans' benefits backlog? And he said: Resources. We need over 700 more employees. We need an increase in resources.

Now, I question that. I will be honest. I think there is a culture that has

changed. I think we need infrastructure and IT that has to change. But he said resources, and so we trusted him. Our bill provides full funding for his request to clear the backlog, and yet he continues to say that our side of the aisle somehow, in providing the request that he made of our subcommittee, is going to fail his administration.

It is a despicable display of partisanship at the helm of a department that has no place for partisanship. And so a department that last year was defined not by its successes but by its failures is now needlessly defined by its politics.

And you know the one thing the Secretary did not ask for? Additional funding for the Office of the Inspector General, the office that uncovered the negligence, that reported to Congress on the negligence. Zero increase in funding was requested. So our subcommittee stepped in and we provided an additional $5 million for that office.

Now, very importantly, we have to acknowledge that this gamesmanship, this leadership failure, should not reflect on the men and women who serve our veterans on the front lines every day. We have great men and women who serve in the VHA and the VBA. I have had the opportunity to visit with them.

Just last week, at our local VA hospital, an elderly veteran was brought to tears telling me how much he appreciated the loving care he was receiving from the employees of the hospital. We must acknowledge their service, their contribution, every day, just as we acknowledge the failure of leadership in Washington, D.C.

So you see, this week's dysfunction, this week's intellectually creative dishonesty, this week's audacity is just Washington ''small ball'' peddled by this administration, but with real consequences that undermine the confidence of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, only in Washington is a 5.6 percent increase actually a decrease. It is appropriations season. It is, indeed, silly season again in Washington, D.C.

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my friend and chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, in offering condolences to the parents and family members of Freddie Gray.

I also want to say to Ms. Toya Graham that I feel and can appreciate her anguish and the pain that she showed the world a few days ago.

I want to say to her son, Michael, that I have also felt his pain and anguish, having been on the receiving end of such discipline from my mother. But I want to say to him that he can rest assured that the love of his mother, her passion for his future, will pay great dividends if he continues to show the deference to her love and affection and her concern that he showed when he was the object of her frustrations.

Mr. Speaker, responding to the situation in Baltimore several days ago, President Obama said: ''We can't just leave this to the police. I think there are police departments that have to do some soul-searching. I think there are some communities that have to do some soul-searching.''

But, he went on to say: ''I think, we, as a country, have to do some soul-searching.''

I want to join President Obama in calling for the country to do some soul-searching.

Let's take a look at just a few of the institutions of learning in the Baltimore community.

I would like to call attention to one school, Frederick Douglass High School, a school that lists among its graduates the likes of Cab Calloway, Thurgood Marshall, a school that I understand that the father of the current mayor of Baltimore also attended.

I understand there are 789 students at Frederick Douglass High School today. Eighty-three percent of them are listed in U.S. News & World Report's index as economically disadvantaged, and only 53 percent of them are listed as proficient in English, only 44 percent proficient in algebra.

I understand that Carver Vocational Technical High is 100 percent minority, with 79 percent of the students economically disadvantaged.

Coppin Academy, 100 percent minority, with 77 percent economically disadvantaged.

Now, as we listen to all of the pundits, editorial writers reflect on what is taking place or has taken place in Baltimore, I would like to call attention to the lack of soul-searching that is taking place here in this body as we represent the people of America. We have just seen the conference report, or the budget, being proposed by the House Republicans. That conference agreement guts strategic investments in education, workforce training, public health, scientific research, advanced manufacturing, and public safety. It does nothing to help those Americans who are looking for jobs. It does nothing to boost paychecks of working Americans. It disinvests in America.

□ 1045

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF FALL OF SAIGON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the last century, a godless totalitarian ideology moved from theory to practice when Communists took over Russia and a global war against freedom began. In the following decades, this ideology slaughtered millions across what was the Soviet Union.

In the 1940s, Communists rolled through mainland China, bringing another reign of terror that killed millions more and that still today limits freedom for the Chinese people.

Also in the 1940s, Communists moved into Vietnam. Those living in northern Vietnam were its first victims. Like other lands under communism's iron grip, Hanoi's rulers killed hundreds of thousands of their citizens. Those who desired and had the means fled to the south.

Throughout the 20th century, America fought against totalitarian ideologies that stripped people of human rights and dignity.

After defeating fascists in World War II, we recognized communism as the single greatest threat to freedom. Indeed, well into the cold war, President Kennedy proclaimed to the world that we would ''pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.''

The cold war at times flared hot, and in Southeast Asia, more than 58,000 Americans gave the last full measure of their devotion fighting for the freedoms for which their nation stands.

Today we mark the 40th anniversary of the tragic fall of Saigon. In doing so, we remember the sacrifices made by our Vietnam veterans and their families, sacrifices that continue to today, such as when a Gold Star mother or wife looks at the photograph of a son or husband who never came home, or when a veteran makes a trip to the local VA for chemotherapy for a cancer caused by Agent Orange, or when a congressional colleague notices he does not have full use of a limb because of the torture he endured as a POW, or when the 65-year-old veteran has the same repeated nightmares, or when a 40-something son or daughter envisions the father he or she never got to know. The sacrifices are noble but painful.

The cause they fought for lives on and will continue so long as humanity dreams of freedom, dreams like those of the thousands of boat people who risked their lives to escape Vietnam, including the 65 boat people President Reagan spoke of in 1982 who had the good fortune of being spotted by the aircraft carrier USS *Midway*. When they were picked up, they cried ''Hello, American sailor. Hello, freedom man.''

Since the last helicopter left the U.S. Embassy roof in Saigon 40 years ago, Vietnam has been under Communist control. And with Communist control

has come a shameful human rights record. What was a hot spot in the cold war is now a cold spot for people aspiring to walk, to borrow a phrase from Hubert Humphrey, in ''the warm sunshine of human rights.''

Vietnam's postwar history began with a purge that resulted in the deaths of thousands. Hundreds of thousands of refugees escaped. Many died in the process, but many survived. Some made it to America, where they pursued the American Dream. They have undertaken diverse endeavors, from running small shops in Orange County, California, to fishing operations in Louisiana, to practicing medicine in places like Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

For those who are still living under the Communist regime, they must be ever-fearful of a government all too willing to crush freedom. Political freedom. Religious freedom. Freedom of the press. Freedom in family life.

In Vietnam, Catholics, Buddhists, Falun Gong, and other religious minorities have been harassed, imprisoned, and persecuted for their faith. In Vietnam, hundreds of political prisoners are held in jail or under house arrest. The Vietnamese Government continues to restrain the press, and they have engaged in coercive population control practices.

Never forget: our servicemembers fought, and many died, to prevent the tragedies Communist rule would impose upon the Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian people, the latter of whom suffered an outright genocide that killed millions.

We are grateful that our servicemembers were able to save thousands of Vietnamese.

To the Vietnam veterans who undertook Operation Frequent Wind 40 years ago this weekend in the chaotic days before Saigon fell, be proud you rescued 7,000 Americans and South Vietnamese. God alone knows the ripples in history that their having escaped will cause.

As we look to the future, let us have a final accounting for all our MIAs. Let us insist that if Vietnam desires to integrate further with the community of nations, then it must allow much greater freedom for its people. And let us hope that the people of Vietnam will not have to endure another four decades of repression and that one day, perhaps this decade, the freedom for which our servicemembers died will finally take root by the South China Sea.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, Congressman BARBARA LEE, for her courtesy.

I join today in standing with my chair, Congressman BUTTERFIELD of the Congressional Black Caucus. I, as well, am overwhelmed with the pain that we have seen not only in Baltimore, which we have seen most recently, but in cities like Ferguson, in North Charleston, in New York, where we have seen the convergence of poverty and the need for criminal justice reform converge.

I too want to offer my sympathy to the family of Freddie Gray. We have watched them over the past couple of days. In the midst of their mourning to be able to stand up and call for peace, nonviolence, nonviolent protests, they should be honored.

And to those in Baltimore, and particularly my colleague from Maryland—I will call him Congressman CUMMINGS with the bullhorn politics, the bullhorn leadership—he should be commended for the stunning and outstanding engagement, that he touched the hearts and minds of his constituents, walked those streets, to be able to acknowledge the pain, the poverty, but that there is a better way, that there is a way toward the stars that we all want our children to have.

And, yes, to Ms. Graham, who wanted better for her son Michael. I want him not to be embarrassed but to be proud that he had a mother with such deep love that she wanted to take him away from doing it wrongly—not against protests, not against the quiet marching of the spirit of Dr. King, but to know that engaging in violence is intolerable and will not allow him to reach the very high heights that he can reach.

Today I stand here to acknowledge the convergence of the need for criminal justice reform and the deep and abiding poverty in the African American community. One in every six Americans is living in poverty, totaling 46.2 million people. This is the highest number in 17 years. Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. It falls heavily on the African American community.

In my district, there are 190,000-plus living in poverty. It falls heavily on the African American community.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a standing invitation for the door to open and say, let's blame President Obama. President Obama has been a stellar leader on the questions of realizing the investment in people. From the stimulus that brought us out of the depths of collapse of the markets and a complete imploding of the capitalistic system, he provided the stimulus that moved us toward an economy where we were creating jobs.

But here we have in Congress this dastardly sequester that is cutting Head Start seats, not investing in infrastructure, not creating jobs or providing opportunities for our young people.

So today I say that there needs to be a call for action. That call for action is that this Congress must get rid of sequester and must look at the Baltimores and must look at the Fergusons and Houstons and L.A.s and New Yorks and cities across America and realize that we are coming upon a summertime. And if we don't act to invest in our children and to begin to give an agenda to release ourselves from poverty, we will have doomed ourselves.

And I would offer to say that the inertia of moving toward criminal justice reform in this Congress is unacceptable.

I call upon Members to come together collectively to be able to pass legislation, the Cadet bill that I have introduced, the Build TRUST bill. But, more importantly, I am calling upon our government to invest in our youth, to get rid of the poverty, to prepare them as they go into higher education, as they go into upper grades. We must have a program of summer jobs this summer, and we must have a collaborative effort with corporate America.

Wake up, corporate America. Wake up, corporate Baltimore. Wake up, corporate New York. Wake up, corporate Houston. There must be an investment in summer jobs, collaborating with the Federal Government to make a difference to lift families out of poverty. We do know that summer jobs with young people elevate families' ability to pay their bills and to provide resources for their families.

So if the story of Baltimore is any, it is one, don't jump to conclusions. Don't jump to conclusions that Freddie Gray tried to hurt himself. Don't jump to conclusions that these young people don't mean well. Don't jump to conclusions that they shouldn't have done what they have done. Jump to the conclusions that these are young people who are hungry and looking for leadership and are in pain, as Congressman CUMMINGS said.

Look for the opportunity for them. Help rebuild Baltimore. Help give them jobs. Help tell them that the improved relationships between police and community are going to be moved forward as a number one agenda for the United States Congress and this government that they call the United States of America.

Let us have a call to action—not of condemnation, but of action.

I want to thank the young people who nonviolently marched all over America, indicating Black lives matter and all lives matter. The Congressional Black Caucus stands to stamp out poverty, and we stand, Mr. Speaker, to bring opportunities to young people.

HONORING SANDERS-BROWN CENTER ON AGING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Kentucky's Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, which was established in 1979 and is one of the original 10 National Institutes of Health-funded Alzheimer's disease research centers.

The University of Kentucky Alzheimer's Disease Center, ably led by Director Dr. Linda Van Eldik and her outstanding team of scientists and investigators, supports and facilitates research with a long-term goal of enabling more effective translation of complex scientific discoveries to intervention strategies that improve the lives of patients.

The Sanders-Brown scientists are focused on understanding the mechanisms involved in development and progression of age-related neurodegenerative diseases, such as Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and stroke, and are seeking new knowledge breakthroughs to combat these diseases of the elderly.

This center also promotes education and outreach, provides clinical and neuropathological diagnoses and care of patients with cognitive impairment, and runs an active clinical trials program to test potential new therapies. These activities are critical because, with the aging of the population worldwide and in this country, age-related cognitive disorders, such as Alzheimer's disease, are reaching epidemic proportions, requiring a desperate need to identify strategies for effective therapeutic intervention.

According to a recent report, an estimated 5.3 million Americans have Alzheimer's disease, and that is in 2015 alone. This includes an estimated 5.1 million people age 65 and older and approximately 200,000 individuals under the age of 65 who have younger-onset Alzheimer's disease. Barring the development of medical breakthroughs, the number will rise to 13.8 million by the year 2050.

Almost half a million people age 65 or older will develop Alzheimer's in the United States this year alone. To put that into perspective, every 67 seconds, someone in the United States develops Alzheimer's. By midcentury, an American will develop the disease every 33 seconds.

Alzheimer's disease is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States and fifth leading cause of death for those age 65 or older. There is an enormous cost and financial impact of this disease.

Alzheimer's is, in fact, the costliest disease to society. Total 2015 payments for caring for those with Alzheimer's and other dementias are estimated at $226 billion. Total payments for health care, long-term care, and hospice for people with Alzheimer's and other dementias are projected to increase to more than $1 trillion in 2050.

So when we talk about reforming Medicare, when we talk about doing the things we need to do to save Medicare and keep our promises to our seniors, we have to recognize the critical importance and the return on investment that that investment in the National Institutes of Health can have.

I say, in the debates about Medicare reform—and these are important debates—let's pay attention to investment in the National Institutes of Health and particularly the underinvestment in the research that goes on in places like the Sanders-Brown Center on Aging.

□ 1100

This can have an enormous impact on our ability to keep Medicare solvent and also improve the lives of so many Americans. So I call on all of my colleagues here to join me in thanking everyone at the University of Kentucky Sanders-Brown Center on Aging for their contributions to continue the fight against Alzheimer's and other diseases of the elderly.

IMPACTS OF PERSISTENT POVERTY IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise first to send my thoughts and prayers to the family of Freddie Gray and the entire city of Baltimore. Today, another family is grieving another young life needlessly cut short; and, again, a community is searching for answers in the face of tragedy and injustice.

My own community knows this all too well. On New Year's Day 2009, Oscar Grant, a bright young man, was murdered on the Fruitvale Bay Area Rapid Transit platform in Oakland. Our community took to the streets demanding justice.

Freddie Gray, Oscar Grant, Mike Brown, Tamir Rice, and Trayvon Martin and the list goes on, all lives cut short. Today, their stories compel us to come to the House floor to join millions of Americans around our Nation in saying that, like all lives, Black lives also do matter.

Make no mistake, the issues rocking many communities are not a new phenomenon. These tragedies, yes, are a part of a dark legacy of injustice born in the sufferings of the Middle Passage, nurtured through slavery, and codified in Jim Crow.

On April 14, 1967, at Stanford University, Dr. King described these issues in his ''Two Americas'' speech. He said, ''There are literally two Americas. One America is overflowing with the milk of prosperity and honey of opportunity. Tragically and unfortunately, there is another America. This other America has a daily ugliness about it that constantly transforms the ebulliency of hope into the fatigue of despair.''

The ugly fact is that two Americas still exist nearly five decades later. An African American male is killed by a security officer, police officer, or a self-proclaimed vigilante every 28 hours in the United States. One in three Black men will be arrested in their lifetime, a reason why men from communities of color, unfortunately, make up more than 70 percent of the United States prison population.

Sadly, our laws have made having a criminal justice record a lifetime barrier to the ''honey of opportunity'' Dr. King described. A formerly incarcerated individual who has paid his or her dues to society and is out of jail is still denied access to Pell grants, closing off the opportunity for higher education and a better job. Ten States enforce lifetime bans on receiving food assistance, SNAP benefits, for drug-related felonies—only drug-related felonies.

Mr. Speaker, these limitations are components of a system that continues to punish someone for life for having made a mistake. This system maintains cyclical and systemic barriers that keep generations of African Americans from building pathways out of poverty.

Recently, the Joint Economic Committee, under the leadership of Ranking Member CAROLYN B. MALONEY, released a report with the Congressional Black Caucus on the economic state of Black America, which Congressman BUTTERFIELD laid out the bleak finding. I hope Members recognize this is a wake-up call.

Children in African American households are nearly twice as likely to be raised in the bottom 20 percent of income distribution as children in White households; and, while African American students represent 18 percent of the overall preschool enrollment, they account for 42 percent of preschool student expulsion—these are kids ages 2 to 5 years old—expulsions. These children don't even get a start, let alone a head start.

The link between the economic inequality and our broken criminal justice system and education is crystal clear, and Congress must do more to break down these systemic barriers.

Our friend and our colleague, our chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, said in his inaugural speech when he was sworn in, ''America is not working for many African Americans, and we, as the Congressional Black Caucus, have an obligation to fight harder and smarter to help repair the damage.''

Mr. Speaker, we must come together as never before to address the systemic, structural, and rampant racial bias endemic in our institutions and criminal justice system.

We have introduced the Half in Ten Act, H.R. 258, to create a national strategy to cut poverty in half in 10 years. By coordinating and empowering all Federal agencies, we can lift 22 million Americans out of poverty and into

the middle class, but that is only one step. We must bring serious structural reforms to our broken criminal justice system.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act, H.R. 1232, because war weapons don't belong on Main Street. We also need to pass the Police Accountability Act, H.R. 1102, and the Grand Jury Reform Act, H.R. 429, to ensure accountability and that deadly force cases are actually heard by a judge.

We also need to stop the racial profiling that disproportionally affects African Americans. We need to pass the End Racial Profiling Act, H.R. 1933, because racial profiling has no place in a 21st century police force.

It is also time to pass ''ban the box'' for Federal contractors and agencies. I am proud to be working with our colleagues on the Senate side, Senators BOOKER and BROWN, to do just that.

We can't stop with the criminal justice system. We have got to create job training, workforce training, and economic opportunities for people of color in marginalized communities who have been, unfortunately, impacted by generations of endemic barriers rooted in discrimination.

BEWARE THE ARROGANCE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you about a brave lady named Ellie, whom I met a few years ago in Kansas. This is her story.

One Tuesday morning, back in 1973, she opened up her local newspaper to read about a U.S. Supreme Court decision that shocked her, outraged her, and saddened her. She questioned how a small group of unelected judges could reach such a tragic and illegitimate decision in the name of constitutional rights.

That case was the fateful Roe v. Wade decision that mandated abortion on demand throughout all 50 States for all 9 months of pregnancy. In response to the Court's ruling, Ellie rushed out to the nearest abortion clinic.

Expecting other outraged Kansans to already be there, Ellie found herself alone. No one else was there. It seemed that the Supreme Court, in far-off Washington, had imposed its radical decision on Ellie and an entire Nation without anyone noticing, few caring, and no one responding about the lives of the unborn.

As history does report, that seemingly deafening silence didn't stay that way. Soon, Ellie was joined by others, many others. Contrary to the expectations of the elite lawyers on the Supreme Court, their decision did not short-circuit or end the debate over abortion; rather, over the following years, it ignited the debate.

While the Court still stubbornly clings to the ruling, science has exposed its folly. Legal scholars recognize its defects. Most importantly, public opinion, from the young to the old, has passed them by. Today, an overwhelming majority of Americans oppose an overwhelming percentage of all abortions.

Today, the Supreme Court may be tempted to repeat that same mistake. They may be emboldened to impose again a so-called 50-State solution on the entire Nation. By radically attempting to redefine marriage for Ellie and the entire country by invalidating centuries of marriage laws and by silencing the more than 50 million Americans—that is 50 million Americans—who have voted to protect marriage as between one man and one woman, this court would, once again, be repeating their arrogant mistake of misreading both the American public and our American Constitution.

Unlike 1973, I believe that Americans are already beginning to engage on this issue. This time, Ellie will not be alone. If this Supreme Court attempts to shred again another foundational aspect of our society, there will be a strong, quick, and ferocious response, for a small group of lawyers should not impose their redefinition of marriage on every single American State, every single American citizen, every single American family, and every single American church and synagogue.

Therefore, I implore this Court to learn from the Roe v. Wade mistake, do its job, read and obey the Constitution, and correctly affirm that Ellie and the citizens of every one of our united States are free to affirm or restore marriage as the union of one man and one woman.

TO BE POOR IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this opportunity. I feel so proud to be an American and be in this great country where so many Members of Congress have come from families and communities that have been poor, without the dreams or hopes that they would ever be in a position to serve this great country in the most august legislative body in the world.

I know I have been through more riots than anyone else, coming from Harlem and being older than most Members; yet, throughout the world, I am so proud that people respect our country because of the opportunities we have here.

Therefore, to all Americans, it has to be painful and embarrassing to see on international news or to have our international friends think that we are a country that allow young, Black men to be shot down, murdered, and killed and that this is supposed to represent America.

It doesn't really, in my mind, represent our country; it represents poverty, but it is so hard for people to believe that the richest country in the world could have this cancer of poverty that eats away from so many things that we could be doing.

There were so many dreams and hopes when President Obama came in and recognized how much you can accomplish if you have access to education. I was among those who recognized that a bum from Lenox Avenue in Harlem, being given an opportunity with the GI Bill, can go to New York University, go to law school, become a Federal prosecutor, and come here in Congress.

I knew, Mr. Speaker, the President understood the power of being exposed to education and what it has done to make America all that she is today, but I had no idea of the problems he would face as our President, the depth of people who wanted to prevent him from making a contribution to our country, the partisanship that exists today, and the pain that I feel now when you talk about education, whether or not you support traditional public schools or charter schools, when the greatest thing that we can do and the obligation we have as Members of Congress is to invest in the education of our young people for the future of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, poverty is more than lack of self-esteem. Poverty means that there is a degree in the connection between poverty and hopelessness, poverty and joblessness, poverty in not being able to send your kids to school, poverty in not even knowing how to take care of yourself in terms of health. Poverty can cause people not to be able to make the contributions that they can make to the country.

The disparity between the wealthy people that we have in this country and those who work hard every day and don't have enough money for disposable income, poverty and near in poverty reduces the ability of the middle class to have disposable income, to be able to purchase, to support jobs through small businesses.

Poverty is so costly, Mr. Speaker, not only in the prestige, the power, and the expectation of our great country; but how much do we pay to put poor folks in jail? How much, really, do we pay to subsidize earned income tax credits, low-income housing credits, children tax credits, subsidies, not because these things don't pay off, but subsidies because we don't have programs for them? We have to do everything we can. These are costly; but who can deny the return on these types of investments?

The trillions of dollars that we have invested in our defense has little or no return, but the investment that we can

have in people and the talent of our minds can make this country all that she can be.

Let's increase education and decrease poverty.

□ 1115

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, which I chair, conducted a hearing to review the National Forest System and active forest management.

The health of our national forests is an issue of vital importance for rural America. Not only are national forests a source of immense natural beauty, but they provide us with natural resources, healthy watersheds, recreational opportunities, and wildlife habitat.

Perhaps more importantly, they serve as economic engines for the surrounding local communities. Our national forests are capable of providing and sustaining these economic benefits, but they need proper management in order to do so.

The U.S. Forest Service manages more than 193 million acres of land across 41 States. Within those 41 States are over 700 counties containing national forestland. These counties and communities within them rely on us to be good stewards of these Federal lands, and there is a direct correlation between forest health and vibrant rural communities.

The people living in these rural areas depend on well-managed national forests to foster jobs and economic opportunities. These jobs come from diverse sources, such as timbering, energy production, or recreation. However, if those jobs disappear, so do jobs that support those industries. It is a snowball effect from there, threatening school systems and infrastructure in these rural communities.

As a result, effective management and Forest Service decisions have significant consequences on our constituents who live in and around national forests. Healthier, well-managed national forests are more sustainable for generations to come due to the continual risks of catastrophic fires and invasive species outbreaks. Especially with the decline in timber harvesting and the revenue to counties from timber receipts over the past two decades, rural economies will benefit immensely from increased timber harvest.

We can continue supporting a diverse population of wildlife through active land management practices, such as prescribed burns. Our national forests are not museums. They were never intended to sit idly. I say it frequently, but national forests are not national parks.

When Congress created the National Forest System more than 100 years ago, it was designed so that surrounding communities would benefit from multiple uses. Our national forests are meant to provide timber, oil, natural gas, wildlife habitat, recreational opportunities, and clean drinking water, not just for the rural communities, but these tend to be the headwaters of the waters that provide water for our cities as well.

During yesterday's hearing, members of the Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee called upon Forest Service Chief Thomas Tidwell to use the tools that Congress made available in the 2014 farm bill in order to strengthen rural economies and improve the health of our national forests. One certainly complements the other.

POLICY FAILURES OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about the policy failures of this body.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at Baltimore, let me tell you why it is not a shock to me. It is because when you disinvest in education, when you provide no places for kids to play and no summer jobs, Baltimore happens. When you refuse to provide resources for job training for decent housing and you have a lack of resources to the communities of highest need, Baltimore happens.

The budget we are working on this week continues to prove that the majority of people in this House care little about the plight of the poor and underserved communities. There is a lack of concern for education.

I sit on the Education Committee as we are talking about reauthorizing ESEA, and the majority passed out of committee the ability to block grant all title I funding. So now children who are poor, disabled, or minority will be at the mercy of their State to determine what kind of education they get. Ohio has one way to do it; Indiana has another way to do it. It all depends on what your ZIP Code is anymore as to what your educational attainment may be. They, further, have reduced Federal funding for education every year of their plan.

I work in a body where the majority wants to block grant Medicaid. So State by State they will determine who qualifies, who is sick enough to qualify. I work in a body where there is no value placed on our greatest asset, which is our people. These are the people who want to reduce block grants and community funding and community policing.

Our communities are crying out every day for our attention. Did what happened in Baltimore get our attention? It should have, and it did. Was it right? No. Violence is never right. But we have to hear the cries of the people in need.

So today, I want to say to the Gray family and all of the people who are in the streets in Baltimore: I apologize. I apologize for a body that has failed you. I apologize for people who only give lip service to the poor. I apologize because we could do better to make your lives better.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility as the leaders of this Nation to take care of the people who need us the most.

Miss Gray, I apologize.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Michael Siegel, Anshe Emet Synagogue, Chicago, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, instill within the Members of the House of Representatives the deep understanding of the potential that this day holds as they work together for the common good of all people in this great land.

Open their hearts to respond meaningfully to the voices of those who hunger for justice, hunger for equality, and hunger for opportunity.

Give them the strength and wisdom to ensure the security of this great Nation and her friends around the world.

On this day that George Washington was inaugurated as the first President of the United States in 1789, we ask You, God, to bless each and every Member of this august body with the same courage that he exhibited in his time, in order to fulfill the vision and purpose of this great land for us and all who will follow in the future.

Let us pray that together this body, together, will do their part to create a world worthy of God's presence and God's blessing.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, April is Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, and I rise to support the goals and ideals we have been promoting these past 30 days.

More than 200,000 people in the United States are sexually assaulted each year. One in five women will be sexually assaulted during her college years.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. Our work is not done until the number of sexual assaults is zero. Sexual assault is an affront to our basic humanity. It threatens our individual liberty, family values, and basic human rights. Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our children to live up to those values.

We must reject the passive, quiet acceptance of sexual assault that has pervaded our society for far too long. We must refuse to accept that which is unquestionably unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, although April is coming to an end, we must remain committed to raising awareness, empowering survivors, and preventing more people from experiencing these heinous acts.

WELCOMING RABBI MICHAEL SIEGEL

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my friend Rabbi Michael Siegel of Chicago, Illinois, for his service today as guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

As the rabbi of the congregation closest to Wrigley Field, for 30 years, Rabbi Siegel's prayers for the Cubs have gone unanswered; however, Michael, again, assures me this is the year.

More seriously, throughout his 40-year career, Rabbi Siegel has been a dedicated leader in the Jewish community, serving both locally and nationally.

Since 1873, Anshe Emet has been a center for Jewish study, cultural activity, and Israel advocacy. Under Rabbi Siegel's leadership, the synagogue has grown and truly fulfilled its commitment to the entire community of Israel—klal yisrael—and healing the word—tikkun olam. I am grateful for my punctuation and pronunciation keys. I am also grateful that my constituents can be part of such an inspiring community—kehila.

Please join me in thanking Rabbi Siegel for leading us in prayer today as guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to kick off May as National Mental Health Awareness Month.

I stand here to bring attention to the dire need to improve the awareness and dialogue surrounding mental health. Far too long, we as a Nation have neglected mental health. It is one of our most critical health problems today.

Mental illness occurs more frequently, affects more people, requires more prolonged treatment, and causes more suffering to individuals and families than most people could ever realize.

I have personally witnessed and experienced the physical and emotional burden mental illness has on the individual and the family. A close family member of mine took their life at a very young age.

Despite having major hospitals and universities in the Syracuse area, there simply are not enough mental health resources to help, especially in the pediatric realm. People in the central New York area often have to travel hours to receive inpatient care, disrupting lives, jobs, and families. Once released, the followup care is lacking, and oftentimes, the patient immediately regresses.

Unfortunately, the lack of resources—in the case of central New York—is not an uncommon issue. As I acknowledge May as Mental Health Awareness Month, this Friday, May 1, I will launch a mental health task force based in New York's 24th District. The task force will be comprised of mental health leaders in the field, including hospitals and employees.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the tens of thousands of students who have been left in the lurch after their for-profit school, Corinthian Colleges, abruptly closed this week.

The closure came as a surprise. It was the middle of their semester. Many of these students are now buried in student loan debt and do not know how or if they can continue their education.

I have urged the Department of Education to make it very clear to these students that they have the option to have their loans forgiven. However, the Department of Education has been encouraging students to transfer to other troubled for-profit schools, rather than have their loans discharged.

Many of the for-profit schools on the Department's list of so-called viable transfer opportunities are currently under State or Federal investigation. This is shocking and unacceptable.

I call on the Department to remove immediately any school currently under investigation or on heightened cash management from its list of recommended options.

Our students deserve better. Let's give them the guidance that they can trust.

NATIONAL YOUTH ORCHESTRA

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, each summer, Carnegie Hall's Weill Music Institute brings together some of the brightest young musicians from around the country to form the National Youth Orchestra USA.

The members of the orchestra spend the first 2 weeks in residency at Purchase College, taking master classes from the best. They have the chance to perform at the world famous Carnegie Hall, where their performance is heard live around the world; then they go on tour.

This summer, the orchestra will make a historic visit to China. It is an incredible experience, and I am extremely proud that, among the 114 amazing young people, two are from the district I am privileged to represent, Ms. Jasmine Lavariega, a horn

player from Astoria; and Laura Michael, an oboist from Manhattan.

Congratulations to them both. Please let your parents know they were right; all that practice, practice, practice paid off. It was worth it. You are performing at Carnegie Hall and in China.

Congratulations.

F/A–18 SUPER HORNET

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to thank my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee—in particular, Chairman MAC THORNBERRY and Ranking Member ADAM SMITH—for all the hard work they have put into crafting our country's national priorities for the upcoming year, way into the wee hours of the morning.

Specifically, I want to thank them for responding to a critical Navy shortfall and a national security need by including the authorization for funding of 12 F/A–18 Super Hornets in the National Defense Authorization Act.

The Super Hornet is truly the workhorse of naval combat operations against the Islamic State and is playing an important role in protecting our warfighters abroad. Twelve additional Super Hornets will help keep a critical production line open that will allow for additional strike fighter jets and electronic warfare attack in the future.

However, our work isn't finished. I look forward to supporting the NDAA when it comes to the House floor and fighting for Super Hornets to be included during the appropriations process.

□ 1215

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say that the budget resolution being moved through Congress right now will help America's middle class.

I wish I could say that this budget will help provide opportunities for struggling Americans and security for our seniors.

I wish I could say that this budget will help raise stagnant wages, help our kids attend college, and help our businesses create jobs.

I wish I could say all of that, but I can't.

What I can say is that the budget being pushed through the House today would make hard-working Americans work even harder and take home even less, while benefiting special interests and the ultrawealthy.

I ask my Republican colleagues to partner with us in a bipartisan fashion to create a budget that will benefit all Americans.

FIXING THE ISSUES AT THE VA

(Mr. HUDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are working through a bipartisan Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill that contains a lot of good measures, that keeps the VA under the magnifying glass, and helps guarantee top-notch care for our Nation's heroes, our veterans.

Continuing to fix the issues at the VA needs to remain our top priority, but the solution is not throwing more money at it, Mr. Speaker. We spend more now on the VA than at any point in our history, but too much money is wasted on the bureaucracy here in Washington and doesn't get down to the caregivers and to our veterans who need the care.

My constituents and veterans across the Nation are waiting months for routine exams, while others who need special care are stuck in backlogs. Mr. Speaker, it simply isn't fair, and it is not tolerable.

Our veterans deserve the best, and we can deliver that by breaking up this bureaucracy in the VA. We should give our veterans the option to get health care at the VA if they choose, or to go to a private healthcare provider in their local community and have the VA pay for it.

Until we move to that system, Mr. Speaker, the VA at the top is going to continue to soak up the money, and the veterans at the bottom are going to continue to not get the care that they deserve.

I ask my colleagues to continue to work with me so that we provide the best health care in the world to our veterans, that we keep the promises we made.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET'S IMPACT ON ACCESS TO SECONDARY EDUCATION

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget we are going to consider later today is a step in the wrong direction for students. At a time when student loan debt is at an all-time high, we need to be doing more to help students, not less.

Unfortunately, the Republican budget will make students work harder for less. It will hurt low-income students by cutting $89 billion for Pell grants. It will dramatically cut back the loan repayment programs that help all student loan borrowers pay affordable rates. And for Americans in job training programs, more than 2 million may be turned away from the critical training programs they need to change careers or secure advancement at work.

Students of all types deserve access to quality, affordable education, but this Republican budget cuts critical programs that help our students get ahead. Mr. Speaker, our young people are 25 percent of our population and 100 percent of our future. We can and must do better.

ENHANCING VETERANS ACCESS TO TREATMENT ACT

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Enhancing Veterans Access to Treatment Act, legislation that eliminates bureaucratic hurdles so veterans using the VA can continue to receive the same lifesaving mental health medication they access while on Active Duty.

Currently, the VA requires a veteran to switch their medication when that drug is not included in the VA's drug formulary, regardless if the drug is working. Instead, the VA will put the veteran on different medication and requires them to fail first before they are switched back, or the vet must go through an appeals process to remain on the current medication.

Instead, this bill simply says, if it works, keep it. This bill allows seamless continuity of medication and leaves any decision to change up to the doctor.

It is not enough to just have the DOD and VA share a limited medication list, because when it comes to psychotropic medication, the doctor needs to have available the full spectrum of choices.

With 22 veterans dying each day by suicide, these veterans don't have time to wait to get their medication for their depression or anxiety.

I ask all Members to please join me in cosponsoring the Enhancing Veterans Access to Treatment Act so we can solve this problem.

GOOD NEWS FROM NIGERIA

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week we received good news. On Tuesday, 200 girls and 93 women were rescued from Boko Haram camps by the Nigerian military in the Sambisa Forest. Yesterday, another group, 160 women and children, was rescued in the same forest.

These reports bring me great hope. My heart goes out to these women,

girls, and their families, who have experienced their worst nightmare.

I am hopeful that the Chibok girls, who were kidnapped over a year ago, are a part of these ongoing rescue missions by the Nigerian Army.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked my fellow Congresswomen to wear red in honor of the missing girls and vote together in of the well of the House of Representatives. Together, we called attention to the atrocities by Boko Haram, called for the return of all of the kidnapped girls, and called for Nigerian leaders to be held accountable by the world.

It takes the political will of the Nigerian Government and the conviction to do what is right to eradicate Boko Haram and end their tragic reign of terror.

We hope to wear red every Wednesday. I will not stop speaking, stop tweeting and fighting on behalf of these girls, their families, until the girls are safely returned.

Tweet bringbackourgirls and tweet #joinrep.wilson.

THE STAPLE ACT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, every year, students from around the world come to the United States to access our high-quality education and universities and colleges. And many of these students obtain doctoral degrees in science, technology, engineering and math, and have job offers from numerous employers that need their expertise and their skills.

However, too often, our immigration rules send these graduates, some of the best and brightest minds who will be highly skilled workers and entrepreneurs, back to their home countries to become our competitors rather than helping grow and create jobs right here.

Today, I am introducing bipartisan legislation, the STAPLE Act, with my colleague, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY, to help fix this problem and keep America on the forefront of innovation. The STAPLE Act will exempt recent STEM graduates with a Ph.D. with pending job offers from H–1B visa quotas.

Mr. Speaker, our immigration system is broken, and we must take action to ensure that the system is fair and that it keeps America competitive, and passing the STAPLE Act is a good step in the right direction.

THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Office of Technology Assessment, the OTA.

For 22 years, the OTA was a key nonpartisan resource for Congress as it dealt with scientific and technical policy issues. The OTA was overseen by a Technical Advisory Board composed of six Senators and six Representatives, evenly split between the two parties.

The OTA was able to provide easy-to-understand explanations of complex scientific issues. For example, in 1988, the OTA provided a study called ''Healthy Children: Investing in the Future,'' showing that infants with low birth weights were more susceptible to a variety of physical and mental disabilities. This study helped change Medicaid eligibility rules by expanding access to prenatal care to millions of women, saving lives and taxpayer money. This, and other reports, provided the information needed to make reasonable policy based on scientific results.

This Congress needs scientific guidance, and I urge my colleagues to join me in calling for the reestablishment of the Office of Technology Assessment.

SUPPORTING THE PTC ELIMINATION ACT

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about making the Tax Code simpler and fairer, then we have to get rid of deadweight handouts. The PTC Elimination Act, which I have authored with Congressman POMPEO, is a step in that direction. The bill scales back and repeals the wind production tax credit.

The PTC was created over 20 years ago to help new forms of energy get on their feet. Today, it is a largely bloated subsidy for the fully grown multi-million-dollar wind industry. The mature wind industry shouldn't be spoon fed by taxpayers any longer. The PTC needs to end.

By taking this no-longer-needed tax credit off the books, the PTC Elimination Act brings fairness to our Tax Code and enhances competition. That is the kind of tax simplification we need to reinvigorate the American economy.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Japan's Prime Minister addressed Congress.

Each U.S. President has their Japan opening initiative. All fail, as will President Obama.

Soothing words are what Prime Minister Abe gave Congress yesterday. But here is the scorecard for U.S. trade with Japan:

There hasn't been a single year of trade surplus for our country, not even balance. Rather, over the last 20 years, we have had $1,963,654,100 trillion lost dollars; U.S. dollars that have gone to Japan from us buying their products, but their markets remain closed to ours.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is not a trade deal. It should be debated as a treaty. It is a foreign policy arrangement that is part of the shift to Asia.

As for the trade portion of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, it facilitates the movement of more U.S. jobs and corporations into Vietnam and other nations in the region. Labor costs there are chasing cheap labor a third of that of China now, and will ease the movement of those goods back into—guess where—our country again.

We have seen it before. It is time for Congress to stand up for the workers and communities of the United States of America. Let us start building back our middle class rather than keep shipping it out every place but here.

CELEBRATING NEW HAMPSHIRE'S EDUCATORS

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and give thanks to all New Hampshire's educators as we celebrate National Teacher Appreciation Day.

Oftentimes our teachers don't get the thanks or credit that they deserve. Granite State teachers devote their lives to providing our children with the tools, the resources, and the attention necessary to be the very best that they can be.

It is our teachers who listen to our children, challenge them, and inspire them to dream the impossible. They spend countless hours devoted to preparing our kids for the next challenge, whether that be passing a test or navigating conflict. They don't simply prepare them for the grammar quiz on Friday; they prepare them for the events that will test them throughout their lives.

So to all those who teach our kids that anything is possible with hard work and dedication, thank you. To all those who encourage our students to shoot for the stars, I say, thank you. It is because of you that our Nation remains the world leader of innovation, ideas, and excellence.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL OUTDOOR LEADERSHIP SCHOOL

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the National Outdoor Leadership School.

NOLS was founded in Wyoming by Paul Petzoldt. NOLS has taught thousands of Americans and people worldwide about the responsible use of the outdoors and an appreciation for outdoor activities, recreation, hiking, that is unsurpassed.

NOLS is headquartered in Wyoming, in Lander, and we are proud that NOLS's mother ship is in our dear State. NOLS is a wonderful organization that provides stewardship of our natural resources in a way that teaches people how to enjoy and appreciate the outdoors.

Congratulations, NOLS, the National Outdoor Leadership School, on 50 years.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1732, REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 43, DISAPPROVAL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 231

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-13 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate.

SEC. 3. Section 604(g) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act shall not apply in the case of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit (if otherwise in order).

POINT OF ORDER

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against House Resolution 231 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.R. 1732, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I was sworn into this Congress, there was quite a bit of fanfare about how many women now serve in this body. But even with all of these women, this body is still 80 percent male.

Men are running the show, and the sideshow that they have used to distract us from the real reasons each of us was elected has been a persistent, absurd, arrogant, and ignorant effort to impede upon a woman's right to make her own choices about her health.

We have wasted—absolutely wasted—taxpayer dollars and valuable time here on the floor of the House again and again and again trying to legislate away something our highest Court confirmed years ago.

We could have spent that time talking about the recent rash of police brutality cases that have long plagued communities of color, an issue that has now caught fire in the streets of Baltimore, just a few miles north of us.

We could have discussed the lack of job training programs preparing workers for careers in technology and health, the fastest-growing professions in an economy doing nothing for the long-term unemployed.

We could have used this time to work on protecting our seniors by expanding Social Security, keeping even more older Americans out of poverty.

We could have debated any issue that would offer better opportunities for our constituents, which is what each of us was elected to do.

Instead, we put Members of Congress one place we have no right to be; and that is, in a woman's uterus. Women are the only ones who have the right to make the inherently private health choices that they are faced with.

Mr. Speaker, when the legislation we are preparing to debate came before the House Oversight Committee, I was particularly disturbed. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle gave us a slew of well-meaning arguments about why we so desperately needed to violate the self-rule of the District of Columbia.

One of these men, a former minister, explained employers, who are moved by faith to judge and persecute their employees, should be free to do so. He

went on to say that employers should have every right to freely exercise their faiths and that the District's effort to ensure employees don't lose their jobs because of in vitro fertilization or birth control or any other reproductive healthcare choice was part of a ''continued attack'' on religion.

One thing that is particularly wonderful about this great Nation is that we offer everyone a right to have an opinion.

As a mother, a grandmother, and a devoted woman of God, I couldn't help wondering how men, who are so very adamant about forcing mothers to have these babies, could refuse to ensure they have access to care.

The same folks calling for bills like this one have called for cuts to programs across the spectrum that will give their children and their mothers access to education, access to healthy meals, and all kinds of tools to assure they are not stuck in the cycle of poverty. So once they have funneled women into the path that brings a child into the world, my colleagues would prefer to say, ''God bless you,'' and walk away.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation this rule would force us to consider is absolutely wrong. It violates the will of the District's voters; it violates the privacy and the rights of women; and most relevant to this point of order, it violates rules of this body for interference in State and local governments.

It is now my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), someone who recognizes just how awful this legislation is and the only Member whose constituents will have to deal with the outcome.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from New Jersey for her extraordinary remarks and for her generosity in yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this rule has the high stink of both unfairness and discrimination. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee voted to overturn a valid local District of Columbia law but denied D.C.'s locally elected officials even the courtesy of defending that law, which is aimed at keeping employers from discriminating against women and men for their private reproductive health decisions, the most personal decisions Americans make off the job.

Of critical importance, the D.C. local law requires that all employees carry out the mission of the organization or business, whatever its mission is. The disapproval resolution was only added to the Rules Committee agenda yesterday, literally at the same time that the committee began its meeting. And no member of the majority showed up at the hearing to defend the disapproval resolution until I noted this unprecedented absence. The committee then hurriedly summoned the subcommittee chair, who spoke without any prepared testimony.

No wonder—how can any American defend an employer who imposes his religion or personal philosophical beliefs on an employee's private reproductive matters by sanctioning the employee because the employer disagrees, for example, with an employee's use of in vitro fertilization to become pregnant or of birth control for family planning?

The employer has no right to even know about such private matters. But if he learns of an employee's reproductive preferences, the D.C. law requires that he must not use this private matter to discriminate on the job.

Not surprisingly, we do not expect this disapproval resolution to be considered on the House floor—in the light of day—until late tonight, for fear that the American people will watch Congress sanction, for the first time ever, discrimination against women and men for their reproductive health decisions and see Republicans violate their own professed mantra for local control of local affairs by overturning the law of a local government for the first time in a quarter of a century.

I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairwoman of the Rules Committee in whose jurisdiction the unfunded mandate point of order resides.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding time.

The question before the House is, Should the House now consider H. Res. 231? While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of today's measures——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and the rules of the House.

The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina may proceed.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, while the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of today's measures, the Committee on Rules is not aware of any violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. This is a dilatory tactic.

These measures will protect our farmers, ranchers, and business community from a massive Federal overreach being perpetrated by the EPA, approve our FY16 budget that puts us on a path to rein in reckless spending, reform entitlement programs, and protect the religious rights of D.C. employers.

As a mother, a woman, and an individual of prayer, I am very glad that we are here today defending life and our Constitution, consistent with our congressional prerogatives.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues across the aisle act shocked that we are debating this issue. But what is truly shocking is that we need to be here today at all, discussing whether to grant employers in the District of Columbia the rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment, but we are.

I would further like to point out to our colleagues across the aisle some of the words of the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence:

''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted.''

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about discrimination against people here. We are discussing the protection of innocent life. As Members of Congress, we have a heightened responsibility to protect the rights of D.C. residents because the Constitution in article I, section 8 gives the Congress explicit jurisdiction over the country's seat of government.

It is under that authority that we consider H.J. Res. 43, a resolution to disapprove the action of the Council of the District of Columbia in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act of 2014, or RHNDA.

Our country holds as its most fundamental freedom the right to practice freely one's religion and associate with others who hold the same beliefs. It is unthinkable that we could allow the leadership—if you want to call it leadership, the people in control of Our Capital City—to infringe on that right for the millions of Americans who live or work inside its borders. But that is what RHNDA does.

It tells churches, religious schools, and advocacy organizations that they may not make employment decisions based on their own core principles, including the respect for precious unborn life, a principle that is central to many of these groups' entire belief system.

Cloaked in language purporting to prohibit discrimination and promote tolerance, this law targets these organizations and tramples their rights to exercise their views on the respect for life.

In truth, Mr. Speaker, this law discriminates against and promotes intolerance of anyone who disagrees with

the world view of the majority of the D.C. City Council. It is not discriminatory for a church or religious school to believe and preach that life begins at conception. It is not discriminatory to practice these deeply held beliefs; that is, unless you are in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, this law may force religious organizations to relocate outside the District of Columbia in order to protect their rights. Given the clear hostility the City Council has shown them and what we have heard on this floor today, that may, in fact, be the ultimate goal.

When we take our oath of office as Representatives, we promise to protect and defend the Constitution. That includes protection of religious freedoms, and it is why I support H.J. Res. 43 which disapproves RHNDA.

In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 174, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—174

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Black
Cárdenas
Clay
Fudge
Gohmert
Hudson
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Kildee
Langevin
Lewis
Payne
Quigley
Roskam
Rush
Shuster
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1312

Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. PALAZZO changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, this is House Resolution 231 down here today. I have got a copy right here. It has been so long since the Reading Clerk read this to us that folks may have forgotten. This represents a lot of what I would argue is best about this institution, and I want to take a little pride and tell folks about what the Rules Committee has been working on.

It makes in order H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015.

As you may know, Mr. Speaker, the EPA and others are hard at work, I would argue, at trying to exert brand-new jurisdiction over waters currently regulated by the State of Georgia. It is the largest power grab over water I have seen in my lifetime and, I would argue, in the history of the Republic. This bill aims to roll that back. Yet, as the committee reported it, there are

always other folks who have ideas, so what the Rules Committee did is to make in order every single Democratic amendment that was offered to this resolution.

If we vote to support this rule today, we will consider this bill. The House will work its will, and it will work its will by considering every single Democratic alternative that was offered. I think that is an important step. It is going to make the legislation better when we move it to final passage, and I am glad this rule provides for that. I hope folks will support that underlying rule.

Passing this rule today will make in order S. Con. Res. 11, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

Mr. Speaker, I almost feel like I need to explain what a concurrent resolution on the budget is because, if you are like more than half the Members of this House, you have never seen one before. More than half the Members of this House have never served when the United States of America got together and passed a budget. It is outrageous, Mr. Speaker. That was yesterday that it was outrageous, and today is about the opportunity to do this.

The House worked its will on the budget. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee made in order every single budget alternative that was offered, both Republican and Democrat. The House debated. The House worked its will. We passed a product. We worked that product out with the Senate. If we pass this rule today, Mr. Speaker, it will be in order to debate the first concurrent budget in my congressional tenure—these two terms—and the first balanced budget since 2001, but only if we make this rule in order.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, is H.J. Res. 43, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council, that this rule will make in order.

Now, for folks who don't follow that, we don't see it that often. In fact, since Republicans first took over Congress for the first time in 40 years back in 1994, we have never seen one of these resolutions before. It is the first one, but it comes from the District of Columbia Home Rule Act. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution delegates to Congress all of the authority for governing the District of Columbia. It is article I, section 8. All of the authority for the governing of the District of Columbia lies in this body.

In 1974, we passed the D.C. Home Rule Act, which allowed for the coordinated governance of D.C., and it included this resolution of disapproval allowing Congress to come back and reject actions that the District of Columbia has taken. Again, folks will not have seen this unless you were in Congress in 1991 when Democrats were controlling the House and Democrats were controlling the Senate. Unless you were here then, you would not have seen one of these resolutions passed. It was last passed in 1991 with folks rejecting the deliberations of the D.C. Council.

This rule makes in order the consideration of that joint resolution again today. It is exactly what was contemplated when, for the very first time in the history of the United States of America, the Congress delegated some of the power of controlling the District of Columbia to the city itself. In the language that designated that authority to begin with, it provided for this resolution of disapproval. For the first time in almost 20 years, this House is considering one of those today.

That is what you get in this rule, Mr. Speaker. It provides for debate on all of the Democratic amendments offered; it provides for debate on those bills that are exactly as the D.C. Home Rule Act anticipated; and it provides for debate on the first conferenced budget that most Members in this House have ever seen. It is a shame this is the first time we have had an opportunity to do it, but, golly, is it exciting that we have an opportunity to do that together today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for the consideration of three unrelated pieces of legislation: a Republican budget conference report, an anti-Clean Water Act bill, and a resolution to interfere with the decisions of the District of Columbia's city council and a bill that limits women's reproductive health rights.

The budget conference report was filed only minutes before the Rules Committee met yesterday, only minutes before the committee formally convened. It was a 100-page conference report that was negotiated in secret by the Republicans, and it was brought before the Rules Committee before anybody had a chance to read it. What ever happened to ''read the bill''? Whatever happened to the pledge for a more open and transparent Congress? It would be nice if all Members, Democrats and Republicans, had the opportunity to carefully review the legislation they are asked to vote on, especially when it comes to a document that provides a blueprint for funding the Federal Government and reforming our social safety net programs.

If that weren't bad enough, the majority claims that this budget conference report is something to be proud of. Mr. Speaker, this is nothing to be proud of. It is shameful. It is shameful in terms of process, and it is shameful in terms of substance. Budgets should be moral documents. They provide our constituents with a clear picture of who we are, of what our priorities are, how we should govern, where we want this country to go. They represent our values, but the values that this budget represents, I would argue, are not the values of working families in this country, and they are not the values of those who are struggling to get out of poverty. They may be the values of corporate special interests or of very wealthy individuals in this country, but they don't represent the values of the majority of people in this country.

This partisan Republican budget takes us in the wrong direction. It cuts $5.5 trillion in funding through a series of unrealistic spending cuts, math magic, and gimmicks. It asks nothing of the wealthiest among us, proposes no elimination of special interest tax breaks, and continues us down the terribly misguided path created by sequestration. In fact, to be honest, Mr. Speaker, this budget basically provides us a pathway to do not a lot of anything, really.

We already know that, unless we deal with the issue of sequestration, our colleagues in the United States Senate are going to block all of the appropriations bills. We know that the President will not sign any appropriations bills that lock us into sequestration. Maybe what we should be doing, rather than wasting time, is fixing sequestration, but my Republican friends have been very good at wasting time and at wasting taxpayer dollars, and that is what we are doing today.

The Republican budget conference report proposes to end the Medicare guarantee and turn it into a voucher program. It turns Medicaid and CHIP into a capped block grant. It eliminates $85 million from Pell grants. It cuts investments in research and in infrastructure. The budget resolution builds upon the draconian $125 billion cut to SNAP, which is the Nation's premier antihunger program that was contained in the House budget. To achieve a cut of that magnitude by block granting the program and capping its allotment means that States will be forced to cut benefits or kick eligible individuals and families off the program.

Boy, isn't that a nice value that we are promoting here—throwing poor people off of a food benefit. Just because the conference report is vague on some details or leaves out a few key buzzwords doesn't mean that it protects programs for the poor. Unfortunately, this Republican Congress has shown time and time again that it plans to balance the budgets on the backs of the poor and working class Americans.

The conference report also includes reconciliation instructions to repeal the Affordable Care Act without proposing an alternative to ensure the 16

million people who have gained health coverage under the ACA are able to remain insured. That is right. If the Republicans get their way, being a woman is, once again, a preexisting condition, and preventative care goes away. Simply, the progress that we have made over the past few years disappears. Senior citizens will see their prescription costs increase. In budgetary terms, we will be worse off when repealing the Affordable Care Act because it will result in higher medical costs and sicker people. It is just that simple. It is a bad idea, but it is a good sound bite, I guess.

Despite claims by my friends in the majority, this budget does not balance. It nowhere near balances. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is filled with gimmicks and contains the very dangerous addiction Congress has for deficit spending by further increasing funds for the overseas contingency operations account, or OCO. Not only does this budget increase the OCO's war spending, but it also facilitates using the OCO as a slush fund for items that should be funded in the base budget. Everything in OCO is on the national credit card. None of it is an emergency. It is deficit spending, pure and simple.

I commend my colleagues on the Republican side who are raising a little hell about this kind of budget gimmick that is going on. This is outrageous. While we continue to pump up the deficit and to pump up the OCO account, we watch our roads and our bridges and our water systems crumble for lack of funding, and we starve our education and our job training and innovation programs.

Mr. Speaker, those are just a few of the outrages contained in the Republican budget. We are still in the process of combing through the 100-page document that was just filed yesterday, and I am sure there will be additional issues that we will want to raise.

In addition to this awful budget, today's rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 1732 and H.J. Res. 43.

H.R. 1732, Mr. Speaker, would basically force the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers to withdraw its proposed rule on Clean Water Act jurisdictional boundaries and start the rulemaking process over again from scratch. Mr. Speaker, the current rulemaking process should be allowed to move forward. The EPA and the Army Corps have painstakingly engaged in an extensive stakeholder outreach and public comment process. They are doing their jobs. The rule is grounded in sound science. H.R. 1732 would cause further confusion, and it would end up delaying essential clean water projects for future generations, not to mention, Mr. Speaker, that a rider in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, which is being considered by this House today, would prohibit the Army Corps from spending any money to propose a new rule.

In one bill, my friends basically null and void what the bill we are going to debate today is intended to do. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in this partisan approach that the majority has taken with regard to clean water legislation and environmental protection legislation.

There is another bill in here, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to say a few words about that. It is H.J. Res. 43, disapproving the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

Mr. Speaker, the D.C. Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act is scheduled to take effect this Saturday. The law passed unanimously by the D.C. City Council. This would protect employees who work in the District of Columbia from workplace discrimination based on their personal reproductive healthcare decisions. The bill is about basic fairness. People should be judged at work based on their performances, not on their personal, private reproductive healthcare decisions. But House Republicans cannot pass up an opportunity to meddle in personal reproductive decisions or in D.C.'s right to govern itself.

The resolution before us, H.J. Res. 43, would prevent the law from going into effect. In doing so, it would allow an employer to fire a woman because she used in vitro fertilization or to demote an employee because she used birth control pills or because her husband used condoms or to pay an employee less because his daughter became pregnant out of wedlock.

□ 1330

In other words, we are a few months into 2015, a year-and-a-half away from the Presidential election, and the Republicans are already restarting their war on women. Sometimes it feels like this Congress is stuck in the mindset of 1815 rather than 2015.

Let my colleagues make no mistake about this: H.J. Res. 43 is about legitimizing discrimination. Enough already.

Mr. Speaker, earlier the gentlelady from North Carolina, my colleague on the Committee on Rules, came on the floor and said we in Congress need to protect the citizens of D.C. Protect them from what? From their own democratic process? Give me a break. Let me tell my Republican colleagues, the citizens of D.C. don't want your protection or your interference. They want this Congress to respect them and their decisions.

Mr. Speaker, this is another lousy piece of legislation that really shouldn't be here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on America's priorities instead of resuming the attack on women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. TORRES) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement for the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of working men and women instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on real priorities like eliminating poverty instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of America, like jobs, jobs, jobs, instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. BASS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of the country instead of another attack on women's health care in Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on jobs and the economy, the real priorities of the American people, instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of the American people instead of another attack on women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of the American people—job creation and getting a stronger economy—rather than attacking women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request,

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will first make an announcement.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure, embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD, and the House should be focusing on the real priorities facing Americans: the economy. They should not be rolling back women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of America instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member on the Committee on Rules, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our Democratic leader, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), one of our young leaders in this Chamber.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for all the work that he has done to protect life and religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong disapproval of religious discrimination in the District of Columbia's local government.

Mr. Speaker, one of the founding principles of our great country is the freedom to worship without government interference. Our forefathers fought and died for that liberty, and I stand before you today to make sure they did not die in vain.

The law passed by the D.C. City Council attacks the core religious beliefs of faith-based organizations, schools, and pro-life advocates. Under this law, these groups could be forced to pay for health services that are in direct conflict with their fundamental religious beliefs. Under this law, a D.C.-based nonprofit whose sole mission is to end abortion could be forced to pay for abortion services. This is not only unacceptable but stands in direct opposition to the Constitution and Federal law.

This is why I am proud to cosponsor Congresswoman BLACK's resolution that formally expresses Congress' disapproval of the D.C. pro-abortion law. I stand here to defend the rights of religious institutions and pro-life companies to honor their faith and respect the sanctity of life.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that life is our greatest gift. I admire the work that many of these faith-based and pro-life organizations do to change the hearts and the minds in this abortion debate, and I will not stand idly by to watch their religious freedoms trampled. I urge my colleagues to do the same and vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say for the record, I strongly disagree with what the gentlelady just said, and we will have some more time to talk about that, but I want to go to kind of a different subject right now.

For those who are watching these proceedings, it may be a little confusing because we are jumping around to different subjects, but my Republican friends have this new kind of ploy to limit and stifle debate, and that is pack as many bills into one rule at a time so that you can limit the amount of participation and debate, which, again, runs contrary to what the people's House is supposed to be about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask at the end of all this that we defeat the previous question, and then I will offer an amendment to the rule that would grant the House an opportunity to consider a budget that rejects the mindless sequester cuts in critical services and instead adopt a plan to put the budget on a fiscally responsible path by making responsible, targeted spending cuts, and by closing special interest tax breaks that benefit only the very wealthiest. It would make necessary investments to boost the economy and create jobs, protect national security, and preserve the Medicare guarantee.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, primarily because of the gimmickry and the coldheartedness of the conference budget. It is not just myself who has understood the tricks and gimmicks that were used to formulate this so-called balanced budget, which doesn't, of course, balance.

It is kind of like if I had gone out and said I am going to spend $2,000 on a cheap racehorse. This is the weekend of the Kentucky Derby. I am going to go out and buy a cheap racehorse, and I am going to enter it in the Kentucky Derby. The horse is going to win the Kentucky Derby, and then I take that prize money from the Kentucky Derby—I might even be so bold as to predict it is going to win the Triple Crown, and I take all that money and put it in my budget as if I had actually done it. That is the way this budget was constructed.

But, again, it is not just me. Virtually everyone who has looked at this budget—detached, impartial observers—says this is not legitimate budgeting. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget noted that the House budget uses ''several budget gimmicks that circumvent budget discipline,'' adding that ''the details are in some ways unrealistic and unspecified.''

□ 1345

The CRFB also observed about the Senate budget, ''Disappointingly, many of the savings are unrealistic or lack specificity.''

Taxpayers for Common Sense said, ''This isn't budgeting, it's gimmickry.''

The Fiscal Times noted that ''there is a widely held belief among many Federal budget watchers that Republicans had to resort to budgetary smoke and mirrors to create a pathway to a balanced budget.''

While my friend from Georgia and other members of the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee are praising the fact that they were able to construct a budget that balances the first time since 2001, it doesn't balance.

For instance, what it does is it eliminates, repeals—or calls for the repeal—of the Affordable Care Act and then takes all of the savings and revenues from the Affordable Care Act and counts that as a way to add $2 trillion to the positive side of their budget over 10 years.

That is not accurate budgeting. That is gimmickry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman from Kentucky an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague.

That is not legitimate budgeting. That is just fantasy. That is really what the budget is about.

Unfortunately, though, there is a very cruel side to this budget. As my friend from Massachusetts said, this does real damage to the American people. It does damage to hard-working families who are trying to get ahead. It actually ends up being a tax increase on hard-working American families.

It repeals the Affordable Care Act, and I just want to talk a little bit about what the Affordable Care Act has done in my State because, if this were to actually happen, here is what the impact on my citizens would be.

In Kentucky, according to the DeLoitte professional services firm that did an audit of Kentucky's experience and a projection over the next 6 years, the Affordable Care Act will contribute $30 billion of additional economic activity in the State, create 44,000 jobs, and have a positive impact on the Kentucky State budget of $850 million. That is in one State.

If you repeal the Affordable Care Act, not only do you do great damage to the health of Americans, taking insurance away from 16.5 million—in my State, 550,000 who have gained insurance just in the last year and a half—but you are doing real damage to our education, to our infrastructure, to our investment in research, to our seniors. Under this bill, seniors will suffer a great financial hardship, as well as a loss of benefits.

There is real damage, as I said, to be done with this budget, but I think the most disturbing part of the entire debate is the fact that this is not a budget that balances. Yes, the numbers at the end on the plus and negative side add up.

They actually match after 10 years, but all of the bases for getting there is about as reliable as, again, if I bought that racehorse and said I am going to win the Kentucky Derby and counted those winnings before that race was ever run.

I oppose the rule on the basis of this conference report on the budget. I think it does great damage to the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank my colleague for his leadership today and every day. I really appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and, more broadly, H.J. Res. 43, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her leadership and her conviction on this issue.

We all want to protect the free speech and beliefs of all Americans, but too often, the line is drawn to discriminate against those with pro-life views. Ironically, this is often done under the guise of antidiscrimination, which is exactly what has happened in the District of Columbia.

Under the recently passed ordinance, religious institutions and other pro-life employers in our Nation's Capital could be forced to make decisions that violate their deeply held religious beliefs.

Despite the Supreme Court ruling in Hobby Lobby, for instance, under this ordinance, religious employers could be compelled to cover elective abortions in their healthcare coverage or face discrimination charges.

It would also prevent faith-based employers from taking actions against employees who participate in activities that run counter to the mission of that organization. For instance, a pro-life crisis pregnancy center couldn't terminate an employee who undermines their cause by volunteering at an abortion clinic.

As a strong pro-life individual myself, it boggles my mind that the government could force like-minded individuals to violate their conscience in such ways. Frankly, no American should be comfortable with such discrimination.

We must take swift action to stop this ordinance, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is founded on two simple and powerful principles, liberty and equality.

In the 18th century, our Founding Fathers saw liberty as freedom from the dictates of a tyrannical government and fought to the death to protect it. What they could not foresee is a modern form of tyranny, the tyranny of employers who seek to impose their beliefs on their employees and control their personal decisions.

I am saddened that, today, my Republican colleagues are bringing up yet another bill to enable employers to control their private, personal decisions of their employees. Today, this body may, with a single vote, strip over 650,000 American citizens of their essential liberty to make their own choices about their health care and their families.

Make no mistake, the District of Columbia's new law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act, is about liberty. We are not talking about an employer who objects to paying for insurance that covers contraception.

D.C. passed this law to protect the citizens from an employer who tells a woman that she will be fired for using contraception or for using in vitro fertilization to start a family or for engaging in any other conduct that violates the employer's religious beliefs.

The D.C. law we are asked to overturn says your employer should not be able to impose his religious beliefs on you. You should not be fired because your religious beliefs differ from those of your employer. The D.C. law protects religious liberty. The disapproval resolution imposes religious coercion.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle who claim so vociferously to support freedom and liberty stand here today and say to the American people: you do not have the right to make decisions about when and how to start a family; your employer has the right to make those decisions for you.

I challenge any Member of this body to go home this weekend and explain that to their constituents and why they must now live under the yoke of their employer's tyranny. The American people will not stand for it, and we must not stand for it today.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and ''no'' on the disapproval resolution. We must send a strong message to the American people that freedom and religious liberty still exist in this country.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a member of the class of 2010, and a public servant.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate my colleague from Georgia yielding me time to discuss this rule and the underlying issue.

I do want to report that it was 229 years ago that the Virginia General Assembly ratified the Virginia statute for religious freedom. This was authored by Thomas Jefferson. The statute serves as the model for the free exercise clause in our First Amendment. This is what it said:

> No man shall . . . suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument, to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion.

Mr. Speaker, religious freedom is a fundamental human right protected by our First Amendment. It is essential to our free and flourishing society. Our Nation was found, in part, by individuals seeking refuge from religious persecution, from religious discrimination. For these pioneers and for all to come after, America was meant to be a permanent fortress of liberty and freedom for all who live within its walls.

At its essence, the concept of religious freedom is about much more than religion. It is much more than just showing up to worship service 1 day or 1 night a week. It is about our fundamental human right to hold our own beliefs and to live out our lives according to these faiths.

Religious freedom, quite simply, is about freedom itself. This is why the very first part of the very First

Amendment to our Constitution is about religious freedom. It is our first and most cherished liberty.

However, our ability to be free to live out the convictions of our faith not only in the public square, but also in the privacy of our own homes, in our churches, in our businesses, is in jeopardy right here in our Nation's Capital.

The misleading name RHNDA is nothing more than a legalized discrimination. If allowed to go in effect, the government would force pro-life organizations, pro-life ministries, pro-life business, pro-life churches, pro-life individuals in the District to violate the very heart of their lives and their work and be coerced into paying for abortion on demand and be forced to hire antilife individuals who actually promote abortion. As a Catholic and as an American, I am offended by such coercion.

Now is the time for Congress to stand up against this direct assault on our freedom of religion, our freedom of association, and our freedom of speech.

I encourage my colleagues to join me and honor our constitutional oath of office by adopting this rule and passing H.J. Res. 43.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the many Democrats who have rallied to the defense of reproductive health decisions of men and women in the District of Columbia, especially since this is a resolution to overturn a District of Columbia law that everyone in this Chamber will be able to vote on, except me.

I wish to respond to a set of untruths you have heard from the other side that, for example, the D.C. law is an assault on religion. On the contrary, it protects an employer's religious beliefs. He can hold those religious beliefs if that is part of what his organization does. The employee must advocate those beliefs. Whatever the organization or business, the employee must advocate the employer's views, not his own. What the employer cannot do is to go into the employee's bedroom to find out what kind of reproductive choices he makes on his own as a private matter.

Abortion has been raised as if it were in this bill. In fact, just the opposite—the D.C. law makes it clear that insurance is not involved, paying for abortion is not involved.

Republicans have done almost the inconceivable. They have resumed, with this disapproval resolution, the war on women, by adding men.

The D.C. law protects all employees from job discrimination by the employer for their reproductive health choices. For example, if the employer discriminates against a male employee who has contributed sperm for in vitro fertilization to help his wife become pregnant, that male employee is also protected.

There has been an attempt to tie the D.C. law to abortion; but, if an employee refuses to carry out—indeed, to advocate—the mission of the organization that opposes abortion, then that employee can be fired.

In fact, you can ask that employee before that employee is hired: Will you advocate vigorously against abortion the way this organization does? That employee must say yes, or that employee may not insist on any right to be hired.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the manager of this bill never defended the bill on the merits; instead, he defended the tyranny of Federal power over local matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. The Home Rule Act, in its terms, Mr. Speaker, does not—and it says so—envision overturning local law, and it says so in its terms. There are only a few matters that the Home Rule Act mentions that cannot be enacted, and the matter on the floor is not one of them.

Republicans have been champions for federalism and local control; yet they are trying to impose their own preferences on a local jurisdiction whose Member cannot even vote for or against it. This is a double whammy.

Their goal here is to resume the war on women. The predicate for getting to the Nation's women is the D.C. Home Rule Act. It goes after D.C.'s right to self-government and women at the same time.

The coming attraction in your district is that this bill or a version of it is pending all over the country. Stop it here, or it will spread throughout the United States of America.

□ 1400

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my colleague from Georgia for the great leadership he shows in the Rules Committee and on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made many comments. Some of them, I am going to do my best to refute comment by comment; others, I am just going to talk about in general.

Their one charge is that Congress should stay out of the business of governing D.C. Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress explicit jurisdiction over the country's seat of government. The extent to which Congress should oversee or intervene in the governance of the District is a debate for another day, but it is clearly our responsibility.

Current law compels congressional oversight, and we must exercise responsibly that jurisdiction. That includes acting to stop legislation that clearly violates the constitutional freedoms of the citizens of the District.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that women are protected by law, both Federal and D.C., from discrimination on the basis of pregnancy. Their personal medical decisions are also private under HIPAA protections.

This discussion is not about how someone chooses to conduct their personal affairs. It is about whether the D.C. government may force an organization to hire, retain, and promote someone who actively opposes their central mission and core beliefs.

Pro-life groups, religious organizations, and Republicans, are not the only ones to see significant problems with RHNDA. Even former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray cautioned that RHNDA goes too far, and called the bill ''legally insufficient'' and ''legally problematic.''

Whatever his position may be on life issues, he recognized that the approach taken by the City Council does not adequately protect free exercise. He further noted that the measure ''raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religions Freedom Restoration Act.''

The District's own attorney general also expressed concerns that ''religious organizations, religiously affiliated organizations, religiously-driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and RFRA grounds for challenging the law's applicability to them.''

The D.C. Council's cavalier attitude toward the constitutional rights protecting religious practice and belief is deeply troubling. Unfortunately, RHNDA is a harbinger of continued efforts to undermine the right of free exercise and association.

RHNDA denies these fundamental rights to pro-life organizations and religious groups who do not fit the narrow definition of ''ministers'' exempted from the D.C. law. Under this law, these organizations can be forced to hire, retain, and promote individuals who work actively against their central mission and core beliefs.

The clear and shameless targeting of these organizations must be opposed by anyone who values the rights guaranteed to us by the First Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, our oath of office requires us to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The Supreme Court ruled unanimously in 2012 that religious organizations have the right to hire individuals

that support their mission, saying: ''The interest of society in the enforcement of employment discrimination statutes is undoubtedly important. But so, too, is the interest of religious groups in choosing who will preach their beliefs, teach their faith, and carry out their mission . . . The church must be free to choose those who will guide it on its way.''

Consistent with our oath of office, I commend this rule and disapproval resolution for our support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is extreme, and it is an outrage to women everywhere. The Republican majority is saying with this resolution that they think a woman's employer has a say in the woman's reproductive healthcare choices, even though the Supreme Court, the Constitution, and women all across this country know that they don't.

It is bad enough that the majority party believes your boss should dictate whether your healthcare plan covers birth control. Now they want to make sure your boss has the right to fire you just for using birth control.

If that was all they were saying, that is outrageous enough, but it is not. This resolution would actually give employers the right to fire an employee for the reproductive healthcare choices of their spouses, or even their children.

Think about it. The other side is saying that it is all right to fire someone because their boss doesn't like their wife's, or even their children's, healthcare choices. Talk about restricting someone's rights.

It would take away a whole range of women's private decisions and make them fireable offenses. In vitro fertilization, you are fired. Exercising your right to choose, you are fired. You have a daughter on birth control, you are fired.

This is outrageous, ridiculous, and totally unacceptable. It is an insult to women everywhere. And even more amazing is that this resolution is being proposed by the so-called party of states' rights.

They are not proposing a Federal law. They are taking away the rights of a locality, the District, Washington, D.C., which is larger than some States and has a population larger than most States.

This is a new low in this Congress. I urge a strong ''no'' vote.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for folks who were just turning on the TVs back in their office, they may think we are in the middle of issue debate right now—not the case. We can get into issue debate as soon as we pass this rule to begin that debate.

What makes me so proud about the work that we do in the Rules Committee is that it makes in order the ability to have these kinds of in-depth discussions.

We can't have this kind of discussion right here—there are three topics in this bill—because these three topics in this bill will come later in the day, each being discussed individually.

I will go back to where I began, Mr. Speaker. We are exercising responsibilities of the Constitution under Article I, section 8, that require us to do oversight on the District of Columbia. Similarly, we are pushing back on executive overreach in H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act. That is that big Federal grab over all the water that our States are currently regulating. And finally, we will be bringing up that balanced budget, the first reconciled budget that most in this Chamber have ever seen.

This rule makes that debate possible. It will be a free and open debate on the budget, as we allowed every single budget to be debated earlier on this floor, it is going to be an open debate on H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, where the Rules Committee made in order every Democratic suggestion that was offered there, every amendment that came before the Rules Committee. And it will be an up-or-down vote after debate on H.J. Res. 43, the resolution of disapproval, as the very 1974 act that provided for self-governance of the District of Columbia anticipated.

If we pass this rule, Mr. Speaker, we can get into that substance, and I look forward to a robust debate on all three of those topics.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN, for your leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to H.J. Res. 43. This bill would undermine the District's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act, which would protect employees who work in the District from workplace discrimination based on the employee's personal reproductive healthcare decisions.

For example, this includes prohibiting an employer from firing an employee for using in vitro fertilization or birth control.

Simply put, this rule and bill is yet another Republican attack on women's access to health care and another battle in the war on women. And of course, as always, you target the women of the District of Columbia to set a standard for the rest of the country.

What in the world is the connection between your private healthcare decisions and job performance? This is so cynical. It is so wrong. No woman should have an employer or a politician interfering in her personal health decisions.

The D.C. government has a right to determine how they want to protect their workers. Employees should be evaluated at work based on their performance, not on their personal and private reproductive healthcare decisions.

The District of Columbia seeks basic fairness for its women, and this rule and this resolution are outrageous. It is undemocratic and, once again, ignores the Home Rule Act. Yes, Congress should not be dictating any policy to the District of Columbia. This debate has been held. The Home Rule Act was passed in 1973.

Instead of undermining the law that seeks to protect the citizens and women of D.C. from discrimination based on their private reproductive healthcare decisions, we should be getting back to the real business that Congress needs to address, like strengthening our economy, lifting families out of poverty, criminal justice reform, and creating job opportunities for all.

So let's defeat this. Let's support the District of Columbia and its decisions. Let's respect them. Let's respect the women of the District of Columbia. They, too, have that right.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from Massachusetts I do not have any further speakers remaining, and I would inquire if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Thank you to the gentleman from Worcester for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and its assault on Americans' reproductive health rights. All women should have the right to make their own healthcare decisions without fear of losing their jobs.

With reports of women being fired for undergoing in vitro fertilization and being fired for being a single mom, the City Council of Washington, D.C. passed a resolution to ban workplace discrimination based on personal reproductive healthcare decisions.

This joint resolution does not infringe on religious liberty. It ensures the freedom to practice individual religious and moral beliefs. This decision of the D.C. Council will protect women and ensure that reproductive health decisions are made by women and not their employers and not corporations.

It is 2015, and I would love for Congress to be debating women in the workplace. We should be talking about how we achieve equal pay, how we increase paid sick leave, and how to help working families make ends meet. We should not be stripping away the progress that has already been made.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ quarter minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend, because I would like to correct some misstatements from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the former Mayor and the former Attorney General never detailed what their concern was, but just in case, the District passed an amendment that made it clear that insurance and abortion are not covered by this bill.

I want to be explicit.

□ 1415

A pro-life organization is not required to hire someone who advocates against abortion. An employee must carry out and must advocate whatever is the mission of the organization.

This bill has an exception for organizations' religious and political views. Both must be carried out.

The 1973 Home Rule Act has not come to this floor before because only three times in 25 years has it been taken up, and that was mostly because D.C. mistakenly wandered into Federal matters. That is why this Federal authority was retained in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, not to overturn local law whenever the other side simply disagreed with it.

I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question and vote ''no'' on the rule. I just wanted to make that clear before I continue here.

Mr. Speaker, it is frustrating to come to the floor and have to squeeze into a very short period of time three different bills on one rule. These are three very controversial bills.

You have heard about the bill that essentially is a war on women in the District of Columbia, that denies women and men their privacy and their right to reproductive health care. We have a bill in here also that essentially tries to gut the Clean Water Act, which is very controversial and has a very direct impact on the health and well-being of the people of this country. And then we have this budget that was filed minutes before the Rules Committee met. Nobody read it.

I should also point out that the Rules Committee reports that, although the resolution waives all points of order against provisions in H.J. Res. 43, the committee is not aware of any point of order. Well, one of the points of order is the 3-day layover, which is being violated, so the committee is waiving a point of order with regard to that.

Look, we should be debating an immigration reform bill. We should be debating a pay equity bill. We should be debating an increase in the minimum wage. We should be debating a comprehensive long-term highway and transportation reauthorization bill to help rebuild this country. There are so many important things that we should be debating, and, instead, we are bringing these wedge issues to the floor. We are bringing an anti-environmental bill to the floor that is going nowhere, and we are bringing a budget to the floor that paves the way for a lot of nothing.

Unless we fix the sequestration problem, the Senate is not going to take up any of these appropriations bills, and neither should we.

We ought to put the American people first and put the electioneering off. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I love about this institution is my colleagues come to the floor with different life experiences. They come with different opinions. They come with a different set of bosses. The 700,000 folks that I call my boss back home in Georgia, I am sure, have very different views than those who call themselves the boss of my friend from Massachusetts.

But I tell you, the three bills that this rule makes in order—not that this rule declares a foregone conclusion of passage. No. It just makes in order for debate on the floor of this House. These three bills are exactly the kind of thing that this House should be working on, and I am proud to bring it today.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, I don't serve on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. That is where this resolution of disapproval has come from. I did last cycle. I don't this cycle. I have heard colleague after colleague come to the floor and defend the rights of not being fired because your sister or your daughter or your son or your brother used birth control.

Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous. I can't imagine that someone would be fired for what their sister or their brother does in terms of their reproductive health choices. I agree. I agree. And if there is an opportunity to work together to prevent that from happening—that is apparently happening en masse here in the District of Columbia—I want to be a part of it.

But the truth is, it is not happening en masse. In fact, it is not happening at all. It is not happening at all.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind being lectured by my friends to get back to the business of the people. I do not mind. In fact, I am onboard with it every single day of the week. We can start earlier, and we can start later, and I will be here. But do not, Mr. Speaker, do not lecture me on getting about the business of the people and come down with story after story after story that is not what this legislation is about, that is not a problem, that is not something that any of us disagree on.

Mr. Speaker, we have some legitimate disagreements on this floor, and if we pass this rule, we will be able to get into the nitty-gritty of those disagreements.

But we do not disagree on the freedom of family members to make their own reproductive health choices without it impacting our own employment.

I will say to my friend sincerely: if we can find a case in the District of Columbia—I don't mean a case this year; I don't mean a case last year; I mean a case ever of that happening—seek me out as your partner, and I will help you. Because what folks seem to miss here in this conga line of frustration is that if we reject the D.C. Council's resolution, we return D.C. to the law of the land as it exists, when? Today. We don't take a single right away from anybody. We don't take a single freedom away from anybody. We are not interested in doing that whatsoever. What we are interested in doing is protecting religious freedom.

It turns out, if you live in Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, you might work for an institution that lobbies for life. You might work for an institution that focuses on faith. This is a town of ideas, Mr. Speaker.

In the rush to pass a piece of legislation—these are not my words. These are the words of Vincent Gray in his letter to the members of the council of the District of Columbia:

> In the rush to push this bill through, the council did not take the time to protect this cathedral of freedom that we have here, did not take the time to make sure that that first and most important of our constitutional freedoms was protected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is the Constitution. There is nothing

that the District of Columbia can do to undermine the Constitution. But they can cause a lot of problems for folks along the way. This is a resolution of disapproval to prevent that from happening.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill that is here, H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, my friends suggest that we are talking about clean water in this country, that this is about Republicans undermining clean water.

I will say again, as I said about the resolution of disapproval: if we pass this bill, we will roll the regulatory environment of clean water so far back, it will be just like it is today. That is what we are going to do. I just want to be clear about those radical ideas that my friends on the left have suggested.

If we have the will in this body to pass this bill, we are going to roll regulations so far back, it will be exactly like it is as I am standing here today.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill is about is preventing the regulatory overreach going forward.

Guess what: I live in Gwinnett County, Georgia. I challenge you to have a water treatment plant that does a better job than we do. We have a water fountain right there where the sewage gets treated, Mr. Speaker. You can go ahead and press that water fountain and have yourself a drink. That is how clean it is. We put it back into the lake cleaner than we take it out of the lake.

I will not be lectured by my friends in an executive office downtown about how to clean water in the State of Georgia. I promise you, I care more about clean water in Georgia than anyone on Pennsylvania Avenue does. We are succeeding today.

If we have a problem with State regulation of clean water, come to me. I will be your partner. We will work on that together.

The problem is not that Georgia isn't doing a good job. The problem is, the Feds are planning to get in the way of Georgia doing a good job. This bill will stop it. If we pass this rule, we will be able to have that debate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill that makes me the proudest is our concurrent budget resolution. My friends have lots to say about why it is this budget doesn't balance. Let's be clear: I believe that they are wrong.

But what is more important in this discussion, Mr. Speaker, is that my friends don't want the budget to balance. We had a free and open debate on this floor. We considered every budget that any Member of this Chamber wanted to offer, every single one.

An interesting thing happened, Mr. Speaker. Every Republican budget that was introduced balanced within 10 years and didn't raise taxes on hard-working Americans. Every single budget the Democrats introduced never balanced—not in 10 years, not in 20 years, not in 100 years—and every single one raised taxes on hard-working Americans by trillions of dollars. Trillions of dollars in new taxes, and it still didn't reach balance.

My friends, I understand we have a fundamental disagreement about how this country ought to be run, and I am glad that we have that debate here in this Chamber. We are a deliberative body. I respect the opinions of my friends. I do believe there is a common ground that we can come to. But, Mr. Speaker, this is that common ground today.

For years, the budget wasn't even passed in the United States Senate, much less try to bring it together so that the House and the Senate are working off a single page of music.

For the first time since 1991, this Chamber has done its job in concert with the Senate. It is no small thing. Far from being something to be criticized, it is something to be celebrated.

I don't know where the votes are going to be, Mr. Speaker. Conferencing something with the Senate is hard. I promise you that my bosses back home in Georgia have a much more conservative view of the world than many of the folks do in the United States Senate. But guess what, I don't get everything I want every day. But what I get is an opportunity to come together to build that bridge of common ground and agreement.

That is the agreement we have before us today—not my ideas, not Democratic ideas, not Republican ideas, but collaborative House-Senate ideas—a budget for the Federal Government for the first time in 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues: Take a look at this rule. You will be proud. Take a look at the work of the hard-working people in the Rules Committee upstairs—nine Republicans, four Democrats getting together late in the evening, trying to make the rules work—you will be proud.

Every single Democratic amendment was made in order on the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act. The resolution of disapproval, brought exactly as the Home Rule Act intended: last used by Democrats to disapprove; today used by this Chamber.

And finally, that budget brought only after every single Member's ideas were debated, and the best rose to the top.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support from all of my colleagues for this fair and honest rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 231, the special rule governing consideration of the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016, included a prophylactic waiver of points of order against its consideration and it was described as such in House Report 114–98. Due to an unexpected change in the legislative schedule, the waiver of all points of order against consideration would now include a waiver of clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule XXII, prohibiting the consideration of a conference report until the third calendar day on which the conference report has been available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is important to note that the text of the conference report and the joint explanatory statement were made available in electronic form on April 29, 2015.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 231 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

In section 2, strike ''except one hour of debate.'' and insert ''except one hour of debate and one motion to recommit with instructions that the Managers on the part of the House—

(1) reject the austere and mindless sequester spending cuts in critical services and instead offer a plan to put the budget on a fiscally responsible path by making responsible, targeted spending cuts and by closing special interest tax breaks that benefit only the very wealthiest.

(2) provide equal increases in both defense and non-defense spending above the sequester cap levels to:

a. make necessary investments that boost the economy to create jobs, rebuild our infrastructure, educate our children and sharpen the nation's competitive edge;

b. avoid another unnecessary and harmful government shutdown; and

c. protect national security, including law enforcement, homeland security, defense and international programs that help protect the nation; and

(3) protect Medicare and reject attempts to end Medicare's guaranteed benefit by turning it into a voucher system that will increase costs for seniors and destabilize the traditional Medicare program that has served seniors well for half a century.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate

vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule . . . because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 181, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Frankel (FL)
Lewis
McKinley
Payne
Polis
Scott (VA)
Smith (MO)
Wasserman Schultz
Welch

□ 1455

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

AYES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Kirkpatrick
Lewis
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McKinley
Payne
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1504

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 175, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—236

Abraham
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garamendi
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—175

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Bass
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Esty
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Fudge
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Lance
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Norcross	Rouzer	Tipton
Nugent	Roybal-Allard	Torres
Pallone	Rush	Turner
Paulsen	Ryan (OH)	Upton
Pearce	Sánchez, Linda T.	Valadao
Perry	Sanchez, Loretta	Vargas
Peters	Sarbanes	Veasey
Peterson	Schakowsky	Vela
Pittenger	Schiff	Velázquez
Poliquin	Schrader	Visclosky
Price, Tom	Scott, David	Walberg
Ratcliffe	Sewell (AL)	Waters, Maxine
Reed	Shuster	Watson Coleman
Renacci	Sires	Weber (TX)
Rice (NY)	Smith (MO)	Wilson (FL)
Richmond	Stivers	Wittman
Rigell	Swalwell (CA)	Woodall
Roe (TN)	Thompson (CA)	Yoder
Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Yoho
Rooney (FL)		Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Gohmert	Tonko

NOT VOTING—18

Blum	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pitts
Conyers	McKinley	Scott (VA)
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Slaughter
Grijalva	Payne	Wasserman Schultz
Kirkpatrick		Welch
Lewis		

□ 1512

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS, THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL, AND EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR OFFICIAL CONGRESSIONAL EVENTS SURROUNDING THE VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on House Administration and Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 43, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 43

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR EVENTS SURROUNDING VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS.—The Capitol Grounds may be used for official Congressional events surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol on Thursday, September 24, 2015, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.—The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to enforce the restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds in connection with the events authorized by this section.

(c) EVENT PREPARATIONS.—The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the events authorized by this section.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF ROTUNDA FOR EVENTS SURROUNDING VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL.

The rotunda of the United States Capitol is authorized to be used for ceremonies and activities surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol on September 24, 2015, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate. Physical preparations for the conduct of such ceremonies and activities shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENTS SURROUNDING VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for ceremonies and activities surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol on September 24, 2015, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate. Physical preparations for the conduct of such ceremonies and activities shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

SEC. 4. ARRANGEMENTS WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.

In carrying out their duties under this concurrent resolution, the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are each authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under such arrangements as each may enter into with the heads of those departments and agencies in connection with the ceremonies and activities surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2028.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2028.

Will the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1515

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BLACK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 29, 2015, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 22, line 7.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 25, lines 13 and 16, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Chair, my amendment builds on the committee's work to support scientific research and development within the Department of Energy.

More than 30 years have elapsed since Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and over that time, technology and scientific knowledge have evolved significantly. However, Congress still clings to outdated technology and policy prescriptions to address today's nuclear waste issues.

The fact is that dumping our country's highly radioactive nuclear waste in a hole and hoping for the best is a 20th century solution. Instead, we must encourage the use of 21st century technology to address this issue. My amendment eliminates the money earmarked for the Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Geological Repository and increases funding for the Nuclear Energy University Program within DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy so that we can better support our scientists and universities as they work to develop a 21st century solution to this problem.

According to CBO, this amendment decreases budget authority by $75 million and has no net impact on budget

outlays. The Nuclear Energy University Program is authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Pursuant to these authorities, DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy allocates up to 20 percent of its R&D to university-based programs and mission-supporting R&D and related infrastructure improvements each year.

The funds provided by my amendment will be used by the Office of Nuclear Energy to support the Nuclear Energy University Program and the efforts by our universities to research and develop ways to reduce the radiotoxicity of nuclear waste, better recycle and reuse spent nuclear fuel, and ultimately provide a 21st century solution to our nuclear waste problem.

For instance, grants provided through the Nuclear Energy University Program to the University of Nevada-Las Vegas College of Sciences help support and maintain a world-class radiochemistry program at UNLV that is currently working to reduce the radiotoxicity of nuclear waste. In fact, the technology available to students at UNLV is so advanced that scientists working at the national laboratories often use the facilities at UNLV to conduct experiments in the field of radiochemistry.

Strengthening and supporting the research and innovations already taking place at UNLV and other universities throughout the country to solve our Nation's nuclear waste problem is a much wiser investment of Federal resources than the flawed Yucca Mountain proposal. Instead of continuing the outdated, unworkable, one-State-must-lose-for-49–States-to-win approach to this problem, why don't we invest in the development of research and technology that will allow every State to win?

For Nevada and other States throughout the country, the 21st century solution proposed by this amendment has the potential to create countless new high-paying R&D jobs by utilizing existing regional technological capabilities. It is time we stopped subscribing to 20th century ideas that waste taxpayer resources by trying to sweep our nuclear waste problems under a very expensive rug and instead invest in American innovation and ingenuity to develop solutions that will make our country a leader in the field of nuclear energy once again.

I urge my colleagues to embrace the future of nuclear waste disposal, support my amendment to help create jobs, and restore the United States role as a leader in science and technology development.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment and him offering the amendment, and I appreciate his point of view and why he is offering it, but this amendment would eliminate $150 million in the bill for the Department of Energy to reorganize its adjudicatory response team and get the Yucca Mountain licensing process back on track and running.

Yucca Mountain is the law of the land. You have to remember that. Yucca Mountain is the law of the land, even though the administration has failed to follow that law. It has seen overwhelming support in countless numbers of votes and countless numbers of times in the House and is the only permanent repository option we have on the table.

This amendment would put in jeopardy the more than $15 billion—let me repeat that, the more than $15 billion—that has been spent so far on this program.

Once the Yucca Mountain application is finished, all Members of this body and the Senate will have the opportunity to decide whether to move forward to construct and use the facility, but killing the process at this point, I think, is shortsighted, even though I understand the gentleman's concern.

I, therefore, urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), $605,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount $120,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $45,000,000)''.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $45,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It is designed to reduce wasteful spending, which I think we all would like to do around here.

This year Republican appropriators increased taxpayer-funded fossil fuel research and development by $45 million above the President's request. My amendment would simply reduce the funding for the Office of Fossil Energy by $45 million, down to the President's requested level, and then dedicate these funds to the spending reduction account, which is something that I think all of us want to do, given how much we talk about wasteful spending and deficit reduction around here.

The five most profitable oil companies—Exxon Mobil, Shell, Chevron, BP, ConocoPhillips—together made more than a trillion in profits last decade. A trillion dollars of profit; I think that is pretty good. Fossil fuels are reaping $550 billion a year in subsidies, four times the amount of $120 billion paid out in incentives for renewable energy. So fossil fuels are not getting the short shrift.

Air pollution from fossil fuels costs money. Nationwide the hidden health costs of electricity generated by fossil fuels adds up to as much as $886 billion annually, or about 6 percent of gross domestic product. I am from Minnesota, and I live in north Minneapolis, and I can tell you, Madam Chair, that children there suffer greater rates of asthma than the rest of the State, partially as a result of emissions from vehicles that run on fossil fuels.

Climate change costs money, too. Climate change will make our electricity costs go up. Greenhouse-gas-driven changes in temperature will likely increase demand for electricity. This will make it necessary for construction of up to 95 gigawatts of new power generation over the next 5 to 25 years.

Residential and commercial ratepayers will pay up to $12 billion more per year, and people living in coastal communities could pay as much as $35 billion a year within the next 15 years because of sea level rise and hurricane activity.

Conclusion: let's lower the deficit; let's cut wasteful spending; let's stop wasting taxpayer money on dirty fossil fuel resources that cost all of us a lot more in the long term.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, it is almost humorous to listen to someone who wants to reduce the deficit and put this money into the deficit reduction account but then complains that we are following sequestration, and it is just too low and too crazy, and we need to do away with sequestration. We need to be able to spend more money.

The reality is, it is not that it is the deficit reduction account; it is that it

is out of the fossil fuel program, which is more than what the President recommended. The administration has priorities, and Congress has priorities. This bill reflects the priorities of the subcommittee and the full committee that brought it to the floor. The amendment would reduce funding for the fossil energy account by $45 million in favor of deficit spending.

Fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by the Nation's homes and businesses. Fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by the Nation's homes and businesses and will continue to provide for the majority of our energy needs for the foreseeable future.

The bill rejects the administration's proposed reductions to the fossil energy program, particularly the drastic cuts to the coal program, which is cut by $31 million in the budget request, and instead funds these programs at $605 million, a $34 million increase over last year. With this additional funding, the Office of Fossil Energy will target research into how water can be more efficiently used in power plants, how coal can be used to produce electric power through fuel cells, and how to efficiently capture and store carbon from our abundant natural resources.

This amendment would reduce funding for a program that ensures we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources as well and as cleanly as possible. Let me repeat. Fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas, provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by our Nation's homes and businesses, and will continue to provide for the majority of our energy needs in the foreseeable future.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, do I have time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, surely my friend and I can join together on the spending reduction account on this particular measure. It is not that much money in the scope of this big event. The fact is, we should all be trying to reduce the deficit where we can, particularly when we are talking about industries that have combined profits of a trillion dollars. A trillion.

I do not think my constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of Minnesota need to foot the bill for R&D for Exxon Mobil, Shell, Chevron, BP, and ConocoPhillips. I think they should pay their own R&D if they are banking money like that. I think they are doing just fine, and they don't need more of the average taxpayer's dough.

Let me also say that we are already giving the fossil fuel industry $550 billion a year in subsidies. Isn't that enough? Can't they live with a little less, given that they are making a trillion dollars in combined profits? We are giving them $550 billion in subsidies, and they want more, and they just cannot possibly do with $45 million less than we are giving them already?

I have got to tell you, I have just got a feeling that if they don't get this extra money, they will be fine. I feel ConocoPhillips and Chevron will somehow make it if they don't get our American taxpayers' $45 million.

□ 1530

I urge a very strong ''yes'' in favor of this amendment for deficit reduction and to end a little bit of corporate welfare.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. The reality is ExxonMobil, all of the other companies you named, don't get this money. This money goes into research, research that fuels 85 percent of the electrical needs in this country—research.

Now, you could also say: If you are going to do that, why not take away all the money that goes into renewable energy research? Why not take away all the money that goes into wind power or into solar power or into nuclear power or into any of the other research that we do?

It is just that some people can't fathom the fact that 85 percent—that is getting close to 100—but 85 percent of our energy is produced by fossil fuel. While the gentleman talks about deficit reduction, the reality is I think he just wants to take some money out of the fossil fuel research account.

I will be interested, being so interested in deficit reduction, how the vote comes later on with the Republican budget that will be before the House later on, so I will be watching that very closely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For Department of Energy expenses necessary to carry out naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities, $17,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated funds remaining from prior years shall be available for all naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), $212,030,000, to remain available until expended.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve storage, operation, and management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), $7,600,000, to remain available until expended.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, $117,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for non-defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $229,193,000, to remain available until expended.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out uranium enrichment facility decontamination and decommissioning, remedial actions, and other activities of title II of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, $625,000,000, to be derived from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, to remain available until expended, of which $32,959,000 shall be available in accordance with title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

SCIENCE

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for science activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and purchase of not more than 17 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one ambulance and one bus, $5,100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $181,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 51, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an important amendment that ensures that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is appropriately funded to meet its core mission. The NRC's work is vital to the energy picture of our Nation, and safety remains and always will be the number one priority.

The NRC is funded in two ways: 10 percent of its budget comes from appropriated funds from the taxpayers; and, secondly, 90 percent of the fees are collected from the nuclear industry.

While I am a strong supporter of nuclear power and safety, the NRC budget has grown dramatically in the last decade from $669 million per year in 2005 to the current level of over $1 billion this year. Herein lies the problem.

This chart lays out the picture that we face today with the NRC. Under the NRC's 2005 budget, there were 3,108 employees responsible for oversight on 104 reactors and the review of 1,500 licensing actions. In their fiscal year 2016 budget request of $1.032 billion, the NRC called for 3,754 employees to oversee 100 reactors and review 900 licensing actions.

In summary, the number of reactors has gone down by 4 percent; the number of licensing actions has gone down by 40 percent; the number of employees has gone up by 21 percent, and the budget has grown by 54 percent.

Madam Chair, only in Washington does the staff and the cost grow while the workload goes down. The historical increases in both funding and staff resources occurred in anticipation of new reactors being built under a nuclear renaissance for our country.

Unfortunately, due to increasing bureaucratic red tape and other market conditions, the work never materialized; thus, a shrinking nuclear industry has faced an ever-growing regulator over the past 10 years. Only in Washington, as I said before, does the bureaucracy grow while the workload shrinks.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission even admits that it needs to downsize. In its February 2015 report entitled, ''Project Aim 2020,'' they said the same thing. Additionally, the NRC has 60 rulemakings underway, and they are collecting additional fees from existing reactors to make up for lost licensing revenue. These fees are ultimately paid by hard-working American families in their electricity bills.

My amendment is simple. It reduces funding by $25 million, or about 2.5 percent, and would right-size the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to meet its core mission and safely regulate our existing nuclear fleet.

The industry share of support, or 90 percent of that, would be reduced by $22.5 million, and the Federal share of $2.5 would be redirected to basic research in DOE's Office of Science in order to develop future American energy solutions.

Madam Chair, in the last few minutes, I have had the opportunity to have great discussions with Chairman SIMPSON, and I am confident that he is aware of this issue and has taken steps to do this. He said he would work with me in the future to continue addressing this issue. I am raising this today, but I will be withdrawing my amendment.

I would like to thank Chairman SIMPSON for his efforts to address this issue and for agreeing to work with me on the issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to thank the gentleman for being dogged on this issue. We share his concern. We had a great hearing with all the commissioners of the NRC. They also understand this concern. It was the Aim Project 2020 that they put together that realized that they have too many staff and they need to reduce it. They want to do it in a responsible way.

In the full committee, we adopted an amendment to reduce their budget by $25 million. That is in addition to the fact that they had carryover fund that they could have spent last year that they won't have available this year.

Their budget is going down; whether it is the right amount or not, we don't know yet, but we are going to keep on this because we want them to reestablish their credibility in the world. They need to do that because they are a regulatory agency that is very important, and they do incredibly important work.

We are going to be holding hearings again on this next year when we do their budget to make sure they are following through on their commitment to reduce their size and scope, particularly the rulemaking authority that they have got out there. Many people believe they are writing far too many rules, and some believe it is because they have too many employees.

I appreciate the gentleman offering this amendment and the discussion and offering to withdraw the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would just say to the offerer of the amendment from Texas that I come from a part of the country where the Nuclear Regulatory Commission did not do its job for a long time.

I appreciate what you are attempting to do, and all I would say is, coming from a region where we have serious infractions that put human life at risk more than once, as you look at that budget and try to improve it, do not assume whatever levels of regulation existed in fact were appropriate because, in many cases, they were shortchanged and inadequate.

As you move forward in this important arena, I would urge you to look at the places in the country where mistakes happened and figure out why and then direct resources to where they are most important in this very important technology.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROKITA) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $239,749,000)''.

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $239,749,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to address an imbalance in our efforts to promote the long-term economic security interests of the United States.

This appropriations bill would underfund the Office of Science by almost $240 million below the President's request for the next fiscal year. My amendment would correct this by bringing the Office of Science account up to the President's request level.

Investments in the DOE Office of Science and its laboratories have supported American innovation and discovery science at the forefront of the physical sciences and engineering.

It is impossible and unwise to ignore the value of our national labs. They have helped answer fundamental questions on how the universe works, supported breakthroughs in fields as diverse as medicine and astronomy and

developments in industry that drive our economy.

Investments in our labs have led to the construction of accelerators and detectors that enable our scientists to discover new particles, including quarks and the Higgs boson, to help explain the nature of the universe in matter, energy, space, and time. Physicists have used their fundamental research to develop new technologies, including the PET scan, which is used every day to treat patients diagnosed with cancerous tumors.

The Office of Science has also supported the training of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers for more than 60 years. We need to maintain a competitive advantage now more than ever.

While the U.S. is reducing investments in Federal R&D, Europe and Asia have been increasing investments. In 1968, we spent 9.1 percent of the budget on research and development. Today, we are spending only 3.6 percent. If this trend continues, it won't be long before China's investments in R&D will far outpace our own.

The Office of Science is not only an important investment in our future, it is a valuable investment in our economy. Our national labs and the major user facilities housed at those labs are some of the greatest tools we have to offer researchers and industry. They are also important contractors to the local economy. The economic impacts of Argonne and Fermilab in Illinois are estimated to be more than $1.3 billion annually.

Those who seek to underfund and eliminate Federal programs often say that the private sector can do it better, but, when it comes to fundamental scientific research, that simply is not an option. The Office of Science is responsible for building and maintaining research facilities, which many private companies rely on but are far too big for any single business or university to develop.

These user facilities, such as the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory, are a critical research tool to academics and industry alike. For example, Eli Lilly conducts nearly half of the research in their drug discovery portfolio at the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne, but the funding levels in this bill will threaten the Advanced Photon Source and other critical projects.

At a time of ongoing economic stress, we must continue to develop the next generation of the American technical workforce. As other world powers are growing and challenging our position as the global leader in science and innovation, we cannot let the number of American scientists and researchers or the quality of their research facilities diminish. Bringing the Office of Science budget up to the President's request is crucial to maintaining that quality.

I would also like to briefly discuss the offset, which is the NNSA weapons activities account. It is important for us to recognize that we need to strike the right balance between defending our country today and investing in scientific research for the future.

□ 1545

I would argue that maintaining an advantage as the global leader in science and technology makes us much more secure than amassing and maintaining excessive numbers of nuclear weapons.

Madam Chairman, I rise today because we must continue to invest in American innovation and fully fund the research and development conducted through the DOE Office of Science.

I understand that the majority party has the power to block that funding and that there will be a point of order pending against this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97–425), including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be made available to affected units of local government, as defined in section 2(31) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101(31)), to support the Yucca Mountain geologic repository, as authorized by such Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $150,000,000)''.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $150,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I come to the floor today on behalf of the people of Nevada to ask my colleagues to reject the failed policies of the past and concentrate our efforts on real solutions to the Nation's energy challenges.

The bill before us appropriates $150 million for the failed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste project. Taxpayer-funded junkets and photo ops cannot change the fact that this project has never been based on sound science but, instead, stems from targeted politics.

After decades squandered and $15 billion wasted, we are no closer to a solution than when President Reagan signed the ''Screw Nevada'' bill in 1988. Yet, today, the House is set to consider legislation that will waste millions more on this failed project.

Now, I have heard my colleagues say this is the law of the land. Well, the ACA is the law of the land, and that hasn't stopped them from trying to overturn it 57 times. Furthermore, it appears that although this is the so-called law of the land, the interpretation of that law is pretty flexible.

I want to bring my colleagues' attention to a particular line in this bill that appropriates $5 million for units of local government to support Yucca Mountain. This simply creates a slush fund to pay off local governments in return for their support of this failed project.

I don't anticipate that many of my colleagues are as familiar with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act as we are in Nevada, but the law clearly states that any benefits that the Federal Government may appropriate can only be provided through mutual agreement between the Federal Government and the State. Last time I checked, Republican Governor Brian Sandoval, not the House Appropriations Committee, is the chief executive of the State of Nevada, and he strongly opposes Yucca Mountain.

Madam Chairman, I will submit for the RECORD an op-ed written by Governor Sandoval and former Governor Richard Bryan, titled ''Yucca Mountain: Unsafe site won't ever be safe for nuclear waste.''

[Special to the Review-Journal, Apr. 12, 2015]

YUCCA MOUNTAIN: UNSAFE SITE WON'T EVER BE SAFE FOR NUCLEAR WASTE

(By Brian Sandoval and Richard Bryan)

Nevada Rep. Cresent Hardy, who joined a pro-Yucca Mountain congressional site visit this past week, recently asked the question, ''Is there a scenario in which Nevadans would actually welcome nuclear waste storage at Yucca Mountain?'' (''Time for Nevada to talk Yucca Mountain,'' March 22 Review-Journal).

The answer to that question is an emphatic ''no'' for one simple yet unavoidable reason: Because Yucca Mountain is an unsafe place for storing or disposing deadly nuclear waste and was selected for purely political reasons having nothing to do with science or suitability. There is nothing for state officials to negotiate. In fact, our leaders would be remiss in their duty to protect the public and the environment to entertain the notion that any amount of dollars could possibly compensate for likely grievous and lethal harm from siting a facility in such an unsafe location as Yucca Mountain.

From day one, science with respect to Yucca Mountain has taken a back seat to Washington, D.C., power politics.

In 1987, Congress ignored science completely and named Yucca Mountain as the

only site to be studied as a potential repository in spite of its known serious flaws. Yucca was picked not because it was the best site or even a safe one. It was chosen solely because Nevada was the most politically vulnerable state at the time. Sites in Texas, Louisiana, Washington, and other states were dismissed out of hand because their states were protected by powerful Washington, D.C., politicians.

As site characterization at Yucca progressed, every time the science showed the site to be seriously flawed, the Energy Department merely invented another engineering fix—like the metal waste packages that will have to remain intact for 10,000 years or more, even though they've never been built or tested; more than 11,000 titanium drip shields that must be placed over the ''corrosion-resistant'' waste packages (DOE does not plan to install them for 100 years or more) in order to meet the radiation exposure criteria; and manipulating the site's boundaries so the aquifer below Yucca can be used to ''dilute'' the radiation that will inevitably escape from the repository.

And when even these ''fixes'' were not enough, the Energy Department simply abandoned its own siting criteria containing specific qualifying and disqualifying conditions (that Yucca couldn't meet) and created a black box-like assessment tool (called Total System Performance Assessment, or TSPA) that allows the site's many flaws to be camouflaged and rendered insignificant.

The way to fix the nuclear waste disposal problem is not to keep beating the dead horse that is Yucca Mountain, as Rep. John Shimkus, R-Ill., appeared to be doing with the promotional tour of the shut-down Yucca Mountain site last week. A more constructive and fruitful approach would be to move forward with new initiatives that rely on real science to identify safe and suitable storage and disposal sites and require states and local governments to give their consent to any future nuclear waste siting efforts.

Brian Sandoval, a Republican, is governor of Nevada. Richard Bryan, a Democrat, is a former Nevada governor and U.S. senator, and chairman of the Nevada Commission on Nuclear Projects.

Ms. TITUS. Also, the committee's report language cites that this hush money is provided for local governments that give ''formal consent.'' This raises yet another question about the intent of this section. The law does not outline any process for giving formal consent, so how would the newly bribed localities be able to provide that consent?

If you are looking for consent, I urge you to support H.R. 1364, the Nuclear Waste Informed Consent Act, which I introduced, along with my colleague Congressman HECK and Senators REID and HELLER. This bipartisan legislation sets out a formal consent process so that Nevada or Texas or New Mexico or any other State and affected local community or tribe that chooses to host a nuclear waste depository will have a process by which it can give consent for siting by the Federal Government. No community should have to face what we in Nevada have faced for the last few decades of having this pushed down our throat.

Madam Chairman, I will also submit for the RECORD two articles outlining nuclear waste storage proposals that are supported in the State of Texas and the State of New Mexico.

[West Texas Radio, Feb. 13, 2015]

COMPANY WANTS TO EXPAND NUCLEAR WASTE SITE IN TEXAS

(By Travis Bubenik)

A Dallas-based company is looking to expand its nuclear waste site in rural West Texas into a longer-term storage site for high-level radioactive waste.

Waste Control Specialists (WCS) is asking the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission to approve a new license to expand its above-ground storage facility in Andrews County to allow more radioactive types of waste.

The company already stores ''low level'' waste—contaminated rags, tools and other equipment that have come mostly from the national nuclear research lab in Los Alamos, New Mexico.

The site also served as a home for waste that was supposed to wind up at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico, until that site was shuttered after a leak contaminated workers there about a year ago.

WCS now wants to store used fuel rods from nuclear power plants across the country—a more radioactive form of waste.

In theory, the waste would stay in West Texas temporarily—until the federal government comes up with a long-term disposal plan—but it could be decades before that happens.

''Even though it is called an interim storage facility, that storage period is a long time,'' says WCS President Rod Baltzer. ''We think that's somewhere between 60 to 100 years.''

Baltzer was in Washington, D.C. Monday talking to reporters about the company's push to expand the facility.

''This wasn't initially something we intended to do when we got out there, but we've been out there a long time, and times have changed,'' he says.

Those changes have riled some environmentalists in Texas.

The Sierra Club has criticized the company for its track record of slowly expanding its intentions for the West Texas site. The environmental group says the company's misled lawmakers and the public as it's sought to store more radioactive types of waste through the years.

Cyrus Reed, Conservation Director for the Sierra Club's Lone Star Chapter, says he's watched with concern while the company's plan for the site grew from storing low level waste to larger quantities of the same waste.

''Now it turns out we are to become the nation's dumping ground for all manner of dangerous highly toxic radioactive waste,'' he says.

WCS maintains it can store the waste safely, and that the community in Andrews County has welcomed the idea.

Baltzer says the company is fulfilling the Obama Administration's call in 2013 for a ''consent-based'' approach to transporting, storing and disposing of the nation's nuclear waste.

That strategy instructs the government to seek out communities willing to house nuclear waste ''in expectation of the economy activity that would result from the siting, construction and operation of such a facility in their communities.''

For now, Andrews County appears to be that kind of place. County Commissioners recently passed a resolution enthusiastically backing the plan.

If the Nuclear Regulatory Commission gives WCS the green light, the company says construction on the expanded facility could be complete by the end of 2020.

[From the Associated Press, Apr. 30, 2015]

NEW MEXICO JOINS RACE TO BUILD STORAGE FOR NUCLEAR WASTE

(By Susan Montoya Bryan)

Two rural New Mexico counties announced Wednesday they're partnering with an international firm in the race to build an interim storage facility to house spent nuclear fuel that has been piling up at reactors around the nation.

Officials from Lea and Eddy counties and Holtec International gathered at the National Museum of Nuclear Science and History in Albuquerque to outline their plans.

John Heaton, a former state lawmaker and chairman of the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance, a consortium of city and county governments, said there's no better place in the U.S. than southeastern New Mexico to build such a facility since the region is already home to a multibillion-dollar uranium enrichment plant and the federal government's only underground nuclear waste repository.

Heaton acknowledged that in vetting the project, safety was the top priority.

The region is still rebounding from the indefinite closure of the government's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, where a chemical reaction inside a drum of waste resulted in a radiation release in February 2014. The U.S. Department of Energy has said it will take years and more than a half-billion dollars before the repository resumes full operations.

The proposed storage facility would be designed to handle spent nuclear fuel from power plants, not the kind of defense-related waste that was shipped to WIPP.

Holtec CEO and President Kris Singh said his company has spent more than a decade developing technology to ensure the safe storage of spent fuel inside triple-lined stainless steel casks that are capable of enduring the force of a freight train collision or an earthquake.

''We became convinced that this is an extraordinary, safe process that needs to occur in this country,'' Heaton said.

Federal officials acknowledged that the future of nuclear energy in the U.S. depends on the ability to manage and dispose of used nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

In March, the DOE announced it would begin siting interim storage sites as part of its plan to spur the use of nuclear power and develop the transportation and storage infrastructure needed to manage the waste.

Some members of Congress have shown renewed interested in the mothballed Yucca Mountain project in Nevada.

In West Texas, Waste Control Specialists announced plans earlier this year to build a temporary storage facility that would eventually be capable of holding up to 40,000 metric tons.

Yucca Mountain was designed with a cap of 70,000 metric tons. The proposed facility in southeastern New Mexico would hold even more.

The agreement between Holtec and the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance addresses the design, licensing, construction and operation of an underground storage site on 32 acres between the communities of Carlsbad and Hobbs.

Holtec officials say the company expects to apply for a permit from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission within a year. State permits would also be required. Licensing could take three years.

''It's a tough road to get any nuclear project off the ground, otherwise we would have repositories and interim storage facilities all over the country,'' Heaton said. ''We have great partners and the will to get it done.''

Gov. Susana Martinez weighed in earlier this month. She sent a letter to Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz as a preliminary endorsement of the proposal.

Watchdogs have raised concerns, pointing to transportation issues and the possibility that New Mexico could become a permanent repository for such waste. Supporters said Wednesday they would have to work with communities along the transportation routes, just as they did when setting up the network for shipping waste to WIPP.

Holtec officials were reluctant to put a price tag on the venture, but Heaton said it could involve anywhere from $200 million to $400 million in capital costs.

The revenue the storage facility could bring in for the counties and the state would ultimately depend on how big of a share of the market Holtec could attract, Singh said.

Ms. TITUS. So I would say, Madam Chairman, instead of wasting tens of millions of dollars more on an unworkable solution, let's, instead, meet our fiduciary obligations to future generations. At the same time, let us commit to moving forward on a new policy to address the Nation's nuclear waste, one that relies on a consent-based system that doesn't force waste on communities like mine, which is the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and send a message that Congress will not continue to move backwards but will take serious action to address our Nation's nuclear waste policy.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I understand the lady's passion for this, but some of the rhetoric, quite frankly, isn't accurate.

When she calls it a failed policy, it is only a failed policy politically because this administration came into office on a promise of not doing Yucca Mountain because they needed electoral votes from the State of Nevada. That is the reality.

The fact is we have spent over $15 billion on this project, and the fact is it is the law of the land. Until you change that law of the land, it remains the law of the land.

Whether it is safe or not, I don't know. I am not a scientist. But what I do know is there has been 52—I think it is 52—National Academy of Sciences studies on all sorts of aspects. This is the most studied piece of earth on the Earth. In fact, I have suggested during a hearing with the Department that if we ultimately decide not to do Yucca Mountain, they shouldn't close that down because they are going to need a space that big to put all the papers from the studies that we have done on Yucca Mountain. That is the reality.

I think we all understand my colleague's opposition to Yucca Mountain. I don't blame her. I know she is from Nevada. But I can't support this amendment. This amendment would eliminate $150 million in the bill for the Department of Energy to reorganize its adjudicatory response team and get the Yucca Mountain licensing process back up and running. Otherwise, more than $15 billion which has been spent on this program will truly be wasted.

Once that application is finished, all Members of this body, all Members of this body and the Senate will have the opportunity to decide whether to move forward, to construct and use the facility. But killing the process at this point, I think, would be very shortsighted. I therefore urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by my colleague, but he does not address the points I make about how this amendment looks at provisions of the bill that are contrary to the new proposal.

I urge a ''no'' vote. There is no point in throwing good money after bad. American taxpayers deserve a wiser expenditure of their dollars. Nevadans deserve to be heard on this issue, and those areas that want to have a site in their State or their community deserve a chance to be considered.

I thank you, and I urge, strongly, a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), the vice chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee and the chairman for acting to impose greater discipline on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

We know that the future of nuclear power in the United States depends on having a credible nuclear safety regulator and depends on the industry continuing to perform at a high level of safety. We feel strongly that the agency must continue its core mission of protecting the public health and safety, but the NRC must do so in a manner that does not add to the economic headwinds that the industry faces.

Thanks to the scientific breakthroughs and renewed interest in nuclear energy, our Nation has an incredible opportunity to develop new sources of power that can provide affordable and reliable energy. I hope that the NRC can work with industry to seize these opportunities, while fulfilling its mission to ensure public safety.

I support the committee's direction to require the NRC's rulemaking process to be commission-driven in order to provide greater discipline, transparency, efficiency, and accountability.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out the activities authorized by section 5012 of the America COMPETES Act (Public Law 110–69), $280,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount $28,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment on behalf of Mr. SCHIFF of California and Mr. POLIS of Colorado, which would increase funding for the Advanced Research Project Agency-Energy, also known as ARPA-E. Mr. SCHIFF offered this same exact amendment last year, and it passed the House with bipartisan support. I hope the House will vote in support of it again.

Like the House's mark last year, the underlying bill this year provides $280 million for ARPA-E, which is $45 million below the President's request. This amendment would increase funding for ARPA-E by $20 million, with the offset taken from the Department administration.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for providing at least level funding for ARPA-E this year, which is a substantial improvement from last year, which cut the program by as much as 80 percent over previous years.

However, I think that rather than providing flat funding, we should be stepping up our commitment to a potentially game-changing research program, and that is exactly what this amendment does.

This is a very modest investment for an agency whose work is helping to reshape our economy. While the amendment would leave us still short of where the funding should be and where it is in the President's budget, passing it would send a strong signal that there is bipartisan support for this kind of research.

Started in 2009, ARPA-E is a revolutionary program that advances high-potential, high-impact energy technologies that are too early for private sector investment. ARPA-E projects have the potential to radically improve U.S. economic security, national security, and environmental well-being as well.

ARPA-E empowers America's energy researchers with funding, technical assistance, and market readiness. ARPA-E is modeled after the highly successful Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or DARPA, which has produced groundbreaking inventions for the Department of Defense and the Nation, perhaps most notably the Internet itself. A key element of both Agencies is that managers are limited to fixed terms, so new blood continuously revitalizes this research portfolio.

As we cut spending to return the budget to balance, we must not weaken those programs that are vital to our economic future and national security, and ARPA-E is such an agency. Even if we can't make the investment that the President has called for in his budget, let's be sure that we don't hinder an agency that is pointing the way to a more energy-secure future.

Energy is a national security issue; it is an economic imperative; it is a health concern; and it is an environmental necessity. Investing wisely in this type of research going on at ARPA-E is exactly the direction we should be going as a nation.

We want to lead the energy revolution. We don't want to see this advantage go to China or anywhere else in the world. If we are serious about staying at the forefront of the energy revolution, we must continue to fully invest in the kind of cutting-edge work that ARPA-E performs. By providing the funding I am recommending today, we will send a clear signal of the seriousness of our intent to remain world leaders in energy.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time reluctantly. I happen to be one who thinks the ARPA-E does some good work. My biggest problem is that, as I said last night on either the first or second amendment that was offered to this bill, they took money out of departmental administration to fund something, and then another one to take money out of departmental administration. So far we have taken out about $50 million out of a $245 million budget for the departmental administration.

It is easy to vote that way because who wants to pay for the administrative costs? Yet we are going to have to deal with that when we get into conference to make sure that they have adequate funding in the Department for the administrative work.

□ 1600

So at some point in time, I have to say I can't support continuing to take money out of the departmental administration in order to fund a variety of programs, even though some of them may be very worthwhile.

And while I, myself, am not opposed to ARPA-E and think they do some good work, the reality is, you have to balance this bill.

We have got ARPA-E down $266 million from what it was last year and substantially below what the President requested, but we had other priorities that we had to fund. And the other thing I had to consider is that the Science and Technology Committee—that is, the authorizing committee that does much of this work—has marked up a bill in their committee that substantially reduces the overall funding authorization for ARPA-E. So that causes me some concern.

While I may or may not agree with their markup—I don't know; we will see when that hits the floor—that is the reason that I am going to oppose this amendment.

Other than that, I understand what the gentleman is trying to do and the concern that many people have for the decrease in funding in ARPA-E.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE 17 INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Such sums as are derived from amounts received from borrowers pursuant to section 1702(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 under this heading in prior Acts, shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided*, That, for necessary administrative expenses to carry out this Loan Guarantee program, $42,000,000 is appropriated, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided further*, That $25,000,000 of the fees collected pursuant to section 1702(h) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account to cover administrative expenses and shall remain available until expended, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $17,000,000: *Provided further*, That fees collected under section 1702(h) in excess of the amount appropriated for administrative expenses shall not be available until appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department of Energy shall not subordinate any loan obligation to other financing in violation of section 1702 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 or subordinate any Guaranteed Obligation to any loan or other debt obligations in violation of section 609.10 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

For Department of Energy administrative expenses necessary in carrying out the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program, $6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), $247,420,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $30,000, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total $117,171,000 in fiscal year 2016 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95–238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $130,249,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $31,297,000 is for Energy Policy and Systems Analysis.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, let me begin by thanking Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for the work that they have done, a very challenging and popular appropriations when it comes to energy and water and also the issues of the environment.

I have a very simple amendment that reinforces our commitment to communities from rural America to urban America, from hamlets and villages to large urban centers. And it simply emphasizes a quality of life: for all Americans to have a good, clean environment; to reduce asthma in children; to help senior citizens; and to have a good quality of life in their sunset years, in their older homes, in older communities, of which I represent, is an important funding necessity for this Nation.

I want to emphasize the work that has been done and remind my colleagues—for those of us who had the privilege of being here—that President Clinton issued an executive order directing Federal agencies to address the disproportionately high and adverse human health environmental impacts on minority and low-income populations, which covered rural America, which oftentimes experienced the impact of the environment.

We have worked over the years to improve their quality of life, and today I ask that we continue to do so.

In particular, I want to refer to a project in Houston, Texas, called the CAS site. That site was attempted to be cleaned up. It is in an older neighborhood, Madam Chair. Senior citizens own their homes. They have been there for a long time.

There have been a lot of machinations about this entity that is espousing chemicals, leaking chemicals because it is old and closed down and abandoned. And we had to call upon the environmental justice sector in the Federal Government to provide the leverage to help these senior citizens, people who did not want to move from their homes.

I walked those streets, went into the backyards of senior citizens and saw the seepage coming out of the ground and, as well, coming in from the property on the back side.

Environmental justice is a good thing, and it is through those efforts that we are working with the EPA to give hope to these citizens that they can stay in their homes.

I live in the energy capital of the world. It is a job-creator. But on occasions, in the midst of our wetlands and our areas of pristine, if you will, environmental assets, we have some ups and downs.

Just recently, I flew over the Houston port at the time of a spillage that was impacting some of our most environmentally important areas, including wetlands and areas that are protected or are important to the environment and to the quality of life.

So I am asking that the Jackson Lee amendment be accepted for the importance of providing for the continued support of environmental justice and equality for areas that are both urban and rural.

Let me finish by making this statement, Madam Chair.

This is an important cause because, as we look at the funds that are dealing with environmental justice, they increase youth involvement through science, technology, engineering, and math. They also help to promote clean energy, weatherization, cleanup, asset revitalization, and they help my constituents and the constituents of so many in this body whose older neighborhoods are sometimes impacted by older entities that are left behind in the neighborhood where seniors continue to live. I want to be able to walk those neighborhoods and make sure that my seniors can stay in their homes—small frame homes—and make sure that as they stay in their frame homes, that they will have the quality of life that all of us would like.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member. This is a tough job to do. And I would like to emphasize the importance of the funding for environmental justice and helping to continue, if you will, to put focus and emphasis on quality of life for homeowners, seniors, and people living in rural America and urban America.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

My amendment increases funding for DOE departmental administration by $1,000,000 which should be used to enhance the Department's Environmental Justice Program activities.

Madam Chair, the Environmental Justice Program is an essential tool in the effort to improve the lives of low-income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

Twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing Federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

A healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth.

Maintaining funds for environmental justice that go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Minority-Serving Institutions, Tribal Colleges, and other organizations is imperative to protecting sustainability and growth of the community and environment.

The funding of these programs is vital to ensuring that minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environment and the continued preservation of their homes.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

IMPORTANCE OF DOE'S ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Funds that would be awarded to this important cause would increase youth involvement in STEM fields and also promote clean energy, weatherization, clean-up, and asset revitalization. These improvements would provide protection to our most vulnerable groups.

This program provides better access to technology for underserved communities. Together, the Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture have distributed over 5,000 computers to low-income populations.

The Community Leaders Institute is another vital component of the Environmental Justice Program. It ensures that those in leadership positions understand what is happening in their communities and can therefore make informed decisions in regards to their communities.

In addition to promoting environmental sustainability, CLI also brings important factors including public health and economic development into the discussion for community leaders.

The CLI program has been expanded to better serve Native Americans and Alaska Natives, which is a prime example of how various other minority groups can be assisted as well.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefited by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. The DOE also works to increase low-income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

Since 2002, the Tribal Energy Program has also funded 175 energy projects amounting to over $41.8 million in order to help tribes invest in renewable sources of energy.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

In fiscal year 2013, the environmental justice program was not funded.

For fiscal year 2016, we ask that money be appropriated for the continuation of this vital initiative.

We must help our low-income and minority communities and ensure equality for those who are most vulnerable in our country.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Jackson Lee Amendment for the Environmental Justice Program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $46,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $8,713,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $92,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BLACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 231, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 29, 2015, at page 5772.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking everyone involved in getting us to this moment, where we have an agreement between the House and the Senate Budget conferees on a joint balanced budget proposal before the Congress.

All members of our committee and the conference committee and their staffs should be commended for their hard work. And I want to commend specifically the staff directors on both sides of the aisle. Rick May on the Republican side and Tom Kahn on the Democratic side worked yeoman's service in making certain that their respective Members were prepared for the activity that we have gone through over the past 4 months.

We are set, Mr. Speaker, to adopt the first balanced budget of this kind in over a decade. That is important not only from an historical perspective but also for what it says about this Congress' commitment to doing the work that the American people sent us here to do, to get it done, to move forward with positive solutions for a healthier economy and a stronger, more secure nation.

□ 1615

What we have before us today, Mr. Speaker, is a budget that balances within 10 years without raising taxes and reduces spending over $5 trillion over that period of time, which will not only get Washington's fiscal house in order, but pave the way for stronger economic growth, more jobs, and more opportunity.

It invests in our Nation's priorities, ensures a strong national defense, and saves, strengthens, and protects important programs like Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I know our friends on the other side of the aisle, we will hear from them, and they may have a difference of opinion. If past is prologue, we are bound to hear from them a few items that they will talk about. They will say that our budget will, in their words, ''hurt the middle class.'' That statement bears no resemblance to reality, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, what is hurting the middle class right now are the policies of our Democrat friends and President Obama that they have put in place, policies that have led to the worst economic recovery in the modern era, stagnant wages and underwhelming growth in our economy. We just heard today, Mr. Speaker, that the economy grew in the first quarter by 0.2 percent. There is a reason for that.

What we need to do is to get the economy rolling. The best thing we can do for the middle class—for hard-working American families—is to get our economy turned around so more jobs are being created and more dreams are being realized.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. Our budget does just that through responsible reforms that make government more efficient, more effective, and more accountable by lifting the oppressive regulatory regime here in Washington off the backs of job creators and entrepreneurs and by fundamentally reforming our Tax Code so it is simpler, fairer, and American companies can better compete more effectively in the global economy.

By doing all of that, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that we will rein in deficits and lower government spending which will have a positive, long-term impact on the economy as well as the budget, benefits like increases in the pool of national savings and investment which would allow for more growth, job creation, and more economic security.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of attacking our efforts to save, strengthen, and protect programs like Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Why some folks here in Washington would be willing to let these programs go bankrupt is beyond me. Medicare and Social Security are going broke. That is not according to me. That is according to the trustees of the programs.

Medicaid is not working for patients or the doctors who would like to be able to serve them. The status quo is unsustainable, and doing nothing is indefensible. We can save these programs and improve them. We have to do so for the sake of their beneficiaries and for future generations, and our budget does just that.

Further, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned before, our budget prioritizes the safety and security of the American people, channeling important resources to our men and women in uniform. We do so in a responsible way, in a manner consistent with current law, and without allowing further across-the-board cuts in defense spending.

There are those who criticize how we do that, and I respect that there are differences of opinion on this, but, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we can all agree that, when we are faced with hugely complex national security threats and growing unrest around the world, what we need to do is to find a way to move forward to ensure that those protecting our lives and our freedom have the support and the training that they need.

I look forward to an open and honest debate about the vision we have put forward to get our Nation's fiscal house in order, to strengthen our Nation's defenses, to protect our most vulnerable citizens, and to ensure a healthier economy for all Americans because that is exactly what this budget agreement does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong opposition to this budget conference report.

I do agree with the gentleman on one issue, which is that the staff of the Budget Committee on both sides, Republican and Democrat, have worked very hard; but, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the product that is brought before us today is the wrong direction for America.

We began with a House budget that was wrong for America, and we went to conference with a Senate budget that was wrong for America. It is not surprising, but it is still disappointing, that we come to the floor today with a budget that is wrong for America.

Why do I say that? We are all entitled to our opinions, but we don't get to make up our own facts. The reality is, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the folks who are referees in this House, in this Congress, where people have competing opinions, they have said that this Republican budget will slow down the economy over the next couple of years.

It is right here on page 3 of their report. Real GNP, real economic growth per person, would be lowered by as much as 0.6 percent under the specified paths than under the baseline 2016 to 2018 CBO budget estimates.

Let's translate that. What that means is that, compared to what would happen in the economy without the Republican budget—if we didn't have this—this will make things worse. This will slow down economic growth. This means less economic growth per person in the United States of America. That is not me saying it, that is the nonpartisan budget experts saying it. So it is going to slow down economic growth, although we have good news, some good news in the economy, right. I mean, we have seen month after month now of positive economic growth. We would like to see the economy grow faster, and we would like to see it grow stronger, but we have seen over 61 consecutive months of positive economic growth. Why in the world would we want a budget that over the next couple of years slows down that economic growth, according to the Congressional Budget Office?

But it gets worse than that because one of the chronic problems we have seen in our economy, Mr. Speaker, over the last many years—not just 2 or 3 or 4, but over decades—is this phenomenon where Americans are working harder than ever and they are more productive than ever, but their paychecks are flat. Their take-home pay is flat.

You have rising worker productivity on the one hand; people are working harder than ever, but it is not translating into higher wages and benefits.

Back about 30 or 40 years ago—we had a chart with rising worker productivity—guess what else was rising with it? It was worker wages. But, over the last 30 years, we have seen people working harder than ever, and productivity has gone up, but wages for most Americans have been pretty flat in real terms.

The gain of that increased worker productivity has flowed dramatically and overwhelmingly to folks at the very top end of the economic ladder, and God bless them. But why would we want to bring a budget to the floor of the House that squeezes even tighter and harder the people who are working hard every day and not seeing their paychecks go up?

How does their budget make life harder for most Americans? First of all, Mr. Speaker, it increases taxes on working families. They get rid of the bump up in the Child Tax Credit. They get rid of the strengthening of the Earned Income Tax Credit.

They eliminate entirely the college deduction that helps families afford college in this era of high tuition rates; they get rid of that. They eliminate the Affordable Care Act tax credits, meaning millions of Americans will no longer be able to access affordable care.

Students, they actually start charging students higher interest rates on their loans. Right now, a student in college doesn't have to pay interest on their loan while they are in college. Our Republican colleagues apparently think that $1 trillion of student debt is not enough. They want to charge them more. It is a fact under this budget.

Seniors, they want to reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole. It is not a secret. They have said they will do this. As a result, seniors with high prescription drug costs on Medicare will be paying lots more, and they will be paying higher copays for preventative health care under this Republican budget.

Mr. Speaker, working families, students, and seniors are all squeezed even tighter.

I will tell you who is not squeezed at all under this budget, the folks at the very top. This budget green-lights the Romney-Ryan tax plan. What does that plan propose? Let's cut the top tax rate for millionaires by one-third—by one-third. Let's take it down from 39 percent to the 28, 25 percent range. That is who gets a big break in their tax rates.

While they are cutting tax rates for folks at the very top, what else are they cutting? They are cutting our investment in our kids' education. They are cutting our investment in science and research at places like NIH. They are cutting our investment in modernizing our infrastructure which has helped power our economy.

Why? It is because they are cutting the portion of the budget we use to make those investments by 40 percent below the lowest level as a share of the economy since we have been keeping records in the 1950s. That is a disinvestment in America, so they are cutting those investments.

I will tell you what they don't cut, Mr. Speaker. They don't cut one special interest tax break to help reduce the deficit, not one penny. Apparently, that corporate jet tax deduction? Oh, they really need it. Apparently, that special tax rate for hedge fund managers? They really need it because they don't want to eliminate any of those in order to reduce the deficit. They do apparently want to increase taxes on working families and cut our investment in education.

Here is the sad part about it, Mr. Speaker. After all that, it still doesn't balance, not by a long shot. Here is the chart. I'm sorry we have to go through this math so many times, but I will tell you that the current chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator ENZI, before he became chairman, talked about this budget accounting scam that is at the heart of the Republican budget and at the heart of the claim that they have a balanced budget because, you see, they claim that, at the end of the 10-year window, they are $33 billion in balance, but they also say they are eliminating the Affordable Care Act.

Guess what, the budget relies on the same level of revenue as the Affordable Care Act. If you get rid of the Affordable Care Act in those revenues, you are not close to balance.

I will tell you what else it doesn't take into account, the tax provisions. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that we had on this floor, just about 10 days ago, a Republican proposal to eliminate the estate tax for estates over $10 million.

That was the overwhelming economic priority of our Republican colleagues, to get rid of the estate tax for estates over $10 million, about 5,500 people in this country per year. You can put more people on a big cruise ship. That added about $260 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

Guess what, it wasn't accounted for in the Republican budget. If you did account for that in the other tax cut measures for special interests that are being brought to the floor, it is even further out of balance, so this is just Alice in Wonderland accounting.

Mr. Speaker, we really should be going back to the drawing board. We haven't even talked about the whole sort of shell game being played with the OCO account, which is already having an impact on appropriations bills here in the House because our Republican colleagues are doing this year the exact opposite of what they said we should do just last year. Read the Republican's own budget conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close with respect to veterans because the reality

is that the first bill coming to the floor based on this budget conference report for veterans and military construction, the Veterans of Foreign Wars says it is bad for veterans.

It has a lower amount for our veterans than in the President's proposal. We believe we should be true to the values and priorities of this country, and we don't think that means giving folks at the very top, millionaires, another cut in their tax rate while disinvesting in the rest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I must strongly oppose this Republican conference committee report because it really does take America down the wrong path, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the distinguished vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

□ 1630

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman PRICE for his extraordinary leadership throughout this entire process. And I want to thank my fellow conferees for their hard work, many hours over many days, to get us to where we are today and, of course, my fellow Budget Committee members, both Republican and Democrat, for the robust discussion, debate, spirit, as it was sometimes. The process worked. We did go late into the night a few times. But we came out of those late nights, those long hours, with the product here today.

The product here today, unfortunately, is a more rare product than it should be. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since 2001, 14 years, we have a balanced joint budget resolution, bicameral.

As a relatively new person to this Chamber, in my fifth year, and you think about why that is the case, you, unfortunately, in my opinion, have to conclude it is because most of the time we are talking about the demagoguery, like some of which we just heard, half the story, so to speak, about what is really going on here. If we had full discussions about where this country really needs to go, where this Federal Government needs to go in terms of improving its debt and deficit picture, the whole budget picture, you would really see that the economy in this country could be better off with those honest, full discussions.

This budget, for example, does balance in less than 10 years without raising taxes—without raising taxes. The gentleman very much knows that the Budget Committee doesn't write tax prescriptions; it is the Ways and Means Committee. We say in our budget document that the Ways and Means Committee should get on with the business of tax reform.

What the Congressional Budget Office that the gentleman mentioned says is that over the 10-year window of this budget agreement, the economy will grow $400 billion. That is hardly a contraction. $400 billion, at least to some of us, is a lot of money, and that is great for economic growth. This budget agreement does that.

Do you see what I mean, Mr. Speaker, by ''the whole story''?

It also ensures a strong national defense, making sure that our troops have the money they need, but remain accountable to the money that is given. It gives us a chance to repeal in full, taxes and all, ObamaCare, and allows us a chance to start over with patient-centered health reform. It hasn't been done. We haven't had that chance in a long time. ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, is an expensive proposition, and we are seeing more and more proof of that every day.

It strengthens Medicare in the future without affecting those in or near retirement now. This is important. Some of us, for my friends on the conservative side, have looked at the press reports and found, hey, we have given up on Medicare. Absolutely not; nor for Social Security.

These are the drivers of our debt, Mr. Speaker, and our budget language remains intact. The fact of the matter is this conference committee report is numerically driven, not policy driven.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROKITA. And for everyone, this is what is driving our debt. These pieces of the pie. They are all attached together, whether it is Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid, or the interest we owe ourselves and others for the amount of money we are borrowing.

Our ideas for correcting this debt, the drivers of our debt, are still in place. I call upon the authorizing committees, whether it be Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, or any other committee, to start working on reforming this debt.

This budget agreement, Mr. Speaker, gives us the opportunity, finally, after 14 years, to start down that road. This is not a conclusion; this is a beginning, and I ask my Democratic friends to join us down that road.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would actually encourage all those authorizing committees to get to work trying to implement this budget so the American people can see just how bad it is. I would be curious as to whether they are actually going to do it in the next couple of months.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

I rise in strong opposition to this budget.

There is football and then there is fantasy football. Mr. Ranking Member, you were being very charitable when you used the word ''scam.'' This is a real lemon by any stretch—and you don't have to use your imagination.

This is a formula for another 2007–2008. This will be a duplication. And the pain caused by that decade, that 8 years of the 21st century, the budgets from 2001–2008 when we cut taxes in 2001 and we cut taxes in 2003, and then 2007 and 2008 the world fell apart. Why? An enormous loss of jobs every month. Look at the numbers. You want to hold up charts, hold them up.

This agreement uses gimmicks to balance the budget and does so on the backs of the poor and the middle class and senior citizens. It imposes its cuts on programs that assist low- and modest-income Americans even though they constitute—those programs—less than one-fourth of the Federal spending.

The Republican plan would cause tens of millions of people to become uninsured or underinsured. I know how you are careful to even talk about that. In other words, if we are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, make sure you put in a sentence about what we need to do about those people who have preconditions.

Phony, phony, phony. You said it; we didn't.

Slashing funding for education, for research, for infrastructure. Wait until the bridges fall down and more people fall into the water. Cuts to nutrition, cuts to health will only increase poverty. Your claims that this budget balances is a total farce—not a semi-farce, a total farce.

Congressman VAN HOLLEN produced a very strong, fair budget. It was a strong budget. It was dismissed. But I like it. I like it. Through the Chair to my ranking member, I like it when we are seen as irrelevant. We do our best work.

So that is what you have got in front of you. This budget, while calling for a complete and total repeal of the Affordable Care Act, continues to assume the law's $2 trillion revenue. That is not a farce. That is fantasy football. How could you do that? The bill stinks, but we will use the money in the bill. Explain that one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. To me, when we get the taxes, this budget assumes that revenues remained unchanged from our current law. Someone needs to have a conversation with the chairman of Ways and Means, because he seems to be unaware. In fact, he stated explicitly that he doesn't think we should be

using the current law baseline. He said it; I didn't.

Two weeks ago, this same majority—and I end on this point, Mr. Speaker—we passed $294.8 billion in unpaid-for tax breaks for Paris Hilton and Ivanka Trump and the rest of that crowd and their fortune enough to be left a nice inheritance. Much of that money has never been taxed in the first place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I said when we talked about this the first time around, folks across this land, if they turn on the television and they take a look, you have got one parent yelling at the other: Hide the dog and the cat and the kids, sweetheart, they are talking about the budget.

The distortion and the misrepresentation that is coming from the other side, Mr. Speaker, it really is absolutely phenomenal.

I am pleased to hear that the gentleman likes their budget, and I commend him for liking their budget; but let me just state for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, that neither their budget nor the President's budget ever, ever, ever gets to balance. If the American people can't live on borrowed money, their Federal Government ought not do so either.

Our budget gets to balance within a 10-year period of time. It does so without raising taxes. That is why the American people are going to appreciate the work that is being done right here.

I am very, very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), an incredibly productive member of our committee, and a member of the conference committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a year makes. Since I came to Congress in 2011, my House Republican colleagues and I worked every year to pass a responsible, timely budget that confronts our runaway spending in Washington; but meanwhile, the Senate Democrats refused to pass a budget during 4 of the last 5 years. That ends now.

This year, our new American Congress worked to pass a balanced budget in both the House and the Senate and to then unify our budgets through regular order. I had the distinct privilege of serving on the budget conference committee, and I am pleased with the final product that we were able to deliver. This will mark the first balanced budget, joint budget resolution, since 2002, and we did it without raising taxes.

But we didn't stop there. This budget would also erase the President's disastrous healthcare law, allowing us to start over on reforms that put patients and their doctors in charge, not Washington bureaucrats. And we used the critical reconciliation tool to help ensure an ObamaCare repeal bill that reaches the President's desk so that we can put him on record, forcing him to make a decision and defend that to the American people.

What is more, this plan supports the growth of 1.2 million jobs over the next decade, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said many times before, budgets aren't just a series of numbers; they are a statement of our values. I believe the priorities found in this budget are shared by my constituents and reflect the values that we can all be proud of.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We keep hearing this mathematical fantasy that somehow the Republican budget balances.

I just want to turn to an authority. He is the now-chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. Here is what he said last year:

> One of the problems I have had with budgets that I have looked at is that they use a lot of gimmicks. Now, when there was an anticipation that ObamaCare would go away, and that all of that money would still be there, that's not realistic. I'd like to see us get to a real accounting with the budget.

Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker; the Affordable Care Act is still here, the revenue is still here, and the Republican budget assumes that revenue for the purpose of achieving balance at the same time they are getting rid of the Affordable Care Act. That leaves people's heads spinning and it means the budget is not in balance.

I am now happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. VAN HOLLEN yielding.

We are talking a lot about gimmicks. Even the conservative Financial Times said the Republicans had to resort to smoke and mirrors to make this budget balance. But I want to talk about one of the other tricks that is used.

What the Republicans' budget uses is they do something called dynamic scoring, which basically allows you to project all sorts of, probably, at least, speculative growth based on policies that they would anticipate doing.

Now, here is a real-world example of that. This weekend is the Kentucky Derby. It would be as if somebody went out and said: I am going to buy a 2-year-old for $2 million. And then that 2-year-old I am sure is going to win the Kentucky Derby, so I am going to use that $3 million purse that that horse is certainly going to win next year, and I am going to plug that into my budget so my budget comes out ahead.

Yes, it could happen, but there is no evidence to believe it will happen. That is one of the ways that this budget reaches so-called balance.

There are other macroeconomic effects which we ought to consider, however. As we have mentioned several times, this budget would direct the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

The Deloitte professional services firm just did an audit of Kentucky's experience over the last 14 months, 15 months, with the Affordable Care Act. Here is what it said would happen in Kentucky over the next 6 years.

□ 1645

$30 billion in increased economic activity, 44,000 new jobs, and a positive impact on the Kentucky State budget of $850 million—that is what would be eliminated from Kentucky. That is another effect of the Republican budget. Think about what it might do in other States—California, New York, Florida. For it to have that much impact in a State like Kentucky, the national effect would be very consequential.

Aside from all of the truly damaging ways in which this budget affects our economy and our citizens, we have to take note of the fact that there are impacts beyond just the Federal budget, and this budget would be a disaster for the American economy and the American people. I urge its defeat.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a productive and delightful member of our Budget Committee and a freshman member of our conference.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. I thank the chairman for his kind words and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited to say that, for the first time in many years, the House and Senate will adopt a unified resolution for a balanced budget. The 2016 Federal budget resolution will set the guardrails for Federal spending, and it is a step in the right direction for our country.

Families in my home State of Michigan and across the country tighten their belts when there is a change in household income or expenses, and Washington needs to do the same. The 2016 budget resolution does not raise taxes on hard-working Americans. It keeps the promises that have been made to seniors while slowing the soaring national debt. Leaving less debt to our children is vital, and if we fail to act, debt payments will crowd out spending for the priorities of the American people, including national security and protecting the Great Lakes.

This budget provides for flexibility, and it gives States the opportunity to innovate on Medicaid policy, allowing them to design a safety net that works best for those in need. This will move Medicaid further away from Washington bureaucrats and closer to the people it was meant to serve.

This budget also calls for tax reform, which has the potential to add 1 million new private sector jobs. The Tax Code is over 74,000 pages long and was last overhauled 29 years ago. It is time for a pro-growth Tax Code that is simpler and fairer.

This budget addresses our country's fiscal problems in a responsible way, and it puts our Nation on a brighter path for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and colleague and the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

Written by House and Senate Republicans alone, it reaffirms their commitment to a severe and unworkable policy agenda that would harm the economy and that stands little chance of being implemented.

This budget conference report draws heavily on the House Republicans' budget framework by eliminating the Medicare guarantee, turning Medicaid into a capped block grant, limiting Pell grants for college students, and cutting nutrition assistance while hiding $1 trillion in additional cuts behind a magic asterisk to be filled in at some time in the future.

These proposals, if implemented, would be disastrous for our country, and I suspect even most Republicans wouldn't vote to make them law, and I predict they will not vote to make them law. Still, many of its proposals must be taken very seriously.

The Republican budget conference report includes reconciliation instructions to fast-track yet another vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, jeopardizing affordable coverage for millions of Americans with no alternative in sight.

It continues the Republican policy of sequester for nondefense priorities this year—a disinvestment suggestion, an undermining of America's economy and its quality of life—and further limits our ability to invest in priorities like education, research, and infrastructure by $496 billion below sequester levels over the ensuing decade. This is the same sequester policy that the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee called ''unrealistic and ill-conceived.'' Let me repeat that. He is the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, HAL ROGERS of Kentucky, and he said that the policies being pursued in this budget are ''unrealistic and ill-conceived.'' He is right.

Shamelessly, they propose to do all of this while exempting defense spending from the sequester caps. Defense spending needs to be raised. It ought to be raised honestly and not pretend that some slush fund will pay for, not contingencies, which it is intended to do, but for regular defense investments, which we need to do.

This budget conference report is, essentially, a work of fiction, promulgated as a message to the Republican base. I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Instead, let us work together in a bipartisan way to replace the unrealistic and ill-conceived—not my words but HAL ROGERS' words—and, I would add, completely unworkable sequester caps with an alternative that enables Congress to invest in America's future growth and prosperity.

That is what our constituents want. That is what we owe them—honesty and responsibility. I hope this resolution is defeated.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my friend that we look forward to enacting and bringing forward the policies that are incorporated within this budget. In fact, just last night, the Armed Services Committee passed out on a 60–2 vote policies that are consistent with the spending on the defense area in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), who is a wonderfully productive and energetic member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in watching this debate back and forth, I am reminded of the saying: ''If you like sausage, don't watch it being made.'' The same is true, certainly, with the budget process, in fairness to my colleague from Maryland, and the same is true for the overall legislative process. It is a decidedly human and imperfect process.

What we have here is a result of the House and Senate coming together on a budget, and it is something that we haven't seen for a long, long while. We certainly didn't see it while HARRY REID was running the Senate. As a consequence of the House and Senate coming together on a budget, we will see debate go to 11:30 or midnight tonight on appropriations bills, and they will do that week, after week, after week going forward. I, myself, will come down with an amendment on Energy and Water. I suspect other Members in this very Chamber will come down with similar amendments, saying, ''I think we need to add something here,'' or ''we need to subtract something here.''

That process of scrubbing the budget is something that has been absent for years. That process is called regular order, but regular folks back home would call it, simply, common sense because it is what they do every day. Vital to any well-run organization is that ability to go in and say, ''This isn't working so well over here. I think we need to take from here this low performer and add to this high performer.'' It is done in churches; it is done in families; it is done in businesses; and it needs to be done in the Federal Government.

I think, as a matter of process, what we have is awfully, awfully important. For too long, our Federal Government has been running on automatic pilot. Entitlements run on automatic pilot, but, in essence, domestic discretionary has been running on automatic pilot as we run on CRs and omnibus bills. I mean, you would go bankrupt in no time if your mode of operation were to simply say, ''I will take what I spent last year, and I am going to spend it again this year.'' Yet that is the way the Federal Government has been running, and it is this budget that actually moves us away from that process.

In fairness to my Democratic colleagues, this is important from the standpoint of democracy. When you have an omnibus bill or a CR, somebody is still deciding what goes into that stuff. It is oftentimes leadership and staff as opposed to rank and file Members going down to the floor and saying, ''I think we need to subtract here or to add here.'' So there are two different levels that, I think, are awfully important.

Are there still deficiencies? Obviously so. I mean, I think that when you look at the budget cap issue and when you look at the issue of off budget those are both pathways to financial oblivion, and they have got to be addressed. The bigger framework that has been set in place is by moving to regular order and by the House and Senate coming together on a budget—thanks to your leadership, Mr. Chairman—which, I think, is vital. As a consequence, I will be supporting this measure.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the Republican budget because of the way that it treats our Nation's veterans.

As I have said during the Budget Committee debates, the Republican proposal does not provide our past and present servicemembers with the resources they need upon their return. Protecting our veterans is not an option—it is our duty. We owe it to our veterans to provide them with quality health care, education, job training, and the long-term treatment they have earned through their service to our Nation.

It is more than just a moral obligation. It is also a wise investment in America's future. The Greatest Generation was not called ''the Greatest Generation'' in 1946. That term didn't come

about until the 1990s. It had as much to do with what our veterans of World War II did after the war, when they came home, as with what they did in it. To ensure success for today's veterans, we need to do much better than the Republican proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MOULTON. As a veteran, I see firsthand that insufficient funding for VA programs creates an environment in which our veterans fall through the cracks. I do not support simply throwing money at the current bureaucracy, but insufficient funding for the VA and its programs will only exacerbate this problem.

We ought to be able to agree that caring for our veterans should be a national priority. The budget before us today fails to prioritize our servicemen and -women, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a very diligent and dedicated senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I first need to commend and thank Chairman PRICE for all of his hard work in putting this budget resolution together. This is a rare occasion on this floor. It has been a long time since we have had a budget agreement, and it is not an easy thing to do. As one of the House budget conferees, I can tell you that a lot of work has to be done and that a lot of difficult choices have to be made.

Mr. Chairman, you have done a spectacular job in getting this here to the floor.

One of the most important things, Mr. Speaker, that the budget resolution has to do is to, frankly, set the stage so that we can move forward on the appropriations process. We need a budget that puts Congress and our committees on a path to move forward, and this budget resolution does it. It balances the budget within 10 years, and it does so without raising taxes.

It is no secret, I believe—and I think many of us believe—that the first responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect the American people, and it is no secret that the world around us—I think greatly due to the failed foreign policy of this administration—is almost in flames. We see a growing instability, and we see a growing pressure to our allies, and we see the thugs and the enemies of freedom who believe they have a green light.

We must provide for a strong national defense through the robust funding of our troops, of their training, of their equipment, of their readiness. This budget does so. It accomplishes these goals while staying under the budget control caps—in other words, adhering to the law of the land.

□ 1700

It funds the military over the President's request, without breaking the law and without raising taxes. Again, something that is easier said than done, but Chairman PRICE has been able to do that.

At a time when we see China's rapidly growing defense capabilities, North Korea's nuclear weapons program, Iran pursuing theirs, and growing threats from terrorist groups, let's not forget what our number one priority has to be.

This budget resolution reflects our commitment to our national security, to the men and women in uniform, to the safety of the American people. It does so, balancing the budget within 10 years. It does so without raising taxes.

I know it is very easy to be critical; it is very easy to lecture why this is not perfect. It has been a long time coming. I am grateful for the leadership of Mr. PRICE, of his counterpart in the Senate, Chairman ENZI. I ask the Members of this distinguished body to approve this well-thought-out, hard-negotiated budget that funds our priorities, doesn't raise taxes, and even balances within 10 years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has been focused on trying to make sure we have an economy that works for all Americans.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for yielding. More importantly, I want to thank him for his tireless work as our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget. It is truly a pleasure to serve with him.

A budget is a moral document, a document that really reflects our values as a nation. Unfortunately, this budget just does the opposite. Mr. Speaker, once again, this Congress is poised to take a huge step in the wrong direction.

The budget agreement before us is truly a work hard, get less budget that uses accounting gimmicks to balance the budget, once again on the backs of the most vulnerable. It calls for cuts to nondefense discretionary programs totaling $496 billion below the already dismally low sequestered level.

This means further draconian cuts to our education, our infrastructure, veterans, and health programs that have already been eviscerated by slash-and-burn Republican austerity plans.

Today, more than 45 million of our fellow Americans are living in poverty. This agreement will push more people over the brink. With $300 billion in cuts to SNAP—that is our food assistance—$431 billion in cuts to Medicare, and a half trillion in cuts to Medicaid, struggling families will continue to fall further and further behind.

We can't forget how these cuts disproportionately affect our communities of color, who are more likely to be living in poverty. What is more, this is the latest in the misguided Republican fixation on repealing the Affordable Care Act, which the House has already voted to repeal over 50 times.

The number of uninsured Americans has gone down by 16 million since it was enacted. Why in the world do you want to take health care away from 16 million people? That is mean.

This agreement continues to use the overseas contingency operation, OCO, account as a slush fund for overbudget Pentagon spending by including—I think it is—$38 billion over the President's request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman another 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. I introduced an amendment in committee to eliminate the OCO account increase of $36 billion that was included in the House Republican budget. Members on both sides of the aisle have criticized OCO as an affront to transparency and Congress' constitutionally mandated oversight responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, last month, we introduced our Democratic, Congressional Progressive Caucus, and Congressional Black Caucus alternative budgets. Those budgets reflect real solutions to lift Americans out of poverty and to support the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided and very cynical agreement that would put us on a path to a greater unequal America that provides less liberty and less justice for all. It doesn't reflect who we are as a nation.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a senior, thoughtful member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, with this vote, our Nation is about to take its first step away from financial ruin and back to prosperity and solvency. Our Nation's debt has literally doubled in 8 years, now exceeding the size of our entire economy. That debt requires us to make interest payments of $230 billion this year. That is nearly $2,000 from an average family's taxes just to rent the money that we have already spent.

On our current path, that burden will triple within a decade, eclipsing our entire defense budget. Medicare and Social Security will collapse just a few years after that. Time is not our ally, and the future is not a pleasant place if

we continue just a few more years down the road that we have been on.

That is why this budget is so important. It changes the fiscal course of our Nation, slowly pointing us back toward solvency and prosperity. It restores congressional oversight of an abusive Federal bureaucracy.

It rescues our healthcare system from the nightmare of ObamaCare. It rescues Medicare from collapse. It adopts the time-tested progrowth policies that produced the Reagan economic recovery and the unprecedented prosperity of the 1980s.

If we can implement this budget, in 10 years, deficits will turn to surpluses, and we can begin paying down this ruinous debt at a pace that ensures that students now in college will retire into a prosperous, secure, and debt-free America.

It is not perfect, and it is not complete. Ahead of us are many months of legislating to build the governmental streamlining and reforms that it calls for, but if we can set this course and if we can stay this course, one day in the very near future, a new generation of Americans can know just how wonderful it is to awaken and realize that it is morning again in America.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), another one of our terrific new members of the Committee on the Budget.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today is deeply flawed. It forces hard-working families to work more and take home less and puts our country on the wrong path.

It concerns me that the budget put forth by my Republican colleagues does not address the deep, arbitrary, and damaging budget caps we are facing right now. These caps, which are so bad that they were never meant to become law, are now a reality, a reality that we are gutting our military and harming working men and women and their families in multiple ways.

The gimmicks in the conference report do nothing to address the long-term structural problems that budget cuts have created at the Pentagon, and they do nothing on the nondefense side to help hard-working families buy a home, send their children to college, or enjoy a safe, secure retirement with adequate health care.

Democrats have a better way, a better budget, one that creates greater opportunity for a secure future. We need a secure budget, and we shouldn't stand for anything less.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to take a moment and thank the chairman. He has done a tremendous job. Again, he has brought another budget to the floor that balances, but he has done something no one has done in 6 years. He has brought a bicameral budget.

That is something that we shouldn't just take for granted, something that the House and Senate couldn't do for quite sometime. Your leadership has been tremendous.

To my friend on the other side, you make a lot of debates, and I look forward to hearing them. I am thankful this time you have more Democrats on the floor helping you than you did a couple weeks ago, and that is helpful. That is helpful for a debate. This is the place we should have it.

Two weeks ago, I was on this floor to talk about a budget. I said that a budget is a vision for the future; it sets out your priorities, but it also shows your values. Well, for the first time in 6 years, the House and Senate have gotten together, worked out our differences, and drafted a bicameral budget. This budget shows America exactly where we stand.

With this budget, we have a choice before us. Do we keep going down our current path? Or do we change course? Our current path adds to the debt; it is stuck in the past. In fact, the budget the Democrats offered would never balance.

I say to my friend, the ranking member: we have a family close in age; we have children about the same age. My question to the other side is simply this: How will our kids invest in the future when they are busy paying for our past?

The budget is a different course. It says that we will balance the budget and then actually start paying down the debt. It says that it is a more dangerous world, so we will increase spending for defense. It says we will repeal ObamaCare, and it says no new taxes. It says that it is time to grow America's economy, not Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the future is not about Washington; it is not about government trying and failing to solve our problems while adding more and more debt that our children and grandchildren have to pay. America's future, our 21st century, will be built by American people. That is what this budget would do. It is the foundation for a strong American future and a future even brighter than our past.

I look forward to taking the first steps to that future. I look forward to not leaving our children our debt, but leaving them a brighter future where they have greater opportunities.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the Republican leader, who mentioned the children of America, that if the children of America learn Republican math, we are going to be in real trouble because they won't be able to count.

As the Republican chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget has said, this kind of budget approach that claims balance because they take the level of revenue from the Affordable Care Act, when at the same time say they are repealing the Affordable Care Act, I think most kids can figure out that that is a shell game, and we are going to be in real trouble if that is the basis of teaching math in our schools, not to mention the fact that we have got a budget here that is squeezing people who are really working hard while providing a green light to tax cuts for people at the very top. That is also not a set of priorities I think that we want to pass on to our children.

We want an economy that works for everybody, an economy where everyone who works hard can get ahead. I don't see how we are going to get our kids ahead by providing tax cuts to folks at the top while cutting our kids' education and making them pay more for their college loans. That is a recipe for decline.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding and also for his leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I really want to thank the entire Committee on the Budget and the conferees for doing the hard work and the responsible work of finally focusing on bringing responsibility and fiscal discipline back to Washington.

If you look at what has been happening all across the country, people are struggling. These are tough times. It is a tough economy. People's wages are stagnant. They are paying more for food. They are paying more for electricity. They are surely paying more for health care.

They are looking to Washington and saying: Why doesn't Washington start focusing on these problems? Why doesn't Washington do what families are doing? Hard-working taxpayers live within their means. Why can't Washington do the same?

This budget does that. It focuses on creating a healthy economy, actually getting jobs, and getting people back to work in this country, forcing Washington to finally balance the Federal budget.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, when we pass this budget, it will represent the first time since 2001 that Congress has come together to pass a budget that balances in the 10-year window. That shouldn't be something that happens every 14 years; that should be something we do every year.

The other side surely didn't do it when they were in the majority. In

fact, none of the budgets they brought to the floor ever get to balance—not 10 years, not 20 years, not 50 years. They rack up more debt. They increase taxes. There are over $2 trillion of new taxes in the President's budget that he proposed, and he never gets to balance.

This budget not only calls for good tax reform to make our country competitive again, lower rates so that families can keep more of their money and invest in themselves and not grow the size of government, but it actually focuses on getting more jobs in this country and stop shipping jobs out of the country.

It repeals the President's healthcare law that is causing so many problems, millions of people losing the good healthcare plans they have and paying more for it.

We have got to finally bring this discipline back and finally force Washington to do what families have been doing and be responsible.

It is a good budget. I am glad that we are going to be bringing it to the floor and passing it. Let's get to doing the other work we need to do to get our economy back on track, and it starts here.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This budget does not reflect the priorities of the American people. If you ask most Americans what kind of economy they want, they would say they want an economy that is growing rapidly, with more shared prosperity.

You don't get that kind of economy with trickle-down economics with the kind of theory that is embedded in the Republican budget. That theory is that if you provide tax rate cuts to people at the very top—to millionaires—somehow the benefits are going to trickle down and lift everybody up. We tried that in the 2000s under George Bush. It didn't work.

What happened—not surprisingly—is folks at the top who got tax cuts ended up with even more take-home income. Everybody else was either treading water or falling behind. Why we would want a budget based on a failed economic strategy is going to leave the American public scratching their heads.

The approach we recommended was one where we provide more tax relief to hard-working Americans. We wanted to expand the provision for child and dependent tax credits so that people can make sure their kids are in a safe environment while they are at work and not have to break the family bank in order to do it.

We want to invest in our kids' education; we want to invest in scientific research, and we want to pay for it by closing some of those tax breaks that encourage American corporations to ship American jobs and money overseas and getting rid of the special tax rates that hedge fund managers have that hard-working Americans don't.

We proposed fixing a tax system that is rigged in favor of the special interests and the very powerful and changing in a way that provides additional help to people who are being squeezed and are in the middle or working their way into the middle. That is an economic plan that works for everybody in the country, not one that just works for people at the very top.

What we saw just last week was the number one economic priority of our Republican colleagues was to eliminate the estate tax on estates above $10 million, help 5,500 Americans run up the deficit by $270 billion, and then come back and say, Hey, the deficit just went up by $270 billion because we provided an estate tax cut to estates $10 million and up. Now, let's cut our kids' education. Let's increase the amount we charge seniors for their prescription drugs. Let's raise the cost of student loans. Let's cut our investment in kids' education.

That is what this Republican budget does. It is not that our colleagues don't believe in this failed theory, but you would think, at some point, reality would intrude, and people would say we need an economy that works for every American, not just a few.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget. Let's start again in a way that really reflects the greatness of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on S. Con. Res. 11.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it is appropriate that we begin the process of this debate that is called ''and now for the rest of the story.''

For folks who are watching and for our colleagues who have been observing this debate and want more information, I would urge you to go to the Web site and take a peek at the resolution, budget.house.gov. You can get all sorts of information about the positive solutions that we are putting forward.

It is not just our opinion. We have got a lot of folks who are out there supporting the resolution that we put forward.

The 60 Plus Association says:

> On behalf of more than 7 million senior citizen activists, the 60 Plus Association applauds the leadership of you and Senate Budget Committee Chairman ENZI in putting forth a responsible balanced budget plan. Not only will this legislation protect today's seniors, but it will also protect our children and grandchildren.

The National Federation of Independent Business says:

> On behalf of the NFIB, the Nation's leading small business advocacy organization, thank you for your efforts . . . NFIB and small-business owners strongly support your efforts.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce: the world's largest business federation representing interests of more than 3 million businesses—those are jobs, Mr. Speaker—of all sizes, sectors, and regions strongly supports your resolution.

The Association of Mature American Citizens:

> On behalf of 1.3 million members of AMAC . . . I am writing to applaud the House and Senate for working to pass a budget this year and to convey our strong support for the policies set forth therein.

There is significant support literally from across the country, Mr. Speaker.

I want to address some very specific issues that have come forward because, as I say, now, it is time for the rest of the story.

Our friends talk about the lack of growth within our budget. In fact, that is not the case. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office stipulates that over $400 million in growth will occur in the first 10-year period of time. We believe it will be much more than that because we believe in a dynamic market.

We believe that, when you allow the economy to thrive, when you allow folks to have more jobs and more opportunity and more dreams realized, that in fact you get the economy rolling to a greater degree and actually more increase in growth will occur within the economy.

We have heard from our friends on the other side about all these tax increases that are in this budget. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you very clearly: there are no tax increases in this budget. We balance the budget within a 10-year period of time with no tax increases. What they describe is their extrapolation on what they think policy is going to be.

As you know and our colleagues in this Chamber know, it is not the Budget Committee that brings forward tax resolutions. It is the Ways and Means Committee. We charge the Ways and Means Committee with coming forward with progrowth tax policy to get this

economy rolling again and to actually get rates down—yes, for large and small businesses, so that we can create more jobs, but, yes, Mr. Speaker, for the American people as well.

That is our vision. That is our goal. That is what we think ought to occur again so that more dreams can be realized and more Americans can have the kind of opportunity that they so desire.

We have heard a lot of talk about student loans. Mr. Speaker, this budget resolution does not decrease student loans, does not decrease the Pell grants. It is important that the American people know that. If you don't believe it, just go to the Web site. Read the resolution at budget.house.gov.

We have heard over and over and over again about the talk on health care. In fact, one individual on the other side of the aisle said we were ''taking away health care from 16 million.''

Nonsense, Mr. Speaker, nonsense—it just simply is not so. What we believe is that we ought to have a healthcare system that actually works for patients and families and doctors and allows them to make medical decisions and healthcare decisions, not Washington, D.C., not the Federal Government. That is not what the American people want.

We are mired in a system right now that the President forced down the throats of the American people and our friends on the other side of the aisle forced down the throats of those of us in this Congress a few short years ago. We are mired in a system that actually is providing less quality of care and less affordability and less access to care.

That is not what we believe ought to happen. What we do is charge the committees with coming forward with that patient-centered solution, a solution that will again put patients and families and doctors in charge.

Then we hear about continuing the sequester. You are right. We do follow the law of the land, Mr. Speaker, because the budget resolution can't change the sequester.

I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and I invite them to work together as we move forward over the next number of months to get together and solve the challenge of sequester in a responsible way by decreasing spending on the mandatory side so that we can find the resources that are so vitally necessary on the discretionary side. I welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that gets our Nation's fiscal house in order. It is a budget that would get folks back to work. It is a budget that would save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid, put us on a path to saving Social Security. It is a budget that protects our national defense. It is a budget that deserves support in this Chamber.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the staff of the House Budget Committee and the Office of the Sixth District of Georgia. We are on the cusp of agreeing to this budget resolution, due in large part, to the hard work and dedication of my staff. For the past four months, they have worked many long hours and out of the spotlight to help build a budget that balances within 10 years. It has been an honor to work with each of these staff members as they have helped craft a budget this Congress can be proud of, and the staff should be proud of what they have helped accomplish.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE STAFF

Alex Campau, Alex Stoddard, Amanda Street, Andy Morton, Ben Garndenhour, Brad Watson, Dick Magee, Eric Davis, Emily Goff, Ersin Aydin, Jane Lee, Jenna Spealman, Jim Bates, Jim Herz, Jon Romito, Jose Guillen, Justin Bogie, Kara McKee, Kelle Long, Kyle Cormney, Mary Popadiuk, Pat Knudsen, Paul Restuccia, Rich Kisielowski, Rick May, Ryan Murphy, Tim Flynn, William Allison.

PERSONAL AND DISTRICT OFFICE STAFF

Brent Robertson, Carla DiBlasio, Charlene Puchalla, Cheyenne Foster, Daniel Grey, Devin Krecl, Gary Beck, Jennifer Poole, Kris Skrzycki, Kyle McGowan, Kyle Zebley, Megan Wells, Meghan Dugan, Meghan Graf, Ryan Brooks, Tina McIntosh, Warren Negri.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank the Democratic staff of the House Budget Committee for their hard work over the past three months on the budget resolution. Since early February when the President sent Congress his budget, our staff has worked many late nights and long weekends to prepare material and provide analysis for our members. Their service to our Committee's work is indispensable and it's hard to imagine how the Congress could do its job without their contributions. They toil behind the scenes and without public recognition. For that reason, I want to salute them for their service to the Congress and our nation.

House Budget Committee Democratic staff: Sarah Abernathy, Erika Appel, Ellen Balis, Kathleen Capstick, Ken Cummings, Bridgett Frey, Jonathan Goldman, Jocelyn Griffin, Jose Guillen, Tom Kahn, Najy Kamal, Sheila McDowell, Diana Meredith, Kimberly Overbeek, Karen Robb, Scott Russell, Beth Stephenson, Cody Willming, Ted Zegers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1740

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 197, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—226

Abraham	Dent	Hunter
Aderholt	DeSantis	Hurd (TX)
Allen	DesJarlais	Hurt (VA)
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Babin	Dold	Jenkins (KS)
Barletta	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Barr	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Barton	Ellmers (NC)	Johnson, Sam
Benishek	Emmer (MN)	Jordan
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Joyce
Bishop (MI)	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)
Black	Fleischmann	King (NY)
Blackburn	Fleming	Kinzinger (IL)
Blum	Flores	Kline
Boehner	Forbes	Knight
Bost	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Boustany	Foxx	Lamborn
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Brat	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Long
Brooks (AL)	Gohmert	Loudermilk
Brooks (IN)	Goodlatte	Love
Buchanan	Gosar	Lucas
Bucshon	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Granger	Lummis
Byrne	Graves (GA)	MacArthur
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Marchant
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Marino
Carter (TX)	Griffith	McCarthy
Chabot	Grothman	McCaul
Chaffetz	Guinta	McClintock
Clawson (FL)	Guthrie	McHenry
Coffman	Hanna	McKinley
Cole	Hardy	McMorris Rodgers
Collins (GA)	Harper	Meadows
Collins (NY)	Harris	Meehan
Comstock	Hartzler	Messer
Conaway	Heck (NV)	Mica
Cook	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Costello (PA)	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (MI)
Cramer	Hill	Moolenaar
Crenshaw	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Culberson	Hudson	Mullin
Curbelo (FL)	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
Denham	Hultgren	

Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

NAYS—197

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Buck
Garrett
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Payne
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1815

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, COLE, STEWART, FINCHER, and REICHERT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 183 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2029.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) kindly take the chair.

□ 1817

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. DOLD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 29, 2015, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 67, line 10.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland.

An amendment by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

An amendment by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

An amendment by Mr. POCAN of Wisconsin.

An amendment by Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 229, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

AYES—191

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Issa

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Meadows
Payne
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1822

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 229, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

AYES—192

Adams
Amash
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Issa

NOT VOTING—9

Buck
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Miller (FL)
Payne
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1827

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 231, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

AYES—190

Adams
Amash
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walker
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—231

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Issa

NOT VOTING—9

Buck
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Kaptur
Lewis
Payne
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1831

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 254, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

AYES—167

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—254

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Payne
Price (NC)
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1834

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 213, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

AYES—210

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—213

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes

Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Buck
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Payne
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1839

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

AYES—186

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—237

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Buck
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Payne
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1842

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

AYES—190

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith

Grothman
Guinta
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—232

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

Barton
Buck
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Payne
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1846

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 235, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

AYES—186

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)

NOES—235

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)

Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Crenshaw
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Payne
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1849

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016''.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. DOLD, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 223, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2029 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the ''Medical Services'' account, on page 27, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

In the ''General Administration'' account, on page 30, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

As we witnessed last year during the VA's patient access crisis, the VA does not have the resources it needs to care for our Nation's veterans. Last year, I worked tirelessly with my colleagues to pass the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act, which established the VA Choice Program, allowing our veterans to seek care outside the VA when they live too far from a VA medical facility or cannot receive timely care.

While some improvements in the VA patient access have been made, I know from listening to the veterans in my district and from veterans service organizations that veterans are still struggling to access care. This bill, in its current form, underfunds the VA by over a billion dollars—a billion dollars. The Arizona Department of Veterans' Services and the Arizona VFW and veterans groups all over Arizona and this country are opposed to these cuts.

This motion to recommit will provide an additional $15 million for vital medical services, long-term care, mental health treatment, assistance to homeless veterans, substance abuse treatment, and caregiver support. $15 million toward these essential services for our veterans is tiny in comparison to the drastic cuts to the VA's budget in this bill. This $15 million is paid for by a reduction in administrative expenses, so this money will go directly to providing care for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind my colleagues that the VA Choice Program will end next year. Whether or not veterans are given a choice where they may receive their care, the VA will still need adequate funding and resources to care for our veterans.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that just 2 months ago we learned from another whistleblower that the Phoenix VA's mental health facility is significantly underresourced. Due to significant understaffing and mismanagement, veterans contemplating suicide and veterans seeking treatment for substance abuse will be unable to receive the immediate care they need. This is horrible and unacceptable.

While it is necessary that we continue to hold the VA accountable, address the VA's management issues, and prevent waste, we will not solve the VA's patient access problem without ensuring the VA has the resources it needs to provide timely and quality care. Veterans will continue to wait if the resources are not there.

If we do not address the lack of VA resources now, we will continue to hear heartbreaking stories from veterans who are unable to receive timely treatment. If the VA Choice Program ends without reauthorization and funding, those veterans will return to the VA, and veterans new to the VA will also need treatment. We will then face another patient access crisis, and this time it will be our fault.

Caring for veterans is a cost of war. Cuts to government spending should not be shouldered by the men and women we have chosen to place in harm's way. We have a moral obligation to ensure these brave Americans who have fought and sacrificed for us receive the health care and the benefits they have earned.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we have a serious responsibility to exercise proper oversight. This bill has long enjoyed broad bipartisan support and was brought up through an open process that allowed all voices to be heard and all opinions to be considered.

Now, I was proud to work in a bipartisan manner with Ranking Member BISHOP on this bill. He is a good friend and a good man and a good partner. We considered, together, 715 Member requests while drafting this bill, of which 562 were from Democratic Members, and we did our best to accommodate the Members on both sides of the aisle. I believe we did. We were successful.

We then considered 43 additional amendments, proposals yesterday and all last night. This motion to recommit could have been offered at anytime during this debate, but they chose to do it tonight.

By the way, I should let you know, too, the bill that we are going to be considering passed last year with all but one vote. The bill that we are going to be considering spends 6 percent more than the one last year.

I want to say something about the motion to recommit. It reflects the administration's continuing efforts to deflect their management failures at the VA on the Congress. And the gentlelady who just spoke said this bill cuts spending. Well, it does not.

□ 1900

It is a 6 percent increase over last year. It is not a cut.

Yes, I know the administration doesn't want us to talk about the $930 million cost overrun at the Denver VA medical construction project, and there are others. I know they don't want us to discuss the pervasive neglect and mismanagement at the Philadelphia VA regional office, and of course, they don't want us to discuss the atrocious failure to serve countless veterans in Phoenix.

I know the administration doesn't want us to talk about the cost overruns in Denver, Orlando, or wherever else they may occur—New Orleans. They don't want us to talk about the problems in Philadelphia, where the inspector general, just 2 weeks ago, provided a laundry list of horrible failures.

Most of all, they don't want us to talk about or discuss the atrocious failure to serve countless veterans in Phoenix, many of whom, tragically, paid for the VA's mistakes with their own lives.

The Obama administration has controlled this government for 6 years. It is time that they take responsibility for the VA's failures and allow us to move forward with this bill to increase the services and resources available to our veterans and servicemembers.

For the administration to say they would veto this bill because we provided a 6 percent increase for the VA over enacted levels, instead of a 9 percent increase, is the sort of incendiary threat that can only make sense here in Washington.

Only here in Washington can a 6 percent increase be called a cut. Everywhere else in America, that is called an increase, 6 percent above last year. Congress should not be expected to behave like potted plants and simply accede to the President's request that does not adhere to the budget caps that he signed into law himself.

By the way, just for some numbers, the bill provides $48.6 billion for VA medical services—$3.4 billion above last year's level—plus we provide advance funding for fiscal year '17 at $51.7 billion.

Our bill is a good bill in its current form. It targets the needs of homeless veterans, caregivers who sacrifice their time and livelihood to care for their injured servicemembers, and those veterans waiting too long for decisions on their disability claims.

In all these areas, the bill provides every dollar the administration requested, but that good news story apparently doesn't fit the gloom and doom narrative of this administration which, once again, doesn't want to acknowledge the management failures at the VA, and they are saying a 6 percent increase is a cut.

We know better. The American people know better. The veterans know better. It is time that we reject this motion and support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 236, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—14

Allen
Barton
Bilirakis
Buck
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Payne
Pelosi
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1908

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 255, noes 163, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—255

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—163

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Buck
DeFazio
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Neal
Payne
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth

□ 1914

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2028.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1917

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 29, line 4.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $167,050,000)''.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $167,050,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, over the next decade, the U.S. is set to spend hundreds of billions of dollars operating and upgrading our nuclear arsenal. But in this budget environment, every dollar we spend to keep our outdated and oversized nuclear arsenal functioning is a dollar we aren't spending on other priorities that keep us

safe and secure or on reducing our unsustainable debt and deficits. That is why the amendment I am offering with Mr. POLIS will put $167 million towards deficit reduction by placing funding for the new nuclear-armed cruise missile warhead back on its original 2015 acquisition schedule.

In the FY 2015 budget, production of the warhead was scheduled to begin in 2027, but this year's budget request sped up the development for the warhead by 2 years. This is despite the fact that the existing air-launched cruise missile and warhead isn't being phased out until the 2030s. And there is plenty of uncertainty about whether this program is affordable or even necessary.

Chairman SIMPSON is so concerned about the cost of the warhead that language was included in the E and W report to require a red team assessment on the affordability of the program—and for good reason, given our history of spending large amounts of money on warhead programs that end up getting tabled.

Given the cost concerns over the program, does it really make sense to rush the acquisition process?

Furthermore, as some experts note, there is no longer a need to shoot nuclear cruise missiles from far away when we have the most advanced bomber ever created in our arsenal, the B–2 stealth bomber, which is capable of penetrating enemy airspace and dropping a nuclear bomb directly above a target. And if we decide we want to shoot nuclear missiles from thousands of miles away, we still have very expensive submarines and very expensive ICBMs capable of doing just that.

So ask yourselves: Should we really be accelerating the development of a warhead that goes on a missile we don't need and could cost hundreds of millions, if not billions, more than anticipated?

I ask my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to maintain funding at the program's FY 2015 acquisition schedule, and save the taxpayers $167 million in the process.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Ensuring funding for the modernization of our nuclear weapons stockpile is a critical national security priority in this bill. The bill fully funds the $195 million needed to initiate a life extension program for the W80 warhead, the only nuclear-tipped cruise missile in the U.S. nuclear arsenal. The life extension program will replace nonnuclear and other components to extend the life of the W80, and to ensure it can be deployed on the Air Force's long-range stand off cruise missile, or LRSO, should that program move forward.

The budget request was considered a 2-year acceleration of the LRSO program, compared to last year's stockpile plan, to meet a defense requirement for deployment in 2030. However, it is clear that there is considerable planning that needs to be accomplished by the administration before Congress can have confidence in these long-term stockpile plans.

While 2030 may seem like many years away, these warheads are very complex, and there is considerable amount of work to accomplish between now and then. Performing additional work earlier in the schedule will allow the NNSA to reduce technical risk and limit any cost growth. The gentleman's amendment would slash funding for this effort, and that will add additional risk and uncertainty to the schedule.

We must do the work that is needed to extend the life of this warhead as long as there is a clear defense requirement for maintaining a nuclear cruise missile capability. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I respect Chairman SIMPSON's request that language be included in the E and W report to require a red team assessment of the affordability of this program. All I am adding to that is, if we have questions about the affordability of this program, a program that is not going to take place for some time, do we really want to accelerate the spending program?

In this budget environment, it does not make sense to accelerate the development of a warhead while, at the same time, requiring an assessment on its affordability. Why would we put more money into a program that may end up getting tabled? Shouldn't we at least wait until the release of the red team report before adjusting the acquisition schedule?

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to please not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. SIMPSON. Again, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

As I said, performing additional work earlier in the schedule will allow the NNSA to reduce technical risk and limit any cost growth while we are finding out about what the red team assessment comes up with. So I think this is important that we defeat this amendment so that we can move forward with modernization of this warhead.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we just heard Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. SIMPSON in a debate about this very same issue, and I don't want to cover the exact same ground, but I want to put this in the context of, I think, a very serious concern that all of us ought to have.

The rebuilding, or what is known as the life extension program for our nuclear bombs, is but one small part, actually, one very large part, but small in comparison to the total reconditioning, rebuilding of our entire nuclear enterprise.

And when you consider the totality of what we are doing in this appropriations bill and last night, when we took up the defense authorization bill, you can only, and you must, come to the conclusion that the United States is now involved in a very significant, total restructuring and rebuilding of our entire nuclear deterrent system. It is not just the six to seven different nuclear warheads that are going to be rebuilt at a cost of several tens of billions of dollars; it is also all of the delivery systems. We are, in fact, engaged in a new nuclear arms race.

Now, many of us grew up in the sixties and seventies—fifties, sixties, and seventies—and I think all of us have a memory of the arms race and all of the drills, hiding underneath the table, all of that trouble. I think we have a memory of what went on with the Cuban Missile Crisis.

When you step back and look at what we are doing in the appropriations bill before us as well as in the National Defense Authorization Act, you must come to the conclusion that we are on

the path to spend $1 trillion over the next 25 to 30 years rebuilding the entire nuclear enterprise. We have, in this bill, all of the nuclear weapons.

In this one, we went from some $9 million last year for this W80 to over $190 million in this bill. Yes, there are safeguards and, yes, we ought to pull all of this money back until we decide how this fits into the new cruise missile, the new long-range cruise missile replacing the old variety.

That goes on the new stealth bomber, the LSRO, a new stealth bomber, at $550 million a copy, more than half a billion dollars a plane. A cruise missile, a new plane doing the exact same thing, and that is to be added to a new Minuteman missile for the silos in the Midwest, the upper Midwest, new Minuteman III missiles.

That will be added to the new submarines that are going out there with new missiles and new warheads and, on top of that, some new stealth technology that is going on that we really can't even talk about.

But it is happening, $1 trillion in a nuclear arms race that is being replicated by China and Russia, the United Kingdom and France.

What in the world is this world coming to?

This isn't Iran. Iran is a separate issue, significantly important, but this is different. This is the major nuclear-armed countries in the world, all of them, upgrading their nuclear systems.

We have the new bombs, new precision bombs. We have the new delivery system, stealth. It is extraordinarily dangerous because the hair trigger of the past and all of the rules of the past are now going to be put aside, and now we have a really, really, fine hair trigger.

□ 1930

You won't know but a few minutes ahead of time when it is incoming because it is a stealth bomber or a cruise missile or even a hypersonic missile. And suddenly, there you are; you have got seconds to make a decision about whether you are going to annihilate the world or not. How do you respond to this?

And you have got Russia over there talking about using a nuclear weapon as a deterrent to reduce some sort of standard military conflict. This is an extraordinarily dangerous situation.

I want to draw the attention of the entire House and use this particular effort to reduce this account by $25 million. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), I think, had a better proposal, and that is to reduce the whole thing.

But here we are. Pay attention, men and women of this House and of the Senate. Pay attention to what the overarching issue is here. It is the opening quarter of a new nuclear arms race among the great powers of the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The bill fully funds the request of $195 million to initiate a life extension program for the W80 warhead. The life extension program will replace nonnuclear and other components to extend the life of the W80 and to ensure it can be deployed on the Air Force's Long-Range Standoff cruise missile, or the LRSO, should that program move forward.

Certainly, the committee will look to realign the work that needs to be done on the W80 if there are changes to the schedule for the LRSO. But as long as that program stays on track, we need to make sure that the work that needs to be done by the NNSA is properly aligned with those efforts.

The gentleman's amendment would make it more difficult for the NNSA to meet its schedule requirements, and I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $1,918,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided by this Act for Project 99–D–143, Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, and by prior Acts that remain unobligated for such Project, may be made available only for construction and program support activities for such Project. *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under this heading, $10,394,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $13,802,000) (increased by $10,000,000) (increased by $3,802,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Nebraska and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, it is my understanding that our chairman, Chairman SIMPSON, as well as Ranking Member KAPTUR actually support this amendment. I want to express my gratitude to the chairman for working with me and thinking critically as to how we make our nuclear nonproliferation architecture more robust.

What this amendment does is it moves $13.8 million from the mixed oxide portion of our nonproliferation account over to the nuclear smuggling and detection account and the research and development account as well.

Nuclear smuggling and detection is an important part of our nonproliferation regimen, and research and development into better techniques to detect the illicit movement of fissile material or technology has to be one of the more robust policy considerations moving forward, not only in this appropriations bill but as a body here, ensuring that we, again, are focused singularly on the nonproliferation threats that are occurring throughout the world as this technology spreads and as fissile material potentially becomes more available to those who would use it for potentially great harm.

I also want, in the amendment, to point out why this money is taken from the mixed oxide program.

Currently in the bill, we are spending about $345 million on this program. But MOX is expensive, and its future is unclear. We have to come to some policy decision here. We keep digging this hole and digging this hole. This policy is adrift, and it is costing taxpayers a great deal of money. It is not fair in terms of public policy. It is not fair to taxpayers. It is not fair to the people of South Carolina and Georgia because of this uncertainty.

So we need a decision here. If it is, No, we are not going to proceed with MOX, then we have to develop an understanding of what we are going to do with this material, whether it is blend it down or store it or whether we need to rethink the entire public policy that led us to this point, which is about 20 years old, and whether perhaps this ought to become some sort of international consortium, for instance, to deal with this particular issue and share in the cost.

If the answer is, Yes, we are going to proceed with MOX, then spending $345 million a year to sort of keep it open, with a little bit extra, and that cost to keep it open—to keep it in cold storage, as we say—is approximately $200 million, so we throw in a little more on top. It doesn't get us to final completion. It doesn't even really get us on that road.

So the policy here is adrift, and we have got to come to some deeper consideration as to what we are going to do.

The problem with MOX fundamentally is the initial cost was $1 billion. Now we are looking at $7 billion. The lifecycle costs are skyrocketing. So some clear, deliberate decision. And if it is ''yes,'' we need to expedite this, and we need to do so in a cost-conscious manner. If it is ''no,'' let's turn to other alternatives quickly so that we can move more of these funds into the robust portions of our nonproliferation regimen, our architecture to ensure that we bring down the probability of a nuclear weapons explosion as close to zero as possible, ensuring as well that we are keeping this material out of others hands.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for taking up this issue. The MOX facility lifecycle cost is now over $47 billion and at the end of the day will not solve the problem.

The disposition of the unnecessary plutonium stock can be done in other ways. We ought to set aside that money. You are quite correct to put it into nonproliferation issues, trying to figure out where the loose nukes might be around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I will draw your attention and the attention of the gentlemen and gentlewomen here today that in yesterday's National Defense Authorization Act, those facilities that sense the movement of nuclear materials across borders, the in-place were withdrawn, taken out. We ought to pay attention to that, put those back in in one more piece.

I commend the gentleman for being right on. And we do need to sort out the MOX facility and come to some conclusion; otherwise, we are in a $47 billion rathole that won't solve the problem.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman for trying to work with me. This is a difficult position. The chairman has a very difficult task here of balancing competing ends. I really appreciate the way in which he has artfully drawn together an important bill here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his efforts in nonproliferation and his strong advocacy for this program and trying to become the expert. And really, he is what I consider maybe one of the foremost experts in the House on nonproliferation issues. I thank both the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from California for their efforts in this area.

It is a challenging issue for us. You know, I was interested to hear the $47 billion because I have heard $31 billion. I have heard $30 billion. There are all sorts of different estimates, and we haven't got the numbers of how they came to these conclusions. And when they look to the alternatives in this report that just came out from the Department, they said, if I remember correctly, the downblend activities had a cost that was much less. But if you look at the downblend alternatives, what they didn't add into it is that you would put that material in WIPP theoretically.

First of all, you would have to get WIPP extended. It is supposed to be closed. So you have got a 15-year extension of what you would have to do. There was no cost in there for the operation of WIPP for those 15 years and what it was going to cost. So we are still having a hard time coming to grips with what the actual cost of the different alternatives are.

This is one of those things that it is frustrating for our committee, I think, over the years for a lot of different things. Where we head down one path, spend billions of dollars, and then all of a sudden, change directions. And it seems like we are throwing money away.

But I am open to looking at what the alternatives are, and I want to look at the numbers behind the report that came out. But this amendment simply adds and reduces the defense nuclear nonproliferation account by the same amount. Therefore, the language of the amendment doesn't change the amounts directed specifically for the MOX project in the House report, which will continue to be funded at $345 million.

But I understand both of your concerns. They are concerns I share. And they are concerns we need to address because you are absolutely right. If we are not going to go down this road, we shouldn't be spending $345 million a year.

Now we are going to spend a bunch of money at the start. Even if you close it down, it is going to cost some money, or if you stop it. So all of that needs to be taken into consideration. But we need to make a determination of what is going to happen with MOX and what we are going to do with this additional plutonium.

Some people have suggested maybe the best thing to do is store it. Of course that violates an agreement that we have with the Russians. So you would have to get their agreement on that. So it is a challenging issue, I will be the first to admit. And we have had a challenge in the committee trying to deal with it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho's concerns and the way he is approaching it is really quite commendable and the right way to go about it. Two studies have been done, the most recent dealing with the $47 million. That speaks to the current MOX procedure and process. The blending down, you have correctly analyzed the problem there because it doesn't take into account the full cost, and then you have still got to dispose of this stuff someplace.

There is also the vitrification of it, which is blending down, putting it into a glass container, and then storing that. Those have problems.

There is another option that will be analyzed and is coming out later in this year, in September, and that is the use of a fast reactor to actually burn the plutonium and, thereby, make it unusable for weapons. It also would generate a significant amount of energy, which could produce steam and electrical energy along the way. That study is coming out later this year.

In the meantime, we ought to do what you are doing here, and that is, just slow down, take a look at this.

And for those who are concerned about the jobs in the Savannah River area, a lot of this work can be done there in any one of these options. Just don't do something that doesn't work, which is the current process underway. So you could do a fast reactor there. Use that as a method of consuming the plutonium and rendering it unuseful.

There are many different ways to do it. But we are headed down a rathole. Slow down. Stop.

I commend both the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Idaho for where they are going on this. Carry on.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from California. And I thank the gentleman from Nebraska, again, for his efforts in this area. I know it is a matter of both urgency to the United States and to the world, actually. But I thank the gentleman for his efforts in this arena, and continue on.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Again, let me just reiterate my deep thanks to the chairman for his leadership on this. This is a tough one, and he is working aggressively to try to get to the heart of a prudential and good decision.

Let me thank, again, the gentleman from California for his insights and participation as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $125,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $105,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I want to raise an issue along the lines of my earlier discussion and part of what we just heard in the previous discussion. That is, where are we going with the nuclear enterprise? What is it all about? Where will it take us?

My personal view is that we are in the first quarter of a new nuclear arms race. This amendment deals with a critical part of that effort to rebuild the nuclear weapons systems of the United States.

We currently have maybe 10,000 unused nuclear plutonium pits. This is the heart of a nuclear bomb. It is pure plutonium, and it is the heart of the bomb.

The 10,000 that are not used came out of nuclear weapons that have been dismantled as a result of the various arms control treaties that have been in place over the last 30 years, all to the good. The MOX facility deals with that unused excess plutonium and others. But this amendment deals with the notion of rebuilding and increasing the capacity of the United States to produce new plutonium pits.

□ 1945

We presently have the capacity to produce somewhere between 5 and 10 plutonium pits, again, the heart of a nuclear weapon, in the existing facilities. We are going to spend a few billion dollars—unknown—but somewhere probably between $1 billion and $2 billion or $3 billion building the facilities to increase the capacity to manufacture these plutonium pits to 50 to 80 a year.

Now, testimony that we have received in the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee indicates that nobody knows what you are going to do with them or whether you even need the pits, but they want to build the facility just in case.

You go: Wait a minute, you have 10,000 out there; what are you going to do? Why are you doing this?

It has never been answered other than: Well, we might need it some day.

Well, God willing, we will never need it some day. Five to 10 a year, more than we need, 50 to 80, the military doesn't know what to do with it; the NNSA doesn't know what to do with it, but they want to build the manufacturing facility even so.

This amendment simply says let's take $125 million of that and apply it to something useful like cleaning up what is going on out there. Just keep in mind that we are talking about an enormous amount of money here for the production or the manufacturing facilities of these pits.

It is not just the facility for the plutonium, but it is also for the rest of the bombs, so it is probably going to be well over $10 billion by the time we finish, and then you have the operating costs, if we ever operate at all. Be careful here. We are into a massive expenditure of over $1 trillion over the next 20 to 25 years.

I have asked the military: Tell us how we are going to spend that.

They say: Well, we really don't know.

They gave me a document that is a bunch of equations with no explanation of what the factors are. I am asking for information. I was shut down in committee yesterday, but we all ought to demand information.

What is going on here? What are we talking about? A new long-range stealth bomber to replace the B–2, new cruise missiles, new submarines, new missiles for land and sea, and new warheads to go on top of it; and, all the while, other countries are trying to match us. It is a nuclear arms race well underway.

Are we causing it? We are clearly part of it. Russia and China are also involved in this and matching technology, spending a vast amount of money. Just think what we could do if we took one-quarter of that and spent it on education. What could we do for the American people? I think I hear the knock-knock of time having run out, and that frightens me because time is running out on this issue, and we need to pay attention here.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SIMPSON and his committee for paying attention to all of this.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Could I just ask for clarification? Which of your amendments are you addressing in your arguments now? It was our understanding the gentleman was addressing the MOX facility. Are you addressing that or your prior amendment?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am addressing the facilities, the nuclear pit facilities, the plutonium pit facilities. It is $125 million. The MOX was my colleague from Nebraska's amendment. That was his amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment you are speaking to on the pit production is an end of the bill amendment, and we are not yet at the end of the bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So I can come back and do it again?

Mr. SIMPSON. There you go. The amendment that was reported by the Clerk was the MOX facility that took $125 million out of the MOX facility.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. That was the amendment that was reported by the Clerk.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is what I was speaking to.

Mr. SIMPSON. You have another amendment that deals with pit production?

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I can go back and talk about the MOX facility now. I stand corrected.

The 125 was the MOX facility amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Our arguments and the debate that we just had with the gentleman from Nebraska about the MOX facility and the challenges that we face in the MOX facility is the same as the debate we just had, and while we asked for the Department to look at the two alternatives, the downblend and the continuing MOX, the Armed Services Committee asked for a report on all five of the alternatives that they were looking at and the cost and stuff.

I would oppose this amendment of taking $125 million out of the MOX facility.

Mr. CLYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, if we are, in fact, about to entertain the MOX amendment, I would love to speak in opposition to that amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. This is the amendment that has been reported.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentleman would yield for 15 seconds, I will explain the error, and then I will be out of the way.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Quite correct, there was an error on my part.

This is the question of the MOX facility, $125 million to be applied to other cleanup programs across the Nation. That is it. I spoke on a different issue, and the MOX facility came up earlier.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I oppose this amendment. I do so because I really believe that this amendment would endanger our national security by making harmful cuts to the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility that is located in South Carolina.

This facility will be used to dispose of 34 metric tons of weapons grade plutonium according to binding international agreements originally signed back in 2000 and reaffirmed in 2010. Most of the plutonium has already been transferred to the Savannah River site, and it is there awaiting disposition through the MOX facility.

The President has requested the level of funding included in this bill to continue construction. The facility is over 65 percent complete and supports over 1,500 highly skilled jobs. Any further delay will jeopardize our international agreements and will abandon commitments that the country has made to the State of South Carolina when we signed and agreed to house these dangerous materials for our Nation.

I want to close by saying South Carolina has developed what I call a level of tolerance for nuclear. It didn't get there, as we say down in Gullah Geechee country, just by itself. We got there because of the commitment we made to this Nation years ago with the Manhattan Project.

I believe the State of South Carolina and the Savannah River site have made significant commitments to helping secure this Nation. I believe we would be breaking faith with the State to cripple this effort at this time because it is an agreement, the agreements are international, and I think we have a commitment to the State of South Carolina to continue the movement on this project.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be opposed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee which has jurisdiction over the NRC, our committee has taken a close look at the regulatory priorities and resource needs of the commission.

The Energy and Power Subcommittee oversees nuclear energy, and the Environment and Economy Subcommittee has oversight on nuclear waste. I serve on both subcommittees.

In both committee and subcommittees, we have held hearings in recent years with the commissioners on the NRC, as well as other experts and stakeholders. In these hearings, we have learned important facts such as, while the Nation's fleet of nuclear reactors continues to operate safely, the evidence clearly demonstrates that the NRC's budget exceeds what is reasonably necessary in light of current regulatory and licensing needs. We have further learned that—and the NRC Chairman recently acknowledged—the NRC budget needs to be right-sized to some degree.

We have also focused on the fact that, unlike most other Federal agencies, 90 percent of the NRC's budget is recovered through fees on nuclear licensees, which are eventually paid through electric rates.

This means that an outsized NRC budget is actually paid for by the American people, both through their taxes and their electric rates. We have also seen recent closures of nuclear power plants in the United States and fewer new plants coming online than anticipated a decade ago. In fact, even though the number of nuclear plants is currently decreasing, the NRC budget has increased substantially compared to 10 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee and the chairman for acting to provide a level of appropriations for the NRC that is appropriate under the circumstances. This budget gives the NRC all it needs to ensure the safe operation of the Nation's nuclear fleet without asking taxpayers and electricity ratepayers to pay more than is necessary.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for his interest in this subject. I can assure you that the subcommittee is very concerned also, and we look forward to working with you and your committees as we try to right-size the NRC and all of the budgets that we will be doing in the future.

As you said, the NRC is well aware of the fact that they need to right-size themselves as they try to attempt to implement their Project Aim 2020, so I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, $1,320,394,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $43,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,426,400).''

Page 30, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000).''

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would support beginning an assessment of the feasibility of using low-enriched uranium in naval reactor fuel that would meet military requirements.

Using low-enriched uranium in naval reactor fuel could yield significant potential national security benefits related to nuclear nonproliferation, could lower security costs, and supports naval reactor research and development at the cutting edge of nuclear science.

As we continue to face the threat of nuclear terrorism and as countries continue to develop naval fuel for military purposes, the imperative to reduce the use of highly enriched uranium will become increasingly important over the next several decades. This is the time to begin investments in new technologies to address proliferation threats and to reduce reliance on highly enriched uranium.

R&D on LEU for naval reactors would also support continued R&D within Naval Reactors at the cutting edge of nuclear science and engineering, which remains a critical capability. The Naval Reactors director Admiral Richardson testified on March 24, 2015, before the House Armed Services Committee that, with current technology, using low-enriched uranium fuel would only be feasible for aircraft carriers and would require an additional refueling at a cost of $1 billion.

He added, however:

The potential exists that we could develop an advanced fuel system that might increase uranium loading and make low-enriched uranium possible while still meeting very rigorous performance requirements for naval reactors on nuclear-powered warships.

Mr. Chairman, this $2.5 million in funding would support early testing and manufacturing development required to advance LEU technology for use in naval fuel. Such a program, if successful, could yield significant benefits for nuclear nonproliferation and yield security cost savings.

Mr. Chairman, it sounds like we have broad-based support for this amendment. I urge acceptance of this amendment in order to start this very important effort, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2000

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for Federal Salaries and Expenses in the National Nuclear Security Administration, $388,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $12,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed one fire apparatus pumper truck and one armored vehicle for replacement only, $5,055,550,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount $281,951,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

DEFENSE URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities for Department of Energy contributions for uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning activities, $471,797,000, to be deposited into the Defense Environmental Cleanup account which shall be transferred to the ''Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund''.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses, necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, and classified activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $767,570,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $253,729,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93–454, are approved for the Shoshone Paiute Trout Hatchery, the Spokane Tribal Hatchery, the Snake River Sockeye Weirs and, in addition, for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $5,000: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2016, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and for marketing electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, $6,900,000, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, up to $6,900,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southeastern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than $0: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $66,500,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and for marketing electric power and energy, for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500 in carrying out section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the Southwestern Power Administration, $47,361,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), up to $35,961,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southwestern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than $11,400,000: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $63,000,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, $307,714,000, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500, to remain available until expended, of which $302,000,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), and section 1 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939 (43 U.S.C. 392a), up to $214,342,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Western Area Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than $93,372,000, of which $87,658,000 is derived from the Reclamation Fund: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $352,813,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, $4,490,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 2 of the Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of that Act and of 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $4,262,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services from the Falcon and Amistad Dams shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the hydroelectric facilities of these Dams and associated Western Area Power Administration activities: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than $228,000: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that

they are incurred: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2016, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration may accept up to $460,000 in funds contributed by United States power customers of the Falcon and Amistad Dams for deposit into the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, and such funds shall be available for the purpose for which contributed in like manner as if said sums had been specifically appropriated for such purpose: *Provided further*, That any such funds shall be available without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission for the sole purpose of operating, maintaining, repairing, rehabilitating, replacing, or upgrading the hydroelectric facilities at these Dams in accordance with agreements reached between the Administrator, Commissioner, and the power customers.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $3,000, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles, $319,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $319,800,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2016 shall be retained and used for expenses necessary in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 301. (a) No appropriation, funds, or authority made available by this title for the Department of Energy shall be used to initiate or resume any program, project, or activity or to prepare or initiate Requests For Proposals or similar arrangements (including Requests for Quotations, Requests for Information, and Funding Opportunity Announcements) for a program, project, or activity if the program, project, or activity has not been funded by Congress.

(b)(1) Unless the Secretary of Energy notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 3 full business days in advance, none of the funds made available in this title may be used to—

(A) make a grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling $1,000,000 or more;

(B) make a discretionary contract award or Other Transaction Agreement totaling $1,000,000 or more, including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation;

(C) issue a letter of intent to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B); or

(D) announce publicly the intention to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress within 15 days of the conclusion of each quarter a report detailing each grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling less than $1,000,000 provided during the previous quarter.

(3) The notification required by paragraph (1) and the report required by paragraph (2) shall include the recipient of the award, the amount of the award, the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated, the account and program, project, or activity from which the funds are being drawn, the title of the award, and a brief description of the activity for which the award is made.

(c) The Department of Energy may not, with respect to any program, project, or activity that uses budget authority made available in this title under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs'', enter into a multiyear contract, award a multiyear grant, or enter into a multiyear cooperative agreement unless—

(1) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award; or

(2) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement includes a clause conditioning the Federal Government's obligation on the availability of future year budget authority and the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 3 days in advance.

(d) Except as provided in subsections (e), (f), and (g), the amounts made available by this title shall be expended as authorized by law for the programs, projects, and activities specified in the ''Bill'' column in the ''Department of Energy'' table included under the heading ''Title III—Department of Energy'' in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act.

(e) The amounts made available by this title may be reprogrammed for any program, project, or activity, and the Department shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 30 days prior to the use of any proposed reprogramming that would cause any program, project, or activity funding level to increase or decrease by more than $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, during the time period covered by this Act.

(f) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that—

(1) creates, initiates, or eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(2) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds are denied or restricted by this Act; or

(3) reduces funds that are directed to be used for a specific program, project, or activity by this Act.

(g)(1) The Secretary of Energy may waive any requirement or restriction in this section that applies to the use of funds made available for the Department of Energy if compliance with such requirement or restriction would pose a substantial risk to human health, the environment, welfare, or national security.

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of any waiver under paragraph (1) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after the date of the activity to which a requirement or restriction would otherwise have applied. Such notice shall include an explanation of the substantial risk under paragraph (1) that permitted such waiver.

SEC. 302. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be available to the same appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Available balances may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 303. Funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2016 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 304. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for the construction of facilities classified as high-hazard nuclear facilities under 10 CFR Part 830 unless independent oversight is conducted by the Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments to ensure the project is in compliance with nuclear safety requirements.

SEC. 305. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to approve critical decision-2 or critical decision-3 under Department of Energy Order 413.3B, or any successive departmental guidance, for construction projects where the total project cost exceeds $100,000,000, until a separate independent cost estimate has been developed for the project for that critical decision.

SEC. 306. Notwithstanding section 301(c) of this Act, none of the funds made available under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science'' may be used for a multiyear contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement of $1,000,000 or less unless the contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award.

SEC. 307. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any prior Act under the heading ''Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'' may be made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to, the Russian Federation.

(b) The Secretary of Energy may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that such activity is in the national security interests of the United States. This waiver authority may not be delegated.

(c) A waiver under subsection (b) shall not be effective until 15 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, in classified form if necessary, a report on the justification for the waiver.

SEC. 308. (a) NOTIFICATION OF STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE DRAWDOWN.—None of the funds made available by this Act or any prior Act, or funds made available in the SPR Petroleum Account, may be used to conduct a drawdown (including a test drawdown) and sale or exchange of petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve unless the Secretary of Energy provides notice, in accordance with subsection (b), of such exchange, or drawdown (including a test drawdown) to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

(b)(1) CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION.—The notification required under subsection (a) shall include at a minimum—

(A) the justification for the drawdown or exchange, including—

(i) a specific description of any obligation under international energy agreements; and

(ii) in the case of a test drawdown, the specific aspects of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to be tested;

(B) the provisions of law (including regulations) authorizing the drawdown or exchange;

(C) the number of barrels of petroleum products proposed to be withdrawn or exchanged;

(D) the location of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve site or sites from which the petroleum products are proposed to be withdrawn;

(E) a good faith estimate of the expected proceeds from the sale of the petroleum products;

(F) an estimate of the total inventories of petroleum products in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve after the anticipated drawdown;

(G) a detailed plan for disposition of the proceeds after deposit into the SPR Petroleum Account; and

(H) a plan for refilling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, including whether the acquisition will be of the same or a different petroleum product.

(2) TIMING OF NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall provide the notification required under subsection (a)—

(A) in the case of an exchange or a drawdown, as soon as practicable after the exchange or drawdown has occurred; and

(B) in the case of a test drawdown, not later than 30 days prior to the test drawdown.

(c) POST-SALE NOTIFICATION.—In addition to reporting requirements under other provisions of law, the Secretary shall, upon the execution of all contract awards associated with a competitive sale of petroleum products, notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the actual value of the proceeds from the sale.

(d)(1) NEW REGIONAL RESERVES.—The Secretary may not establish any new regional petroleum product reserve unless funding for the proposed regional petroleum product reserve is explicitly requested in advance in an annual budget submission and approved by the Congress in an appropriations Act.

(2) The budget request or notification shall include—

(A) the justification for the new reserve;

(B) a cost estimate for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of the reserve, including funding sources;

(C) a detailed plan for operation of the reserve, including the conditions upon which the products may be released;

(D) the location of the reserve; and

(E) the estimate of the total inventory of the reserve.

SEC. 309. Of the amounts made available by this Act for ''National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities'', up to $50,000,000 may be reprogrammed within such account for Domestic Uranium Enrichment, subject to the notice requirement in section 301(e).

SEC. 310. (a) Unobligated balances available from appropriations for fiscal years 2005 through 2010 are hereby permanently rescinded from the following accounts of the Department of Energy in the specified amounts:

(1) ''Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'', $16,677,000.

(2) ''Energy Programs—Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability'', $900,000.

(3) ''Energy Programs—Nuclear Energy'', $1,665,000.

(4) ''Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development'', $12,064,000.

(5) ''Energy Programs—Science'', $4,717,000.

(6) ''Power Marketing Administrations—Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration'', $4,832,000.

(b) No amounts may be rescinded by this section from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, notwithstanding 40 U.S.C. 14704, and for expenses necessary for the Federal Co-Chairman and the Alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $95,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100–456, section 1441, $29,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, as authorized by the Delta Regional Authority Act of 2000, notwithstanding sections 382C(b)(2), 382F(d), 382M, and 382N of said Act, $12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998: *Provided*, That funds shall be available for construction projects in an amount not to exceed 80 percent of total project cost for distressed communities, as defined by section 307 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (division C, title III, Public Law 105–277), as amended by section 701 of appendix D, title VII, Public Law 106–113 (113 Stat. 1501A–280), and an amount not to exceed 50 percent for non-distressed communities.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the Northern Border Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be available for administrative expenses, notwithstanding section 15751(b) of title 40, United States Code.

SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, $250,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, $1,003,233,000, including official representation expenses not to exceed $25,000, to remain available until expended, of which $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, not more than $9,500,000 may be made available for salaries, travel, and other support costs for the Office of the Commission, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which, notwithstanding section 201(a)(2)(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5841(a)(2)(c)), the use and expenditure shall only be approved by a majority vote of the Commission: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $862,274,000 in fiscal year 2016 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than $140,959,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be for university research and development in areas relevant to their respective organization's mission, and $5,000,000 shall be for a Nuclear Science and Engineering Grant Program that will support multiyear projects that do not align with programmatic missions but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $12,136,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $10,060,000 in fiscal year 2016 shall be retained and be available until September 30, 2017, for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than $2,076,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $958,000 shall be for Inspector General services for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, which shall not be available from fee revenues.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100–203, section 5051, $3,600,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act, $1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That any fees, charges, or commissions received pursuant to section 106(h) of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720d(h)) in fiscal year 2016 in excess of $2,402,000 shall not be available for obligation until appropriated in a subsequent Act of Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

SEC. 401. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall comply with the July 5, 2011,

version of Chapter VI of its Internal Commission Procedures when responding to Congressional requests for information.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

SEC. 502. (a) None of the funds made available in title III of this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriations Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(b) None of the funds made available for any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may be transferred to accounts funded in title III of this Act, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriations Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(c) The head of any relevant department or agency funded in this Act utilizing any transfer authority shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a semiannual report detailing the transfer authorities, except for any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality, used in the previous 6 months and in the year-to-date. This report shall include the amounts transferred and the purposes for which they were transferred, and shall not replace or modify existing notification requirements for each authority.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations).

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to conduct closure of adjudicatory functions, technical review, or support activities associated with the Yucca Mountain geologic repository license application, or for actions that irrevocably remove the possibility that Yucca Mountain may be a repository option in the future.

SEC. 505. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547 of July 19, 2010.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 506. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transform the National Energy Technology Laboratory into a government-owned, contractor-operated laboratory, or to consolidate or close the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, there have been efforts to privatize and consolidate the National Energy Technology Laboratory, also known to us as NETL. This amendment is offered to eliminate that uncertainty of privatization and to continue the present public-private partnership.

NETL is our Nation's premier energy laboratory for fossil energy, using 600 government scientists, technicians, and employees, but they couple that with nearly 1,200 private sector contractors. Through this partnership, NETL has developed breakthrough research, carbon capture, enhanced natural gas exploration and production, emission control for our power plants, and steam and gas turbine efficiency.

Having NETL government owned and operated also maintains that the research that they produce will not be proprietary and is available to all utility companies. Small utility companies in rural America where I come from would potentially suffer the most from a move towards privatization, and they would no longer be able to perform this research and be forced to buy the new technologies at very high costs.

Mr. Chairman, who would end up paying these high costs? The limited customers of these small companies through higher electric bills.

People looking to privatize and consolidate these laboratories seem to be searching for a solution to a problem that doesn't exist.

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment would prevent the Department from transforming the National Energy Technology Laboratory into a government-owned, contractor-operated laboratory, or to consolidate or close NETL.

NETL does important research in support of a balanced energy portfolio that will increase the efficiency and safe usage of abundant natural resources in this Nation.

I appreciate my colleague's passion for this issue, and I have no objection to this amendment being included in the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BABIN

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'' may be made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that require the Islamic Republic of Iran to cease the pursuit, acquisition, and development of nuclear weapons technology.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying that I strongly support programs and operations that are funded by the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation section of the underlying bill.

Keeping loose nuclear materials—especially from places like the former Soviet Union states—out of the hands of America's enemies is one of the most important duties of the Department of Energy and the Federal Government as a whole. That being said, Congress has the obligation to set requirements and criteria for every dollar of taxpayer money that we spend, especially funds that are sent or used overseas. In fact, my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee already exercised this judgment with an additional provision in their bill that is very similar to the amendments that I will be offering today.

Section 307 of the underlying bill specifically prohibits any DOE nonproliferation funds from being used to enter into new contracts or agreements with Russia, sending a strong signal to Mr. Putin and others that there are real consequences for their irresponsible and destabilizing actions of the last few years.

My amendment adds this section to the end of the bill:

''None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading 'Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation' may be made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that require the Islamic Republic of Iran to cease the pursuit, acquisition, and development of nuclear weapons technology.''

If the last line of my amendment sounds familiar, it should. It is the very same language that Congress defined as total disarmament of Iran's weapons of mass destruction program when it passed the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010. That bill passed the Senate by a vote of 99–0 and in the House 408–8, and only two of the Members who voted ''no'' on that bill still serve here in Congress today.

There is a lot to be worried about in President Obama's deal with Iran, but two serious concerns trump all of the others:

First, how will Iran properly deal with and dispose of 14,000 centrifuges and 9,700 kilograms of highly enriched uranium that they are supposed to give up?

And if they are serious about not pursuing a bomb, what are they planning to do with the 6,000 centrifuges and 300 kilograms of uranium that they get to keep under this deal?

On the first question, the Web site Vox, hardly a rightwing outlet, says that the disposal of these materials is an open question and that the negotiators punted on how to safely and effectively remove this material from Iran. Given that fact, there is every reason to believe that the DOE nonproliferation account could be used for this purpose.

The second question is even more troubling than the first. Michael Morrell, former Director of the CIA, said back in February that ''the potential Iran nuclear agreement would limit Iran to the number of centrifuges needed for a weapon but too few for a nuclear power program,'' a statement verified as ''true'' by PolitiFact.

□ 2015

Iran's leaders have repeatedly said they have no interest in developing a nuclear weapon, and over the years, they have made that promise to the international community to gain relief from crippling economic sanctions. I don't trust Iran, but even if I did, I would still say that we follow President Reagan's charge that led us to victory when facing another nuclear foe: trust but verify.

Let me be clear. If Iran proves that they are serious about giving up all of their nuclear ambitions, I fully support using DOE nonproliferation assets to get their nuclear materials safely out of that country. Why, I would write a check myself to make sure that my grandkids don't grow up in a world where loose Iranian nuclear material makes its way to the black market or into the hands of terrorists.

But Iran can't have one without the other. That is why my amendment will make sure that, if DOE signs a contract with Iran to help remove nuclear material from Iran, it will also stipulate that they are giving up all efforts to build a bomb.

This is a commonsense amendment that reiterates the position of Congress and the promises made by President Obama's negotiating team. I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and I share a great desire to prevent the spread of Iran's nuclear capabilities, but the only thing that, unfortunately, your amendment does is endanger security, including America's security.

We can differ on how we work with Iran on the broader issue of conditions for an agreement on sanctions and their nuclear program, but that is not the issue we are debating here today. What we are debating here today is the nonproliferation program at the Department of Energy. Stopping the spread of dangerous materials from the Republic of Iran is in our Nation's interest regardless of the outcome of the broader discussion.

While there are currently no plans to work in Iran and no funding that directly supports work in Iran, let me give you a few examples of what your amendment would stop, would preclude:

One, the Department of Energy's nonproliferation program might be asked to engage with Iran to facilitate the removal of excess low-enriched uranium or heavy water from Iran. Such an engagement could necessitate contracts to arrange for the packaging, shipment, and disposition of such materials and would be prevented by the proposed amendment.

Second, the Department of Energy's nonproliferation program might also be asked to engage with Iran to strengthen Iran's nuclear safety, nuclear security, or nuclear safeguard practices. Such engagement could require contracts to provide technical expertise or support logistical arrangements and would be prevented by your amendment.

There may be some who want to use any bill, including our bill, to make political points, but shouldn't we be more concerned about endangering American lives and the lives of other innocents around the world? Wouldn't you prefer that this material be under lock and key in the United States, for example, or with one of our allies than have it stored in Iran? I can only speculate that our security practices are much better.

This amendment has no place in this bill, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, yes, I would still earnestly urge an ''aye'' vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BABIN

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee call up amendment No. 4.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'' may be used to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that include authority for the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct anytime, anywhere inspections of civil and military sites within the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is similar in nature to the one just offered, and I want to ensure that my strong support for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program and the good work of the committee to properly fund it is, once again, reflected in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this second amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill to make clear to Iran and to the world that the complete, intrusive inspections of all Iran civil and military sites are nonnegotiable and must be part of any deal with Iran.

My amendment adds this section to the end of the bill: ''None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading 'Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation' may be made available to enter into new contracts with or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that include authority for the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct anytime,

anywhere inspections of civil and military sites within the Islamic Republic of Iran.''

I was encouraged to see Energy Secretary Moniz, President Obama's chief technical expert in the Iran negotiations, quoted as saying: ''We expect to have anywhere, anytime access'' to conduct nuclear inspections of Iran.

I share his view that without these full, intrusive inspections there is simply no way to fully and truly verify that Iran is complying with the terms of any deal they supposedly agree to.

Unfortunately, the Iranians do not share the views of our Secretary. Shortly after the Secretary made these comments to Bloomberg News, Iranian Brigadier General Hossein Salami responded by saying:

''Not only will we not grant foreigners the permission to inspect our military sites, we will not even give them permission to think about such a subject. They will not even be permitted to inspect the most normal military site in their dreams.''

Apologists for Iran say that they just need to say these types of things, as well as maintain a limited nuclear stockpile, in order to save face and preserve their national pride.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't come here to help the Iranians with their PR efforts. Neither did you, and neither did anyone in this body. Our job is to keep the American people and the free world safe, and any deal with Iran that lifts sanctions but is not coupled with strict inspection requirements isn't just not worth the paper it is written on; it will make us less safe.

History can be our guide on this very subject. In one of his biggest but least discussed foreign policy failures, President Clinton in 1994 made a similar ''deal'' with North Korea that was supposed to end their nuclear ambitions and bring them into the international community.

Sanctions were lifted, but we were given nothing but mischief and deception by the North Koreans in return. International inspectors were obstructed and blocked on a regular basis. North Korea continued to develop their nuclear program, only now in the shadows and in hardened, underground facilities. In 2006, they successfully detonated a nuclear bomb, and they continue to develop and test long-range missiles and to threaten their neighbors and the West. Instead of weakening the authoritarian regime that controls North Korea, the lifting of the sanctions and the development of nuclear weapons allowed the Kims to tighten their grip on the country and pass it along to the next generation.

Congress cannot allow President Obama's flawed deal on Iran to take us down this same path.

Once again, if we are going to use DOE resources and taxpayer money to help Iran clean up the mess created by their nuclear ambitions, it should come with conditions. The most important condition should be that they permit the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct the anytime, anywhere inspections that are so essential to any nuclear reduction agreement.

History and our own Energy Secretary tell us that this deal won't work without robust and full inspections. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment to make sure that those inspections do happen.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination as to the meaning of inspections that qualify as ''anytime, anywhere.''

The proponent has failed to fulfill his burden as to the meaning of that term.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I call up the Hudson amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. (a) Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 11.1208 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts under the headings ''National Nuclear Security Administration'', ''Environmental and Other Defense Activities'', or ''Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, this evening, I offer an amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill that would cut spending back to the fiscal year 2008 level.

While I appreciate the work of the Appropriations Committee in crafting this important bill, I recognize that we should go further to cut reckless spending. Washington has a spending problem, and we can't afford to kick the can down the road any longer.

My amendment makes an across-the-board cut of more than 11 percent to the bill in order to decrease the amount back to the fiscal year 2008 level, saving nearly $2 billion for the taxpayers.

We are over $18 trillion in our national debt. This is merely a drop in the bucket, and we owe it to our constituents to cut even more to restore fiscal sanity in Washington. Defense accounts are exempt from this cut because Congress is expected to take up the National Defense Authorization Act in the near future to address those programs.

Mr. Chairman, when I first ran for Congress, I was repeatedly asked: ''If you are elected, what programs would you cut?''

The answer I gave was: ''First, I would go back to 2008 spending levels, and then we will start cutting.''

My amendment does just this. It allows us to return to the point when we can finally get serious about paying down our national debt and saving future generations from economic disaster. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because it is sort of an untargeted proposal, and our budget in many places on this bill is very tight. We know the net effect will be to reduce jobs and hurt the middle class in a sector where America needs help, and that is energy independence and the modernization of our infrastructure.

The result of the amendment will be less investment in water resource infrastructure all over this country at a time when global trade is increasing. Energy research and development programs, which lead us to future energy, not past energy resources, which create good jobs and have substantial returns on investment, will be harmed.

At a time when unemployed Americans lose jobless benefits and when many young families struggle just to survive, we should be creating jobs and securing the American Dream through investing in our energy future, including innovation and investments in the ground in every ''all of the above'' energy sector we have, not tearing it down. Just since 2003, the United States has spent $2.3 trillion in importing foreign petroleum. Think about that one.

This is a vast shift of wealth, and thousands upon thousands of jobs are connected to energy production from

our country. This amendment only exacerbates this shift of wealth from the American middle class to offshore. It is not something I support, and I doubt the gentleman really wants to support that.

This bill funds critical water resource projects; it supports science activities necessary to breakthroughs to lead us to a new energy future; and it contributes, importantly, to our national defense through vital weapons, naval reactor research, and the nonproliferation funding we had been discussing earlier this evening.

□ 2030

We must make certain decisions to lead our country forward. There are a lot more people who live in this country than lived here in 2008 or 2003. Also, one of the reasons that we have a little bit of uptick in some of the accounts is, there are actually more American people now, so we have got to do some things in terms of the ports. Our ports silt up. We have got to get that out of there in order that we can get larger ships into our ports carrying more goods.

We can't live in the past. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment. Let's take America to the future and not backwards.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment. This bill that we are currently considering meets the budget resolution that was just adopted. We have been cutting discretionary spending for the last 4 years, $173 billion, as I understand it, over the last 4 years, not in decreases in the increases, but actual decreases in spending. This goes way too far and makes sweeping changes with broad cuts to the reductions. This is an approach I can't support.

I am particularly concerned about the impact this amendment would have on our critical infrastructure, as mentioned by the gentlewoman from Ohio, and the basic research needs that are prioritized in this bill. While the gentleman has attempted to exclude national security activities, I have got to tell you, in all honesty, national security is not the only thing the Federal Government does. We do do other things. We maintain our waterways and our ports and other activities. This amendment would still have the detrimental impact on the security of nuclear materials at the Idaho National Laboratory. These accounts are very complex, and reductions to each account must be carefully weighed, and that is what this subcommittee has been doing and holding hearings on for the last 4 months.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.'' I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just wanted to say to the author of the amendment that I said something to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means today. I think he took it rather lightly, but I said, Here we are discussing our appropriation bills on the floor, and I said, We are trying to balance the budget. I said, But you know what? Your committee is sitting back; there are no revenues on the table, and mandatory spending isn't on the table, and you are trying to take it out of the hides of discretionary spending, which is such a small part of the entire Federal budget. You know what he did? He twirled around and kind of laughed me off and walked toward the back of the Chamber. I didn't think that was a very responsible answer.

So I respect the gentleman being down here tonight, offering his amendment. I would encourage you to talk to the head of the Committee on Ways and Means because to try to get us to shrink even more than we have done in many of our accounts—and, by the way, eleven other appropriation bills coming after us that have been asked to do the same—really isn't fair to the American people.

We need all hands on deck, all hands on deck. So I thank the gentleman for attempting to be responsible, but I really think you ought to look to some of the other committees that are sitting back while the burden is on our committee to make these decisions alone. That isn't right.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I acknowledge the fine point the gentlewoman made that we can't cut discretionary spending to get ourselves out of debt. She makes two valid points: we need more revenue and we need to address the mandatory spending side. I agree wholeheartedly. We need tax reform to get us more revenue, to get the economy generated, to get people back to work, and we also need to look at saving Social Security and Medicare, shoring them up for future generations and controlling the cost curve. She makes a valid point.

I also want to acknowledge that Chairman SIMPSON and the Committee on Appropriations have actually made real cuts over the last few years. He also makes a valid point that we have actually cut discretionary spending in real dollars. I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, we can do more. I just believe that if you look at the path we are on, we are heading, if we don't spend another dime, toward a horrific debt crisis in this country. We just can't afford to sit back and not deal with that.

I believe we do need to work on the mandatory side for sure because that is the real driver of our debt. But in the meantime, let's go back to pre-stimulus time, let's go back to 2008 spending levels because I don't remember the Federal Government starving for money. I don't remember the Federal Government just barely being able to function because it didn't have enough revenue back in 2008. I think it is prudent for us to do that. It is about jobs, it is about the economy, it is about our future generation, our children and grandchildren who are going to have to actually pay the bills that we are running up right now. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to please support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that required all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternative fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31 of this year.

My amendment echoes the President's memorandum by prohibiting funds in this act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles unless that purchase is made in accord with the President's memorandum.

I have submitted identical amendments to 15 different appropriations bills over the past few years, and every

time they have been accepted by both the majority and the minority. I hope my amendment will receive similar support today.

Global oil prices are down. We no longer pay $147 per barrel, but despite increased production here in the United States, the global price of oil is still largely determined by OPEC. Spikes in oil prices have profound repercussions for our economy. The primary reason is that our cars and trucks run only on petroleum. We can change that with alternative technologies that exist today. The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America, over 635,000 vehicles. More than 50,000 of those vehicles are within the jurisdiction of this bill and being used by the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding the use of ethanol. People there can drive to a gas station and choose whether to fill their vehicle with gasoline or with ethanol. They make their choice based on cost or whatever criteria they deem important. I want the same choice for American consumers. That is why I am also proposing a bill this Congress, as I have done many times in the past, which will provide for cars built in America to be able to run on a fuel instead of or in addition to gasoline. They do it in Brazil. We can do it here, and it would cost less than $100 per car to do so.

In conclusion, expanding the role these alternative technologies play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage that foreign government-controlled oil companies hold over Americans. It will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers. I am delighted that both my Republican and Democratic colleagues have unanimously supported this bill for the past several years. I ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) The amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Department of Energy—Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program'' is hereby reduced to $0.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide a loan under section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise because too often here at the Federal level we find ourselves rewarding or occasionally funding corporations that would do what they do irregardless of what we did at the Federal level. It has been a point of contention with Democratic colleagues. Too often we continue to pay for programs that have outlived their original purpose. I think that too often we find ourselves looking the other way at programs that don't work and/or have wasted tens upon tens of millions of dollars.

It is for those different reasons that I rise to offer this amendment, which would indeed defund the Department of Energy's failed Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing program. Quite simply, it would just do two things: one, it would eliminate the $6 million in funding that would go to this program, and, two, it would prevent any further lending from this program's unused lending capacity.

The reason I think doing those two things are awfully important is, one, this is, indeed, a case of paying corporations to do what they would already do. Again, this has been a point in the budget debate that we had earlier today from both Republican and Democratic colleagues alike, saying we shouldn't be paying corporations to do things they would already do. Two, this is, indeed, a stimulus era program. However well intended in 2009, it has outlived its purpose, and we are not in the economic situation that we found ourselves in 2009. In fact, this program's authority expired back in 2012, and I think it is a recognition by this Congress of the fact that maybe some of the program hasn't been working so well as to why that has indeed occurred.

Finally, this program has seen real losses; 40 percent of its loans have gone bad. According to a GAO report, they actually wrote up some of those losses. What I might do is just share for one moment with my colleagues, as part of a government reform look at this program, there was a letter to then Secretary Chu February 28, 2012, from one of the applicants. In it he quotes the chairman of a Fortune 10 company—not 100, but Fortune 10 company, and this is in the reference to the letter—told your former deputy, Jonathan Silver, that this program lacked integrity. That is, it did not have a consistent process and rules against which private enterprises could rationally evaluate their chances and intelligently allocate time and resources against that process.

There can be no greater failing of government than to not have integrity when dealing with its taxpaying citizens. For a variety of reasons, I offer this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I want to share a story. I was out at one of our energy labs in California and walked into a research lab, a Cummins engine was up on the boards. I said, What is going on in here? The answer was, We are trying to understand the science of combustion. I said, You mean it is 2014, and we don't understand that yet? They said, No, Congresswoman, we really don't know what happens inside an internal combustion chamber. They were studying what happens when fuel ignites inside that chamber so they could make it more energy efficient. I was surprised to learn that every single automotive company in this country depends on the results of that research, and Cummins is in the lead.

I want to say to the gentleman, I come from automotive America. When the industry fell to its knees in 2008 because we have never had a trade policy that opens closed markets like Japan and Korea and China, I thought to myself, I never thought I would live to see this day. After the wise decision of a majority of this Congress and the Obama administration, we lifted the automotive industry of this country out of the dregs.

I have watched it recover with vehicles like the Cruze and with the Wrangler, which is leading the list. When I look at what Ford is doing in terms of its EcoBoost engine, I see an industry being reborn in our Nation. The economic growth that comes with it, the incredible muscle that it provides inside the spine of this economy—not tangential growth, but real wealth, real wealth being created, again, across this country in this very important industry—I wouldn't do anything at this point in American history with the closed markets we are facing abroad not to support advanced technology in this country.

What we are competing against in other places are countries disguising themselves as companies, and they are able to subsidize their industry, close their markets, and prevent even our parts going into their original equipment. We can succeed most importantly by advancing automotive technology, advanced vehicle technology.

□ 2045

This particular program allows the component suppliers, as well as the original equipment, to benefit. I can tell you, though, the companies do research themselves; they don't do the kind of basic research that is necessary to provide the incredible breakthroughs that can come through the Department of Energy.

If I said to you 25 years ago, ''Would you believe that 10 percent of gasoline

blends are ethanol and renewable fuels,'' you would probably say, ''Congresswoman, you have been staying up too late too many nights of the week.''

In fact, it has happened. Now, we are going to move to a 15 percent renewable blend. Who would have thought that would be possible? Who would have thought we could get 40-mile-a-gallon vehicles on the road? We are moving toward that now, flexible fuel. That is not by accident. This program supports just what it says, advanced technology vehicles manufacturing.

Given concerns that have been expressed by my colleagues regarding appropriate oversight of these programs, I think the net effect of your amendment is going to be to eliminate oversight of this program, which I don't think we want to do. I think we want to make it work for America's sake.

I oppose your amendment, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I also have to oppose this amendment. While I appreciate the gentleman's position on the ATVM program, the elimination would hurt Federal oversight of the program of more than $8 billion in loans already given. The committee recommendations include the $6 million as a reasonable amount to provide oversight and direction to the existing loan portfolio and no more.

I don't think the gentleman wants to actually eliminate the oversight of the loans that are out there that are going to be running for the next 30 years.

I must oppose the gentleman's amendment in order to ensure that there is proper oversight of taxpayer funding.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman very much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank both of my colleagues for their counterpoints, and I understand absolutely this notion of competitiveness. I agree with Thomas Friedman, the world is flat; and we are in a global competition for jobs, capital, and way of life.

Look at, again, the fundamentals of this program. I have here a GAO—Government Accountability Office—report that says the cost of participating in this program outweighs the benefits to companies. That is a GAO report, not a private sector report, not a rightwing report.

I think it is also interesting, in pulling this letter that was, again, written by a supplicant to the agency itself, said that the due diligence process in their attempt—and they ultimately quit—but their attempt to get a loan was more than 1,175 days. His point in this letter was that that was more than tenuous and, frankly, had much to do with their ultimately ceasing and desisting.

I would also make this point: they have only made five loans. If we were depending on these five loans for innovation in new technology in the way that internal combustion engines work or the way that we burn fossil fuel, we are in real trouble, but five loans is what we are talking about.

I would also make this point: I think, at some point, given the scarcity of resources that we do deal with in Washington, D.C., we have to at some level make a divide between big companies. Ford's market cap is $63 billion. Alcoa's is $16 billion.

Would not these funds be better used going to small innovators, as opposed to these large, multinational corporations that I think, in many cases, are the beneficiary of corporate largesse, but corporate largesse that I don't think serves the taxpayer well or, according to these industry analysts, the industry as well?

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. During fiscal year 2016, the limitation relating to total project costs in section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280) shall not apply with respect to any project that receives funds made available by title I of this Act.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would waive the limit on total costs for Army Corps projects which are set forth in section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

The law states that a project cannot be funded by more than 20 percent of the project's total authorized cost. This amendment would waive that limitation for any project that receives funds made available by title I of this act.

Thirty or so years have passed since Congress originally authorized many of the current Federal flood control projects. Unfortunately, the large backlog of projects, incremental funding by Congress, and unforeseen circumstances has resulted in costly delays for projects across this country, pushing many over the now outdated authorized limits. Many of these projects are so close to the finish line, and this language could help them cross it.

Mr. Chairman, this language is vital to the continuation of valued flood control projects in my congressional district. The Dodson Industrial District project in Kansas City, Missouri, has completed its first three phases. However, without an increase in its authorized total cost, the project cannot move forward on the final phase.

Currently, the area has a floodwall unconnected to the rest of the project and investments of $250 million at risk. If the project could be fully funded at the increased total amount, it could be completed in fiscal year 2017.

Projects that have reached their 902 limit can apply for a project cost modification. However, the application and review process routinely takes several years to get approval from the Army Corps headquarters. These valued projects, in which the Federal Government has already invested millions of dollars, are languishing for 2, 3, or more years during that review process.

Another control project in Kansas City, called Turkey Creek Basin, has over $200 million in investment protected by this project, including a major interstate highway. It was authorized in 1999 and is ready for the final phase, but did not receive Federal funding last year or in this year's budget request because of a pending cost modification application, which began in 2013.

Mr. Chairman, just in my district, there are three flood control projects that have pending cost modification applications that were started in 2013. I can only surmise that this trend has continued in just about every other congressional district in the country.

Mr. Chairman, these are not exotic projects. These are projects which will help generate the businesses in those areas to a point where they can begin to grow.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their attention to this matter. With some assurances that the committee will try to address this issue as the bill moves into conference process, I would consider withdrawing the amendment at any time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law by waiving section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 with respect to certain projects covered by the bill.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that actually maintains current law.

Since its passage in 2007, I have heard from tens of thousands of constituents about how the language in the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act will take away consumer choice when deciding what lightbulb to use in your home. In fact, they are right.

While the government has passed energy efficiency standards in other realms over the years, they have never jumped so far and lowered standards so drastically. It is to a point where technology is still years away from making lightbulbs that are compliant with the law at a price point that the average American can afford.

Opponents to my amendment will claim that the 2007 language does not ban the incandescent bulb. That is true. It bans the sales of the 100-watt, the 60-watt, and the 45-watt bulbs. The replacement bulbs are far from economically efficient, even if they are energy efficient. A family living paycheck to paycheck can't afford to replace every bulb in their house at even $5 a bulb.

The economics of the lightbulb mandate are only part of the story. With the extreme expansion of Federal powers undertaken by President Obama and the Democrats in Congress during the first 2 years of the Obama administration, Americans have woken up to just how far the Constitution's Commerce Clause has been manipulated from its original intent. The lightbulb mandate is a perfect example of this.

The Commerce Clause was intended by our Founding Fathers to be a limitation on Federal authority, not a catchall nod to allow for any topic to be regulated by Washington; indeed, it is clear that the Founding Fathers never intended this clause to be used to allow the Federal Government to regulate and pass mandates on consumer products that do not pose a risk to human health or safety.

This Congress must be on the side of consumers and consumer choice. If new, energy-efficient lightbulbs save money and are better for the environment, we should trust the American people to make that choice on their own and move to these bulbs. We should not be forcing these lightbulbs on the American public.

The bottom line is the Federal Government has no business taking away the freedom of Americans to choose what bulb to put in their homes. I will add that, recently, the lightbulb manufacturers in this country have claimed that, because of the stopgap provision in the 2007 law, if we continue to prevent the Department of Energy from promulgating rules pursuant to these provisions, the manufacturers will be forced to stop manufacturing compliant incandescent bulbs.

This is actually an argument to repeal the 2007 language in its entirety, not to allow it to be implemented. We should not allow a stopgap trigger in the law to extort us into passing bad policy and moving forward.

This exact amendment has been accepted for the past 3 years by a voice vote and has been included in the annual appropriations legislation signed into law by the President each year since its first inclusion. It allows consumers to continue to have a choice and to have a say about what they will put in their homes. It is common sense.

Mr. Chairman, I should add that I have had conversations with my good friend, Mr. JORDAN from Ohio, on this amendment. I understand that there have been discussions about changes to the language in order to balance both the philosophical belief that this is the wrong policy for our country and the pragmatic belief that we should do no harm to the livelihoods of our constituents.

I continue to offer, as I did last July, to sit down with Mr. JORDAN or anyone else to see if compromise language can be achieved prior to the end of the fiscal year, but in the meantime, I offer this amendment to the body.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment. I think it is absolutely the right thing to do. It is pure common sense.

As you know, these newer bulbs, while they may be more energy efficient, they are much more expensive. I have yet to see one that costs less than $3 or $4. The incandescent bulbs—when you can find them—you can get four for $2.50 or something like that.

This is a commonsense approach to let the consumer choose. Certainly, for lower-income Americans that don't have the ability to buy the more expensive bulbs, it makes a lot of economic sense.

I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2100

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I strongly oppose this damaging rider by my good friend, Congressman BURGESS of Texas, because it would block the Department of Energy from implementing or enforcing commonsense energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs. This rider was a bad idea when it was first offered 4 years ago, and it is even more unsupportable now.

Every claim made by proponents of this rider has been proven wrong. Dr. BURGESS told us that the energy efficiency standards would ban incandescent lightbulbs, but that simply is false. You can go to the store today and see shelves of modern, energy-efficient incandescent lightbulbs that meet the standard. They are the same as the old bulbs, except that they last longer, use less electricity, and save consumers money.

We have heard for years that the energy efficiency standards restrict consumer choice. But if you have shopped for lightbulbs lately, which I have, you know that isn't true either. Modern incandescent bulbs, compact fluorescent lightbulbs, and LEDs of every shape, size, and color are now available. Consumers never had more choice.

The efficiency standards spurred innovation that dramatically expanded options for consumers. Critics of the efficiency standards claimed that they would cost consumers money. In fact, the opposite is true. When the standards are in full effect, the average American family will save about $100 every year. That is $13 billion in savings nationwide every year. But this rider threatens those savings, and that is why consumer groups have consistently opposed this rider.

Here is the reality. The 2007 consensus energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs were enacted with bipartisan support and continue to enjoy overwhelming industry support. U.S. manufacturers are already meeting the efficiency standards.

The effect of the rider is to allow foreign manufacturers to sell old, inefficient lightbulbs in the United States that violate the efficiency standards. This is unfair to domestic producers who have invested millions of dollars in U.S. plants to make efficient bulbs that meet the standards.

Why on Earth would we want to pass a rider that favors foreign manufacturers who ignore our laws and penalize U.S. manufacturers who are following our laws?

But it even gets worse. The rider now poses an additional threat to U.S. manufacturing. The bipartisan 2007 energy bill required the Department of Energy to establish updated lightbulb efficiency standards by January 1, 2017. It also provided that if final updated standards are not issued by then, a more stringent standard of 45 lumens per watt automatically takes effect. Incandescent lightbulbs currently cannot meet this backstop standard.

This rider blocks the Department of Energy from issuing the required efficiency standards and ensures that the backstop will kick in. Ironically, it is this rider that could effectively ban the incandescent lightbulb.

The Burgess rider directly threatens existing lightbulb manufacturing jobs in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, to name but three. It would stifle innovation and punish companies that have invested in domestic manufacturing. This rider aims to reverse years of technological progress, only to kill jobs, increase electricity bills for our constituents, and worsen pollution.

It is time to choose common sense over rigid ideology. It is time to listen to the manufacturing companies, consumer groups, and efficiency advocates who all agree this rider is harmful. I urge all Members to vote ''no'' on the Burgess lightbulb rider.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I would just observe, at the end of calendar year 2007, the commentator George Will observed the United States Congress had two jobs: deliver the mail and defend the border. It had done neither. But what it had done was ban the incandescent bulb, perhaps the greatest invention ever invented by an American inventor.

This is a commonsense amendment. It deserves passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled ''Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits'' and identified by regulation identification number 1904-AC87.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to stop overbearing Department of Energy regulations from driving up the cost of ceiling fans and increasing energy consumption as a result. I offer this amendment, along with my colleagues Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee and Mr. ROKITA of Indiana, both of whom have been very engaged on this issue.

The Department of Energy is currently considering a proposed rule, entitled, ''Standard Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits,'' which would impose increased efficiency requirements for ceiling fans sold in the United States. This regulation, if implemented, would have the effect of increasing the cost of ceiling fans, in some cases by nearly double, thereby reducing the purchase and use of ceiling fans by American consumers. The end result, ironically, would be heavier reliance on central air-conditioning and, thus, increased energy consumption.

Ceiling fans, by their nature, are already an extremely energy-efficient method of cooling a home or a business, using between 20 and 100 watts during operation, compared with a central A/C unit which typically uses between 3,500 and 5,000 watts. That is an order of magnitude less energy, which can save a household up to 14 percent on cooling costs.

The Department of Energy's proposed standard is regulatory solution in search of a problem.

Now, the ceiling fan industry has already demonstrated a strong commitment to energy efficiency, as evidenced by the dramatic increase in ENERGY STAR certified ceiling fans on the market over the past decade. The industry continues to develop energy-saving innovations, such as a redesigned motor, which uses up to 70 percent less electricity than the traditional ceiling fan motor. This has all taken place absent the heavy hand of government regulation.

At a time when homeowners across the United States are trying to reduce energy usage and cost, we should not increase the price of ceiling fans by setting unrealistic and unnecessary efficiency requirements on an already efficient product. Ceiling fans can help reduce dependence on foreign energy sources and ease the strain on our national power grid during the time of year when it is most heavily taxed.

Madam Chairman, I would simply state that ceiling fans are an inexpensive, easy way to reduce cooling costs, and the Federal Government should avoid taking actions that will stifle innovation and, ultimately, drive consumers to less efficient methods of cooling their home and business.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to stop this burdensome government regulation, and encourage reduced energy consumption through increased efficiency.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I want to thank Mr. DENT and Mr. ROKITA for their work on this issue.

The Department of Energy is so determined to redesign the ceiling fan that they have released a 101-page rulemaking framework document which evaluates the potential energy savings of their new regulations.

Well, what we have found is that, just like stretching their tentacles into lightbulbs and so many other areas of our home, what they are doing is pricing people out of the ceiling fan market. These new regulations would significantly impair the ability of ceiling fan manufacturers like Hunter Fans in Memphis, Tennessee, to produce reasonably priced, highly decorative fans.

The regulations will not only place a higher price tag on the less-pleasing designs, but could increase homeowners' reliance on cooling systems that are less energy efficient.

What we are seeing is, with ceiling fans, that many of our constituents save as much as 14 percent on their energy use to cool their home, and they can save homeowners as much as 40

percent of their air-conditioning bills by creating a breeze that makes the room feel a little bit cooler. New regulations will curb increased consumer trends in the marketplace, which currently include placing ceiling fans in laundry rooms, closets, and master bathrooms.

I would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her continued work on this matter.

Frankly, as I look around the room tonight, I think it is kind of ridiculous that we are sitting here talking, standing here talking about ceiling fans. This is what it has come to.

The bureaucracy in this town is now telling the American people that they know what belongs on their ceiling more than those people do. It is government run amok. It is an example of the complete disregard bureaucrats have for the practical implications of the regulations they issue.

The Department of Energy, as is stated, contends that a certain amount of energy would be saved by requiring greater efficiency from ceiling fans, completely disregarding the fact that if you price people out of this market, as the gentlewoman from Tennessee said, they are going to have to buy cooling systems that are even more expensive, buy fans that are even more expensive.

Let's get out of this business. We have more important things to do than worrying about bureaucrats and what they decide people need on their ceilings. Let's remember, this amendment was adopted in 2014 on the floor, and it was in the base text of the 2015 bill.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I oppose the gentleman's amendment, given it is a solution in search of a problem.

Since their implementation, standards for ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits have saved American consumers—are you ready?—$4.5 billion—billion—in energy costs, and cut greenhouse gas emissions by 22 metric tons.

Nearly a decade ago—why do we have this system? Because three States—California, Maryland, and New York—created their own unique standards for ceiling fan test procedures and performance, and these varying requirements created difficulties for manufacturers marketing products across all 50 States.

In response, the fan manufacturing industry asked the Federal Government for a national standard that would reduce unnecessary complexity. Since that time, the DOE, Department of Energy, has not even proposed a new rule on ceiling fans, so it is premature to react to what might be in a new rule. Even if a new rule is proposed, implementation is years away.

The Department's analysis so far has shown that options exist for increasing ceiling fan efficiency that are cost-effective for manufacturers and the consumers. Any upgrades will enable consumers to save money by saving energy, also moving our country closer to its low-carbon future.

Given the proposed rule has yet to be released, industry cannot anticipate how much their manufacturing costs might increase, whether their business model would be turned upside down, or whether the rule would result in energy growth. Industry has not substantiated any of their claims.

The Department of Energy has conducted extensive consultation with industry stakeholders, including the companies themselves, and any potential indirect effects on air-conditioning units.

The amendment ensures that consumers will be stuck with less efficient fans and higher energy costs. I can't see why we would want to do that.

Let's help this industry. As I have stated, I object to the amendment as proposed and urge a ''no'' vote by my colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 2101 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238b) or section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the DeFazio-Poe-Napolitano amendment.

I sincerely thank Ranking Member DEFAZIO and, of course, the ranking member of the committee for offering this critical amendment which implements the harbor maintenance allocation formulas that were carefully negotiated and included in the WRRDA 2014 and passed the House by a vote of 412–4. I repeat, 412–4.

WRRDA '14 said that any funds appropriated for the harbor maintenance account above $898 million—of course this was the baseline amount appropriated in fiscal year '12—should be—it doesn't say ''would be,'' ''could be''—it should be allocated based on the following parameters:

Ten percent at least goes to the Great Lakes. At least 10 percent goes to expanded uses at donor ports, which would be New York/New Jersey, Miami, Seattle, Tacoma, Los Angeles, and Long Beach. Expanded uses are berth dredging, removal of contaminated sediment, environmental remediation, and/or subsidies to shippers to continue to use their ports. At least 5 percent goes to underserved harbors. Ten percent goes for emerging harbors.

The 2016 Corps budget does not—I repeat, does not—include the WRRDA 2014 harbor maintenance trust allocations. It does not include them.

This amendment is needed to require the Corps to implement these funds allocations, as directed by Congress.

Madam Chairman, this amendment is especially important to provide fairness to my State of California and to other ports.

All ports in California only receive 15 percent—this is all ports—back of what their shippers paid into that harbor maintenance trust fund.

Last year, the users of the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach alone paid $263 million in harbor maintenance taxes and received zero—I repeat, zero—back in harbor maintenance funds. This is terribly unfair, and it is, as far as we are concerned, illegal.

This amendment will ensure that it brings back a little bit of that fairness to the donor harbors by providing them with a small portion of what they paid into the system.

I do want to add that this amendment is supported by the American Association of Port Authorities and the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

I ask for support of the DeFazio amendment. I request a ''yes'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Cape Wind

Energy Project on the Outer Continental Shelf off Massachusetts, Nantucket Sound.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Chair, the amendment I am offering tonight is simple. It prohibits funding for the Cape Wind project off Nantucket Sound. This amendment was offered last year and was accepted unanimously, and I hope it will be again.

The problem with this project isn't that it is renewable energy. We all support renewable energy. This is a renewable energy that is not supporting American jobs. In fact, they have outsourced their turbines to Denmark and their turbine platforms to Germany.

The other issue is, this project has been quite controversial, and I think that we don't want another Solyndra.

This amendment was adopted last year by a voice vote. I would urge a ''yes'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. NEWHOUSE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DISAPPROVAL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 231, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 43

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress disapproves of the action of the District of Columbia Council described as follows: The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Act 20–593), signed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia on January 25, 2015, and transmitted to Congress pursuant to section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act on March 6, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for the purpose of controlling the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unfortunately, our thoughts this evening have to be with the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, who could not be here due to ongoing events in his Baltimore district, but his statement strongly opposing H.J. Res. 43 will be entered into the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, resentment does not begin to relate our response to this unprecedented disapproval resolution. Republicans this evening continue their war on women, but this time, they have added men in the District of Columbia for good measure.

This resolution is wildly undemocratic. It is a naked violation of the Nation's founding principle of local control of local affairs, and it is profoundly offensive to D.C. residents.

This resolution uniquely targets my district, but every Member will get to vote on it except for me, the District's elected Representative.

Notwithstanding its late-night consideration, Democrats will make sure Americans understand this inflammatory resolution. For the first time ever, the House is voting to license employers to discriminate against employees for their private, constitutionally protected reproductive health decisions.

For the first time in a quarter of a century, the House is voting to overturn the law of a local jurisdiction. The D.C. bill stops employers from job discrimination based on the reproductive health decision of employees, their spouses, or their dependents.

To name just a few of the horribles permitted by this resolution: employers may fire a woman for having an abortion due to rape or a man for using condoms. Or to use actual examples in the United States today, Emily Herx of Indiana was fired for using in vitro fertilization to become pregnant. Jennifer Maudlin of Ohio was fired for having nonmarital sex and becoming pregnant. Christina Dias of Ohio was fired for using artificial insemination to become pregnant. Shaela Evenson of Montana was fired for using artificial insemination to become pregnant. Michelle McCusker of New York was fired for having nonmarital sex and becoming pregnant.

The D.C. bill is constitutional and legal.

Under the U.S. Constitution, laws may limit religious exercise if they are neutral, generally applicable, and rationally related to a legitimate governmental interest. The D.C. bill applies to all employers, does not target religion, and promotes workplace equality.

Under the Federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act, laws may substantially burden religious exercise if they further a compelling governmental interest in the least restrictive means. D.C. has a compelling interest in eliminating discrimination, and the D.C. bill is the least restrictive means to do so.

The D.C. bill certainly protects religious liberty. The bill is subject to constitutional and statutory exceptions to discrimination laws.

The narrow constitutional ministerial exception allows religious organizations to make employment decisions for ministers and ministerial employees for any reason whatsoever.

The exception in title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which I enforced as chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, permits religious organizations to make employment decisions based on religion.

□ 2130

D.C. law permits religious and political organizations to make employment decisions based on religion and political views; thus, employers in D.C. may continue to make employment decisions based on their religious and other beliefs, and their employees must be willing to carry out the employer's mission and directives with no exceptions.

The D.C. bill does not require employers to provide health insurance; instead, it requires equal treatment of employees. Both the text and the legislative history of the D.C. bill make that clear.

Nevertheless, when Members of Congress express concerns, the D.C. government, in order to eliminate any doubt, passed a new version of the bill that says, ''This act shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to reproductive health decisions.''

This provision is in effect now, but, under the Home Rule Act, a D.C. bill is not final until the end of the congressional review period. How absurd is that?

This disapproval resolution is a deliberate abuse of congressional authority over the district. In 1973, Congress passed the Home Rule Act to give the district the authority to legislate on local matters with a few enumerated exceptions and ''to relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters.'' D.C. employment and reproductive health laws are not among those exceptions.

This evening, Madam Speaker, I ask my Republican colleagues to live up to their own recently passed fiscal year 2016 budget which calls for the Federal Government to let States and cities govern their own affairs.

''America is a diverse nation. Our cities, States, and local communities are best equipped and naturally inclined to develop solutions that will serve their populations. But far too often, local leaders are limited by numerous Federal dictates,'' so said the Republicans in their own budget this very year.

I ask the majority to live up to its professed principles of local control and of local affairs, Federalism and limited government. I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the disapproval resolution to protect employees' reproductive health decisions, to protect workplace equality, and to protect the District's right to self-government as taxpaying American citizens.

I insert in the RECORD the President's veto threat on this resolution.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.J. RES. 43—DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

(REP. BLACK (R–TN) AND 46 CO-SPONSORS)

The Administration strongly opposes H.J. Res. 43, which would overturn the District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (the Act). The Act added reproductive health decisions to the list of employment non-discrimination protections included under the basis of sex, which had previously included pregnancy, childbirth, related medical conditions, and breastfeeding. By taking away this newly-added protection, H.J. Res. 43 would undermine the reproductive freedom and private health care decisions of the citizens of the District of Columbia. This legislation would give employers cover to fire employees for the personal decisions they make about birth control and their reproductive health. These personal decisions should not jeopardize anyone's job or terms of employment.

The Act preserves the current exception in the District's Human Rights Law for religious entities and does not impose additional requirements on employers, contrary to their personal beliefs, to provide insurance coverage related to reproductive health decisions.

H.J. Res 43 would also have the unacceptable effect of undermining the will of District of Columbia citizens. While the Home Rule Act of 1973 created a procedure for the Congress to overturn laws passed by the District of Columbia, the Congress has not exercised this authority in over two decades and should refrain from doing so in this circumstance, as well. The Administration urges the Congress to adopt the President's FY 2016 Budget proposal allowing the District to enact local laws and spend local funds in the same way as other cities and States.

If the President were presented with H.J. Res. 43. his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this resolution.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we are here today for two reasons: one, our constitutional duty assigned to us by the Constitution; and, two, to maintain the protections that same document ensures for all Americans.

First, the Constitution mandates Congress oversee the District of Columbia. Article I, section 8, clause 17 makes clear Congresses exercises ''exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the District'' of Columbia.

In that vein, Congress passed the Home Rule Act, which gives the District some autonomy, but Home Rule also retains the constitutional duty imposed on Congress to be the ultimate signoff for all of the District's legislation. That responsibility could not be more important than today.

The D.C. Council recently passed legislation that affects the hiring practices of organizations that work to advance certain beliefs. As passed, the bill fails to acknowledge certain longstanding constitutional protections of the First Amendment for political and religious organizations. Because of this, we cannot let this legislation stand.

Former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray requested the council postpone its vote on the bill because of its legal problems. In a December 2014 letter, Mayor Gray explained D.C.'s attorney general found that the bill ''raised serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993.''

He went on to say, ''Religious organizations, religiously affiliated organizations, religiously driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and Religious Freedom Restoration Act grounds for challenging the law's application to them.''

To remedy these problems, the Mayor requested the council include an exemption to ''protect the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act are designed to secure.''

Madam Speaker, I will insert Mayor Gray's December 2, 2014, letter to the D.C. Council into the RECORD.

While the council postponed the vote, they took none of the Mayor's advice. Once again, Mayor Gray wrote the council, again, in mid-December voicing his disapproval for the bill.

In that letter, he suggested, ''If the council wishes to adopt this bill, it should clarify the D.C. Human Rights Act's existing exemption for religious and political organizations to ensure that that exemption protects the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act are designed to secure.''

Mayor Gray concluded that, ''Without this language, I cannot support the legislation and believe that the council would expose the District government to costly legal challenges by moving forward.''

Again, Madam Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD Mayor Gray's December 17, 2014, letter to the D.C. Council.

Despite these warnings, the council and Mayor Bowser ignored the former Mayor's requests, passed the bill, and sent it to Congress. If they had taken Mayor Gray's advice, we would not be here today.

Madam Speaker, this law is contrary to the Federal statute, and the D.C. Council knows it. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed in 1993 prevents the government from creating any law, rule, or regulation that prevents an individual from freely exercising their religion.

Based on this mandate, the Supreme Court recently held that certain corporations are not required to provide health insurance coverage for contraceptive methods that violate their religious beliefs.

From the way it was drafted, it is unclear if the D.C. bill violates this mandate, making it unconstitutional. Both Mayor Bowser and the D.C. Council know that this is a problem.

In fact, in February, Mayor Bowser admitted that the bill was ambiguous and requested the council pass temporary emergency legislation clarifying that the bill doesn't require employers to provide insurance coverage for reproductive health decisions.

Madam Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD Mayor Bowser's February 2, 2015, letter to the D.C. Council.

Madam Speaker, that fix was only temporary and does not address the constitutional concerns I share with Mayor Gray. Given this ambiguity and no permanent fix, the bill is unconstitutional and cannot stand, given the

recent Supreme Court decision in Hobby Lobby.

Protecting the freedoms guaranteed by our First Amendment should not be a partisan issue. Mayor Gray knew this and pointed this out to the council that it has gone too far.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to speak directly to the claims that this resolution is somehow an attack on women's health care or their rights to use contraceptives. These attacks are offensive and are patently false.

As a registered nurse, I have spent my adult life bringing health care to women, children, and families. This resolution would in no way threaten anyone's access to care or freedom from discrimination based on the use of contraceptives; rather, it simply maintains the status quo in Washington, D.C., before this misguided law was passed.

Women are already protected from discrimination on the basis of pregnancy status and a number of other fronts through both D.C. and Federal law, as they should be.

Specific to concerns regarding how this would impact women using contraceptives, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission makes clear ''an employer could not discharge a female employee from her job because she uses contraceptives.'' Those protections would in no way be impacted if any resolution were to be signed into law.

Madam Speaker, the RHNDA law is fundamentally dishonest. It purports to be a nondiscrimination act, but it directly targets the fundamental First Amendment freedoms of employers in our Nation's Capital, the very city charged with protecting those same freedoms.

We must act to protect religious freedom and to offer relief from this oppressive RHNDA law.

THE ''DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOTS 36, 41 AND 802 IN SQUARE 3942 AND PARCELS 01430107 AND 01430110 EMINENT DOMAIN EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014''

I urge the Council to approve the potential use of eminent domain to acquire Lots 36, 41 and 802 in Square 3942 and Parcels 01430107 and 01430110 (W Street Site). DC Water currently operates a site south of N Place, S.E., north of the Anacostia River and between 1st and Canal Streets, S.E. (DC Water Site). The District plans to revitalize and develop a portion of the DC Water Site and leverage other District investments, such as the South Capitol Street Bridge project and the Nationals Park, and serve to accelerate and promote economic vitality in the Capitol Riverfront neighborhood

The District of Columbia and DC Water have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding for DC Water to relocate a portion of the uses from the DC Water Site to a site in Prince Georges County. In order to ensure adequate response times to water and sewer emergencies, DC Water must also maintain a site west of the Anacostia River.

The W Street Site is currently occupied by a trash transfer station, and has been considered by many as blight to nearby communities.

READING AND VOTE ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION

BILL 20–790, THE ''REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014''

I urge the Council to postpone voting on this measure until significant legal concerns expressed by the Office of Attorney General are resolved. My staff shared with the Committee on the Judiciary a detailed review of the bill by OAG that deemed the legislation legally insufficient. The District of Columbia Human Rights Act (Human Rights Act) protects many facets of an individual's identity (such as race, nationality, religion, and sexual orientation) from discrimination. Bill 20–790, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, would expand these restrictions by prohibiting employers (and others) from discriminating against an individual based on that individual's reproductive health decisions.

According to OAG, the bill raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA). Religious organizations, religiously-affiliated organizations, religiously-driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and RFRA grounds for challenging the law's applicability to them. Moreover, to the extent that some of the bill's language protects only one sex's reproductive health decisions, that language may run afoul of the Fifth Amendment's equal protection guarantee. If the Council wishes to adopt this Bill or similar legislation, it should clarify the Human Rights Act's existing exemption for religious and political organizations to ensure that the exemption protects the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and RFRA are designed to secure.

While I applaud the goals of this legislation, as currently drafted, this legislation is legally problematic. I am committed to working with the Council on language necessary to make the changes needed.

BILL 20–48, THE ''CIVIL ASSET FORFEITURE AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014''

I support passage of this legislation in Final Reading. Bill 20–48 creates a free-standing title for civil forfeitures, which includes sections on seizures, notice, contesting seizure, interim release of seized property, filing a complaint, forfeiture proceedings, return of property, disposal of forfeited property, adoptive seizures, reporting requirements, remission or mitigation, and the rule of lenity.

While I continue to have reservations about the limitations this bill places on the Executive Branch and the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), I recognize that the forfeiture of civil assets—and procedures for their timely return to the owner—is a significant one in the community that is in need of reform. OAG and the U.S. Attorney's Office worked with the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety on this legislation and was successful in making significant improvements to the requirements included in the legislation. I appreciate the work that the Committee has undertaken to include affected parties, and believe that while this compromise is a good one, future Executives may have to amend the law if the District experiences challenges with the procedures the law puts in place.

BILL 20–468, THE ''LIMITATION ON THE USE OF RESTRAINTS ACT OF 2014''

With the amendments circulated on Monday, December 1, I support passage of this measure. Bill 20–468 limits the use of restraints on a woman or youth who is known to be pregnant or in post-partum recovery, including in limited circumstances while in transport to a medical facility or while receiving treatment at a medical facility.

The District of Columbia is considered a national leader in its treatment of pregnant inmates, and I support codifying existing procedures to continue to be a model to other state penal institutions. However, I do not want to overly burden the administration of our detention facilities with procedures that are unsafe both to inmates and corrections officers. The amendment being offered today strikes that balance.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the Administration's views on these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. GRAY.

''DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOTS 36, 41 AND 802 IN SQUARE 3942 AND PARCELS 01430107 AND 01430110 EMINENT DOMAIN AUTHORIZATION EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014'' AND ACCOMPANYING DECLARATION AND TEMPORARY VERSION

I urge the Council to approve this legislation giving the Mayor authorization to utilize eminent domain to secure District ownership of property in Ward 5 that has long been a source of community complaint. This authorization is supported by the surrounding neighborhood community. Further, it does not mandate the use of eminent domain. Councilmember McDuffie and I agree that having this tool available to the incoming Administration will be helpful in finalizing the future of the site.

READING AND VOTE ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION

BILL 20–790, THE ''REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014''

I appreciate that the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety has worked with the Office of the Attorney General to make the bill legally sufficient. However, it is my understanding that additional language which would correct significant legal concerns will not be offered today.

While I support the intent of the bill, without the amendment, the Bill raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA). Religious organizations, religiously-affiliated organizations, religiously-driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and RFRA grounds for challenging the law's applicability to them. Moreover, to the extent that some of the Bill's language protects only one sex's reproductive health decisions, that language may run afoul of the Fifth Amendment's equal protection guarantee.

If the Council wishes to adopt this Bill or similar legislation, it should clarify the Human Rights Act's existing exemption for religious and political organizations to ensure that the exemption protects the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and RFRA are designed to secure. Without this language, I cannot support the legislation and believe that the Council would expose the District government to costly legal challenges by moving forward.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the Administration's views on these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. GRAY.

''H STREET, N.E., RETAIL PRIORITY AREA CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY DECLARATION RESOLUTION OF 2015;'' ''H STREET, N.E., RETAIL PRIORITY AREA CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015;'' AND ''H STREET, N.E., RETAIL PRIORITY AREA CLARIFICATION TEMPORARY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015''

I urge the Council to support this legislation. The ''Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Support Act of 2014'' and subsequent emergency legislation amended the Bladensburg Road, N.E., Retail Priority Area and included it into the H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area. The ''H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area Incentive Emergency Amendment Act of 2014'' amended the criteria for eligible retail development projects eligible to receive grants, but ambiguity remains on the clarity and accuracy of the legislation amending the criteria for eligible retail development projects eligible to receive grants. This emergency legislation addresses those immediate concerns before the next grant cycle, which concludes at the end of February 2015.

''REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY DECLARATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015;'' ''REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015;'' AND ''REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION CLARIFICATION TEMPORARY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015''

Finally, I would like to draw the Council's attention to legislation circulated by the Chairman on my behalf to address legal concerns in Bill 20-790, the ''Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.'' The attached emergency legislation, which was circulated on Friday, January 30, will repeal and replace language from the underlying bill to make clear that it does not impose any new insurance requirements on employers related to reproductive health decisions. This emergency legislation ensures that the District will remain in compliance with Federal and Constitutional law. I urge the Council to agendize the emergency at its next legislative meeting.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the Administration's views on these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER.

Chairman Phil Mendelson at the Request of the Mayor

A BILL IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To amend, on an emergency basis, the Human Rights Act of 1977 to provide a clarification that the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to a reproductive health decision.

Be it enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia, That this act may be cited as the ''Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Clarification Emergency Amendment Act of 2015''.

Sec. 2. Reproductive health choices clarification.

(a) Section 105(a) of the Human Rights Act of 1977, effective July 17, 1985 (D.C. Law 6–8; D.C. Official Code §2–1401.05(a)), is amended as follows:

''(a) For the purposes of interpreting this act, discrimination on the basis of sex shall include, but not be limited to, discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth, related medical conditions, breastfeeding, or reproductive health decisions; provided that this act shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to a reproductive health decision.''.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, may I point out that, far from not discriminating, I have named five women in five different States who have been discriminated against because of language precisely of the kind the District of Columbia bill needs to avoid.

It is true that the former Mayor and the former attorney general had some issues with the bill. They are no longer in office. Nevertheless, the current Mayor and the current city council have reviewed those issues.

May I say that the Mayor never offered any examples of the kind of interference with religious or other rights. He was referring to the council, and the Mayor, nevertheless, reviewed his objections, and unanimously, the D.C. City Council and Mayor Bowser have, in fact, endorsed this bill.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

This is a new low in the war on women. Women have been fired for using in vitro fertilization and fired for being pregnant before they are married. This isn't some hypothetical or a cautious story from the 1950s. This is happening in America in the 21st century.

The D.C. Council voted unanimously to protect workers from this type of discrimination because it understands what House Republicans must not, that employees should be judged by their performance, not their reproductive healthcare choices.

Madam Speaker, hard-working women already have enough on their plate, from making 78 cents on the dollar compared to men, to acting as caregivers without paid family and medical leave. The majority doesn't even have the courage to bring up this bill in the light of day.

Congress should be focused on growing the economy and providing opportunity for all Americans, not making women fear that they might be fired if their employer does not approve of contraception or the manner in which they conceive children.

□ 2145

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), the cosponsor of this bill, the chair of the Republican Study Committee, and someone who has worked very hard on this legislation.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, to formally disapprove of the recent measure passed by the District of Columbia that clearly violates religious liberty.

I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Tennessee, for her work on this important issue. I urge all of my colleagues to join her in reaffirming Congress' commitment to protecting our First Amendment rights.

Despite its name, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act does, in fact, discriminate against those who exercise their right to live according to their religious beliefs. The D.C. measure tells values-based organizations that they may no longer live and work according to the very principles that they advocate. A Christian school would be required to pay for health insurance policies that include provisions that violate the beliefs that they teach their students. In addition, a pro-life organization would be forced to hire individuals regardless of their commitment to pro-life values.

Simply put, the D.C. Council measure compels Americans to act in clear violation of their conscience. In doing so, they ignore the opinion of most Americans, Supreme Court precedent, and the First Amendment to our Constitution.

More than 80 percent of Americans agree that individuals should be free to run their businesses and their organizations according to their beliefs, without the government telling them what to do. In 2013, the Supreme Court upheld that opinion, ruling in Burwell v. Hobby Lobby that employers have the right to operate their businesses according to their religious beliefs and principles.

Most importantly, however, the freedom of belief is enshrined in the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. Freedom of belief is the cornerstone of America's founding principles. It was the promise of religious freedom that spurred the first generation of immigrants to come here, and it is the practice of religious freedom that has brought people from all over the world, from all races and creeds, to our shores ever since.

Religious freedom may be one of our oldest tenets and oldest principles, but it is one we must constantly strive and work to defend. This is not about one city or even one piece of legislation. Other cities or States may be considering similar measures, and doing nothing will only embolden those who would violate religious liberty.

We need to make clear, Madam Speaker, where the House stands on this important issue. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join the gentlewoman from Tennessee and me in supporting today's resolution.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to correct the gentleman that the church would have to buy insurance to cover abortion, the church is

completely—every church is completely—exempt from this law. Or, as he indicated, that a pro-choice group would have to hire a candidate who believes in abortion, on the contrary, a pro-choice group can ask a candidate if that candidate is willing to carry out the mission of the organization against abortion, and if that candidate has any compunction, that candidate can, indeed, be refused employment; and if such a person is on staff, that person can be fired. You cannot be on somebody's staff and then take a position against the mission of that business or organization.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), my good friend.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this resolution is an insult to women everywhere. What business is it of an employer—or anyone else, for that matter—to know whether or not workers or their daughters are taking birth control? It is absolutely none of their business.

And it also makes a mockery of the majority party's oft repeated claims that it wishes to scale back the overreach of the Federal Government, yet here they are reaching into personal lives.

And the resolution is being proposed by the so-called party of states' rights. They are not proposing a Federal law. They are trying to override the decisions of elected officials in the District of Columbia.

Why should the Congress have the right to override the democratic decisions of people in our Nation's Capital? A city with more people than the State of Wyoming and larger than Vermont gets no voting Senators or Congressmember in this body.

This offensive effort to intrude into the most intimate of decisions of a woman's life sends a loud and clear message from the majority that they think a woman's employer does get a say in a woman's reproductive healthcare choices, even though the Supreme Court, the Constitution, and women all across this country think that they do not.

This resolution would give an employer coercive power to intrude on a woman's private decisions about birth control, in vitro fertilization, and abortion. They are activities that obviously happen off the job and decisions that have no bearing whatsoever on a person's ability to do her job.

The District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act does not diminish the right of religious freedom. This new D.C. law is modest in its scope. It simply protects an employee's right to self-determination. It handles a perceived conflict between two differing claims to rights in a simple and straightforward way.

I urge a ''no'' vote to this new low and public policy.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is an insult to women everywhere.

What business is it of an employer—or anyone else for that matter—to know whether or not workers or their daughters are taking birth control? It is none of your business.

And it also makes a mockery of the majority party's oft repeated claims that it wishes to scale back what it calls the overreach of the Federal government this offensive effort to intrude into the most intimate of decisions of a woman's life—sends a loud and clear message from the Majority that they think a woman's employer does get a say in a woman's reproductive health care choices.

Even though the Supreme Court, the Constitution and women all across the country think you don't.

This resolution would give an employer coercive power to intrude on a woman's private decisions about birth control, in vitro fertilization, and abortion.

They are activities that obviously happen off the job and decisions that have no bearing whatsoever on a woman's ability to do her job.

The District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act does not diminish the right of religious freedom.

This new DC law is modest in its scope—it simply protects a employee's right to self-determination.

It handles a perceived conflict between two differing claims to rights in a simple and straightforward way.

An employer has the right to hold whatever belief his conscience dictates—but he does not have the right to discriminate against employees based on their private choice to use birth control, in vitro fertilization, or abortion.

The DC law received a unanimous vote on the DC Council and was even revised to make it clear that it would not force an employer to provide insurance coverage for contraceptive or abortion coverage.

And while this resolution might just affect women and their families here in our nation's capital, women across the U.S. should be very much alarmed: Because if this resolution stands—Can there be any doubt—they're coming for you next.

I urge my colleagues to consider the ways this resolution would threaten the jobs and economic security of hardworking DC residents, and to oppose this absurd, discriminatory resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who has been a big protector of life and has been a good colleague of mine since our election in 2010.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, and I commend the gentlewoman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Texas for sponsoring this important piece of legislation. This resolution would prevent the District of Columbia from violating America's basic First Amendment freedom of religion.

We must protect pro-life organizations in D.C. and allow them to operate according to their sincerely held beliefs. The D.C. City Council's actions would have serious negative consequences for religious organizations operating in D.C., and religious or pro-life groups could be forced to make personnel decisions that are inconsistent with their moral convictions. Additionally, these actions will force employers to defend against lawsuits of questionable merit brought with a political motivation.

Our Nation's Capital should not be a place where people's freedoms are taken away; it should be a place where the right to live according to your beliefs is most fervently protected. We must respect and protect the religious freedoms established by the Constitution and the Federal law. We must reject the overreach by the D.C. City Council.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 43.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I must reject the gentlewoman's desire to protect organizations or residents in D.C. No resident in D.C. has asked any Member of this body to protect them except the Member standing before you, and that Member can't even protect them with a vote on this floor.

This bill was passed unanimously by the D.C. City Council. If there is any objection to this bill, D.C. residents will repair to the courts, who are the only authorities who can tell us what is constitutional and what is not constitutional.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, the distinguished Delegate from the District of Columbia. I thank her for her courageous, relentless, persistent, effective leadership and representation of the District of Columbia.

I come to the floor, Madam Speaker, to ask several questions. I think they have to be addressed to you.

How many times have our Republican colleagues come to this floor to express their belief in reducing the role of government, of the Federal Government? How many times have they come to the floor to preach their deference to states' rights and local government? And how many times have these House Republicans thrown all of that out the window when it comes to meddling, government meddling in the reproductive choices of America's families?

Here we are with Republicans who disapprove a duly passed D.C. law in order to enable businesses to fire their employees for the reproductive health decisions that they make. And not only that, not only the decision that the employee makes, but the decision that

a spouse makes or a dependent, a child, makes.

Allowing employers to fire employees for using birth control or in vitro fertilization, which answers the prayers of so many families, or any other reproductive health service is an outrageous intrusion into workers' personal lives.

This is Hobby Lobby on steroids. This is about a business firing someone—man or woman—for private health decisions with no bearing on the workplace. In fact, if Republicans have their way, employers would not need to cite religion at all to discriminate against employees for their reproductive decisions.

House Republicans—and I say House Republicans, Madam Speaker, because this isn't what Republicans think throughout the country. House Republicans need to recognize that personal healthcare choices are not your boss' business. A business has no right to threaten its employees for their reproductive choices or for the reproductive choices made by members of their families.

I keep saying it over and over. House Republicans have no business using this House of Representatives to enable such appalling discrimination. I urge my colleagues to stand against this radical assault on the rights of workers and families here in D.C.

Again, how many times have we seen our House Republican colleagues come to the floor to speak of their belief in reducing the role of the Federal Government? Not so fast, families of the District of Columbia. This doesn't mean you.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is the chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus. He is a cosponsor of this bill, and he is a defender of life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, let me just say at the outset to my friend, the former Speaker for whom I have the highest regard, it is always appropriate to defend to the best extent possible the fragile lives of unborn children from the violence of abortion, and it is always appropriate to defend to the greatest degree possible conscience rights when they are under assault. That is why I, along with many of my colleagues, rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, to disapprove of D.C. legislation that infringes on the First Amendment freedoms of religious charities and pro-life advocacy groups in the District of Columbia.

I especially want to thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for her consistent and highly effective leadership over many years for fundamental conscience rights and for attempting to respect human life to the greatest extent possible.

□ 2200

I agree with six distinguished law professors—and I will include their letters fully in the Record—who wrote the D.C. Council last November and who said:

''RHNDA's attempt to prevent employers from making decisions based on their 'personal beliefs' implies that the State has the power to judge what are and are not legitimate 'personal beliefs' and to conclude that religiously motivated opposition to State policies is unacceptable. The Supreme Court has unanimously affirmed that employers, not the State, may determine which religious practices they use as the basis for their organization's policies.''

The Secretary of Education for the Archdiocese of Washington wrote every Member of Congress, and he said:

''RHNDA would force religious institutions, including the 20 Catholic schools in the District of Columbia that I oversee, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of the mission of their employer. It would subjugate the church's moral teaching to the moral views of the government.''

The National Right to Life Committee, which has its national headquarters right here in the District, said:

''It would be intolerable for an advocacy organization such as ours to be required to hire or prohibit from firing a person who makes a 'decision' to engage in advocacy or any other activity that is directly antithetical to our core mission to lawfully advocate for the civil rights of the unborn.''

Christian and Muslim leaders also wrote a letter in which they pointed out:

''We come together to oppose RHNDA. We believe it would infringe on religious employers' freedom to make employment decisions when necessary to preserve their religious mission and identity.''

Catholic University president John Garvey, a very, very distinguished president of Catholic U. and whom I literally had up in hearings to speak out against anti-Semitism, said:

''This bill would require all employers, including religious schools such as ours, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of our mission. It would take away our right to carry out our mission through personnel policies and practices that are rooted in our faith. The D.C. bill carries no exemption or language of tolerance.''

Again, I would agree with former Mayor Vincent Gray in that it raises serious First Amendment concerns in the Constitution.

APRIL 29, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, I am writing to urge your support of the House Joint Resolution 43, disapproving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act in the United States House of Representatives.

The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act would force religious institutions, including the 20 Catholic schools in the District of Columbia that I oversee, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of the mission of their employer. It would subjugate the Church's moral teaching to the moral views of the government, violating the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and result in discrimination against religious believers. Practically speaking, Catholic schools would be obliged to keep teachers that sow confusion among schoolchildren by engaging in conduct that is contrary to Catholic teaching on the fundamental dignity of human life from the moment of conception. The Archdiocese of Washington has long respected home rule for the District of Columbia and, therefore, advocated for our constitutional rights with the D.C. Council and Mayor. However, they moved forward despite our objections forcing us to appeal to the United States Congress to restore our freedoms.

Accordingly the Archdiocese of Washington joins other religious institutions, faith-based organizations and pro-life advocacy groups urging you and your colleagues to defend our freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom of association in the Nation's Capital.

Please vote for House Joint Resolution 43 disapproving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act. Thank You.

Sincerely,

THOMAS W. BURNFORD, D.MIN.
Secretary for Education.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, I urge you to vote for House Joint Resolution 43 when it reaches the floor today. The bill would express the House's disapproval of the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act passed by the D.C. Council.

That bill would require all employers, including religious schools such as ours, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of our mission. It would take away our right to carry out our mission through personnel policies and practices that are rooted in our faith.

The D.C. bill carries no exemption or language of tolerance that would acknowledge or accommodate the religious and associational freedoms protected by the First Amendment. It places the preferences of the government above the Church's teaching on important matters.

I recognize the significance of Congress's acting to disapprove a bill passed by the D.C. Council and urge you to take this unusual step only because of the great impact the bill would have on our ability freely to operate this University. I am grateful for your support

Sincerely,

JOHN GARVEY,
President.

NOVEMBER 5, 2014.

Hon. PHIL MENDELSON,
Council of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MENDELSON: We are college and university professors opposed to the

Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act of 2014 (RHNDA). It seeks to amend Sec. 2. Section 211 (D.C. Official Code §2–1402.11) of the Human Rights Act of 1977, effective December 13, 1977 (D.C. Law 2–38; D.C. Official Code §201401.01 et seq) (the Act) to read: ''An employer or employment agency shall not discriminate against an individual with respect to compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of or on the basis of the individual's or a dependent's reproductive health decision making, including a decision to use or access a particular drug, device or medical service, because of or on the basis of an employer's personal beliefs about such services.''

We are convinced that RHNDA violates the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), which governs the District's policies on the restriction of religious freedoms. RFRA is not limited to institutions owned by religious organizations, but extends to closely-held corporations whose owners' free exercise of religion is burdened by state regulation. Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, No. 13–354 (U.S. June 30, 2014).

The Act currently contains an exemption for religious organizations and organizations ''operated, supervised or controlled by or in connection with a religious . . . organization'' (§2–1401.3). RHNDA appears aimed at owners of entities like Hobby Lobby, whose owners would seek the same exemption offered religious organizations and their subsidiaries. The standard that RFRA stipulates, that the government may burden religious practice of owners of closely-held corporations only when it is advancing a compelling state interest by means that are the least restrictive to the affected religious practice, is ignored by the proposed legislation.

RHNDA proposes to overturn the long-standing recognition of the right of religious employers to run their enterprises according to their religious beliefs. RHNDA's attempt to prevent employers from making decisions based on their ''personal beliefs'' implies that the state has the power to judge what are, and are not, legitimate ''personal beliefs'' and to conclude that religiously-motivated opposition to state policies is unacceptable. The Supreme Court has unanimously affirmed that employers, not the state, may determine which religious practices they use as the basis for their organizations' policies. Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC, 132 S. Ct. 6.

We oppose passage of the RHNDRA and urge you and your colleagues to reject this bill.

Signed,

PROFESSOR GEORGE W. DENT, Jr.,
Case Western Reserve University School of Law.
ROBERT A. DESTRO,
Professor of Law, Columbus School of Law, The Catholic University of America.
JOHN FARINA,
Associate Prof. of Religious Studies, George Mason University.
ROBERT P. GEORGE,
McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence, Princeton University.
JOHN C. HIRSH,
Professor of English, Georgetown University.
FRANK A. ORBAN III,
Institute of World Politics (Ret.).

APRIL 30, 2015.

Re nullify the D.C. ''Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination'' law.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The National Right to Life Committee, the nationwide federation of state right-to-life organizations, urges you to vote in favor of H. J. Res. 43, a resolution introduced by Congresswoman Black to nullify the so-called ''Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act'' (RHNDA) in the District of Columbia. NRLC intends to include the roll call on H. J. Res. 43 in our scorecard of key pro-life votes of the 114th Congress.

The RHNDA prohibits employers within the District from engaging in ''discrimination'' on the basis of ''decisions'' reached by employees, or potential employees, regarding ''reproductive health'' matters. It is not disputed that abortion is among the matters encompassed by the term ''reproductive health'' as used in the new law. The scope of the RHNDA is very broad, covering any ''decisions'' that are ''related to the use . . . of a particular . . . medical service . . .'' [emphasis added].

The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) advocates for recognition that each unborn child is a member of the human family, and that each abortion stops a beating heart and ends the life of a developing human being. That viewpoint is shared by many women who once believed otherwise and submitted to abortions, and by many men who once believed otherwise and were complicit in abortion; such persons number among the most committed activists within our organization and other pro-life organizations. Yet it would be intolerable for an advocacy organization such as ours to be required to hire, or prohibited from firing, a person who makes a ''decision'' to engage in advocacy or any other activity that is directly antithetical to our core mission to lawfully advocate for the civil rights of the unborn.

Under the RHNDA, using any ''decision . . . related to'' abortion to inform decisions about hiring, firing, or benefits (among other things) would expose our organization both to enforcement actions by the District government bureaucracy, and to private lawsuits (some of which would likely be engendered by ''sting'' operations by pro-abortion advocates).

Some have suggested that we would be protected from such results by a clause in the pre-existing D.C. Human Rights Act that makes narrow allowance for ''giving preference to persons of the same religion or political persuasion'' as a controlling ''religious or political organization.'' But NRLC is neither a political nor a religious organization as those terms are used in the law. NRLC is not ''operated, supervised or controlled by'' any religious institution or political party, as the law requires to claim the narrow exemption. Moreover, our staff is made up of persons who are personally affiliated with a wide variety of religious bodies, or with none, and persons who belong to a variety of political parties, or to none.

Article I of the U.S. Constitution provides that Congress shall ''exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'' with respect to the seat of government, the federal District. Therefore, the RHNDA has been enacted with legal authority delegated to the District Council by Congress; that local body has no other political authority whatever under the Constitution. It follows that members of Congress are responsible for, and accountable for, abuses of the legal authority that Congress has delegated to District officials. The RHNDA is just such an abuse of delegated power—it is a politically motivated attack on our organization and the other organizations that seek to vindicate the human rights of unborn children.

The roll call on H. J. Res. 43, the resolution of disapproval, will be accurately described in our scorecard and in reports to our national membership as a fair reading of where each Member of the House of Representatives stands regarding a blatantly political attack on the pro-life movement.

Respectfully,

DOUGLAS D. JOHNSON,
Legislative Director.
SUSAN T. MUSKETT, J.D.,
Senior Legislative Counsel.

Hon. PHIL MENDELSON,
Council of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MENDELSON: We represent the city's broad and diverse faith community. We may believe and practice our faith differently. We may have divergent positions on important issues. However we all agree that faith communities have a right to freely exercise their religion and a responsibility to promote and protect this important freedom. We believe religious freedom is not only our priority, but also a priority in our society.

We come together then to oppose the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014. We believe it would infringe upon religious employers' freedom to make employment decisions when necessary to preserve their religious mission and identity. In doing so, the legislation would allow for unjust and unnecessary government interference into religious employers' governance and operations.

While religious employers do not police employees' or dependents' private reproductive health decisions, these employers must have the freedom to respond to employees' public behavior repudiating their religious mission and identity.

We believe that the legislation would in fact discriminate against religious employers in a manner prohibited by the significant constitutional and legal protections provided to religious organizations in the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act

We respectfully request that you oppose the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act. We pray that you will be fair and reasonable in your considerations of our sincere concerns. We will follow up with you with regard to these priority concerns.

Sincerely,

Reverend Patrick Walker, President, Baptist Convention of D.C. and Vicinity; Reverend Susan Taylor, National Public Affairs Director, Church of Scientology National Affairs Office; Talib M. Shareef, CMSgt, USAF-Retired, Imam/President, The Nation's Mosque, Masjid Muhammad; Reverend Kendrick E. Curry, Pastor, Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist Church—DuPont Park; Reverend Dr. George C. Gilbert, Pastor, Holy Trinity United Baptist Church—Hillbrook; Reverend A.C. Durant, Pastor, Tenth Street Baptist Church—Shaw; Reverend Sylvia Stanard, Minister, Church of Scientology;

Reverend Lee Holzinger, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Monsignor Robert Panke, Rector, Saint John Paul II Seminary—Brookland; Reverend William Byrne, Secretary of Pastoral Ministry and Social Concerns, Archdiocese of Washington.

Michael Scott, Director, D.C. Catholic Conference; Reverend Frederick Close, Pastor, St. Anthony Catholic Church—Brookland; Reverend Adam Y. Park, Pastor, Epiphany Catholic Church—Georgetown; Reverend Michael Briese, Pastor, Holy Name Catholic Church—Capitol Hill North; Reverend Monsignor Godfrey T. Mosley, Pastor, St. Ann Catholic Church—Tenleytown; Reverend Mark R. Ivany, Pastor, Assumption Catholic Church—Congress Heights; Reverend Michael J. Kelley, Pastor, St. Martin Catholic Church—Bloomingdale; Monsignor Raymond G. East, Pastor, St. Teresa of Avila Catholic Church—Anacostia; Reverend William Gurnee, Director of Spiritual Formation, Saint John Paul II Seminary—Brookland.

Monsignor John Enzler, President and CEO, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington; Reverend Henry A. Gaston, Pastor, Johnson Memorial Baptist Church; Reverend Beth Akiyama, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Kay Holzinger, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Mario E. Dorsonville, Vice President of Mission and Immigration Outreach, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington; Reverend Avelino A. Gonzalez, Director, Ecumenical and Inter-Faith Affairs Archdiocese of Washington; Reverend Monsignor Ronald W. Jameson, Rector, Cathedral of Saint Matthew the Apostle—DuPont Circle; Reverend Monsignor James D. Watkins, Pastor, Immaculate Conception Catholic Church—Shaw; Reverend Monsignor Paul Langsfeld, Pastor, St. Joseph's Catholic Church on Capitol Hill.

Reverend Gregory Schommer, O.P., Pastor, St. Dominic Catholic Church—Southwest Waterfront; Reverend Andrew F. Royals; Reverend Mark R. Ivany, Pastor, St. Benedict the Moor Catholic Church—Kingman Park; Reverend Ron Potts, Pastor, Shrine of the Most Blessed Sacrament—Chevy Chase; Reverend Thomas Franks, S.S.J., Pastor, Our Lady of Perpetual Help Catholic Church—Buena Vista; Reverend Cornelius Kelechi Ejiogu, S.S.J., Pastor, St. Luke Catholic Church—Marshall Heights; Reverend Alfred J. Harris, Pastor, St Mary Mother of God Catholic Church—Chinatown; Reverend Evelio Menjivar, Pastor, Our Lady Queen of the Americas—Kalorama; Reverend Richard Mullins, Pastor, St. Thomas Apostle Catholic Church—Woodley Park; Reverend Raymond M. Moore, Pastor, St. Thomas More Catholic Church—Washington Highlands; Monsignor Charles Pope, Pastor, Holy Comforter-Saint Cyprian Catholic Church—Capitol Hill.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, a pro-life organization can hire or fire anyone it wants to. If that person opposes the mission of the pro-life organization, the pro-life organization does not have to hire that person and may fire that person.

Another matter that has to be corrected is that the D.C. discrimination law provides that nothing in the act—the act under discussion here—prohibits religious and political organizations from limiting employment or admission to or giving preference to persons of the same religion or political persuasion as calculated by that organization to promote the religious or political principles for which it is established or maintained.

That is the text.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), my friend.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentlewoman from D.C.

Madam Speaker, I stand today in opposition to this resolution.

I want to make clear the consequences of the misguided resolution that we are considering today because it is not about religious freedom; it is about the freedom to make incredibly personal and significant decisions without having to consult your boss.

I have recently experienced the joy of becoming a mother for the first time. This miracle was not possible without the aid of in vitro fertilization. Given the excess radiation exposure I received during treatment for my combat-related amputations, this was the only way I would ever have a child.

Every woman in this country should have the same opportunity to start a family, and no woman should ever be fired for doing so. This should be common sense. Unfortunately, the resolution before us today would remove the legal protections ensuring that this is the case in D.C.

The law we are voting to disapprove today would prevent stories like that of Emily Herx's, a language arts teacher at a Catholic school in Indiana. She was fired after school authorities discovered that she and her husband used in vitro fertilization to try to have a child. They sought IVF treatments after learning that she suffered from a medical condition that caused infertility. She was told that the procedure was contrary to church teachings, and, as a result, her teaching contract would not be renewed. Last December, a jury sided with her, awarding her damages in the case.

Employees like Emily Herx should be judged at work based on their job performances, not on private decisions they make with their families and doctors. That is exactly what the D.C. Council intended to ensure in passing their resolution to protect women in the District.

I urge all Members to oppose this attempt by the majority to limit the rights of the people of the District of Columbia. In this day and age, the last thing we should be doing is punishing couples who are having difficulty in starting a family.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE), one of our freshmen and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 43, to protect different organizations from having to choose between their faiths and their jobs.

This is not a war on women. It is an outright war on religious liberties. Forcing people to participate in offensive acts in order to stay in business is unconstitutional, and the D.C. Council has wholeheartedly interfered with the rights that are guaranteed in our Constitution. It is not a crime for individuals or organizations to exercise their First Amendment right. Respecting religious liberties when it can be reasonably accommodated is both common sense and constitutional.

As Congress, we have a duty to disapprove of what the D.C. Council has done, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 11 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a member of our committee.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, we have an obligation to fight discrimination wherever it exists and in whatever form it exists.

This resolution would allow employers to discriminate against employees who make decisions based on the interests of their health and their families. If employers don't like the personal health care decisions that their employees make, this resolution would allow employers to fire them.

Is it right to allow employers to fire women who use contraception or who try to conceive through in vitro fertilization?

Employees should be judged on their job performances and nothing else, especially not on their private medical decisions. Nobody has the right to interfere with those decisions—nobody—not an employer, not the House of Representatives, not any of us.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I first want to start by thanking my ranking member, Mr. ELIJAH CUMMINGS. I feel for him and for his city and what they are having to go through in Baltimore. I know he would have liked to have been here, but I have the utmost respect for him, and I wish nothing but the best for the people of Baltimore. I thank him for the decorum we have had and for the success we have had thus far on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. We have had good debates. We

have disagreed on issues, but I think we have probably agreed on most issues that we have had come before us.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from the District, who cares passionately about her service and the people of Washington, D.C., and I know it comes from her heart as she speaks about these. We have had good success on our committee in having these vigorous debates but having done so in a professional manner, and I thank her for that kind of discussion that we have had. Again, I know that she speaks from her heart on this.

Madam Speaker, we do believe that this was a timely and appropriate bill to bring up. I know that it doesn't happen very often. It is not a common occurrence. That is because a lot of what Washington, D.C., does and passes is not something that is of any controversy whatsoever. Yet, when you have the attorney general for the District of Columbia saying this has problems with the Constitution and problems in the law and when you have Mayor Gray making the same case that this has problems, I hope that both sides will recognize, no matter how they vote, that this law that was transmitted to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee—to Congress—is problematic, and they have admitted as such. They know that it is problematic, and I think we have a role and a responsibility to add our voice to that. That is what the Constitution calls for.

The Constitution makes it clear that Congress does have the ability to exercise the ultimate legislative authority over the District of Columbia. In the typical case, Congress plays no part in it as the overwhelming majority of pieces of legislation that get transmitted to us continue to sail on, but the RHNDA legislation, as passed by the D.C. Council, has left us with no choice but to act.

The bill affects the hiring practices of all D.C. employers, but it provides no exemption for religious or political organizations that work to advance certain beliefs regarding reproductive health. Because of this, the bill fails to ensure that protections are guaranteed under the First Amendment.

As I said before, former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray, a Democrat, wrote the D.C. Council twice, warning that this bill was unconstitutional. To fix the problem, Mayor Gray recommended the council include an exemption for religious or political organizations, but the council and the current mayor ignored Mayor Gray's request, which would have alleviated the constitutional concerns. She ignored that. The current mayor ignored that. If they had taken Mayor Gray's advice, I don't think we would be standing here today, talking about this bill.

Washington, D.C.'s current mayor, Ms. Bowser, also saw the problems with the bill. She requested the council pass temporary—and that is important, ''temporary''—emergency legislation clarifying the bill doesn't require an employer to provide insurance coverage for reproductive health decisions that an employer does not agree with. That is an important part of this discussion, but the legislation is only temporary. The bill remains unclear as to what it requires the D.C. employers to cover.

The other point that I would put in place here is that Washington, D.C., has been a city for a long time—for a couple hundred years, I think—and this legislation has not been in place. We are not trying to erase something. We are saying that the bill that was transmitted to us is problematic, and there are ways to remedy and fix that. Some would say, well, it has been fixed by this temporary—again, temporary—piece of legislation, but that hasn't been transmitted to us. The D.C. Council had an opportunity to provide us with that temporary legislation, but they didn't. Maybe they will in the future—I don't know—but that is not the bill that is before us today.

What I am arguing for is the same thing in concept as from the Washington, D.C., attorney general. It is the same thing in concept that D.C. Mayor Gray has said, and it is the same thing, quite frankly, that the current mayor has argued is problematic, because she wanted to clarify that the very arguments we hear back to us are that their bill doesn't actually do that, that we are not trying to effect that—in essence, saying that we are right, that we are not trying to get into this dangerous, unprecedented territory which a lot of us find offensive.

Madam Speaker, I think what we have done is very reasonable in our approach. We have very differing approaches and mindsets. I get that, but I do appreciate the debate. That is what we are supposed to be doing in Congress.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and, certainly, our ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS. He is a good man, and he is in a tough situation. Again, our thoughts and prayers are with him and with the people of Baltimore and of Maryland. I would hope they would look to his leadership and what he is telling the people, which is to calmly, calmly discuss these issues as we are calmly discussing these issues here tonight.

Again, I urge the passage of this. I think it is an appropriate thing to do, and it is a timely thing to do. The clock has run out. We only have 30 days. The time is right upon us, so I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution tonight.

□ 2215

Finally, I will say I really do appreciate Mrs. BLACK for her heart and passion on this issue and the good work that she has done. She cares deeply about these issues. We all do.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and say that I do want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. CHAFFETZ, for the way he has run the committee and especially with respect to this controversial legislation. He has allowed members to speak. It has been a very civil repartee on both sides.

I would like to offer that I have already read the text of D.C. law that exempts both religious and political organizations from limiting employment in the way that other employers must, that they may hire based on their religious views and their political views. Pro-life organizations are protected; churches are protected.

The continuous citation of the former Mayor and the former attorney general would make you think that they were still in office. The council did, in fact, look once again at their objections, finding that their objections had already been taken care of in prior D.C. law. The council then unanimously passed the bill again.

It is painful to hear the insurance matter cited against the District of Columbia because the only reason it isn't final law is because the District of Columbia has to transmit to this body every law, and it has to lay over for at least 30 days before it becomes final. If we had our way, if we had the same rights that every other Member has whose district is in the United States of America, it would already be law. It shouldn't be cited against us.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a member of the committee.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I address you today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 43. The resolution undermines the purpose of the D.C. Council antidiscrimination bill. D.C. residents deserve to be protected from discrimination in the workplace. Everyone should have the ability to make a private healthcare decision, including when and how they will start a family, and without the fear of losing their jobs or facing retaliation or retribution from their employer.

Unfortunately, women across the country have faced discrimination for personal decisions such as using birth control, becoming pregnant while unmarried, or using in vitro fertilization to become pregnant. Contrary to claims by my Republican colleagues, this bill does not impose any new requirements on employers to cover or to pay for any reproductive health services.

Are women's rights not guaranteed by the Constitution just like those of men in this country? This is not about whether you or I have an abortion or

whether you or I use IVF. Madam Speaker, this is about a woman's right to choose what is right for them in the privacy of their homes and doctor's office and with their family. This is not about pro-choice or pro-life. This is about religious freedom. This is about government intrusion.

This resolution, forced on the people of D.C. by a Member of Congress from Tennessee, flies in the face of the democratic debate and vote already heard by the D.C. Council. This resolution preserves the current exemption in the D.C. human rights laws for religious organizations and does not impose any additional requirements on employers based on their religious belief.

I stand here today, Madam Speaker, as a member of the largest number of women in this Congress, and I can tell you, I am offended by this bill. I stand here today in opposition.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a cosponsor of the bill and one of my colleagues from my State.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her work on this issue, and I also thank Chairman CHAFFETZ for the work that he has done on this issue.

Both the gentlewoman and the chairman have mentioned the work and the comments by Mayor Gray regarding this policy and the policy by the RHNDA. You can say the reason that we are here tonight is to correct a wrong. I think you could also say that it is here to protect one of those first principles that we hold so very dear in this country and one of the reasons that our country was founded: to celebrate and enjoy religious freedom. So that is what brings us to the floor tonight. One of the things that we hear from our constituents all the time, Madam Speaker, is that we should never pass bills that are going to compromise or limit our freedoms.

Now, it is important to note that what the District has done with the RHNDA would prevent organizations of faith—including schools, churches, and pro-life groups established explicitly to uphold their moral and ethical views—from making personnel decisions consistent with the mission of their very establishment. So that is a prohibition that we are addressing with this resolution that we are bringing forward tonight.

I think it is important to note the resolution doesn't take away any rights and it doesn't add any new rights. What it does is to maintain what has been current law. That is something that is important for us to remember. I also think it is important to note that in 2012 the Supreme Court unanimously affirmed the rights of religious organizations, and we stand tonight with that affirmation.

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I insert for the RECORD two letters, one from Americans United for Separation of Church and State, and the other from over 20 organizations, including the Anti-Defamation League, Catholics for Choice, People for the American Way, United Methodist Church General Board of Church and Society, over 20 organizations. Both letters are in opposition to the resolution.

AMERICANS UNITED, APRIL 30, 2015.

Re: Oppose Attempts to Curtail Civil Rights in the District of Columbia

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Americans United for Separation of Church and State, we write to urge you to oppose efforts to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia, including H.J. Res. 43, the resolution to disapprove of D.C.'s Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (RHNDAA). This bill, which the D.C. Council recently passed unanimously, expands civil rights and effectuates the will of the people of D.C. It should not be nullified by Congress.

Founded in 1947, Americans United is a nonpartisan educational organization dedicated to preserving the, constitutional principle of church-state separation as the only way to ensure true religious freedom for all Americans. We fight to protect the right of individuals and religious communities to worship—or not—as they see fit without government interference, compulsion, support, or disparagement. Americans United has more than 120,000 members and supporters across the country.

THE REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT

The RHNDAA protects D.C. employees and their dependents from discrimination based on their personal reproductive health care decisions. This bill strengthens existing protections against employment discrimination and ensures that employees and their families can make their own private health decisions, including whether, when, and how to start a family and what the size of their family should be, without fear of losing their jobs or facing retribution from their employers.

Our nation's laws have long protected the freedom of religion and belief, ensuring every person has the right to follow the dictates of his or her own conscience. Contrary to opponents' claims, the RHNDAA does not violate religious freedom protections.

In accordance with the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, religious beliefs do not excuse compliance with valid and neutral laws of general applicability. Courts deem laws neutral unless they ''target religious beliefs'' or ''if the object of [the] law is to infringe upon or restrict practices because of their religious motivation.'' The RHNDAA does not single out religious beliefs or practices. Instead, the bill treats all employers the same.

The RHNDAA would also survive a challenge under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), which applies to D.C. RFRA prohibits the government from ''substantially burden[ing] a person's exercise of religion'' unless the government can demonstrate that the burden is justified by a compelling government interest and is the least restrictive means of furthering that interest. RFRA is not triggered when there is just ''the slightest obstacle to religious exercise.'' And, burdens are permissible when the government's interest is important, including combatting discrimination.

The bill does not compel any employer to endorse any actions that may be in conflict with their religious tenets. This act merely ensures that employees and their families face no employment consequences for their private health care decisions. Eradicating employment discrimination against women is a compelling government interest and there is no less restrictive means of preventing discrimination.

Furthermore, this bill protects women who choose to exercise their constitutionally protected rights to make ''personal choice[s] in matters of marriage and family life.'' Business owners are absolutely entitled to their religious beliefs—but they cannot use their beliefs to justify discrimination against their employees. The RHNDAA would make sure that employees and their families can make their own private health decisions, based on their own consciences and in consultation with their own physicians, without fear of losing their job.

Finally, it's important to remember that the RHNDAA does not override existing protections for religious employers in hiring. The D.C. Human Rights Act already contains an exemption for employers ''operated, supervised, or controlled by or in connection with a religious . . . organization'' to give preference or limit employment to those of the same faith. Moreover, as the Supreme Court held in Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & Sch. v. E.E.O.C., the First Amendment protects religious institutions' right to make decisions about employees in ministerial positions—those who preach and teach the faith. The RHNDAA does not alter these already-existing protections.

THE HUMAN RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT

Although the House will be voting on H.J. Res. 43, which would prevent the RHNDAA from taking effect, H.J. Res. 44, a resolution of disapproval of D.C.'s Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014 (HRAA), has also been introduced. This is another attempt to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia and should likewise be rejected.

The HRAA would ensure that LGBT students in the District are not subject to discrimination by educational institutions. Under the HRAA, religiously affiliated educational institutions would have to provide LGBT student groups with the same equal access to school facilities and services as all other student groups, but they would not be required to provide LGBT student groups with funds or official recognition.

The HRAA, like the RHNDAA, has also been attacked by opponents claiming it violates religious freedom protections under the First Amendment and RFRA. But religiously affiliated educational institutions have neither a constitutional nor statutory right to discriminate against LGBT student groups in the name of religion. The HRAA is a neutral law of general applicability that has the effect of ensuring all schools and universities provide equal access and services to LGBT students. It would not compel the schools to fund or recognize LGBT student groups and serves a government interest that the D.C. Court of Appeals long ago held was compelling. As explained by the Court, eradicating discrimination against LGBT students serves to ''foster[] individual dignity, . . . creat[e] a climate and environment in which each individual can utilize his or her potential to contribute to and benefit from society, and [promote the] equal protection of the life, liberty

and property that the Founding Fathers guaranteed to us all:''

CONCLUSION

The D.C. Council, supported by the people it represents, passed the RHNDAA and the HRAA to protect members of the D.C. community from discrimination. Contrary to the rhetoric surrounding this bill, it does not violate religious liberty protections. Rather, the RHNDAA stands to protect all employees in the District from discrimination. Accordingly, we urge you to reject any attempts to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia, including H.J. Res. 43.

Religion should never be used an excuse to justify discrimination. Yet that is what opponents of these measures would like to do. We know there will be other attempts to misuse religious liberty in Congress. We urge you to reject this one and those to come.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

MAGGIE GARRETT,
Legislative Director, Americans United for Separation of Church and State

ELISE HELGESEN AGUILAR,
Federal Legislative Counsel, Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

APRIL 30, 2015.

Re: Oppose Attempts to Curtail D.C. Civil Rights

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned religious, interfaith, and civil liberties organizations that advocate for freedom of religion and belief write to urge you to reject any and all congressional efforts, including resolutions of disapproval, that would prevent two D.C. civil rights bills from taking effect. The D.C. Council unanimously passed both the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (RHNDAA) and the Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014 (HRAA) to support one basic underlying principle: fairness. The bills help ensure that others are treated fairly—as we all would like to be treated. These bills do not violate religious freedom, but instead protect freedom of conscience of and ensure equal treatment for all students and employees.

We urge you to oppose H. J. Res. 43, which seeks to overturn the RHNDAA. The RHNDAA strengthens the District's existing nondiscrimination protections so that employees in D.C. and their dependents do not face employment discrimination because of their personal reproductive health care decisions.

The RHNDAA would ensure that employees and their families can make their own private health decisions, based on their own consciences and in consultation with their own physicians, without fear of losing their job. Business owners are absolutely entitled to their personal religious beliefs—but they cannot use their beliefs to justify discrimination against their employees.

Similarly, we urge you to oppose H. J. Res. 44, which would repeal the HRAA. The HRAA ensures that all educational institutions in D.C. provide access to school facilities and services for all student clubs equally. Contrary to opponents' claims, the HRAA does not require religiously affiliated schools to provide LGBT student groups with funding or official recognition. The HRAA simply upholds students' freedom of conscience by repealing a congressionally imposed exemption to D.C. law that allows religiously affiliated educational institutions to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.

Despite opponents' claims, neither bill violates the religious freedom protections found in the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment or the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA). The two bills are neutral and generally applicable because they have the effect of applying nondiscrimination protections to all employers and all educational institutions in the District; neither single out a faith group or religious practice. Moreover, neither bill requires a religious organization to endorse any action that conflicts with its religious teachings. Finally, each bill furthers the government's compelling interest in eradicating discrimination in the District.

Religious freedom is a fundamental American value. It guarantees us the freedom to hold any belief we choose without government interference. It cannot, however, be used to trump others' civil rights, and it should not justify striking down laws that ensure people are treated fairly. We should strive to expand civil rights protections, not curtail them.

We urge you to oppose any attempts to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia, including H. J. Res. 43 and H. J. Res. 44.

Sincerely,

Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Anti-Defamation League, Catholics for Choice, Center for Inquiry, Disciples for Choice, Disciples Justice Action Network, Equal Justice Task Force of African American Ministers In Action, Equal Partners in Faith, Hindu American Foundation, Institute for Science and Human Values, Inc., Interfaith Alliance, Methodist Federation for Social Action, Metropolitan Community Churches, National Council of Jewish Women, People For the American Way, Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, Secular Coalition for America, Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund (SALDEF), Union for Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries, United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society, Unitarian Universalist Association.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a member of the committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this extreme and misguided resolution.

I am deeply troubled that this Chamber continues to waste its time attacking women's health rather than crafting solutions for the American people. Instead of addressing the real challenges facing our Nation, this resolution is yet another attempt by House leaders to inject ideology into women's personal medical decisions. A woman's healthcare choices should be made between her and her doctor, not by her boss.

By overturning D.C.'s new anti-discrimination protections, this resolution would give employers the right to fire workers based on the decisions they make about their birth control. This is simply unacceptable. All Americans should be free to make medical decisions without the fear of being fired or demoted.

Now is the time for House leaders to stop undermining women's reproductive rights and focus on the actual needs of working families. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, let me repeat the opinion of former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray and his attorney general. They believe that this law we are considering tonight is legally problematic and raises serious concerns under the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, many organizations in the District have asked Congress for help, including Cardinal Wuerl of the Catholic Diocese. I include for the RECORD the April 17, 2015, letter to the editor of The Washington Post from Cardinal Wuerl and President Garvey from Catholic University.

[From the Washington Post, April 17, 2015]

DISAGREEMENT IS NOT DISCRIMINATION

(By Donald Wuerl and John Garvey)

Cardinal Donald Wuerl is the archbishop of Washington. John Garvey is the president of Catholic University of America.

Last month, Pope Francis announced that the Catholic Church would celebrate a Holy Year of Divine Mercy. God's mercy has been a theme of his pontificate.

We all need God's forgiveness. The pope has said, ''I am a sinner.'' The Catholic Church's response to our human frailty is not condemnation but mercy. There may be no institution that understands this better.

Recent laws enacted by the D.C. Council would have us believe otherwise. The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act and the Human Rights Amendment Act purport to address ''discrimination'' by institutions such as ours, the Archdiocese of Washington and the Catholic University of America. The putative victims of this discrimination are people who part ways with church teaching about unborn life and sexual autonomy.

Consider the reproductive health law, which the council says is designed to prevent discrimination against employees who have abortions, have sex outside marriage or seek sterilization or other means to prevent pregnancy. Given the effort expended and ink spilled on this purported civil rights measure, you would think the church was hunting out sexual offenders and fining or firing them. But the church understands that we are all sinners, all equally deserving of punishment (if it comes to that) and all equally in need of God's mercy. We are not in the business of privileging some sinners over others.

The church's message, though, is one of mercy, not moral indifferentism. That is why we object to these two laws. They ask for much more than mercy and understanding. Consider again the reproductive health law. It forbids an employer to ''discriminate against an individual'' on the basis of her ''reproductive health decision making.'' Suppose your job is pro-life education in the archdiocese's Department of Life Issues. We can imagine a woman who had an abortion working effectively in that office. (Dorothy Day, founder of the Catholic Worker movement and a great witness to

life, had an abortion when she was 21.) But suppose you continue to believe that abortion was the right choice for you to make and honesty compels you to share that opinion with other women in your circumstances. A law forbidding discrimination on the basis of ''reproductive health decision making'' would seem to prevent the church from challenging or dismissing such an employee, even though she is working at odds with the mission of the office that hired her.

We have similar concerns about the Human Rights Amendment law. It says that religious institutions are guilty of discrimination against gay and lesbian student groups if, in the words of the committee report, they deny them the same ''rights and facilities as other officially recognized student groups.'' The Catholic Church's views about sexual autonomy, like its views about reproductive health, are more traditional than those held by the D.C. Council. But it seems peculiar to say that the church discriminates, in some morally objectionable way, by declining to give official support to groups that hold views opposed to its own.

Mercy is not the same as moral relativism. Disagreement is not the same as discrimination. The law goes too far when it demands that the church abandon its beliefs in the pursuit of an entirely novel state of equality.

The D.C. Council has failed to appreciate this point. Reluctantly, we turned to Congress for a resolution of disapproval. This procedure is in keeping with the American tradition of political appeal against political decisions. If that course of action fails, we have no doubt we will eventually prevail in court. The respect for religious freedom that we ask for is enshrined in the Constitution. But we hope that our elected officials can also see that it's a matter of common sense.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, our history has a long history of tolerance toward religious institutions. Indeed, one of the words inscribed on the rostrum here in the center of it is ''tolerance.'' We need to approve this resolution to be tolerant of our religious institutions. I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 43.

Ms. NORTON. May I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 5 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her outstanding service and leadership on behalf of the District of Columbia and the people of the District of Columbia. As well, let me acknowledge the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for his kind words of deliberation, and certainly the ranking member for his leadership, Mr. CUMMINGS, who, as we all know, is addressing some of the very heavy concerns in his own city.

Let me give all the facts, Madam Speaker. I happen to believe in statehood for the District of Columbia. I think that is important to state on the record. But I realize that the Constitution has a framework for the Congress to address the issues of the laws here in the District of Columbia. I realize, as well, that home rule has been given under that authority, and this Congress, in the right thinking, has allowed basically for the District of Columbia to rule its city on the basis of good governance of the citizens of this particular community. That is the right thing to do. They are taxpaying Americans.

So I am disturbed by H.J. Res. 43 because it seeks to cause confusion where there is no need for confusion. Let me first start by saying that the Ninth Amendment gives a right to privacy to all Americans, and Washingtonians are Americans. The right to privacy has indicated, through the Supreme Court, that Roe v. Wade, the right to choose, is the law.

Yes, the First Amendment gives the freedom of religion, but our gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has indicated that the District of Columbia clarified that this law does not violate and will not force someone to go against their political views or their religious views.

Why are we here tonight when this resolution that the District of Columbia passed simply prohibits employers from discriminating against employees based on their reproductive health decisions, protects the reproductive health decisions of the spouses and dependents, and prohibits an employer from firing an employee for using in vitro fertilization or birth control?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady.

So, in essence, Madam Speaker, this resolution is not in order.

If I might make another analogy, what is not given to the Federal Government is left to the States in the Tenth Amendment. I know that D.C. is not a State, but what I would say is that this law has been clarified in the District of Columbia. We are intruding. The rights are protected under the Ninth Amendment, and this resolution is out of order. I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition of H.J. Res. 43 disapproving the District of Columbia government's approval of the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act also known as RHNDA.

As I have before, I maintain that the right of a woman to privacy must remain sacrosanct because the well being and protection of women is the nucleus of a healthy America and a healthy world.

Indeed, in most parts of our country, the woman is the constant that keeps all the variables of family together, organized and on track.

Thus, for three key reasons I oppose H.J. Res. 43.

First, it is in derogation of DC's local autonomy, an autonomy that we enjoy in our respective states, pursuant to the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

In relevant part, the Tenth Amendment states that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I find it ironic, as duly elected officials that some of us seek to trample upon the rights that we enjoy vis a vis the separation of the federal and state powers, as delineated in our Constitution.

To add insult to injury, some of us are even able to look the congressional representative from Washington, DC in the eye, while we take adverse decisions that affect the livelihood of her constituents.

Second, the District of Columbia government's action does good without infringing on the First Amendment and religious freedoms of American citizens.

Third, this recent iteration of the war on the rights of women underscores our misplaced priorities where we have numerous pressing issues.

Among others, we continue to have unemployment, national security concerns with the continued proliferation of terrorist organizations across the globe.

We continue to grapple with how we need to work in a bipartisan manner on the issues of education, healthcare and infrastructure building to protect children, our elderly, veterans and other groups.

Our focus ought to be on bettering the quality of life for everyday American people.

Let us zoom in on one of what should be our major priority areas: jobs.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that over 8 million Americans are unemployed.

Specifically, among the major worker groups affected by the current unemployment rates are adult men who account for 5.1 percent, adult women who account for 4.9 percent and teenagers who account for 17.5 percent.

Whites make up 4.7 percent, African Americans 10.1 percent, Asians 3.2 percent and Hispanics make up 6.8 percent.

Should we really be focusing our attention on a measure that blocks the District of Columbia's effort to make laws that protects the privacy rights of women and their spouses when we have more pressing priorities?

But back to H.J. Res. 43.

What does this legislation do to undermine DC's autonomy, attack women's rights and waste precious tax payer resources?

H.J. Res. 43 seeks to undermine an underlying Bill: the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act considered, voted upon by the duly elected officials of the District of Columbia and signed into law by Mayor Muriel Bowser of Washington, DC in January of this year.

The underlying bill signed into law in Washington, DC would do the following:

Prohibit employers from discriminating against employees based on their reproductive health decisions.

Protect the reproductive health decisions of spouses and dependents.

Prohibit an employer from firing an employee for using in vitro fertilization or birth control.

Contrary to assertions by my colleagues across the aisle, let us look at what RHNDA does not do:

First, it does not impose any new requirements on employers to provide health insurance coverage;

In fact, the D.C. Council considered this issue and clarified that RHNDA's protections do not reach insurance coverage by passing a temporary clarification;

Second, the RHNDA does not infringe on First Amendment rights;

Indeed, the RHNDA does not impact an organization or church's ability to make hiring decisions based on religious or political views.

Opponents may claim that the bill might require churches or religious organizations to hire pro-choice candidates.

This can hold no water because it is simply not within the scope of RHNDA.

The RHNDA strikes the balance of protecting personal decisions a woman makes regarding her reproductive health while not overreaching related to personal religious beliefs as it relates to a woman's reproductive health.

In my view, H.J. Res. 43 is another jab at the voice of women, their rights to self-determination and reproductive freedoms articulated in our nation's highest court's ruling in Griswold v. Connecticut and Roe v. Wade.

My friends, this week, 100 years ago, over 1000 women activists congregated at the Hague to ask for peace, protesting World War I and asserted their right to self-determination.

Dr. Aletta Jacobs, Jane Addams and sociologist Emily G. Balch were some of the champions of women's rights a century ago at the Hague.

Similar to their counterparts a century ago, today, in our era, we are blessed with women who are champions of a woman's right to self-determination and privacy.

Wendy Davis, Sandra Fluke and Lilly Ledbetter, just to name a few.

Notwithstanding the sacrifices made by all these women of courage, women and girls continue to be at the mercy of people who fail to try to show empathy towards their mothers, their sisters, their daughters, and loved ones.

Take for example the case of Emily Herx, a married woman who was terminated for using in vitro to become pregnant.

With her husband by her side, fortunately she was awarded a $1.9 million judgment against her employer.

Then there's the case of Jennifer Maudlin, a single unmarried mother working to support her children, who worked for an employer hostile towards unmarried women who became pregnant.

Maudlin was terminated as well, but was able to enter a settlement with her employer after she fought her illegal termination.

Then there is the case of Apryl Kellam, who was threatened with termination for being a single mother.

And the stories go on and on.

Clearly, as these real life stories reflect, H.J. Res. 43 affects all: significant others, spouses and daughters.

If passed, Republicans seek to empower employers to fire a woman because she has an abortion after experiencing the violent act of rape.

That is immoral.

Republicans seek to empower employers to demote a woman or pay her less if she chooses to take birth control pills.

That is unfair.

Indeed, Republicans seek to empower employers to fire a male worker because he uses condoms and because his wife uses birth control pills.

That makes no sense.

Republicans seek to empower employers to terminate a male employee because his teenage daughter becomes pregnant out of wedlock.

That is irrational.

In other words, Madam Speaker, H.J. Res. 43 is immoral, unfair and irrational.

It is also in derogation of women's privacy rights, violative of family rights and economic empowerment-issues affecting the livelihood of millions of families across our nation.

Thus, I stand in solidarity with my colleagues in opposing this Bill.

I also stand in solidarity with the Administration which has urged Congress in this Statement of Administration Policy to adopt the President's FY 2016 Budget proposal allowing the District to enact local laws and spend local funds in the same way as other cities and States.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose H.J. Res. 43.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), who is a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I rise today and want to reach out to my colleague, the Delegate from D.C. to, one, say that I appreciate the tone and tenor of this debate. I have great respect for her and, actually, during this debate have grown to admire her even more.

I would like to point out, however, that much of what has been talked about tonight about there being clarity is simply not the case, Madam Speaker.

□ 2230

We do know that, if we just broaden the ministerial exception, where we can look for items of conscience and make sure that those fundamental rights are protected, Madam Speaker, that this particular legislation would indeed do exactly what the Delegate from D.C. has said that it would do.

I stand here tonight to offer, again, my willingness to work with not only the Delegate from D.C., but the Mayor and the city council, to hopefully provide that clarifying language.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

May I say how much I appreciate that the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MEADOWS, made every effort to try to find some accommodation with the District of Columbia. I certainly appreciated that so much.

We were, unfortunately, unable to do so because the exemption he sought would have swallowed the equal employment laws. There would have been nothing left to them, but he tried very hard, and I appreciate the spirit in which he has acted as our subcommittee chair.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 43.

This resolution would express Congress' disapproval of the District of Columbia's legislation that would protect employees from discrimination based on their reproductive health decisions.

Just last month, the States of Indiana and Arkansas attempted to pass so-called ''religious freedom'' bills that are really an attempt to permit discrimination.

Tonight, we are debating a resolution that would allow employers to fire or refuse to hire workers because of their private reproductive medical decisions, notwithstanding the protection provided to the employees by the District of Columbia.

Madam Speaker, in 1993, when Congress passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, better known as RFRA, it did so with the intent to expand protections for religious exercise; but since then, we have seen attempts by Congress and some States to use so-called ''religious liberty'' or ''religious freedom'' measures to undermine otherwise valid protections against discrimination provided in the Civil Rights Act.

This resolution would allow claims of a ''sincerely held religious belief'' to justify otherwise illegal discrimination. The reasoning in this resolution would also undermine all civil rights laws because anyone could claim a sincerely held religious belief to justify discrimination based on anything—race, religion, or any other protected class.

The District of Columbia got it right. This law protects Washington, D.C., citizens from invidious discrimination based on reproductive health decisions. We should not overrule this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.J. Res. 43.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has three-quarters of a minute remaining.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, which will stop the so-called Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

This bill, passed by the D.C. City Council, discriminates against religious and pro-life advocacy groups in the District of Columbia.

The D.C. government forces employers to provide abortion coverage for their employees. This law represents a flagrant disregard for the conscience rights of all D.C. employers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow Members of the House to vote ''yes'' on this important resolution of disapproval.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, to disapprove the action of the D.C. Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, which I believe clearly violates the constitutional freedoms of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

This is not just about the citizens of one city. It is about protecting the freedoms and liberties enshrined in our Constitution for all Americans. This is about making sure the government does not force employers with deeply held religious beliefs and values to act against their conscience.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.J. Res. 43.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank Mrs. BLACK for her leadership.

''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.''

Madam Speaker, will we dare vote tonight to uphold the free exercise of religion? Will we dare vote tonight to ensure that no church or religious institution in the District of Columbia is forced to violate their beliefs and convictions?

Yes, we have a solemn obligation to support our constitutional commitment to religious liberty, so I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 43, the disapproval resolution to block the D.C. Council's disregard of fundamental constitutional rights.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, the question tonight is clearly the evisceration of the U.S. Constitution by the District of Columbia.

Don't take my word for it. Even the former Mayor of D.C., who agrees ideologically with the D.C. Council, warned his colleagues that the D.C. bill was ''legally insufficient,'' ''legally problematic,'' and ''raises concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.''

RHNDA discriminates against mission-driven organizations located in the Nation's Capital, impinging on the freedom of association and religion for advocacy groups, particularly religious and pro-life affiliates, our neighbors right here in the District of Columbia.

I ask we vote ''yes.''

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. This resolution represents tyranny on two levels: the tyranny the Framers most feared, by the Federal Government interfering with local government; and the tyranny Americans especially fear today, interference with the most private decision they make, the decision concerning their reproductive health.

Vote ''no.'' Stop this tyranny in the District of Columbia before it spreads throughout the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the robust debates that we have had here today on this important issue.

As I close, I would like to remind everyone, Madam Speaker, that this is legislation that has constitutional problems. We have said this over and over again since its inception, and the constitutional problems have been recognized by both the Democrats and the Republicans.

There has been a lot of conversation tonight about what this bill does and does not do. This resolution is about allowing religious and political organizations to hire employees who agree with their core mission as protected by the First Amendment.

It is imperative that this body adopt this resolution of disapproval to ensure the protections granted to each and every American by the First Amendment of our Constitution.

As a matter of fact, folks tried to say what this resolution would do. It is a very simple resolution. It is a 1-page resolution. It has a few sentences to it, and I would like to just read those sentences. It is ''disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.'' That is simply what it does.

We have the constitutional authority to give an up-or-down vote. We are not amending. If this resolution of disapproval is adopted by this body, it simply will put back into place what is already law in the District of Columbia. It will not be taking away any rights.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, which would disapprove of the D.C. Council's passage of the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

This resolution infringes on the reproductive rights of American citizens.

It allows employers to discriminate against employees based on their personal health decisions.

And it tramples on the rights of the people of the District of Columbia to govern themselves.

In January, the Mayor of the District of Columbia signed the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

This Act was passed by the District's elected representatives on the D.C. Council.

The Act prohibits employers from discriminating against employees based on their reproductive health decisions.

It also protects the reproductive health decisions of their spouses and their dependents.

By passing this resolution, congressional Republicans are impinging on the rights of women in the District of Columbia to make their own reproductive health decisions without fear that their bosses will punish them.

This resolution would permit an employer to fire a woman because she has an abortion after being raped.

It would allow an employer to demote a woman—or pay her less—if she chooses to take birth control pills.

This resolution would not affect only the rights of women.

It would allow an employer to fire a male worker because he uses condoms, because his wife uses the pill, or because his teenage daughter becomes pregnant out of wedlock.

As I told my colleagues in the Oversight Committee when we marked up this resolution, this is the same Committee that brought the world Sandra Fluke.

She wanted to come before the House Oversight Committee to testify about contraceptives on February 16, 2012.

But she was not allowed to speak. She was deemed ''unqualified.''

Today, this is exactly what House Republicans are doing to the people of the District of Columbia.

They want a voice in their own governance. They expressed their will. And their elected officials passed a law protecting their rights.

But now, House Republicans are trying to silence the voters of the District of Columbia, just as they tried to silence Sandra Fluke.

This approach will backfire, just as it did with Sandra Fluke.

She gave a voice to millions of women across the country, and she was heard far and wide.

The simple fact is that, regardless of what House Republicans do here today, this resolution has no chance of becoming law.

We all know this is nothing more than a symbolic gesture. But it reveals very clearly what Republicans stand for.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this measure,

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, it is simply shocking that in this day and age employees are still being discriminated against because of their reproductive health choices, such as whether or not to use birth control, undergo in vitro fertilization to get pregnant, or for having sex without being married.

The Council of the District of Columbia recently passed a law protecting D.C. women and families from such discrimination, making it clear that they cannot be penalized or retaliated against because of the employee's personal reproductive health care choices. The District of Columbia Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act takes a stand and makes a statement that this sort of discrimination will not be tolerated in the District of Columbia.

The House Majority wants to overturn the D.C. Council's law. H.J. Res. 43 is not only a slap in the face of the women of D.C. but also to their families. It affects whether people can choose to wait to have children, have children at all, and when they can or cannot have sex. Frankly, it's none of our business. Is there anything more private than someone's childbearing decisions? Than who to get intimate with? In a country that will spend $166 million on the movie 50 Shades of Grey, the Republican Majority thinks imposing their own Puritanical ideology and theology on District residents is acceptable?

House Republicans constantly argue for limiting the power of the federal government and to respect the rights of the state and local governments. However, once again, they feel it is necessary to usurp the decision that the D.C. government unanimously voted on for its own citizens. Do unto others but don't do unto me. That is about as hypocritical as you can get.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject H.J. Res. 43 and to support D.C.'s local government and the women of D.C. to make their own reproductive choices.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose the Republican Majority's unilateral, and rather extraordinary, effort to undermine democracy in the District of Columbia.

A majority that claims to oppose big government and fancies itself as the champion of State and local rights; astonishingly finds itself on the precipice of wielding the Federal Government's power to overturn the decision of a local government solely because it can. Not because it should; but because it can.

Never mind that the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act was appropriately considered, passed, and enacted by the duly elected representatives of the District of Columbia. The majority has decided that democratic principles take a back seat to pleasing its anti-reproductive rights base.

Make no mistake; this disgraceful vote represents a strike against the right to self-governance. It is an affront to D.C. home rule and a regrettable regression by the majority to a previous era, when Republicans of the 1990's abused congressional power to advance intrusive, anti-democratic legislation that meddled in the District's local affairs. Indeed, this resolution is emblematic of efforts by certain segments of the conservative movement that intended or not, would actually have the effect of enshrining bigotry into our laws in the name of fighting it.

Let us have no illusions about what the majority seeks to do this evening. In making a mockery of the D.C. Home Rule Act, the majority is seeking to repeal a local government statute that prohibits discrimination on the basis of reproductive health decisions and protects its citizens against prejudice in the workplace.

This law has absolutely nothing to do with health insurance coverage. As the Chairman of the D.C. Council stated in a letter to Congress, ''The purpose and intent of this bill is to prevent an employer, through our Human Rights Act, from firing an employee for that employee's personal decision regarding his or her reproductive health.''

In closing, it is true that the United States Constitution grants the Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the affairs of the District of Columbia. Yet, just because we can does not mean we should.

I implore my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who loudly proclaim to be the part of limited government, to recognize that Congress should always strive to treat the District of Columbia like any other State, and respect the rights of all Americans to exercise democratic self-governance.

I urge all my colleagues to strongly oppose this anti-democratic resolution.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 43 to overturn the D.C. Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

To be clear, this Resolution is not about protecting freedom of religion and beliefs. No, House Joint Resolution 43 is about allowing discrimination.

Despite misleading rhetoric, this Resolution would allow an employer to discriminate against an employee based on the employee's personal health care decisions—decisions which have nothing to do with the employer.

Everyone should have the ability to make private health decisions including whether, when, and how to start a family, without fear of losing their jobs or facing retribution from employers.

The D.C. Council understands this and, by passing the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act, seeks to ensure fair and necessary employment protections for the people of the District of Columbia.

The Council deserves our respect when protecting the rights of their constituents . . . the people who elected them. The oversight of this body should not extend to overturning legislation passed by democratically-elected representatives of the people of D.C.

The freedom of religion is a fundamental freedom established by our founding fathers that we should fiercely protect, but to suggest that it extends to employers imposing their beliefs on the people that work for them, as this Resolution does, is just plain WRONG, particularly when it comes to something as personal as reproductive health.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 43, Disapproving the Action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act. While this resolution is certainly an abuse of Congress' authority over the District of Columbia, it more importantly undermines the right of a woman to make personal, private healthcare decisions.

The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act of 2014 (RHNDA) was passed by the D.C. Council in order to protect employees and their families from discrimination. RHNDA ensures that an employee cannot be terminated based on personal reproductive healthcare decisions. For instance, the use of birth control, the decision of when to start a family, or the use of in vitro fertilization are not grounds for termination in the District of Columbia.

The RHNDA does not impose any new requirements on employers to provide health insurance coverage or to pay for any reproductive or abortion services nor does it discriminate against pro-life organizations. The RHNDA actually clarifies that every employee in D.C. is able to follow their own moral or religious beliefs, including when and how to start a family, without fear of facing consequences at work.

Religious liberty is of the utmost importance and the RHNDA respects religious and moral decision-making without impacting anyone outside of the person making their own decisions. We must allow religious liberty to also mean allowing people to work in an environment that respects their dignity and private life and is free from discrimination.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.J. Res. 43 because it not only infringes upon the personal decision-making of an individual, it also blatantly disregards D.C.'s local laws.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 43, a joint resolution of Congress, which is needed to protect the conscience rights of pro-life employers that operate in the District of Columbia. Under DC's home rule law, Congress has a time period in which to review DC-passed legislation.

In January, DC Mayor Bowser signed the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act (RHNDA). This measure would, in part, ban employers from making personnel decisions based on an individual's decisions relating to abortion and other reproductive health issues.

RHNDA would have the force of law and specifically discriminate against pro-life employers by potentially forcing them to hire and retain individuals who advocate for policies that run counter to the employer's mission.

Pro-life organizations, including those who exist to advance pro-life policies, should not be forced by the DC government to hire individuals who hold and advocate for positions that run counter to the core values of that organization. Christian schools and pro-life organizations should not be required to cover ''reproductive health decisions'' in their health care plans that are counter to their core pro-life convictions.

This DC law amounts to coercion and should have no place in the nation's capital, or any jurisdiction for that matter. This is a step too far and H.J. Res. 43 restores these fundamental conscience rights.

I rise in strong support of this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this important legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to H.J. Res. 43, a

bill that aims to overturn the Reproductive Health Non-discrimination Amendment Act (RHNDA) which was recently passed by the DC City Council.

The purpose of the RHNDA is to prevent DC employers from discriminating against workers for making personal reproductive health decisions that conflict with the expressed values of their employer. For example, the law prevents the firing of an employee for getting pregnant outside of marriage.

Supporters of H.J. Res. 43 say the bill's intent is to protect the rights of employers who do not want to be forced to support the reproductive decisions of their employees. However, the RHNDA imposes no new requirements on employers to provide health insurance and does not change the insurance policies of current workers in any way. RHNDA's aim is simply to ensure that workers are judged based on their work decision-making, rather than on their personal health decision-making.

This Republican bill is not only an assault on workers' rights; it is also an assault on the rights of self-determination of the people of Washington D.C. Why should an Idaho congressman be able to overturn the unanimous decision of an elected body which is simply expressing the will of the DC voters that elected it?

For these reasons, I oppose this bill and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—228

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—192

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Poliquin
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

□ 2308

Mr. BARLETTA changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2028.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 2310

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 57, line 11.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. RUIZ of California.

Amendment by Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. SWALWELL of California.

Amendment by Mr. BYRNE of Alabama.

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. SWALWELL of California.

Amendment by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment by Mr. HUDSON of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. SANFORD of South Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 295, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—126

Allen
Amash
Babin
Benishek
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Long
Loudermilk
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thornberry
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Zinke

NOES—295

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2314

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 249, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—172

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin

Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

NOES—249

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2317

Mrs. DINGELL changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 244, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—177

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Zinke

NOES—244

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter

Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2320

Mr. AMODEI changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

AYES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

NOES—248

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2324

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 282, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

AYES—139

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barr
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grothman
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.

Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Stutzman
Thornberry
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOES—282

Abraham
Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2327

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 311, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

AYES—110

Amash
Babin
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grothman
Harris
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
LaMalfa
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Olson
Palmer
Perry
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Stutzman
Thornberry
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOES—311

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell

Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2330

Mr. PITTENGER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 246, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

AYES—175

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gowdy
Grayson
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Woodall
Yoho

NOES—246

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (NC)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2332

Mr. ASHFORD changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 219, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

AYES—202

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Harris
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yoho
Zeldin

NOES—219

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2335

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 257, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

AYES—164

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sires
Speier
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yoho

NOES—257

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren

Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2339

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 272, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

AYES—149

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Speier
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yoho

NOES—272

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2342

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 278, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

AYES—143

Allen
Amash
Babin
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan

Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Neugebauer
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Zinke

NOES—278

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2345

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

AYES—171

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zinke

NOES—250

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.

Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Knight
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2347

Mr. GUTHRIE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

AYES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zinke

NOES—189

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2350

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTON

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the Account ''Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.'' After the dollar amount, insert (increased by $30,000,000) (decreased by $30,000,000).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I had offered an amendment for the RECORD that was a very specific amendment, and I am going to read that:

The Secretary shall accept from the Trinity River Authority of Texas, if received by October 31, 2015, $30,191,026 as payment in full of amounts owed to the United States, including any accrued interest, for water supply storage space in Joe Pool Lake, Texas, previously known as Lakeview Lake, under contract No. DACW63–76–C–0106.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was approved by the Corps of Engineers, approved by the Trinity River Authority, and approved by the municipalities that are obligated to purchase water that is stored in this lake. However, only one of those municipalities is actually taking the water, and because of a very high interest rate, it would never be feasible for the water to be taken by the three municipalities that are not taking it. Under this agreement, the Trinity River Authority would pay all principal and accrued interest but at an interest rate of a little over 2 percent.

The Corps has accepted it. The municipalities have accepted it. The State of Texas has accepted it. It has all been accepted. The committee of authorizing jurisdiction is supportive of it, which is the Transportation Committee. In principle, on policy, the appropriators of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle are supportive.

However, there is a point of order against the amendment as originally drafted. I respect that point of order. I respect the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member, and I respect the full committee chairman, so I have drafted the substitute amendment, which there is no point of order against. I am told that, if accepted, this will have an effect that, if the appropriators support it in principle, the Corps will accept it, and the municipalities will accept it, and we will get this problem solved.

I want to emphasize that the United States Government is going to get all of its money back with interest at the prevailing market rate of the little over 2 percent that exists today. This is not a giveaway. This is literally found money that goes back to the Corps of Engineers, and they, under the leadership of the subcommittee that Mr. SIMPSON and Ms. KAPTUR are responsible for, can designate that money however they think it is best to be obligated.

I ask for the chairman of the subcommittee to enter into a colloquy to see if he accepts this amendment in principle and is willing to work with me and Ms. JOHNSON to implement it in the appropriate fashion at the appropriate time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman would like to do and how it would be helpful to his constituents. I would be happy to continue the discussion of this issue to see if there is anything that this subcommittee can do. I will not oppose this amendment, and I will try to help accomplish this goal that the gentleman is trying to achieve. It is amazing to me that, when everybody agrees on something, how hard it can still be to get it done.

Mr. BARTON. In reclaiming my time, we are trying to give money to the Federal Government that your subcommittee can use. It is a good amendment. I appreciate your support, Mr. Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0000

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank my friend and colleague from my home State of Texas (Mr. BARTON), who I share the lake with.

This is a commonsense amendment. I want to thank all of those who have helped to arrive at this acceptable language for this amendment.

The language of the amendment has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office and has a zero score. More importantly, the amendment would provide a revenue for the government. It would make good on unintended consequences that came as a result of a now antiquated metric of calculating costs for such projects.

In the 1986 WRDA bill, Congress recognized this mistake in its formulas for rates and added a provision allowing for the recalculation of such project rates for ever 5 years, but it was not retroactive.

This amendment will enable the Trinity River Authority to make a final payment to the Corps of Engineers, begin providing water supply and storage, and allow the Federal Government to finally begin collecting revenue on this investment.

I will remind my colleagues these contracts are congressionally approved, but this contract was agreed to on terms no longer favorable to the U.S. Government.

The original formula has tripled the valuation of the project, and as it stands, the project will never be completed, and we will never collect on the contract. There is no existing obligation to pay for the completion of the project, so what we have now is a half-completed project and no path forward for the government to collect on its investment.

This is revenue for our government. It has a zero CBO score, and it is a commonsense amendment.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I thank all those who helped us to arrive at this point.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Is it not true there literally is an escrow account in Texas with $30 million in it that they wish to send to the Federal Government?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. That is true. They are ready to pay it.

Mr. BARTON. Is it not true that this is what we would call found money?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, indeed; $30 million is a lot of money for the government these days.

Mr. BARTON. Is it also not true that, if Mr. SIMPSON and Ms. KAPTUR and their subcommittee and the full committee accepts this and works in good faith to actually implement it, that the subcommittee and the full committee can use these unobligated funds in whatever fashion they see best for programs within the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. That is true.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and thank you to our ranking member and the chair for the good work that they have done on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice to those in support of water power and the Bonamici-Perry-Pingree amendment.

This amendment provides a modest increase in funding for the Department of Energy's Water Power Program, but that modest increase will make a big difference in developing new sources of clean energy, tidal power, and hydropower from all across the country.

I have seen this program work firsthand in the State of Maine. Ocean Renewable Power Company has taken advantage of this program and leveraged these modest investments into a company that has created or retained over a hundred jobs in every part of our State and directly pumped over $25 million into our economy.

Tidal and river power projects create jobs in areas where they are needed

most, in Eastport, Maine, for example, or in rural villages in Alaska. These projects lower energy prices and create jobs. For some remote communities, creating these new forms of clean energy is a matter of survival.

These projects are examples of American technology and know-how at work. By creating homegrown solutions to our energy needs, we are investing in our communities and developing technology that the rest of the world wants to buy from us. Most importantly of all, this allows us to keep the money we spend on energy right here in America.

This Department of Energy program supports private sector research and development and implementation of water power technology that creates these jobs and these new sources of clean energy. This modest increase in funding will translate directly into jobs and an increase in the supply of clean renewable energy across the country.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congresswoman PINGREE of Maine for her efforts here this evening and for her dedication to renewable energy, including in the tidal arena.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ABRAHAM

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, carry out, modify, revise, or enforce Executive Order 13690 (entitled ''Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input'').

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are here today because, with the stroke of a pen, President Obama has threatened decades of work by Americans and local governments to combat flooding.

Executive Order No. 13690 establishes a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard that greatly expands the area defined as flood plain and imposes unreasonable standards on any Federal activities in that expanded flood plain.

The administration crafted this policy in secret, without input on its merits from local officials or stakeholders, those stakeholders that will have to live with this policy.

The Office of Management and Budget predicts that this standard will significantly increase the cost of living and doing business in all areas that are at any risk of flooding.

This is just another case of the President imposing his climate change politics on hard-working Americans. This new standard will have a real devastating impact on communities throughout the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that will prohibit funding for this woefully shortsighted executive order.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY, my good friend.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, the administration continues to rule using executive orders and a top-down approach without taking stakeholder voices into account. That is arbitrary, and it is just wrong.

This Federal Flood Risk Management Standard is a case in point established by executive order. The President solicited no public input on its merits before charging full speed ahead. This is horrible for Louisiana. It will be devastating for our coastal communities, inhibiting their ability to grow and develop.

This order affects critical programs like disaster preparedness assistance and Federal highway and housing aid; yet no cost-benefit analysis was ever undertaken. This is just not the way things are supposed to work around here.

I encourage all my colleagues who are concerned not only with the content of this, but the fly-by-night process by which this revision was proposed, to support our amendment and send a message to the administration that this will not stand.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our great friend and majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. ABRAHAM, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at this proposal, the way it came about, there was not the right kind of planning and the right kind of feedback, the right kind of working with people who have been working hard on flood protection structures.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal by the President, if it were implemented, would actually make it harder to build flood protection projects. Why would the President want to bring forward a proposal that is going to make it harder for people to protect their homes from flooding?

This isn't just a south Louisiana problem; this impacts the entire Nation. There are people all around the country that would not only be threatened by the inability to build stronger flood protection, but this would also lead to dramatic increases in insurance rates on homeowners.

This proposal by the President is not only a solution in search of a problem; this is going to be a dangerous proposal that will have dramatically devastating impacts on families all across this Nation.

This is a proposal that needs to be reversed. I support it.

□ 0010

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman ABRAHAM for bringing this amendment up.

I strongly support resiliency efforts, making our communities more resilient and our ecosystem more resilient. In this case, we are taking a standard that is universally considered to be a 100-year standard and bumping it, in many cases, to a 500-year standard.

In the State of Louisiana, FEMA has gone through and tried to establish maps to determine a 100-year standard. We found areas where they are 6 feet off where they should be, yet we are going to try and go to a 500-year standard. I remind you, our Nation hasn't even been around that long.

Most concerning, Mr. Chairman, is when you combine this proposed executive order with the Waters of the U.S. proposal that clearly states that flood plains are within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, you suddenly grossly expand the Federal Government's jurisdiction over private property and prevent or obstruct or increase the cost of development on that private property.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I just want to state that in December of last year, Congress raised strong concern about this, about the huge implications of this and, therefore, they put a provision in law that required that input from stakeholders occur before this executive order be put forth, and that was ignored.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition the gentleman's amendment.

It doesn't take a mental giant to see that floods are among the most costly and frequent of all nature's hazards.

Between 1980 and 2013, the United States suffered more than $260 billion worth of flood-related damages. Flooding accounts for approximately 85 percent of all disaster declarations in the country. And on average, more people die annually from flooding than any other natural disaster. I can tell you that even in the Midwest, which isn't one of the coastal communities, we have more significant storms of late and more rainfall and more flooding to deal with.

The costs borne by the Federal taxpayer by flooding exceed any other natural hazard. Losses caused by flooding impact our economic prosperity, public health and safety, and our national security by straining disaster response

resources and increasing the frequency and cost of disaster relief.

When you look at the cost of what FEMA has to spend to try to clean up everything from basements to neighborhoods, oh, my goodness. The millions and millions of dollars that go out, the billions of dollars that go out the door because of these disasters around the country related to flooding is huge.

Flooding risks are anticipated to increase over time due to the continued occupation of flood-prone areas, the impacts of climate change, and other threats. That damage can be particularly severe to our Nation's infrastructure, including our buildings, roads, ports, industrial facilities, and even our coastal military installations.

I actually have traveled to Louisiana, and my heart goes out to the people of New Orleans and all of the surrounding areas for what they suffered. But I can tell you, I was shocked to see that there were decisions made for land planning to absolutely rebuild where all the damage had occurred. I even made suggestions in the Ninth Ward inside New Orleans. I said: Why don't you leave that open for agriculture, so that when you get another big threat from the ocean, you won't harm as many people? It was as though no one wanted to listen.

Well, God bless everyone, because nature we can't control. She does what she wants.

Federal agencies will be given the flexibility to select the best approach for establishing the flood elevation and hazard area they use in siting, design, and construction: utilizing the best available actionable data and methods that integrate current and future changes in flooding based on science and experience; 2 or 3 feet of elevation, depending on the criticality of the building itself, above the 100-year, or 1 percent, annual chance flood elevation; or a 500-year, or 0.2 percent, annual chance flood elevation.

The new flood standard will help reduce the risk and costs and, frankly, loss of life of future flood disasters by providing a margin of safety so that federally funded structures, facilities, and infrastructure last as long as intended.

Why should we ask people who are living responsibly with the land and the forces of nature to pay for those who want to live irresponsibly with those same forces?

It seems to me that one of the most cost-effective things we can do is to be sensible about our land planning for the future, so that we avoid the harm to human life and our built environment. We are more intelligent, we hope, than we were a century ago. We have a lot more data. We have a lot more experience, and it should influence our decisions from now into the future.

I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to join me. Let's be responsible in this new century and minimize the harm, both to human life as well as taxpayers' pocketbooks.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, the good, hard-working people that live in these areas that would be affected now have not incurred floods in their lifetimes or in their generations of lifetimes before them, but this would impact some States up to 40 percent of their total landmass.

This is unacceptable. Cost of flood insurance would go astronomically high in some cases. Federal overburden would again be an issue, and businesses could not function. Even existing businesses would be put out of business.

This administration has violated the congressional intent in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2015 by crafting the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard without consulting the necessary officials and basing it on some climate issues that have no scientific basis at this point.

This standard will affect both private and federally financed development in areas considered flood plain. This means certification and accreditation of new and improved levees, issuance of section 404 Clean Water Act permits, issuance of federally backed mortgages, issuance of grants, construction of new transportation projects, and on and on would be affected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act for ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science'' may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank again the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for their courtesy and, as well, for the work that they have done on this legislation.

This amendment was in this bill in the 113th in the FY 2013 Energy and Water Resources. It is a continuing effort to ensure that we focus on the need for science, technology, engineering, and math among minority populations in the United States.

The amendment prohibits the use of funds made available for science in title III of the Department of Energy programs to be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act, and addresses the need to increase programs that educate minorities in science, technology, engineering, and math.

Some almost 20 years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton, in an executive order, directed Federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

The Department of Energy seeks to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chairman, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students but only 45 percent of undergraduate STEM degree holders. This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals.

As the Nation's demographics are shifting, as more and more of our children come of age, it is important that we continue to focus on improving the numbers of minorities who seek STEM opportunities. It is good for the country.

I applaud Energy Secretary Moniz' commitment, which will increase the Nation's economic competitiveness and enable our people to realize their full potential.

Mr. Chairman, there are still a great many scientific riddles to be solved, and the more people we have trained in the sciences, the more competitive our Nation will be; and the more we invest in underserved communities, the more competitive our Nation will be.

The larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for them. So I ask my colleagues to ensure that we continue this very important focus and emphasize the continued investment improving access to science, technology, engineering, and math to, in essence, solve, or help solve, the scientific riddles that continue to be before us to improve the quality of life of all Americans.

□ 0020

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, which invests in STEM in America for those who are underserved and whose lives could be enhanced by these programs.

Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to describe my amendment, which simply provides that: "None of the funds made available by this Act for 'Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science' may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.)."

This amendment was approved and adopted in identical form on June 5, 2012, during the 112th Congress as an amendment to H.R.

5325, the Energy and Water Resources Appropriations Act of 2013.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman Simpson and Ranking Member Kaptur for their stewardship in bringing this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

Mr. Chair, twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

The Department of Energy seeks to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chair, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students, but only 45 percent of undergraduate STEM degree holders.

This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals.

As the nation's demographics are shifting and now most children under the age of one are minorities, it is critical that we close the gap in the number of minorities who seek STEM opportunities.

I applaud the Energy Secretary Moniz's commitment which will increase the nation's economic competitiveness and enable more of our people to realize their full potential.

Mr. Chair, there are still a great many scientific riddles left to be solved—and perhaps one of these days a minority engineer or biologist will come-up with some of the solutions.

The larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for them.

The energy and science education programs funded in part by this bill will help ensure that members of underrepresented communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environmental sustainability, preservation, and health.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefitted by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

The DOE also works to increase low income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can increase diversity, provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities, and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

But most importantly businesses will have more consumers to whom they may engage in related commercial activities.

My amendment will help ensure that underrepresented communities are able to participate and contribute equitably in the energy and scientific future.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, printed as No. 5 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to apply the report entitled ''Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas from the United States'', published in the Federal Register on June 4, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 32260), in any public interest determination under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will keep America's energy economy growing and keep good-paying jobs coming to gas-producing regions across the country, including western Pennsylvania.

The natural gas boom is transforming local economies across the country, and it is creating a new wave of opportunity for hard-working Americans who want to earn a living and provide for their families.

American ingenuity has empowered us to safely harness our tremendous energy resources, turning the United States into a breakout success story as the world's top natural gas producer. Countries in Europe and Asia, many of which are our allies, are eager to tap this abundant supply of affordable American energy. They consider America to be a much more attractive business partner and a safer alternative to their reliance on belligerent, energy-rich countries, like Russia.

Given the abundance of domestic natural gas resources, especially in the Marcellus shale region, American energy companies are eager to accept more business and stand ready to fulfill the global demand.

We must do everything we can to help energy producers succeed so they can continue to grow, hire more workers, and bring prosperity back to our American cities.

Congress must work to lift barriers to energy exports and help domestic energy producers cut through the bureaucratic red tape that threatens to put a stranglehold on continued economic growth.

My amendment seeks to eliminate unnecessary challenges to these increased energy exports on environmental grounds. Specifically, my provision would prevent the Department of Energy from using its report entitled ''Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas'' in any public interest determination under the Natural Gas Act.

There are legitimate concerns that this DOE report and many of its arbitrary determinations may now be used to slow-walk or completely block much-needed liquefied natural gas export approvals. Identical language was proposed and included in last year's Energy and Water and Related Agencies appropriations bill by then-Representative BILL CASSIDY from Louisiana.

I thank Chairman SIMPSON for his hard work and support, and I urge all my colleagues who support an all-of-the-above approach to American energy independence to vote ''yea'' on this amendment so we can keep our energy sector booming.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, when a company wants to export liquefied natural gas, LNG, it has to submit an application with the Department of Energy. For export to countries with a free trade agreement with the United States, the Department of Energy must grant the applications without modification or delay. For export to countries without a free trade agreement, the Department of Energy must approve an export application unless it finds that the proposed export will not be consistent with the public interest.

To make this determination, the Department of Energy evaluates a range of factors when reviewing an application, including economic impacts, international considerations, U.S. energy security, and environmental effects.

The Rothfus amendment prohibits the Department of Energy from even considering one of the most important factors; that is, the impact of LNG exports on climate change.

The world's leading scientists are unequivocal: climate change is already happening on all continents and across the oceans and will get much worse if we do not act to cut our emissions of carbon and other greenhouse gas gases. That means that we need to scrutinize the energy infrastructure decisions that we make today for their impacts on climate change in the future.

Every decision to build a new LNG export terminal has climate implications. We need to understand and weigh those effects.

Whether exporting LNG will have a positive or negative impact on global greenhouse gas emissions is a complex but critical question. Natural gas combustion for electricity emits less carbon pollution than coal. And that is good. Proponents of LNG exports argue that these exports will displace coal consumption in other countries, which could produce a climate benefit. That is good.

But LNG exports will raise natural gas prices in the United States, which could increase coal consumption and carbon pollution from coal-fired power plants. LNG exports also would drive new domestic natural gas production in the United States.

Coming from Ohio, I can guarantee you, this would increase emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, unless we take measures to control that pollution at the wellhead and throughout the natural gas system. It is a great problem to have but one we need to meet.

In a carbon-constrained world, we need to understand and consider the climate impacts of key energy policy decisions, such as building new LNG export terminals and exporting America's natural gas.

The Rothfus amendment takes a head-in-the-sand approach, I am sorry to say. The Department of Energy has completed a report examining lifecycle carbon emissions from LNG. This amendment says that the Department of Energy can't consider those findings of climate impacts when making a public interest determination. Considering climate impacts is not going to slow down the review process. It makes no sense to require the Department of Energy to make a determination without the benefit of all the facts.

Let's make enlightened decisions. Ignoring climate change will not make it go away. Quite the opposite.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Let's move to the future, not the past.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, it has been the practice of this administration to stall, stall, stall, delay, delay, delay. We have had tremendous growth in our economy in western Pennsylvania and in Ohio, for that matter, given the natural gas boom that is going on.

The price of gas is suppressed right now. We see drillers even slowing down, which is affecting jobs in the gas areas. Fewer wells are being drilled.

And to take a report that the DOE has, with its arbitrary determinations, to, again, slow-walk approvals, which is what we have been seeing with the administration—meanwhile, allies in Eastern Europe are literally being held hostage to Russia—this natural gas will be used. Natural gas will be used by these countries in Eastern Europe. They are going to use Russia's natural gas or they want to use American natural gas.

So, again, I would encourage adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are procured from a manufacturer that is part of the national technology and industrial base.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a simple and straightforward amendment to this year's Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Every year since 1991, Congress has included a provision in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill to require that military agencies purchase anchor and mooring chain from American manufacturers.

□ 0030

My amendment simply clarifies that this requirement also applies to anchor and mooring chain purchased by the Army Corps of Engineers. Everyone in this Chamber can agree that taxpayer dollars should be used to buy goods manufactured right here at home whenever possible.

While our economy continues to recover, it is imperative that we protect and support Americans' production capabilities. Doing so not only supports employment opportunities for Americans, but also reinforces our national security.

Both Congress and the Pentagon have long recognized the importance of maintaining a strong industrial base right here in America. While I understand that we must balance our procurement needs with shrinking budgets, we should not be putting foreign workers ahead of Americans.

My amendment is a commonsense way to protect a critical production capability, support our manufacturing industry, and put American workers first. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the removal of any Federally owned or operated dam.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will help prevent future floods, as well as protect valuable water storage and hydropower systems throughout the country.

Specifically, the Gosar-Newhouse amendment will prevent any funds in this bill from being used to remove any federally owned or operated dams. In recent years, extremist environmental groups have increased efforts to dismantle and remove Federal dams. These efforts defy common sense, particularly at a time of major water challenges across the West and with an increasing need for clean, renewable hydropower.

The gentleman from Washington has seen these attempts firsthand, and I am grateful for Congressman NEWHOUSE's leadership in coleading this amendment.

Electricity generated from the Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation operated dams is utilized by millions of Americans every day and represents the largest source of renewable energy in this country.

These dams are multiuse facilities that provide navigation, hydropower, and important recreational benefits. Fringe efforts to remove these dams are not only misguided, but extremely dangerous. Many of these dams are essential components for flood controls, strategic water storage, and life-sustaining irrigation for millions of acres of American agriculture.

Tens of millions of Americans rely on these dams to supply their drinking water and to support their livelihoods. The vital water, energy, economic, and ecological benefits provided by these federally owned and operated dams must be protected.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Corps of Engineers infrastructure and to support this

amendment. The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have both indicated they have no plans to remove any dams in fiscal year 2016, and both agencies don't have any issues with this amendment.

Both committees of jurisdiction have also signed off on and support the amendment. Any emergency removals will be made by a different authorization or appropriation.

With one of the worst droughts in 100 years currently transpiring in the West, there is no logical reason to oppose the commonsense Gosar-Newhouse amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my friend.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the good gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Gosar-Newhouse amendment which would prohibit any funds in this act from being used for purposes of removing Federal dams, which are a vital component of the water infrastructure in the West.

I would like to thank my good friend and colleague Congressman GOSAR for his hard work on this issue which is so important, given the devastating drought conditions facing most of the Western United States. According to the U.S. Drought Monitor for March 31, 2015, all or significant portions of 11 Western States, including the State of Washington, are suffering from severe to exceptional drought.

Given the current drought conditions facing my State and many other States in the West, now is not the time to consider removing Federal dams. These dams provide important hydropower in my State and also have conservation, recreation, and navigation benefits.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, these dams play a pivotal role in water storage, irrigation, and flood control. They also help ensure many rural and agricultural communities in the West have access to clean water supplies, providing critically important irrigation for countless agricultural operations and millions of acres of farmland.

We have fought these dam wars for decades; and, with the West facing a possible 100-year drought, now is not the time to destroy and remove these assets which benefit all of us. Removing this vital infrastructure would have a devastating impact on communities, farms, and businesses throughout the West.

This commonsense amendment will help ensure States like mine are not additionally burdened as we work to deal with impacts of mounting water shortages and drastic drought conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment, and I would like to thank my good friend from Arizona for his hard work on this.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express the opinion, though I will not oppose the amendment, because there are no funds in the bill for dam removal, and I wanted to just clarify that for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that were inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill that was considered under an open rule during the 113th Congress, as well as one yesterday.

My amendment would expand the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of contractors.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to save taxpayer money, help the Department of Energy avoid duplicative programs, and ensure the agency's limited resources are focused on programs directly related to its mission to ensure energy security for the United States.

This simple amendment would prohibit the use of funds to be used for the proposed Climate Model Development and Validation program within the Department of Energy. This exact same amendment passed this body by a voice vote last year, and this year, I am also proud again to offer this commonsense policy.

The duplicative and wasteful nature of this new program has been recognized by several outside spending watchdog groups. This amendment proposal has been supported in the past by the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, The American Conservative Union, Eagle Forum, and the Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives already declined to fund the proposed climate model program in fiscal years 2014 and 2015. In previous years, the committee has proactively included language in the committee report to prohibit funding for this new program. However, such language does not exist in this year's report, making this amendment even more necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that the House of Representatives must continue its firm position that we should not be wasting precious taxpayer resources on new programs that compete with the private sector and are funded by private investment.

If funded, this program would be yet another new addition to the President's ever-growing list of duplicative global programs that have been instituted and funded all over the Federal Government in recent years.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service estimates this administration has already squandered $77 billion from fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2013 studying and trying to develop global climate change regulations.

While research and modeling of the Earth's climate and how and why Earth's climate is changing can be of value, it is not central to the Department's mission and is already being done by dozens of government, academic, business, and nonprofit organizations across the globe.

□ 0040

Considering the extensive work that is being done to research, model, and forecast climate change trends by other areas in the government, in the private sector, and internationally, funding for this specific piece of President Obama's climate agenda is not only redundant, but is also inefficient.

I thank the chairman, ranking member, and committee for their work on this bill. This amendment is about effective use of taxpayer money, and I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that passed this same body just last year.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. The Gosar amendment blocks funding for the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program. This is climate science denial at its worst.

The world's top scientific institutions are telling us that we have a rapidly closing window to reduce our carbon pollution before the catastrophic impacts of climate change cannot be avoided.

So far, the world already warmed by 0.8 degrees Celsius, and we are already seeing the effects of climate change. Most scientists agree that 2 degrees Celsius is the maximum amount we can warm without really dangerous effects, although many scientists now believe that even 2 degrees is far too much, given the effects we are already seeing. But absent dramatic action, we are on track to warm 4 to 6 degrees Celsius by midcentury. That is more than 10 degrees Fahrenheit.

The International Energy Agency has concluded that if the world does not take action to reduce carbon pollution by 2017, just 3 years from now, then it will be virtually impossible to limit warming to 2 degrees Celsius.

How do we know all of this? There are multiple lines of evidence, including direct measurements. But scientists also use sophisticated computer models of how the atmosphere and oceans work and how they respond to different atmosphere concentrations of heat-trapping gases. For projections of future emissions and their impacts, scientists have made numerous advances by collaborating across academic fields, including climatology, chemistry, biology, economics, energy dynamics, agriculture, scenario building, and risk management. These projections are critical, as they provide guideposts to understand how quickly and how steeply the world needs to cut carbon pollution in order to avoid the worst effects of climate change.

The goal of the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program is to further improve the reliability of climate models and equip policymakers and citizens with tools to predict the current and future effects of climate change, such as sea level rise, which we know is happening, extreme weather events, and drought.

Mr. GOSAR's amendment scraps this program. It says no to enhancing the reliability of our climate models. It says no to improving our understanding of how the climate is changing. It says no to informing policymakers about the consequences of unmitigated climate change. That is absolutely irresponsible.

The amazing thing is the base bill already zeroes out funding for this program. But apparently that wasn't enough to satisfy the Republicans' climate denial. So Mr. GOSAR has offered this amendment to just reiterate the point that the House Republicans reject the overwhelming scientific evidence about climate change.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this redundant amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that we have numerous universities already doing this duplicative study, like the University of Michigan, like the University of Colorado Boulder, like Harvard University, the University of Arizona, the University of Chicago, the University of California—Berkeley—hardly squandering research.

This is a duplicative problem and program, and that is exactly what we are doing. I want to find out exactly this climate model change that we have been seeing over and over with time, but it is best to be done by those universities and those who are already there.

We have also got a dire emergency in regards to the finances that we find this country in. Duplicative services from the Department of Energy should be on their mission statement, and that is dependable energy for this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) For an additional amount for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction'' for additional funding for ongoing work on authorized projects (except for Flood and Storm Damage Reduction, Navigation, and Environmental Infrastructure projects) there is appropriated, and the amount otherwise made available for such account is hereby reduced by, $10,000,000.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction'' in excess of $276,117,000 may be used for additional funding for ongoing work on Flood and Storm Damage Reduction projects.

Mr. SIMPSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Army Corps of Engineers construction general account permits the Corps to enter into agreements with local governments and municipalities to reimburse these entities for certain funds. This allows cities across the country in both Republican and Democratic districts to take on public works projects and leverage the fact that they will later be reimbursed by the Federal Government.

The problem we face today is that millions, hundreds of millions of dollars are owed to localities across the country, and the account to pay them back this year is slated to have only $10 million in it. Last year, that amount was $25 million. It has gone down by $15 million.

So for just a second, I want to give you an example of a wonderful public project in my hometown of San Antonio, Texas. The San Antonio River Authority, or SARA, recently undertook a sizable project along the San Antonio River, called the Mission Reach Ecosystem Restoration project. It has been an effort to extend, both to the north and the south, the wonderful San Antonio River Walk in San Antonio, Texas, one of the crown jewels for tourism and culture in our city. Despite the fact that this project was completed sometime ago, the city is still owed much money from the Corps.

This is just one example of a wonderful public project where the Federal Government owes our cities or local entities a substantial amount of money. There are other examples in Texas, in Harris County, the Brays Bayou project in Harris County, where $146,885,000 is pending; the White Oak Bayou project in Harris County, where $73 million is pending; also, the Lower Colorado River Basin, Onion Creek, in Austin has $5 million pending. I know there is a big project in Florida.

So my effort, my amendment, is an attempt to expedite getting these local agencies paid back because they are owed so much money. I know that as we do our budget and we do our appropriations, we are talking about doling out money in the future to fund programs, but these are projects that were already completed with the promise that they would be reimbursed. They have not been reimbursed to the tune of millions and millions of dollars.

I hope that as a gesture of good faith we can increase this account by $10 million. Bear in mind, that would still be $5 million less than was dedicated to this account in the last year.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0050

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. I object. I am going to be opposed.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman claim time in opposition?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman have time remaining?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I reserved the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. You reserved your time. So you could yield time to the gentleman.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, I would be glad to yield time. How much time do I have?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, where I am from in Texas, when you make a deal with someone, you look him in the eye and shake his hand, honor the agreement, and keep your word.

For years, the United States Army Corps of Engineers has been making deals throughout the country. Yet, in many instances, despite project cooperation agreements, the Corps has failed to honor its end of the bargain. Many State, local, and municipal entities have advanced funding or paid out of their pockets to help better their communities with the understanding that the Federal Government would reimburse them. This is what happened in my hometown of San Antonio.

This amendment would limit expenditure on flood and storm damage reduction to $10 million less and would add $10 million to the ''other authorized purposes'' item in the committee report. This is a matter of fairness to our communities, and if we cannot proceed with this bipartisan amendment, I hope the chairman will work with us going forward.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

First, let me assure my colleague that I am sympathetic to the intention of what he is trying to do here. The gentleman seeks to show support for additional funding for projects that are important to his district and to his constituents, and I understand that.

Unfortunately, although I know it is not the gentleman's intent, the amendment would limit all funding for the construction of flood control projects to no more than $276 million. That is a cut of almost $500 million in flood control projects. I would hope that we would all agree that that is unacceptable. Even as intended, though, I must oppose the amendment.

The President's budget request increased funding for environmental projects above the fiscal year 2015 level while slashing funding for flood control projects by almost $300 million. In this bill, on the other hand, we were able to restore the flood control funding, and we did it without slashing the funding for environmental projects.

I would, respectfully, ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment even though I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. We would be more than willing to work with him—with both of you—in trying to address this issue as we move this process forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I know the appropriations process is a tough one. You are making difficult choices among many things.

I would just point out that, in this account, as you know, there have been funds that have gone unallocated in recent years in this very account from which I withdraw. Again, our local agencies in Republican and Democratic districts have already committed these funds with the promise that they would be reimbursed. A failure to reimburse them is essentially saying that we are going to stiff them on money that we said that we would pay them. This is a very small amount given the amount of money that is owed by the Corps to our local agencies.

I would ask you for your reconsideration now, and certainly, as I know how Congressman HURD feels and many others, I would ask for your help in remedying this situation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, again, I understand what he is trying to do, and I sympathize with what you are trying to do. You are correct in that the funds remain unallocated in the flood control account. That is because, for some reason, the administration is dragging its feet on allocating these funds. It is not because the funds are not needed or cannot be used. In fact, the bill includes language to try to correct this problem. But I can't support increasing funding for environmental projects at the expense of projects that improve public safety and protect our communities.

I would offer both of the gentlemen the opportunity to work with the committee, and I will work with you to try to address this issue as we move forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. 507. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, promulgate, or enforce the Department of Energy's proposed rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Furnaces'' (80 Fed. Reg. 48: March 12, 2015).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Energy has proposed new rulemaking that will eliminate the use of noncondensing natural gas home furnaces.

On average, condensing furnaces cost $350 more than noncondensing furnaces and require as much as $2,200 in additional installation costs. The DOE itself has estimated that it will cost the American consumer up to $12 billion to install condensing furnaces nationwide. The upfront costs of installing a natural gas condensing furnace may force families to switch to alternative furnaces which are cheaper to

install but that cost more to operate. Home furnaces fail and need to be replaced when people are most likely to use them—in the middle of the winter when it is cold outside. Families shouldn't have to face increased costs to replace their natural gas furnaces to get the heat flowing back into their homes.

Furthermore, the proposed rule creates a nationwide standard that fails to take into account the different climate zones throughout the country. The Department of Energy has proposed a one-size-fits-all approach that unfairly punishes Americans living in warmer climate zones such as the Southeast. This means that the payback period for the installation of condensing furnaces in the warmer climate zones will be much longer than in the colder zones.

My amendment to this appropriations bill will prevent the Department of Energy from using funds to finalize, promulgate, or enforce the proposed rule.

My amendment has been supported by the American Gas Association, the American Public Gas Association, the Home Builders Association, the Indoor Environment and Energy Efficiency Coalition, the Air Condition, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute, and the heating and air-condition and refrigerating distributors.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Blackburn amendment because it would prevent the Department of Energy from issuing long-needed efficiency standards for residential furnaces. In the end, that will only hurt consumers and needlessly waste energy.

The current standards, which are essentially 25 years old, leave consumers with higher utility bills than are necessary. Further delays to the furnace rule will allow this situation to continue indefinitely. The new DOE standard would cut energy waste, saving consumers more than $600 over the lifetime of their furnaces. On a national level, that will work out to savings between $4 billion to $19 billion. The proposed DOE standard does not apply to furnaces that are already in use. It grandfathers them or it doesn't apply to repairs that can be made to existing furnaces.

It is also worth mentioning that the Blackburn amendment would be especially negative for low-income households. Many low-income people who are renters do not get to choose the furnaces that heat their homes. Property owners will generally choose the lowest cost furnace even if that furnace will result in higher energy bills. In the end, it is the low-income renters who are stuck with the gas bills from the inefficient furnace. The DOE standard would help ensure all Americans can benefit from lower energy bills thanks to increased efficiency.

Finally, the proposed rule would save more natural gas than other rules to date and would, therefore, deliver large, cumulative greenhouse gas emission reductions at a cost savings to everyone. The Blackburn amendment would throw away that opportunity.

□ 0100

It is true that there are still some things to be worked out with the regulation, and we should move toward that end, but what the industry needs and what the consumers need is certainty going forward, so everyone can plan to build and install the latest and most efficient technology. We should let the Department of Energy do its job.

Let's not waste time; let's not waste energy, and let's not waste money and consumer savings that will result.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Blackburn amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased that my friend and colleague mentioned cost because I want to point out, again, what it would cost. These furnaces cost $350 more and require as much as $2,200 additional in installation cost.

In addition to that, there are alterations that are needed to existing homes for venting purposes. Those cost estimates are $2,550 per home just for the venting that is necessary for these.

This is one of those regulations, Mr. Chairman, that is too expensive to afford. The cost on this is astronomical. Even DOE itself says the cost to the American consumer is $12 billion to install these furnaces.

Then you say that, maybe over the lifetime of this, you are going to save an amount. I think that this is one of those areas where you look at how much it is going to cost.

This is why this amendment is so widely supported. I encourage support for the Blackburn amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I bring every year. I told Chairman SIMPSON that I knew he was delighted to see me back on the floor again this year with the amendment for the 1 percent across-the-board spending cut.

I do want to thank the committee for its hard work in cutting, and it is important to note that the proposed funding levels for this appropriations bill this year is $35.4 billion, which is $633 million below the President's budget request.

I have got to say, with the situation in our Nation with our debt, I think my 1 percent spending reduction, which will save taxpayers an additional $356 million, is something that is necessary, and it is a step that we need to take.

I am really fully aware that some of the appropriators aren't standing in favor of the 1 percent across-the-board cuts. In fact, when I offered this amendment to last year's bill, I was told that cuts of this magnitude, quite honestly, go far too deep.

Well, I think that, when you look at the fact that we need to be cutting another penny out of a dollar, that is not too deep because our debt is something that is damaging our Nation's security.

Even Admiral Mullen has said that the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our growing national debt. Because of that, we need to do a little bit more every time we come to the floor for appropriations to get this $18.2 trillion debt under control.

As I have said before, across-the-board spending cuts effectively control the growth and cost of the Federal Government. They not only give agencies flexibility to determine which expenses are necessary, but more importantly, they don't pick winners and losers.

Not only do I support the across-the-board cuts, many of our Governors support them, Republican and Democrat. When I was in the State senate in Tennessee, we couldn't adjourn that until we balanced the budget. That is why our States are controlling their debts, reining in their expenses, and our Federal Government is not.

We kick the can down the road, go print more money, run up more debt. It is time to get it under control. Saving another penny on a dollar is a necessary step.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Tennessee's consistency.

We have seen a lot of these amendments. The problem is with the debate.

You would think that we were not doing anything to reduce this deficit, that we were not cutting spending. The reality is the only committee in Congress that is actually cutting spending is the Appropriations Committee, and we have been cutting spending for the last 4 years.

Now, this bill that we have before us today meets with and falls within the budget resolution that was just adopted earlier this day, and, if we had wanted to reduce everything by 1 percent again, then we should have adopted a different budget resolution.

It is easy to say let's just take one penny out of every dollar. Who can't do that? We have taken much more than one penny out of every dollar as we have cut spending more and more in the appropriations process by the Appropriations Committee.

It is not that we don't want to reduce spending; we are reducing spending, but, of course, we could cut one more cent out of every dollar we spend. Who couldn't do that? Then we will have a new baseline. You know what? Then we ought to cut one penny out of every dollar at that baseline. You know what? Then we will have another baseline, and we can cut one more penny out of that.

We are trying to do it smarter. We are trying to look at the needs of the agencies that we fund, reduce spending, and set priorities.

While I commend my colleague for her consistent work to protect taxpayers dollars, this is not an approach that I can support.

While the President may have proposed a budget that exceeds this bill, the increases were paid for with proposals and gimmicks that would never be enacted. This bill makes the tough choices within an allocation that adheres to the current law.

While difficult tradeoffs had to be made—and difficult tradeoffs were made—there are accounts in this bill that I think we ought to be spending more money on. There are accounts in this bill that I think we ought to be spending less money on that are a higher priority to some other Members of Congress. That is kind of the nature of how the appropriations process works. Nobody gets everything they want.

One thing we have been consistent on for the fifth year in a row is that we have been reducing spending. We prioritize funding for critical infrastructure and our Nation's defense. Most of the increases that are in this budget this year that will be coming out of the overall 302(a)'s went to the national defense, the NNSA, our nuclear weapons programs.

We prioritize funding, as I said, for critical infrastructure. The President cut $750 million—around that—out of the harbor maintenance trust fund. In trying to secure our inland waterways and our harbors for the commerce that our economy needs, we replaced that, which means we had to make even more difficult cuts in a lot of these agencies.

These tradeoffs were carefully weighed for their respective impacts and their responsibility; yet the gentlelady's amendment would propose an across-the-board cut on every one of these programs.

This makes no distinction between where we need to be spending or investing our infracture, promote jobs, and meet our national security needs and where we need to limit spending to meet our deficit reduction goals.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Let me say again, I appreciate the gentlewoman's consistent effort in making sure that we keep focused on addressing what is the number one problem in this country, and that is the debt this country faces, and this committee has been doing that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

The way you balance budgets is to have a robust economy, where everybody is helping to pull the ship forward. That isn't the case right now.

What we have dug out since 2008 was the largest recession since the Great Depression. America's chief strategic vulnerability throughout this period of time—for actually over a quarter century now—and our largest area of economic loss is energy.

□ 0110

It rests in energy. Since 2003, just since 2003, our country has spent $2.3 trillion importing foreign petroleum. That is just petroleum. That is not a country that is self-reliant. That is a country that deeply needs energy security here at home.

The result of this amendment will be less investment in the sector most critical to helping us right this hole that we have dug for ourselves.

Can you imagine if that $2.3 trillion had been spent in this country, the number of jobs we would have, the greater amount of income and revenue we would have flowing into people's pockets and also into the public sector where we have to pay the bills?

In addition to moving us backwards on the energy front, this amendment will be less investment in water resources, and we have $62 billion worth of Army Corps projects alone that have sat on the shelf. We have no new starts in this bill. That is not a country on the grow. That is a country in retrenchment.

So this amendment, it isn't a 50 percent cut. It is meant to send a signal. I say to the gentlelady, as I said to the chair of the Ways and Means Committee today who turned away from me and walked to the back of the Chamber, you know, it is pretty hard to balance a budget when not everybody is at work, their wages have been cut, the middle class has shrunk, but then you don't put revenues on the table.

Some of those lucrative operations, these transnational corporations have operating offshore aren't bringing their money home. They are holding it over there.

Revenues need to be on the table and mandatory spending has to be on the table.

He walked away from me, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It was a rather interesting conversation.

The Appropriations Committee can't do this alone, and we certainly shouldn't do it in sectors where America truly is hurting.

At a time when unemployed Americans are losing jobless benefits and many young families struggle just to survive, we should be creating jobs and securing the American Dream, starting with a self-reliant energy future.

This bill underfunds that. The chairman has spoken eloquently to that. And it harms American economic growth and energy growth and energy security, and it damages those portions of our budget that are critical to our national security: vital weapons programs, our Naval research reactor research, and nonproliferation funding.

We believe our bill builds America forward to achieve progress for our country again and not retrenchment.

So I oppose the gentlelady's amendment. I think she has the right spirit, but I think she is looking in the wrong place in terms of what we face as a country. I oppose her amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am just so delighted that my friend mentioned what we need is a robust economy because I agree.

The Obama economy has been abysmal and has been terrible for our country. And you are exactly right. The middle class has shrunk. Wages have been cut. All that has happened.

I know the American people are sick and tired of it, and they would like to get this country moving again. And the Obama economy has caused many of the problems that are in front of us.

I am so pleased, too, that she mentioned the $2.3 trillion that we have spent importing oil. If you look at who has been importing a lot of that oil, OPEC, exporting that to us. OPEC is one of the top five holders of our debt. That adds to both our energy security and our national security problems. Mr. Chairman, it is time to open up our lands and drill here and drill now.

Now, quite frankly, a penny on a dollar is another way to engage rank-and-

file employees. I have seen it work at the State level. I know other States have used that, as I said. Both Democrat and Republican Governors have done it. My State of Tennessee did this as we reduced the size and growth of the budget in our State.

By the way, we had to do it because we were the test case for Hillary Clinton's healthcare plan, and that just threw our budget all out of whack.

So yes, we found ourselves cutting about 9 cents across the board per department.

Do across-the-board cuts work? Yes. Do they send the right message? Absolutely. Do they engage the rank and file? You better believe it. Are they a step toward getting out-of-control spending under control? Yes, they are, and we need to do that.

Every man, woman, and child in this country, right now, has over $56,000 worth of debt that they would be responsible for. That is a per person load for our $18.2 trillion worth of debt. We have got $18.2 trillion worth of debt, and we can't cut another penny out of a dollar?

The chairman has done a great job. They have the right focus. I think that what we do is give them another little push, engage the bureaucracy—which, by the way, they are not having to make the cuts that men and women and small businesses are having to make. It is the fair thing to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to continue the study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–114).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, from extreme flooding to extreme drought, the Missouri River basin has been hit very hard over the past few years. The families who live and work along the Missouri River have endured great hardships, and these events serve to highlight the importance of maintaining effective flood control infrastructure.

Though it is one of our region's greatest resources, the Missouri River would produce extreme, erosive, regular flooding and be mostly unfit for navigation if not for aggressive long-term management by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress first authorized the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project, BSNP, in 1912, with the intention of mitigating flood risk and maintaining a navigable channel from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the river in St. Louis. Though the BSNP's construction was completed in the 1980s, the Corps' ability to make adjustments as needed remain crucial to this day.

President Obama, in his fiscal year 2015 budget, requested $47 million for the Missouri River Recovery Program, which would primarily go towards the funding of environmental restoration studies and projects. This funding dwarfs the insufficient $9 million that was requested for the entire operations and maintenance of the aforementioned BSNP.

It is preposterous to think that environmental projects are more important than the protection of human life. I do not take for granted the importance of river ecosystems. I grew up near the Missouri River, as did so many of the people I represent, yet we have reached a point in our Nation in which we value the welfare of fish and birds more than the welfare of our fellow human beings. Our priorities are backwards, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment will eliminate the Missouri River Ecosystem Recovery Program, or MRERP, a study that has become little more than a tool of the environmentalists for the promotion of returning the river to its most natural state, with little regard for the flood control, navigation, trade, power generation, or the people who depend on the Missouri River for their livelihoods.

The end of the study will in no way jeopardize the Corps' ability to meet the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. MRERP is one of no fewer than 70 environmental and ecological studies focused on the Missouri River.

The people who have had to foot the bill for these studies, many of which take years to complete and are ultimately inconclusive, are the very people who have lost their farms, their businesses, and their homes.

Our vote today will also show our constituents that this Congress is aware of the gross disparity between the funding for environmental efforts and the funding for the protection of our citizens. This exact amendment has been passed by voice vote during the debate in the last three fiscal year appropriations bills, which were ultimately signed into law by President Obama. It is supported by the American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Missouri Corn Growers.

□ 0120

It is time for Congress to take a serious look at the water bill and funding priorities, and it is time we send a message to our Federal entities that manage our waterways.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support our Nation's river communities and encourage more balance and Federal funding for water infrastructure and management.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 507. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to purchase water to supplement or enhance the instream flow requirements in the State of California that are mandated under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, or the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, hydrologists tell us that California is facing the worst drought in 1,200 years. With the rain season officially over, our snowpack is just 3 percent of normal, and many reservoirs are already drawn down perilously. Californians are now threatened with draconian fines if they take too long in the shower.

This amendment forbids the Bureau of Reclamation from purchasing scarce water in California in the midst of this catastrophic drought for the purpose of dumping it in rivers to adjust the water temperature to nudge baby fish to swim into the ocean.

As ridiculous as this sounds, that is exactly what the Bureau of Reclamation has been doing throughout this drought. It is using money taken from families' taxes in order to purchase water that is desperately needed by these same families and then literally dumping it down the drain in front of them.

This exacerbates an already perilous scarcity of water while forcing the price of our remaining supplies even higher. It also makes a mockery of the sacrifices that every Californian is making to stretch every drop of water in their homes. And it undermines the moral authority of the government to demand further conservation from the people when it is squandering water so outrageously itself.

We don't know exactly how much the Bureau is spending for this purpose because they don't account for how their purchased water is used.

This measure would forbid them from wasting any of our water on such frivolities as adjusting water temperatures.

Now if this sounds harsh for the fish, let's remember that in a drought like this one, there would be no water in our rivers. There would be no fish. The dams make it possible to save the water from wet years so that we can get through the dry years. That doesn't work if we open floodgates in an extreme drought like this to make the fish happy.

This month, the Bureau of Reclamation released nearly 30,000 acre-feet of water from the New Melones Dam in my district for that purpose. That is enough water to meet the annual residential needs of a population of nearly 300,000 human beings for the express purpose of encouraging the offspring of some 29 steelhead trout to swim toward the ocean—which, by the way, they tend to do anyway. And to add insult to injury, almost all of these smolts will be eaten by predators before they reach the ocean.

So let me put this again and quite bluntly. In order to benefit a handful of steelhead trout, the Bureau sacrificed enough water to meet the annual needs of a human population of 300,000. At $700 per acre-foot, the cost of this exercise amounted to $21 million.

This is the lunacy of the environmental left and the policies they have imposed on our State and our country. It needs to stop now. And to the extent that we can do so through the power of the purse, we must.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this McClintock amendment because it sounds like a solution in search of a problem.

This amendment seeks to undermine the Endangered Species Act by restricting the Bureau of Reclamation from expending funds on water for the purpose of managing endangered fish populations.

While I oppose the spirit of the amendment, I must also object to it because it does absolutely nothing. The Bureau of Reclamation does not purchase water for the purpose of temperature management. The Bureau of Reclamation does not purchase water now, and they have no plans to do it in fiscal year 2016. In fact, due to water scarcity, the price of water is too high.

The extreme drought in the West presents significant management challenges, and Bureau of Reclamation biologists should have every tool possible to make decisions and provide a safety net for species nearing extinction.

Instead of attempting to undermine the judgment of those professionals, we should be working on solutions to grow the water supply in California. That involves water reuse; increased efficiencies, which have already started; conservation; storm water capture; agricultural practices.

The dry West faces very difficult choices, and we want to walk alongside them but with solutions that make sense and that are capable of being implemented.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, perhaps from the damp State of Ohio, this might look like a solution in search of a problem. I would invite the gentlelady to come to California in the midst of this drought to see the devastation it is causing.

The Bureau just released 10 billion gallons for this stated purpose, to adjust river water temperatures and to nudge steelhead trout smolts to the ocean. They weren't coy about it. They were very, very clear. They have been very clear in their budget requests for this practice.

But let me, just for the sake of argument, accept the gentlelady's point that they have no plans to do so. Well, if that is the case, she should have no objections to this measure. The fact is, they not only have plans to do so, but they have been doing so, and it is devastating what little precious water is remaining behind our precious reservoirs.

We will run out by the end of the summer if these practices continue. And if they continue and if we do, I think that the gentlelady will need to make an apology to the 38 million suffering people of California.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LA MALFA

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the requirement in section 323.4(a)(1)(ii) of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, or section 232.3(c)(1)(ii)(A) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, that activities identified in paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (f) of section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A)) must be established or ongoing in order to receive an exemption under such subsection.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the gentleman from Idaho, Chairman SIMPSON.

Mr. Chair, the House has previously passed language to require the Army Corps of Engineers to apply the Clean Water Act as the Congress has passed it, not as the Corps may wish it to have been written. Unfortunately, the Corps has disregarded these efforts and imposed regulations that could actually prevent farmers from changing crops or fallowing fields during, especially, California's historic drought.

□ 0130

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act exempts from regulation the following: ''Normal farming, silviculture, and ranching activities such as plowing, seeding, cultivating, minor drainage, harvesting for the production of food, fiber, and forest products, or upland soil and water conservation practices.''

No additional requirements are included, and these activities are specifically identified as exempt. However, the Corps and the EPA have used creative interpretations to drastically increase their jurisdiction beyond what Congress has intended.

In fact, the Corps states the following on their Web site:

If a property has been used for cattle grazing, the exemption does not apply if future activities would involve planting crops for food.

An operation is no longer established when the area on which it is conducted has been converted to another use or has lain idle.

Now, under this interpretation, a farmer switching from one crop to another, such as corn or tomatoes, would no longer be engaged in normal activities and could be subject to regulation.

As I mentioned earlier, in this time of record drought in California, a practice such as leaving a field fallow, as is happening now across California due to the historic droughts, means that replanting the following year, if possible, would be seen by the Corps as a new—not existing—activity triggering regulation and permitting requirements. This is not the intention of what Congress had years ago with the Clean Water Act.

This overreach could even prevent farmers from switching to less water-intensive crops, if they saw fit, during California's droughts for fear of an impossible morass of regulatory requirements or, with the involuntary cuts that have been underway, see that they would again be required to have new permits because of this misinterpretation by the Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the House has supported amendments I have sponsored on two other occasions. Language addressing this issue previously passed by voice vote and was included in the CR/Omnibus; yet the Corps has refused to recognize clear congressional intent and abandoned its interpretation.

My amendment, for the third time, will seek to prohibit funding for these creative interpretations. I urge your support of this effort to once again make clear the will of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). This amendment makes a significant change to the Clean Water Act regulations, one we should not be making late at night in an appropriations bill. It deserves thoughtful consideration. I think the gentleman probably would agree with that.

Mr. Chairman, under current law and regulation, activities that convert wetlands that occur as part of existing, ongoing farming, ranching, and silviculture activities do not require a section 404 wetlands permit.

Let me repeat that for my colleagues. The Clean Water Act explicitly exempts certain activities from regulation, and these include normal agricultural activities like plowing fields, planting and harvesting crops, and maintaining irrigation and drainage ditches.

Those exemptions were added by Congress in 1977. The 1977 law created the list of activity-based exemptions from normal farming, ranching, and forestry activities; but it also included safeguards to ensure that these exempted activities were not exploited by large-scale commercial interests. The regulations implementing those exemptions were completed in 1986 during the Reagan administration.

The underlying fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Appropriations bill before us already includes language in section 106 affirming that these activities exempted by Congress 38 years ago continue to be exempt. It clearly states that none of the funds made available by this act may be used to require a permit when these activities are conducted.

The gentleman from California wants to go further than the language already in the bill with his amendment. In his view, wetlands should be able to be filled even when a farm has been converted to another use or farm fields have lain idle so long that modifications to the hydrology are necessary to conduct operations.

I say to my colleague from California, it is hard to understand how any discharge can be normal for an operation that isn't established.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleague why this concerns me. According to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, in my home State, since the late 18th century, 90 percent of Ohio's wetland resources have been destroyed or degraded through draining, filling, or other modification. Because of the valuable functions the remaining wetlands perform, it is imperative to ensure that all impacts to wetlands are properly mitigated.

Wetlands help filter impurities from water. Sediment settles out of runoff, and contaminants bind to plant surfaces in wetlands resulting in improved water quality. Wetlands perform other valuable functions, including reducing flood flow and shoreline erosion control. They are almost like lungs. They are the lungs of the Earth and connect the land to the water.

In Ohio, we also depend upon our wetlands as haven for rare and endangered plants, and one-third of all the endangered species depends on wetlands for survival. Many wetlands are important fish spawning and nursery areas, as well as nesting, resting, and feeding areas for waterfowl.

We should make certain that any changes we make to wetlands policy that may result in the destruction of these remaining very important ecological areas are evaluated carefully and we do not overturn nearly 40 years of policy lightly.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I must respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments by my colleague from Ohio on that, but in practice in California, they are already moving well beyond established law in the 404 section that would indeed allow for normal activities to be exempted.

I say ''normal activities.'' It is normal for farmers to change crops, to rotate crops as what fits the land, that fits available water supply, that fits what the farmer deems to do with his or her land. There is this thing called property rights in Ohio and California.

It is amazing to me that the Army Corps continues to misinterpret and creatively interpret the 404 exemptions because, in practice in northern California, we have seen that the ability to switch crops, to do as you see fit with your land within the permit, with the exemptions of the 404, are being violated.

We have attempted to work with the Army Corps in northern California on that when I was told recently that they would ignore this section and ignore the efforts we have made previously.

That is why this amendment is necessary, not only to send a message, but to remove the funding that they would try to use to stop the cultural practices of farmers across the country, especially as it seems to be affecting northern California, to do as they see fit within the exemptions that are already in the law, but seemingly outside of what the wishes of the Army Corps are.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the ''aye'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LA MALFA

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver water to the Trinity River above the minimum requirements of the Trinity Record of Decision or to supplement flows in the Klamath River.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, as was discussed earlier, California is seeing the most severe drought in many, many years. Our own Governor has recently ordered a mandatory 25 percent water rationing across the State.

Despite these dire conditions which have idled hundreds of thousands of productive farmland and caused billions of dollars in economic damage, the Bureau of Reclamation has unnecessarily diverted water from the Central Valley Project which serves the entire State, 20 million or more people, to salmon habitat in the Klamath River. I say ''unnecessarily'' because the chinook salmon of the Klamath River are not threatened or endangered and have, in fact, been returning in near record numbers.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau has misused over 100,000 acre feet of water over the last 2 years, which will be enough for up to 800,000 people or even 30,000 acres of cropland.

What is more, stakeholders have already reached an agreement. All the stakeholders in the area have a previous agreement to ensure enough water for both humans and for salmon, according to the Trinity Record of Decision.

□ 0140

The Bureau's actions go above and beyond the requirements of the agreement and negatively impact the very stakeholders that agreed to it, including my constituents.

Two years ago, a bipartisan group from this Congress sent a letter urging the Bureau of Reclamation not to carry out this activity. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply prohibits the Bureau of Reclamation from releasing water beyond the record of decision it is a party to and ensures that cities and farms have access to as much water as possible, especially during this acute drought period. It also maintains the river flows that stakeholders have agreed to and forces the Bureau of Reclamation to keep its promises to the people of California.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment but, believe me, with sympathy toward what the people of the West are facing. I just hope that we can get through this situation reasonably and seamlessly somehow. I oppose the amendment because it would lock in a specific operating regime, regardless of facts on the ground.

In 2014, the Bureau of Reclamation made the decision not to release water above the minimum requirement, clearly showing they are realistic and willing to change to meet the circumstances at hand. I hope the gentleman agrees. Reclamation monitored temperatures and fish health to balance risks.

Then last September, the Bureau of Reclamation did release flows because of a deadly detection of a parasite impacting salmon. Yet we must ensure that the massive fish kill of 2002 doesn't happen again. This balancing act is really difficult, but we cannot sacrifice the environment either. We must find a way to balance the needs of people and the environment in the West.

Further, in the Klamath Basin, we must meet our obligations to the tribes who have relied on the river. None of this will be easy. We should not be locking in an operating regime that ignores science and does not allow us to adapt to changing circumstances.

On this basis, I oppose the gentleman's amendment and honestly hope, as a country, we can do what is necessary to help the West.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, well, I appreciate that sentiment on helping the West. Perhaps a pipeline from Ohio with all that excess water during flood flows would help us out. But short of doing that right now, indeed, coming back to what is happening with the fish we are speaking of in these systems, the salmon in the Klamath River that we are speaking of are not in danger and are near record numbers in that leg.

This amendment will assist actually downstream on the Sacramento River the endangered winter-run chinook with this additional flow. So even though there may have been detected a parasite, it is not affecting natively what we are talking about here.

And this goes beyond the Record of Decision with agreed water flow amounts of the stakeholders involved. So this is more by whim of BOR once again deciding that additional flows, based on no science beyond the Record of Decision, are taking valuable water away, and it could happen again in this record drought year.

We need not lose the opportunity to have these waters, or other ones talked about earlier tonight, based on the whim of a bureaucracy somewhere that really doesn't seem to be paying attention to the needs of California's farms, cities, and that the water is actually being used to the best benefit of the fish being debated in any one of these systems. So diverting more water away from this is not productive. It doesn't fulfill any scientific goals.

With that, I ask the ''aye'' votes of this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, before I make a motion, let me thank you for your excellent stewardship of this bill through general order, through the amendment debate in the wee hours of the morning. We all appreciate it. It has been fair and helped move it along in an orderly manner.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HONORING THE ARKANSAS TOWNS OF MAYFLOWER AND VILONIA

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, April 27, marked the 1-year anniversary of the devastation that occurred when a tornado struck the Mayflower, Vilonia, and Paron communities in Arkansas, destroying more than 400 homes and costing 16 people their lives. The theme of this year's anniversary is, ''Remember our loss, celebrate our recovery.''

I have had the opportunity to visit with folks in these communities and to hear their stories of courage and resilience. While I mourn those that are lost, I am thankful for the health and safety of Martin and Kristin Patton and the miraculous survival of their family. Their home literally disintegrated around them.

I am thankful for the leadership of Vilonia Mayor James Firestone and Mayflower Mayor Randy Holland who, along with county and local leaders, are charting a course toward the future. In the face of this tragedy, they furnish us with an inspirational model of solidarity and hope.

I applaud the recovery efforts and dedication of these great Arkansas communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Paron Community in Pulaski County and the Faulkner County towns of Vilonia and Mayflower, Arkansas have experienced tragedy and disaster over these past years, but their resilience and determination to rebuild and recover has never been more prevalent.

Four years ago, on April 25, 2011, an EF2 tornado struck Vilonia, killing four of its 4,000 citizens.

Not two years after that, on March 29, 2013, the residents of Mayflower were left reeling after being flooded with 5,000 barrels of heavy crude oil that erupted from the burst Pegasus Pipeline.

The ability to bounce back after such misfortune is a testament to the great determination and toughness of the townspeople of Vilonia and Mayflower.

And that ability was put to yet another test when, on April 27, 2014, the Mayflower, Vilonia, and Paron communities were struck by a monster of a tornado.

That tornado was classified as an EF4 with reported winds approaching 200 miles per hour. The half-mile wide twister left a swath of destruction that stretched for over forty miles. In fifty-six minutes, more than 400 homes were destroyed and sixteen people lost their lives. The National Weather Service stated that this was the single deadliest tornado to hit the state of Arkansas since 1968—nearly fifty years earlier.

This past Monday, April 27, marked the one-year anniversary of the devastation wrecked during this horrific storm. The theme of this year's anniversary is, ''Remember our loss; celebrate our recovery.''

Over the past few weeks, I have had the opportunity to visit with folks from Mayflower and Vilonia and to hear their stories of courage and resilience.

While I mourn those lost in the April 2014 tornados, I am thankful for the health and safety of Martin and Kristin Patton and the miraculous survival of their family. Their home literally completely disintegrated around them and I certainly join them in counting their blessings of moving into their new home last weekend, 364 days after that frightening evening.

I am thankful of the leadership of Vilonia Mayor James Firestone on the job for six and one half years; four of them in a ''recovery mode.'' I am grateful for his leadership with that of the city council in carefully charting a course toward the future.

I am thankful for Mayflower Mayor Randy Holland, who, with county and local leaders, is crafting new economic development directions for this growing community.

In the face of tragedy, they, along with all those who selflessly provided financial support and thousands of volunteer hours, furnish us with an inspirational model of solidarity and hope.

As these brave communities continue to recover and rebuild, I applaud them for their dedication to their neighbors, economy, and community.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE UNDERLYING OBJECTIVES OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–30)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

My Administration fully supports the underlying objectives of the recommendations that the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (the ''Commission'') offered in January. These recommendations represent an important step forward in protecting the long-term viability of the All-Volunteer Force, improving quality-of-life for service members and their families, and ensuring the fiscal sustainability of the military compensation and retirement systems.

As I directed in my letter of March 30, my team has worked with the Commission to further analyze the recommendations and identify areas of agreement. At this time I am prepared to support specific proposals for 10 of the Commission's 15 recommendations, either as proposed or with modifications that have been discussed among the Department of Defense, other agencies, and the Commission. These include the following:

Survivor Benefit Plan
Financial Education
Medical Personnel Readiness
Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Collaboration
Child Care
Service Member Education
Transition Assistance
Nutritional Financial Assistance
Dependent Space-Available Travel
Report on Military Connected Dependents

In some instances, the Department of Defense is already taking actions to implement these recommendations, and I will direct the Department to develop plans to complete this implementation. In those areas where legislation is required, I expect the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the Congress on my behalf the relevant legislative proposals, which I recommend be enacted without delay.

With respect to the remaining recommendations, given their complexity and our solemn responsibility to ensure that any changes further the objectives above, we will continue working with the Commission to understand how the following proposals would affect the All-Volunteer Force:

Blended Retirement System
Reserve Component Duty Statuses
Exceptional Family Member's Support
Commissary and Exchange Consolidation

I believe there is merit in all of these recommendations and that they deserve careful consideration and study. I will ensure that the Congress is kept apprised of this ongoing work.

Finally, I agree with the Commission that we need to continue to improve the military health care system. The health care reforms proposed in my Fiscal Year 2016 Budget are a good first step and offer service members, retirees, and their families more control and choice over their health care decisions. This remains a critical issue, and my Administration will work with the Commission and interested Members of Congress in the coming months to develop additional reform proposals for consideration as part of my Fiscal Year 2017 Budget.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 30, 2015.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today after 4 p.m. and May 1 on account of attending the promotion ceremony of her son Raymond Wagner, III to Captain in the United States Army.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.) the House adjourned until today, Friday, May 1, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1318. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0248; FRL-9926-24] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1319. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Phenol, 2-(2H-benzotriazol-2-yl)-6-dodecyl-4-methyl-; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0418; FRL-9925-78] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1320. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Arkansas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Fee Regulations [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0054; FRL-9926-91-Region 6] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1321. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0969; FRL-9926-81-Region 5] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1322. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, New Mexico, and the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incinerator Units [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0763; FRL-9927-00-Region 6] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1323. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Stage I Regulations [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0846; FRL-9927-10-Region 6] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1324. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — General Permits and Permits by Rule for the Federal Minor New Source Review Program in Indian Country

for Five Source Categories [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0151; FRL-9919-85-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ95) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1325. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Energy Labeling Rule (RIN: 3084-AB03) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1326. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Authority of DOE Protective Force Officers That Are Federal Employees To Make Arrests Without a Warrant for Certain Crimes (RIN: 1994-AA03) received April 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1327. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Vermilion Snapper [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XD734) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1328. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD844) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1329. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 32 [Docket No.: 140501394-5279-02] (RIN: 0648-BE20) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1330. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 140117052-4402-02] (RIN: 0648-XD874) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1331. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 101214615-5254-02] (RIN: 0648-BA61) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1332. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Delaware River; Marcus Hook, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0129] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1333. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Charleston Race Week, Charleston Harbor; Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0018] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1334. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Vessel Fire and Escort, Port of New York, NJ, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0189] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1335. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electrical Equipment in Hazardous Locations [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0850] (RIN: 1625-AC00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1336. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Ontonagon River, Ontonagon, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0082] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1337. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hoquiam River, Hoquiam, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1029] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1338. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone: Tesoro Terminal Protest: Port of Long Beach Harbor; Pacific Ocean, California [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0163] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1339. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Naval Helicopter Association (NHA) Red Bull Helicopter Demonstration; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0137] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1340. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Sellwood Bridge Construction, Willamette River, Portland, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0187] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1341. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone: Marina del Rey Fireworks Show, Santa Monica Bay; Marina del Rey, California [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0155] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1342. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum Fireworks Display; Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0186] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1343. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Naval Helicopter Association (NHA) Red Bull Helicopter Demonstration; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0137] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1344. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Barge-based Fireworks, Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0213] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1345. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Eastern Branch Elizabeth River; Norfolk, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0202] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1346. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections to 38 CFR Part 3 (RIN: 2900-AP33) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1347. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updating Certain Delegations of Authority in VA Medical Regulations (RIN: 2900-AP17) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. House Joint Resolution 43. Resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (Rept. 114–99). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 2123. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish non-formulary drugs and medicines to veterans diagnosed with mental health disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2124. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 2125. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to revise its sponsorship identification rules so as to require the disclosure of the names of significant donors to persons paying for or furnishing broadcast matter or origination cablecasting matter that is political matter or matter involving the discussion of a controversial issue of public importance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2126. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from replacing ICD-9 with ICD-10 in implementing the HIPAA code set standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. KATKO, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 2127. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to limit access to expedited airport security screening at an airport security checkpoint to participants of the PreCheck program and other known low-risk passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. REED, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 2128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2129. A bill to strengthen the disclosure requirements for creditors under the Truth in Lending Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 2130. A bill to provide legal certainty to property owners along the Red River in Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 2131. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the ''J. Waties Waring Judicial Center''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. DOLD, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2132. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency retrofit pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 2133. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide additional training opportunities under the Transition Assistance Program to members of the Armed Forces who are being separated from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2134. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require review of the economic cost of adding a species to the list of endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide certain individuals with information on employment support services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 2136. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for quality reviews of benefit decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2137. A bill to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 2138. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified registered nurse anesthetists in such hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JONES, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2139. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide notice of average times for processing claims and percentage of claims approved, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 2140. A bill to promote freedom, human rights, and the rule of law as part of United States-Vietnam relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 2141. A bill to require consultation with Congress, insurers, and consumers with respect to domestic insurance and international insurance standards, regulations, or frameworks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2142. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for facilities using a qualified methane conversion technology to provide transportation fuels and chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2144. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2145. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Physician Ambassadors Helping Veterans program to seek to employ physicians at the Department of Veterans Affairs on a without compensation basis in practice areas and specialties with staffing shortages and long appointment waiting times; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age

50, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2147. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding featuring the likeness of a woman on the twenty dollar bill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 2148. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to require a substance abuse risk assessment and targeted drug testing as a condition for the receipt of unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 2149. A bill to establish a grant program to ensure that students in high-need schools have equal access to a quality education delivered by an effective, diverse workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BASS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2150. A bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2151. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the calculation, oversight, and accountability of non-DSH supplemental payments under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ESTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 2152. A bill to ban meat and poultry products processed in China from school lunches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2153. A bill to reclassify certain low-level felonies as misdemeanors, to eliminate the increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, to reinvest in our communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reduce injuries and deaths caused by cell phone use and texting while driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BOST, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 2156. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the practices of recovery audit contractors under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year tax-free distributions from individual retirement plans for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the credit for energy-efficient existing homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for one year the credit for energy-efficient new homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the employer wage credit for employees who are active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the enhanced charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the deduction for mortgage insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the deduction of State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2164. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the 15-year straight-line cost recovery for qualified leasehold improvements, qualified restaurant buildings and improvements, and qualified retail improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2165. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the above-the-line deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2166. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion from gross income of discharges of qualified principal residence indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2167. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans, to help restore natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources of the United

States, to train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, to promote the value of public service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2168. A bill to make the current Dungeness crab fishery management regime permanent and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2169. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to require the President to transmit the annual budget of the Social Security Administration without revisions to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2170. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23rd Headquarters Special Troops, known as the ''Ghost Army'', collectively, in recognition of its unique and incredible service during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2171. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Pole Creek Wilderness, the Owyhee River Wilderness, and the North Fork Owyhee Wilderness and to authorize the continued use of motorized vehicles for livestock monitoring, herding, and grazing in certain wilderness areas in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 2172. A bill to establish a pilot toll credit market place program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2173. A bill to require States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2174. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2175. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to ensure oversight and cost savings in the pricing and contracting of prescription drug benefits under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2176. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Duwamish Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2177. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2178. A bill to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from timber sales conducted on National Forest System land, to reduce payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to reflect such counties' receipt of timber sale revenues, to strengthen stewardship end result contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception from the passive loss rules for investments in high technology research small business pass-thru entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2180. A bill to authorize grantees of Department of Justice grants to set up task forces on policing in local communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 2181. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize certain aliens who have earned a Ph.D. degree from a United States institution of higher education in a field of science, technology, engineering, or mathematics to be admitted for permanent residence and to be exempted from the numerical limitations on H-1B nonimmigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2182. A bill to deregulate interstate commerce with respect to parimutuel wagering on horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2183. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to consider Brunswick County, North Carolina, to be part of the same metropolitan statistical area as Wilmington, North Carolina; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the phasedown of the credit percentage for the dependent care tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 2185. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from using extraordinary measures to prevent the Government from reaching the statutory debt limit, or using extraordinary measures once such limit has been reached, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2186. A bill to establish a pilot grant program to support career and technical education exploration programs in middle schools and high schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 2187. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise its regulations regarding the qualifications of natural persons as accredited investors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SIRES, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 2188. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide assistance to eligible nonprofit organizations to provide specialized housing and supportive services for elderly persons who are the primary caregivers of children that are related to such persons; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 2189. A bill to direct the President to submit to Congress a report on fugitives currently residing in other countries whose extradition is sought by the United States and related matters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2190. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve procedures for legal justice for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DOLD, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr.

GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LEE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2192. A bill to improve the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 2194. A bill to reauthorize the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal years 2016 through 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 236. A resolution expressing condolences to the family of Dr. Warren Weinstein, and commemorating the life and work of Dr. Warren Weinstein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Res. 237. A resolution declaring that achieving the primary goal of the National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease of the Department of Health and Human Services to prevent and effectively treat Alzheimer's disease by 2025 is an urgent national priority; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. LEE):

H. Res. 238. A resolution promoting minority health awareness and supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2015, which includes bringing attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations of the United States such as American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 239. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to childhood stroke and recognizing May 2015 as ''National Pediatric Stroke Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 240. A resolution recognizing the economic, cultural, and political contributions of the Southeast Asian American community at this time of the 40th anniversary of the Khmer Rouge control over Cambodia and the beginning of the Cambodian Genocide, and the end of the Vietnam War and Secret War in Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Res. 241. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2015 as ''Alcohol Responsibility Month'' and supporting the goals and ideals of responsible decisions regarding alcohol; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 242. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week, the week of May 3 through 9, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 2124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 2125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the ''power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises.''

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 2131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 2133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 2139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 2141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and within the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congressional power to provide for public financing of presidential campaigns arises under the General Welfare Clause, Art. I, Sec. 8, of the U. S. Constitution.

In Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 91 (1976), the Supreme Court upheld the congressional power to enact public financing of presidential elections under this Clause. The Supreme Court stated with regard to the provisions in the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 establishing a presidential public financing system, ''In this case, Congress was legislating for the 'general welfare'—to reduce the deleterious influence of large contributions on our political process, to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate, and to free candidates from the rigors of fundraising.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 2144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 6, Congress has the authority to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 2148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare) and Clause 3 (Commerce) 'Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare'

'Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate Commerce'

The Medicare Audit Improvement Act makes several changes to the way hospital audits are conducted which involves at least three parties: a hospital, a private Medicare contractor who conducts audits and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services. During the auditing process, transactions take place between these parties which is what constitutes this bill as regulating commerce. Further, Medicare is considered to be constitutional as part of providing for the general welfare and therefore any changes to Medicare would fall under this provision as well.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 2168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 2170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which allows Congress to regulate Commerce among the several States

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 2173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, . . .

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the US Constitution: The Congress shall have power to borrow Money on the credit of the United States; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution. The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 2185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To . . . pay the Debts''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: ''The Congress shall have Power To . . . borrow Money on the credit of the United States;''

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 2187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States . . .

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 156: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 213: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 232: Mr. YOHO and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 251: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 292: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 329: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 335: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 358: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 359: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 379: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 402: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 465: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. REED, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 511: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 535: Mr. COFFMAN, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 539: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SIRES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BISHOP

of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 540: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 546: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 563: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 578: Mr. BUCK and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 592: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 606: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 609: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 616: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 619: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 624: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 625: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 649: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 672: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 702: Mr. COLE and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 727: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 738: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 767: Mr. COLE and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 774: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 784: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 789: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 793: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 799: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 842: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. GRANGER, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 868: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 879: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 881: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 902: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 911: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 915: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 921: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DENT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 939: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 952: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 980: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 985: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 989: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1060: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1062: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1089: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1094: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1174: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1188: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1192: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HARPER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1203: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1220: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HARDY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1250: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1258: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1266: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1282: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1299: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1300: Mr. ISSA and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1308: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1310: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1323: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1331: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 1356: Mr. POLIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1364: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1375: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1384: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1399: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1414: Mr. DELANEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1439: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1462: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1464: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1475: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1476: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1503: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1519: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1555: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1559: Mr. KIND, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1567: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1571: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1598: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1599: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1600: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1602: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1608: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1610: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1624: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1633: Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1634: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1635: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1664: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1666: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1674: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1713: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1714: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1718: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Mr. YODER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1728: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1734: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1736: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1737: Mr. TURNER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1739: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1752: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1768: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1769: Mr. COOK and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1786: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1795: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1801: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1814: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1818: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1853: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1859: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1901: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1908: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEWIS, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1924: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 1937: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1956: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1957: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1958: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1959: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1960: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1961: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1994: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2006: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2007: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2025: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. Cárdenas, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2031: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 2033: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2068: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2109: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2121: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.J. Res. 22: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.J. Res. 36: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. HILL.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HILL, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. ZINKE.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. MEEKS.

H. Res. 14: Ms. GRAHAM.

H. Res. 54: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Res. 56: Mr. TROTT and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H. Res. 110: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H. Res. 112: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 181: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Res. 186: Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 203: Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 216: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 224: Mr. STEWART and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 226: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 235 : Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of April 29, 2015]

OFFERED BY MS. DONNA F. EDWARDS

The amendment to be offered by Representative Donna F. Edwards or a designee to H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. DENT

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled ''Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits'' and identified by regulation identification number 1904–AC87.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $125,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $105,000,000)''.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to expand plutonium pit production capacity at the PF-4 facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. ELLISON

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $45,000,000)''.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $45,000,000)''.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MS. TITUS

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 25, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $150,000,000)''.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $150,000,000)''.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT NO. 29: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. QUIGLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 30: Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $167,050,000)''.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $167,050,000)''.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MS. DELBENE

AMENDMENT NO. 31: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are procured from a manufacturer that is part of the national technology and industrial base.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXTENDING CONGRATULATIONS TO JOYCE GARVER KELLER

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize my friend, Ms. Joyce Garver Keller, on her retirement.

For 25 years, Joyce has stood as a faithful advocate and a strong voice for justice. As the Executive Director of Ohio Jewish Communities, she has led the way in providing elected officials guidance on the most important issues impacting the Jewish organizations and congregations in Ohio and across the country.

I am glad to call Joyce my friend and I am glad she was one of the many in attendance of what she described as ''an extraordinary moment in history,'' during Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's address to Congress this year.

Joyce, thank you for all your work. You will be missed in the halls of the Congress but your drive and unwavering dedication will have a lasting impact that will continue to resonate here and in Ohio. I wish you the very best as you begin your next chapter.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I proudly recognize Ms. Joyce Garver Keller for 25 years of service with the Ohio Jewish Communities.

HONORING THE BARTELS FAMILY FOR THEIR OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION AND THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAVEN

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join the University of New Haven's (UNH) Board of Governors and its President, Dr. Steven Kaplan, in recognizing the Bartels family for its unremitting commitment to the University and its students through generous support of scholarships and academic programs.

I am honored to be a part of recognizing this tremendous family and formalizing this special recognition in memory of Henry E. ''Hank'' Bartels. Over the past forty years, Hank and Nancy Bartels, along with their son Philip, and his wife, Susan, have contributed immeasurably to UNH's development, supporting its mission of providing high quality experiential education, through a combination of liberal arts and real-world, hands-on professional training. In the words of President Kaplan, ''The Bartels family has established an indelible legacy at this institution and has touched the lives of countless students.'' The Bartels continue this tradition by demonstrating an unwavering appreciation for UNH, its potential, and the promise it delivers to innumerable students.

There is no greater tribute to Hank Bartels and that of the entire Bartels family than its most recent work in commissioning UNH's inaugural Washington Program. The initial launch of the program last fall consisted of a team of 19 students participating in the 2014 Annual Model United Nation Conference. They were Aemin Becker, Matthew Belletete, Connor Briggs, Juliana Calcagno, Rob Granoth, Jamie Harron, James Hart, Elise Lenahan, Sarah Markland, Amanda Nash, Emily Nash, Samanth Paquette, Melissa Peil, Paul Raffile, Bobby Rousseau, Jessica Sattler, Emil Thomsen, Randi Trinidad, and Connor Vargo. In preparation for the competition, students were exposed to high-level briefings by international stakeholders based in Washington, DC and Federal officials integral to the operation of the UN and its missions. As a result of the intense preparation and high-caliber exposure to UN stakeholders, the UNH delegation won the Distinguished Delegation Award, an honor bestowed to only 14 colleges and universities out of the more than 100 from the U.S. and abroad that participated.

The next installment of UNH's Washington Program consisted of a semester course entitled, American Rome: Washington DC—Power, Politics, Policy. This course exposed students to the structure and culture of the U.S. Federal government as it relates to the national security system. The course culminated in a week in Washington where students met with current and former officials from the Executive Branch, Federal Agencies, and Congress, as well as academia. During this week, 15 UNH students visited the White House, Pentagon, Capitol Hill, Federal Bureau of Investigations, Central Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency and U.S. Naval Academy. Students included Naif Alharbi, Brittany Codiana, Lindsey Conley, Zachery Fiermonti, Michael Hagen, Sarah Hoffman, Ryan Lebel, Sebika Mazumdar, Paul Raffile, Richard Rotella, Elizabeth Rowan, Jonathan Trinh, Andrew Walles, Walter Williams, and Cassidy Yotnakparian. In the words of one participating student, ''This is my first Political Science/National Security class here at UNH, and it has truly changed my perspective on my future career; the trip made me want to join the Navy then work in Washington after a military career.'' Each student indicated the visit to Washington heightened interests to serve our country as military officials, civil servants or another capacity to enhance the country's national security interests.

As a result of the Bartels family's incredible generosity, these students were able to travel to Washington and engage in a transformational experience that will undoubtedly help shape the careers and lives of our country's next generation of leaders. I am proud to join the students, faculty and university administration—particularly Dr. Steven Kaplan, President, Dr. Daniel May, Provost, Dr. Lourdes Alvarez, Dean of College of Arts & Sciences, Dr. Mario Gaboury, Dean Henry C. Lee College of Criminal Justice and Forensic Sciences, Dr. Chris Haynes, Assistant Professor and Political Science Coordinator, Dr. Matthew Schmidt, Assistant Professor of National Security and Political Science, Dr. Patricia Crouse, Practitioner in Residence, Department of Political Science, and Dr. Christy Smith, Assistant Professor of Public Administration—in expressing the deepest gratitude to the Bartels family for providing these young men and women with a solid foundation and instilling a sense of purpose and service to our great nation.

HONORING MR. BILL RUFTY

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I first met Bill Rufty nearly 30 years, when I was serving in the Florida House of Representatives. Our paths crossed often when I was Speaker of the House in Florida, and Bill always had an ear out for Polk County. Throughout his career, Bill has been a steady reporter who stuck to the facts, reporting information just as he saw it. In that way, Bill was old school, a dying breed of journalist.

A few years ago, Bill was the first reporter to interview me when I began representing Polk County in Congress and opened an office inside the Winter Haven City Hall. Measured and accurate, Bill has been a friend and familiar face while covering both state and federal issues. It has been a pleasure to work with him for three decades in serving the best interests of Central Florida. I wish him the best.

COMMEMORATING THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GIFT OF MEMORIAL CITY HALL

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 85th anniversary of the gift of Memorial City Hall in the City of Auburn, New York. In 1929, Memorial City Hall was built in the City of Auburn in memory of David Munson Osborne, Mayor of the City of Auburn from 1879–1880. Memorial City Hall continues to serve as the center of civic activity in Auburn, a memorial to the City's rich history, and an architectural classic.

Memorial City Hall was commissioned by daughters of David Munson Osborne and sisters of Mayor Thomas Mott Osborne, Helen Osborne Storrow and Emily Osborne Harris. The Hall was designed by the acclaimed architecture firm, Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch, and Abbott. Memorial City Hall's grand portico, pediment, and ionic columns stand as a monumental example of Colonial Revival architecture in 19th and 20th century America.

The history and strength of the City of Auburn is reflected in Memorial City Hall. I am pleased to share in the 85th anniversary of this landmark which continues to serve the residents of Auburn and memorialize the public service of David Munson Osborne and the entire Osborne family.

TRIBUTE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, last week, with great fanfare and enthusiasm, the Bike Away the Atomic Bomb ride set off from in front of the Capitol. That project, coordinated by Kazakhstan's ATOM Project along with Bike for Peace and Mayors for Peace, sent riders from DC to New York to call for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty at the UN Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference that began April 27. They were seen off by the ATOM project's Honorary Ambassador, the artist and painter Karipbek Kuyukov, who was born—without arms—roughly 60 miles from the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site in eastern Kazakhstan. It was the beginning of a 200-mile ride, but also a leg in a long, admirable journey Kazakhstan has taken since its independence.

In an increasingly dangerous world, the Republic of Kazakhstan has taken the lead in eliminating nuclear weapons while supporting the safe, secure, and peaceful use of nuclear energy. When the Soviet Union collapsed in December 1991, a newly-independent Kazakhstan inherited 1,410 nuclear warheads as well as the Semipalatinsk nuclear weapon test site. By 1995—just four short years later—the young country had destroyed or removed all their nuclear weapons and joined the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear weapons state; by the year 2000, it had destroyed its nuclear testing infrastructure at Semipalatinsk.

Kazakhstan is one of only a handful of countries that has taken these dramatic steps to make the world safer. Of those few, it is in a unique position to understand the devastating effects of nuclear weapons. For forty years, Kazakhstan was a test site for nuclear weapons. The fall-out from these hundreds of tests, including over 100 above ground, has left the Kazakh people with a terrible legacy of untimely deaths and birth defects that continue to this day. As Americans, we are lucky to only be able to grasp the threat of nuclear weapons abstractly and intellectually; for the Kazakhs that threat has been all too real.

In response to this terrible historical burden, Kazakhstan has taken the lead promoting nuclear non-proliferation. It has promoted a Central Asian Nuclear Weapons Free Zone and is now leading a global movement against nuclear weapons testing while offering to host the world's first "nuclear fuel bank" in cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency. It has worked to keep Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, and hosted the P5+1 talks in Almaty. And while taking advantage of its natural and technological resources to develop civilian nuclear power as an additional energy source, for both itself and other countries, Kazakhstan sought to make civilian nuclear power production more safe and secure by agreeing to adopt the Nuclear Security Guidelines at 2014 Nuclear Security Summit.

Members, myself included, regularly take to the floor to call attention to the problems in another country. Whether we censure other nations for their belligerence, condemn them for their treatment of their own populations, or express concern over their challenges in the face of internal crises, we too often speak out on the depressing news that somewhere in the world, something has gone terribly wrong. It gives me enormous pleasure, as a co-chair of the House's Nuclear Security Working Group, to call our attention today to a nation where something that has gone very, very right, and to commend the Republic of Kazakhstan for the role it continues to play in creating a safer, more secure future for itself and for the globe.

CELEBRATING MAYOR KEITH CAIN

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Keith Cain, City of Princeton Mayor, and to recognize his years of dedication and honorable service to the city of Princeton, Bureau County, and the State of Illinois.

Mayor Cain served as Princeton's Mayor since 1999—ushering in a new City Manager Form of government, leading to more efficiency and economic development. Mayor Cain's leadership in transforming a Brownfield site into Festival 56—the largest professional theater festival in the State of Illinois—has been instrumental in strengthening city tourism and retail development.

These are just a couple examples of how Mayor Cain has guided the city to new heights and was a constant comforting presence to the residents he so honorably served.

Though Mr. Cain is retiring from the position of Mayor—I know he will continue to serve his community and be a constant presence and a trusted confident to those seeking his advice. Mr. Cain has been an invaluable source of information to my office on the issues facing the residents of Princeton and the City as a whole.

While Mr. Cain is retiring from his post, I know he will continue to work and serve the community that he loves so much and will always lend a helping hand when needed. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I wish to express our deepest thanks to Keith Cain for his commendable service and dedication.

CELEBRATING MRS. TRELLIE ELIZABETH HARTMAN'S 97TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate a truly remarkable woman who is celebrating her 97th birthday, Mrs. Trellie Elizabeth Hartman. It is with great enthusiasm that I join her family and friends in celebrating this milestone and her many lifetime achievements that exemplify her Hoosier values.

A native of Argos, Indiana, she worked on her family's farm where she gained a strong work ethic at a young age. Trellie took her work ethic and Hoosier values to Contra Costa College in California, where she earned a degree in nursing. For more than 35 years, she worked as a nurse and cared for others in need. Since her retirement, she has stayed involved in her community by volunteering for Kaiser Hospital, oftentimes working double shifts.

Mrs. Hartman has been blessed with three children, nine grandchildren, 16 great grandchildren, and five great-great grandchildren. Although Trellie no longer lives in Indiana, she exemplifies what it means to be a Hoosier and continues to act as a strong role model for future generations.

I want to sincerely thank Trellie for her service and recognize her unwavering commitment to the healthcare field. It is my honor to offer my sincere congratulations to Mrs. Hartman on this special occasion. I wish her a very happy birthday and many more years of continued health and happiness.

HONORING JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John Jay College of Criminal Justice in my district in New York City, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Located steps from Lincoln Center in the cultural heart of New York City, John Jay College is one of the nation's leading liberal arts institutions of higher education with a mission of educating for justice. This theme is at the core of each of its programs across arts, sciences, and humanities. An international leader in educating for justice, John Jay offers a rich liberal arts and professional studies curriculum to upwards of 15,000 undergraduate and graduate students from more than 135 nations, including over 47% first generation students and more than 500 veterans. John Jay College is ranked #3 in the nation as a "Best for Vet" institution by Military Times in

its 2015 national college rankings of 600 universities and colleges.

The original catalyst for the school came from increasing concerns among civic leaders in New York over ongoing relations between the police and the community and the increasing complexity of police work. A small and dedicated group of academic visionaries came together to develop a plan for a new college named the College of Police Science within the City University of New York. Within a year, the college was renamed the John Jay College of Criminal Justice to reflect broader aspirations and achievements in criminal justice, leadership, and public service. John Jay, of course, was the first Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court and served as governor of our New York.

The challenges and hard work envisioned when John Jay College was created continue today. John Jay College is a critical part of our community. The essence of John Jay College of Criminal Justice can be found in its students, Pulitzer Prize-winning faculty, and enthusiastic administrators who form a civic-minded community of motivated and intellectually curious individuals committed to public service and global citizenship.

The accolades are many:

Just a few weeks ago, the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations (NECO) established a scholarship at John Jay College in memory of New York City Police Department Detectives Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu who lost their lives in December 2014 while serving the citizens of New York. The scholarship was announced on March 11 during the college's NYPD alumni reception held in celebration of the longstanding partnership and collaboration with the NYPD.

The National Network for Safe Communities at John Jay College, led by Professor David Kennedy, supports strategic interventions to reduce violence and community disorder. These strategies combine the best of law enforcement and community-driven approaches to improve public safety, minimize arrests and incarceration, enhance police legitimacy, and rebuild relationships between law enforcement and distressed communities. Attorney General Holder just announced six host pilot sites in Birmingham, AL; Fort Worth, TX; Gary, IN; Minneapolis, MN; Pittsburgh, PA; and Stockton, CA for the National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice, a three-year multi-million dollar project under the leadership of the National Network and John Jay. As part of a larger effort, each pilot site will assess the police-community relationship and develop a detailed site-specific plan that will enhance procedural justice, reduce bias, and support reconciliation in communities where trust has been harmed.

John Jay College was called on to provide expert advice and testimony to President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, including expert testimony from President Jeremy Travis, Professor Delores Jones-Brown and Professor David Kennedy.

September 11, 2001 had a profound impact on the campus and served as a catalyst to honor the 67 students, faculty and alumni that lost their lives that day. John Jay established a variety of initiatives, programs, research centers, and scholarships including the creation of the Center on Terrorism to study global terrorism and the Christian Regenhard Center for Emergency Response Studies, named after a probationary firefighter killed at the World Trade Center. As one of the leading institutions in the country in the field of criminal justice and public safety, John Jay College is one of the few institutions to offer M.A. students a certificate in the critical study of terrorism.

John Jay College's commitment to diversity is shown by the fact that it has the highest Hispanic enrollment of any four year college in the northeastern United States, and it has ranked #1 in the nation in awarding bachelor's degrees in protective services, #3 in psychology degrees, and #7 in public administration. John Jay's undergraduate, graduate and doctoral forensic degree programs are tops in the country. The College's Master of Public Administration programs recently received the Diversity and Social Equity Awards by the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs and Administration. The nationally-recognized Program for Research Initiatives in Science and Math (PRISM) at John Jay College engages underrepresented students in careers in science and math by providing an opportunity for them to participate in faculty-mentored scientific research in areas like molecular biology, toxicology, criminalistics and computer science, and partake in professional research conferences while completing their degree. Since its inception, graduation numbers from the College's science majors have tripled, and the number of students, and especially underrepresented minority students, moving on to doctoral and medical degrees has grown five-fold.

John Jay's faculty personify excellence—they include Pulitzer Prize winners, Presidential scholars, recipients of prestigious book awards, presidents of leading professional organizations and editors of prominent scholarly journals. They have been recognized by their peers, and even by the White House, for their dedication to teaching, research and mentoring. The College's students regularly win prestigious scholarships, including the Marshall Scholarship, internships, including the White House Internship, and fellowships, including Fulbright, JK Watson and the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship. They are also accepted to high-profile graduate and professional schools. Their alumni number more than 54,000, many of whom hold leadership roles in public sector agencies, including the United States Marshals Service, the FBI, the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the National Parks Service, the State Department, Peace Corps, the United Nations, and private companies in the U.S. and worldwide.

Affordability is an essential component of the College's core mission. At a time when over 37 million Americans are saddled with over $1 trillion in student debt, John Jay College recently was named one of the top ten colleges where students graduate with the least debt. Only 20% of John Jay students were compelled to borrow money to finance their college education, less than one third of the national average. And the vast majority of John Jay students graduate debt-free—enabling them to become successful in service for others without having to spend years paying off their student loans. In fact John Jay College was recently ranked #4 in the ''Best Bang for the Buck'' in the northeast rankings in Washington Monthly's College guide.

John Jay develops fierce advocates for justice—each committed every day to building a better democracy. I am proud to represent John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the values that it stands for and works for every day. Congratulations to John Jay College on this very important day and its 50 year record of fighting for justice.

IN RECOGNITION OF REVEREND JOHN S. TERRY FOR HIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION INTO THE PRIESTHOOD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Father John S. Terry, who will be celebrating his 40 years of service to the Priesthood on Saturday, May 2. Born in Scranton, Pennsylvania, Father Terry heard his calling to the priesthood while attending St. Michael's Grade School and Scranton Preparatory School.

Father Terry began his religious studies at the University of Scranton. After two years, he continued his formation at St. Pius X Seminary. He further continued his studies at Our Lady of Angels Theological Seminary in Albany, NY before transferring to Christ the King Seminary in Olean, NY. In May 1974, he was ordained a deacon and assigned to a small community in Ellicottville, NY. His next assignment was to the Diocese of Buffalo Seminary at East Aurora, NY. The next year, he was assigned to his home Diocese, and he served as a Deacon to St. Mary's Church of the Immaculate Conception in Wilkes-Barre.

On May 2, 1975, Father Terry was inducted into the priesthood and assigned to St. Mary's Church of the Immaculate Conception. In 1979, Father Terry was appointed Assistant Pastor at St. Patrick's, and he was also made Director of the Catholic Youth Center, where he still serves today

In 1982, Father Terry was assigned to Holy Savior Church and St. Christopher's Church, where he spent eight years. In December of 1990, Father Terry was temporarily stationed at the Catholic Community in Sugar Notch, and, in 1992, he was named Pastor of all three Sugar Notch churches—St. Peter and Paul, St. Charles Boromeo, and Holy Family.

On July 6, 2004, Father Terry became Pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Maternity. The consolidations of St. Joseph's Church of Wilkes-Barre Township and Holy Trinity of Wilkes-Barre with St. Mary's of the Maternity formed the new parish of Our Lady of Hope, where Father Terry serves today as its first Pastor.

It is an honor to recognize Father John S. Terry on his 40th Anniversary. I am grateful for his many stations and years of service to Wilkes-Barre and the surrounding area. May

he continue to serve his civic community, the priesthood, and his faith community with continued, inspirational dedication.

CELEBRATING MRS. NELLIE ESTHER HUNTER'S 97TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate a fellow Hoosier who is celebrating her 97th birthday, Mrs. Nellie Esther Hunter. Mrs. Hunter is a truly remarkable woman who embodies Hoosier values to the fullest. A native of Argos, Indiana she attended the one-room Santa Ana School House. Like many Hoosiers, she worked on her family's farm where she learned a strong work ethic, something she has utilized throughout her life. She has been blessed with three children, four grandchildren and one great grandchild. At the age of 81, she earned her General Education Development degree and was awarded ''Adult Student of the Year'' by the State of Indiana. A woman deeply committed to the community around her, she continued to serve others by working as a tutor at a local private school until last year and volunteered at the local food pantry.

I want to sincerely thank Mrs. Hunter for her service and recognize her unwavering commitment to her community. It is my honor to offer my congratulations to Mrs. Hunter on this special occasion. I wish her a very happy birthday and many more years of continued health and happiness.

HONORING THE MICHAEL BAKER CORPORATION'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Michael Baker Corporation, an engineering firm which is celebrating its 75th Anniversary on May 1.

Founded in 1940 in Rochester, Pennsylvania, the firm's success began with a focus on surveying and civil engineering. Since that time, Baker has added a host of differentiated services including communications, planning, architecture, and environmental consulting to assist its clients' projects. The Michael Baker Corporation has grown to employ more than 5,000 employees in over 90 offices worldwide.

Baker has a storied history of completing landmark projects throughout the world. In 1977, Baker engineers designed the New River Gorge Bridge in West Virginia, at that time the world's longest single span steel arch bridge. Baker's important projects extend internationally and include infrastructure improvements in Afghanistan and a 2,600 mile fiber optic network linking Mexico's major cities with the United States.

Baker employees continue to exemplify their core principles of leadership and the development of an employee and client focused company. All Michael Baker employees, from interns to the Chairman of the Board of Directors, take time to engage in the communities they serve.

I also have personal experience with the Michael Baker Corporation, having worked as a summer intern on a highway construction project when I was studying engineering in college. Lessons from that internship still help me today as I serve on the Transportation Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the great service that the Michael Baker Corporation and its employees have provided for 75 years. May their dedication and work ethic serve as an example to all.

HONORING MR. STEVE ANDERSON FOR RECEIVING NATO'S SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer Mr. Steve Anderson my sincere congratulations on being named a recipient of the 2014 NATO Science and Technology Organization's (STO) Scientific Achievement Award for his outstanding contributions in the realm of defense data farming methodologies. This award is NATO's highest honor for those in the defense and science technology industry. There is no question that the contributions from him and the MSG–088 task group to NATO's humanitarian assistance and disaster relief will continue for years to come.

Mr. Anderson is a fine example to his fellow citizens of dedication, selflessness, and commitment to the common good around the world. I thank him for his devotion to NATO preparedness, and I commend him on this special occasion. Again, congratulations on this much deserved award.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RICHARD CHOI BERTSCH

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Richard Choi Bertsch, who passed away unexpectedly last weekend at the age of 56.

Richard was an integral member and leader in the Korean American community. His business acumen matched the respect he garnered from his peers. He dedicated much of his life to important causes, especially the fervent fight on behalf of the so-called ''comfort women''—women who were sexually enslaved by the Japanese Imperial Army during the World War II.

Born on August 9, 1958, to his parents, Kenneth and Kyung Bertsch, Richard attended elementary school in Seoul, South Korea. In 1973, he came to the U.S. with his family, where he grew up in Southern California. A graduate of the University of California, Irvine, he started multiple electronics business.

He found his true passion as a civic leader, and he was exceptionally skilled in connecting people of diverse backgrounds and communities. Richard founded the Korean American Democratic Committee and helped found the Korean American Coalition, serving as chairman of its Orange County chapter.

Richard was a selfless individual who cared passionately about justice and the civic spirit. To put it simply, he left a deep and lasting impact on his family and his many friends from all walks of life. When a 2004 South Korean book blamed Jews for the attacks of September 11, 2001, Richard joined with Rabbi Abraham Cooper to fight its publication. Also, in 2008, when police killed a young artist, Richard led the Korean American Advisory Commission to bring the case before federal authorities for a civil-rights violation review.

Just last month, when Los Angeles Times asked about his hopes for the future in Washington, he said, if ''The two parties sincerely work[ed] together for the betterment of our country, rather than constantly [being] locked in ideological gridlock . . . it would give some hope to people that politics does matter.'' Each of us in this hallowed chamber should take these words to heart.

My heart was broken when I learned of Richard's untimely passing. Yet, I believe it is safe to assume, Richard continues to task each of us to continue our service and dedication to the betterment of our community, and this nation.

Richard is survived by his wife Yang-Uk Kim, his sons Sunny and Sunoo, and his daughter Summer. Richard's family, friends, and I will miss him greatly.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart, I recognize and remember the life of Richard Choi Bertsch—a man whom I am honored to have called a dear friend.

RECOGNIZING DR. KAREN STOUT

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Dr. Karen Stout for her outstanding dedication as President of Montgomery County Community College.

Dr. Stout is moving on after fourteen years of service as President. Her tenure has brought the college success and expansion at a time of remarkable transformation in higher education. Under her leadership, the college has been an example of management and vision for community colleges in Pennsylvania.

Her initiatives have reshaped the college's campus, forged new and important partnerships in the Montgomery County community, and given students access to programs that will teach them the skills they need for the jobs of the future. Dr. Stout is a visionary not only in her work with students and the community, but also because of the particular emphasis she has had on creating opportunity for our veterans. Her leadership will certainly be

missed, but she has left the college strong and poised for continued prosperity in the future.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 7th district of Pennsylvania, I want to thank Dr. Stout for all she has done to educate countless students and I look forward to working with her again in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS OF THE NAMI OF SYRACUSE

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) of Syracuse to the 24th District. Since 1981, NAMI of Syracuse has worked to improve the lives of countless families in Central New York who have relatives suffering from mental illness.

NAMI of Syracuse is a leader in the Central New York effort to expand awareness of and dialogue on children's mental health care. Due to the organization's programs that aim to improve children mental illness early identification, outreach, and family education, NAMI of Syracuse is being honored by NAMI of New York State at the What's Great in Our State—A Celebration of Children's Mental Health Awareness event.

I have personally pledged to increase accessibility to children's mental health resources in Central New York. I am proud to recognize NAMI of Syracuse for their work on this issue and the tremendous service they are providing to the communities of the 24th District.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JANINE FOSTER WOODY

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplished and honorable life of my good friend, Janine Foster Woody. Sadly, Janine has recently passed away and is mourned by many.

Janine was one of the most dedicated and warm hearted people I was fortunate enough to know for many years. Her endless resume of involvement with local schools and the community are difficult to portray in words. She devoted much of her time to education and helping students and community members alike. It was an honor and a privilege to have known her.

As a member of the Dallas County School Board, and chair of the Technology Committee, she worked with various Independent School District (ISD) boards and superintendents to better technological services provided to the ISDs. Janine was also elected to the Texas Association of School Boards' Legislative Advisory Committee and the North Texas Council of Governments. Her hard work and generosity reached far and wide in North Texas.

Janine's involvement in Christ United Methodist Church also brought her great joy; she dedicated valuable time and energy to teaching and volunteering in the church for many years. Her other activities included chamber of commerce Education Committees, Farmers Branch Women's Club, Garland Asian American Festival Committee, Richardson Community Band, and several public service posts, along with many others. Janine was a great role model and someone you would want members of the community looking up to.

Janine received a B.A. in History and English from Northwestern University as well as a Master of Library and Information Science degree from the University of North Texas. A thesis she wrote on ethnic bibliographies was published in the Wilson Library Journal.

As a precinct chairwoman, and Headquarters Chairwoman of the Dallas County Republican Party, she worked hard in keeping people involved and informed on many issues. She organized and maintained events, started clubs, and generally performed above and beyond her civic duties. Janine's work ethic and ability to keep people involved in the community will be greatly missed.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize and celebrate the eventful and prosperous life of Janine Foster Woody. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KILGORE COLLEGE RANGERETTES

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the First District of Texas has been blessed as the birthplace of many remarkable individuals who have made notable contributions that have enriched lives well beyond the borders of Texas. One such example was born from a rather simple concept, yet grew into a worldwide movement. It is a great pleasure to stand in honor of the world famous collegiate drill team, the Kilgore College Rangerettes, as they celebrate their 75th anniversary this year.

The Rangerettes have long been considered the personification of talent and precision, the standard of excellence which has sparked an estimated $8 billion industry and created more than fifty-thousand permanent jobs in the United States, according to one famed economist. The Rangerettes have inspired similar all-female dance drill teams, with an estimated 15,000 high school students and some 1,000 college students across the state of Texas taking part each year; while approximately 75,000 high school drill team members across the nation participate annually. The Rangerettes have been the impetus behind this major industry which has influenced lives and careers around the world.

The precision dance team concept began in 1939, and came to fruition led by the incomparably talented Miss Gussie Nell Davis with their first halftime performance on September 15, 1940. The Rangerettes were originally intended to promote diversity among the student body at Kilgore College while also encouraging football fans to stay in their seats during halftime; but while effectively accomplishing these tasks, they also introduced something astoundingly innovative to the field of sports entertainment. This group of talented young women set into motion a revolutionary model for all future choreographed dance teams. Technical skill and absolute choreographed perfection, along with the incomparable high kick routines, characterized the Rangerettes' routines at their inception, and those words can still be used today to describe the captivating performances of these young women.

The world renowned Rangerettes have toured the United States multiple times, performing for U.S. Presidential inaugurations, professional sports venues, nationally televised parades, collegiate bowl games, and even Indy 500 race events. They have been featured on television, in films, and in widely circulated magazines and newspapers. In addition to the notoriety they have experienced here in the United States, the Rangerettes have headlined several international tours which have allowed them to perform for massive numbers of enthusiastic fans on four continents and in countless cities worldwide.

The commitment to preserving the legacy and rich heritage of the young women who have achieved the honor of being named a ''Rangerette'' does not end upon graduation, but is demonstrated through the continuing efforts of their Rangerettes Forever alumni organization. Rangerettes now and forever have enjoyed an accomplished and vibrant history of group performances and individual achievement, while bringing visibility and prestige to Kilgore College, east Texas and the State of Texas.

It is a distinct privilege to honor this remarkable organization today since they have been so hard-working, motivational, & inspirational. Please join me in recognizing and congratulating the Kilgore College Rangerettes on their 75th anniversary, a milestone now recorded in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

HONORING DOT PONDER

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to salute Mrs. Dot Ponder, a devoted Nashvillian and this year's Girl Scouts of Middle Tennessee honoree. I also have the great privilege of calling Dot my friend.

For more than thirty years, Dot devoted herself to the Girl Scouts. She registered with ten troops and served hundreds of girls as troop leader, instructor and camp director.

From sharing her love of the outdoors to teaching financial literacy, Dot's energy is endless. But her contributions didn't end when troop meetings were over. She taught civic responsibility and, through her example, she encouraged Girl Scouts to actively engage in

their communities. She inspired girls to pursue the highest accolades in Girl Scouting, including the Gold and Silver Awards.

It is an honor to commend Dot Ponder for her contributions to the advancement of girls in our community through her tenure of devoted and humble service to the Girl Scouts of Middle Tennessee.

HONORING EVELYN COLLINS

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor the 33-year career of Evelyn Collins, who is retiring this week as a budget analyst for the United States Army Military District of Washington and Joint Force Headquarters-National Capital Region located on the historic Fort Leslie J. McNair in Washington, DC.

A native of Dothan, Alabama, Ms. Collins graduated from George Washington Carver High School in 1965. One year later, she joined the Army family as a military spouse. Ms. Collins began her career by working as a cashier and later became a teacher's aide. She attended Burlington County College in Pemberton, New Jersey, where she earned her accounting certificate. She then began working extensively in the Department of Defense budget career field, culminating her career as a budget analyst for the Army since 2010.

Ms. Collins' service to our nation as both a military spouse and civil service employee has spanned the country: she has traveled, worked and lived in Fort Ord, California, Fort Wainwright, Alaska, Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, Fort Dix, New Jersey, Fort Gilliam, Georgia, and served two assignments with Defense Finance and Accounting Services in Orlando, Florida, and Fort Meade, Maryland.

Ms. Collins is the well-deserved recipient of numerous superior performance awards, incentive awards, certificates of appreciation and certificates of achievement. She has earned the Outstanding Financial Support Award, Peer Award and two commander's awards for her untiring work supporting the relief efforts with Hurricane Katrina as well as her subject matter expertise in the Bradley Manning court martial that drew worldwide media attention.

Throughout her career, Ms. Collins has always upheld the highest standards of integrity and professional conduct. Her colleagues have described her as a ''trusted professional who took care of Soldiers, Army Families and Army Civilians.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join with me today to honor and thank Ms. Evelyn Collins as well as her two sons, Calvin and Adrian, for their unwavering support of our country. The sheer longevity of her career is indicative of her strength of character and her dedication to the United States. She has been an invaluable Army employee that will be difficult to replace. I wish her many more years of happiness and success in her retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF TORKLIFT CENTRAL

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Torklift Central from Kent, Washington, for their dedication to the community as demonstrated through their annual Turkey Challenge.

In 2011, with the economy in the depths of the recession and many families struggling as a result, the Kent Food Bank unexpectedly lost the majority of its funding with the holiday season just around the corner. This left many households in the area scrambling to find ways to feed their families. Fortunately, Torklift Central—a family-owned company based in Kent—stepped up to meet the needs of the community by forming the Turkey Challenge. The Challenge, which is heading into its fifth year this winter, pits local businesses against each other in a friendly competition to see who can collect the greatest amount of canned food items and cash donations for the food bank. One hundred percent of the proceeds go to providing Thanksgiving meals for residents and families who visit the Kent food bank during the holiday.

Every year, donations for the Turkey Challenge have grown in both the number of cans and monetary donations received. The goal for 2014 was 4,000 pounds of food and $17,000, an ambitious goal that would have nearly doubled what they collected in the previous year. Participating companies far exceeded those goals, bringing in 10,820 pounds of canned food and $22,418 in donations. Altogether, the Turkey Challenge has raised $56,560 and collected 16,804 pounds of food.

Without the continued dedication of Torklift Central to the Kent Food Bank, many families in our community would go without a Thanksgiving meal and food throughout the year. No longer does the food bank have to turn away families on this special day and at other times during the year due to lack of supplies. Because of Torklift Central's outstanding initiative and contributions, the community can give less fortunate families a memorable Thanksgiving.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize Torklift Central. Their service to our community is an inspiration to all organizations across the State of Washington.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF SONNY DIXON

HON. EARL L. ''BUDDY'' CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Sonny Dixon for his hard work and dedication throughout his broadcast career and public service.

Mr. Dixon is a proud Savannah native, who has readily volunteered to help out in and around his community for decades, serving on numerous boards, including various Chamber of Commerce boards, the United Way of the Coastal Empire, American Cancer Society, Savannah Technical College, Boy Scouts of the Coastal Empire, and many more. Mr. Dixon was twice elected to serve on the Garden City Council before moving on to the Georgia General Assembly. Continuing his public service, Mr. Dixon was elected to five terms in the Georgia House of Representatives, where he served on the key committees of Appropriations, Rules, Transportation, and Interstate Cooperation, on which he served as vice-chairman. Mr. Dixon later retired from elected office in 1997.

After 18 years on the anchor desk at WTOC, Mr. Dixon is set to retire on May 31, 2015. Mr. Dixon has been a fixture on the Savannah broadcasting landscape for decades covering various issues. He has garnered national attention through his appearances on CBS Evening News, the CBS Early Show, CNN, and the Montel Williams Show. Mr. Dixon has also been featured in Newsweek magazine and in other major newspapers. Mr. Dixon has claimed many awards and achievements, including the Edward R. Murrow Award, Georgia Associated Press Award for Best Documentary and Georgia's Best TV Anchor by the Associated Press. He has also received an Emmy for Best Anchor which distinguishes him amongst both large and small television markets.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join his colleagues, family and many friends in celebrating Mr. Sonny Dixon. He will always be respected for his civic service in assisting and informing our community and the State of Georgia.

HONORING THE 416TH/412TH THEATER ENGINEER COMMANDS AND ENGINEER COMMANDS ASSOCIATION MEMORIAL WALL DEDICATION

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the opening of a new memorial wall dedicated by the 416th/412th Theater Engineer Commands along with the Engineer Commands Association in honor of members of the armed forces who have paid the ultimate price in service to our country.

The memorial, located at the Parkhurst United States Army Reserve Center in Darien, Illinois, features pictures of the brave service members who laid down their lives for their country. The 416th/412th Theater Engineer Commands and the Engineer Commands Association worked countless hours planning, designing, and fundraising for the memorial which will stand in testament to sacrifices made by their fellow soldiers.

I would like to thank the 416th/412th Theater Engineer Commands and Engineer Commands Association for honoring our fallen heroes with this memorial wall.

HONORING PHYLLIS MITZEN WITH THE NATIONAL LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FROM THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my dear friend Phyllis Mitzen on her well-deserved recognition from the National Association of Social Workers. Tonight, Phyllis will be presented with their prestigious 2014 National Lifetime Achievement award. This is a fitting accolade as she has devoted most of her adult life to the social work profession and to improving the care and lives of older Americans.

Phyllis is the co-director of the Center for Long-Term Care Reform in Chicago. She is known and respected as a leader in gerontological social work, has authored books and scholarly papers in the field, and was integral in reforming long-term care in Illinois by helping to craft trailblazing reform legislation. In addition, she serves on a number of statewide advisory boards and commissions. She has also influenced and inspired many as the coordinator of the Older Adult Studies Program at the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration.

Before her work at the Center for Long-Term Care Reform, Phyllis spent close to 25 years helping to establish the Council for Jewish Elderly's important presence in our community, first as Director of Home and Community Based Services and ultimately as Director of Government Affairs. Under Phyllis' leadership, CJE Senior Life expanded programming to offer a myriad of services, from evaluating the evolving needs of seniors to adult day programs and other supportive services which allow individuals to remain in their home and community with dignity. It is critical that such comprehensive and supportive programs are available in our area, and CJE Senior Life gives seniors appropriate services through professional care. It is a testament to Phyllis' amazing contributions to seniors and their families.

Phyllis has served as a mentor and friend to many. I join with them in applauding her steadfast commitment to fighting for the dignity and care of older Americans and in thanking her for her decades of work in our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAUREEN MARINELLI

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Maureen Marinelli, a thirty-two year veteran letter carrier for the United States Postal Service and the former president of the Massachusetts State Letter Carriers Association. As someone who served as a letter carrier in the past, I applaud her dedicated service to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Ms. Marinelli's career as a letter carrier began in 1983. Almost immediately, it was clear Maureen Marinelli was an exemplary leader among the Massachusetts Letter Carriers, and her peers took notice. Maureen worked tirelessly to help letter carriers across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. She spent her career working at the grassroots level, representing and advocating for her fellow letter carriers at the state and local level. She did this while remaining a loyal letter carrier. Because of her day to day drive to listen to local letter carriers, she understood the fundamental needs of the men and women we rely on to get our mail.

After twenty years of distinguished service as a letter carrier, her peers elected her the president of the Massachusetts State Letter Carriers Association in 2004 and then again in 2011. During both terms in office, Maureen worked with labor groups across Massachusetts in order to better serve her letter carriers. Because of her hard work, she improved the lives of men and women across the Commonwealth by ensuring that our mail was delivered on time and with a smile.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Maureen Marinelli on this remarkable occasion. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her a wonderful retirement and many years of happiness, as well as in thanking her for working tirelessly as an advocate for letter carriers across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

RECOGNIZING RAINIER BEACH HIGH SCHOOL

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Rainier Beach High School in Seattle, Washington for increasing its graduation rate by 25 percent since 2011. Located in the southeastern region of Seattle along the shores of Lake Washington, Rainier Beach High School first opened its doors in 1960, and is currently home to about 400 students from the 9th Congressional District.

In previous years, Rainier Beach suffered low enrollment and graduation numbers, as well as high dropout rates. This suddenly changed two years ago when parents, staff, and community members of the Rainier Beach neighborhood pushed for an investment in an International Baccalaureate (IB) advanced learning program. This investment was made to improve the educational outcomes for all students at Rainier Beach. IB is a proven academic curriculum for 11th and 12th grade students across the nation that challenges young adults and prepares them for higher education. Students who have successfully completed IB classes have the opportunity to earn an IB diploma, making them more academically competitive in the college application process.

Since the implementation of this program, Rainier Beach High School has witnessed tremendous improvements in the academic success of their students. Graduation rates have risen substantially in recent years, with 79 percent of seniors graduating with high school diplomas this past spring. Moreover, Rainier Beach continues to exceed the Seattle School District's average graduation rate of 74 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate Rainier Beach High School on this academic achievement. I am extremely proud of Rainier Beach for valuing education and promoting growth. Their success story sets the bar very high for schools around the country.

2015 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ART COMPETITION

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the artistic ability of a young man from my Congressional District, Andrew Lowery from the Pittsburgh Creative and Performing Arts School. Mr. Lowery is the winner of the 2015 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania's High School Art Competition, ''An Artistic Discovery.'' Mr. Lowery's artwork, a self-portrait in graphite, was selected from a number of outstanding entries to this year's competition.

In fact, 63 works from 15 different schools in Pennsylvania's 14th Congressional District were submitted to our panel of respected local artists. It's a real tribute to Mr. Lowery's skill and vision that his work was chosen as the winner of this year's competition.

Mr. Lowery's artwork will represent the 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in the national exhibit of high school students' artwork that will be displayed in the United States Capitol over the coming year. I encourage my colleagues as well as any visitor to Capitol Hill to view Mr. Lowery's artwork, along with the winning entries from the high school art contests held in other Congressional Districts, which will be on display in the Capitol tunnel. It is amazing to walk through this corridor and see the interpretation of life through the eyes of these young artists from all across our country.

Cassandra Finnegan from Springdale High School was awarded second place for her watercolor and pen composition ''The Early Bird.'' Miranda Miller from Woodland Hills High School received third place for her acrylic on board painting entitled ''Corner of Hanover and Church.'' Faiza Amir from Woodland Hills High School was awarded fourth place for her acrylic painting on canvas entitled ''Flat Out Majestic,'' and Jared Bollman from Northgate High School received the fifth place award for his untitled chalk pastel composition.

In addition, Honorable Mention Awards were presented to works by Shannon Nelis from East Allegheny High School, Andrew Beninate and Katie McGregor from Montour High School, Spencer Condon from the Pittsburgh Creative and Performing Arts School Jimmy Niu from the Pittsburgh Science and Technology Academy, Shannon Kelly from Riverview High School, Brandon Konkiel and Natalie Walker from Sto-Rox High School, and Isis Duncan of Woodland Hills High School.

I would like to recognize all of the participants in this year's 14th Congressional District High School Art Competition, ''An Artistic Discovery:'' from Carrick High School, Kiera Manus; from East Allegheny High School, Adrienne DeLisi, Katlin McArdle, Shannon Nelis, and Abigail Petrocelli; from Montour High School, Andrew Beninate, Grady Butler, Joanne Fowkes, Erin McCleary, Katie McGregor, and Olivia Trevenen; from Northgate High School, Jared Bollman and Jesron Hall; from Penn Hills High School, Racine James, Anna Lintelman, Areanna Russell, and Sarah Wheeler; from the Pittsburgh Creative and Performing Arts School, Spencer Condon, Andrew Lowery, Gigi Varlotta, and Rosalea Williams; from Pittsburgh Science & Technology Academy, Jimmy Niu; from Pittsburgh Westinghouse School, Margaret Ahmad-Revis, Christjon Malloy, Layla Miller, William Penn, and Alanna Young; from Riverview High School, Shannon Kelly, Kylie Mericle, and Kelly O'Donnell; from Serra Catholic High School, Tyler J. Gedman, Kalin Greene, Victoria Hart, Jen Pricener, Erin Thomas, and Rachel Vidil; from South Allegheny High School, Matthew Dougher, Noah Elder, Adriann Frantish, Tywan Igles, Nicolette Ruhl, and Lesley Taylor; from Springdale High School, Cassandra Finnegan, Zachary Lamperski, Maria Lucas, Marisa Stover, Emily Thomm, and Milana Yaksich; from Sto-Rox High School, Brian Berry, Tieka Berry, Brandon Konkiel, Alanna Molter, Katelyn Parker, and Natalie Walker; from Wilson Christian Academy, Nicole Bonomo and Haley Peretic; from Woodland Hills High School, Faiza Amir, Isis Duncan, Miranda Miller, Rayven Smith, and Tonee Turner.

I would like to thank these impressive young artists for allowing us to share and celebrate their talents, imagination, and creativity. The efforts of these students in expressing themselves in a powerful and positive manner are no less than spectacular.

I hope that all of these individuals continue to utilize their artistic talents, and I wish them all the best of luck in their future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO THE ROTARY CLUB OF COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Rotary Club of Council Bluffs, Iowa. The Club was chartered by Rotary International on April 1, 1915. The members of this Club exemplify the Rotary Motto: ''Service Above Self and One Profits Most Who Serves Best.'' The Club Members convey this philosophy of unselfish volunteer service at every opportunity.

In 1913, a young Council Bluffs businessman, while on a business trip to New York City, came upon a Rotary International convention and asked, ''What is Rotary?'' He was told, ''It is an organization for the prevention of what is harmful to business and society; and the promotion of that which is helpful.'' That same spirit is alive and well within the Rotary Club of Council Bluffs today. The Club members actively participate in community activities, promote a college scholarship fund, hold an annual food drive, sponsor a 5th grade career fair, and hold fundraisers throughout the year to support their activities. This Club is a reflection of the mission of Rotary International, ''to promote service to others, promote integrity, and advance world understanding, goodwill, and peace through its fellowship of business, professional, and community leaders.''

The Rotary Club of Council Bluffs has made a difference in serving the Council Bluffs community. The members of the past 100 years have been dedicated to helping and serving others and it is a great honor to recognize them today. I know my colleagues in the House join me in honoring their accomplishments. I thank them for their service and wish them all the very best moving forward.

HONORING MARK DIEL

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mark Diel as he departs the Children's Health Initiative in Napa County. As the founding Executive Director of this vital organization, Mr. Diel shepherded its growth and greatly increased access to healthcare among the less fortunate in our community.

During his time as the head of the initiative, Mr. Diel enrolled 16,000 children and their families in Napa in comprehensive affordable health insurance and put into place systems which ensured that over ninety-nine percent of its clients received all the healthcare services they needed. Eighty-seven percent of the Initiative's clients also retain their coverage each year, a rate that is far higher than the state average.

Mr. Diel's dedication to ensuring children and low-income communities have the quality healthcare has been a lifelong passion. In addition to heading the Children's Health Initiative, he has served as a WIC manager in Yolo County and as Director at QueensCare. While at QueensCare, he built relationships with inner-city schools and families that led to valuable mobile medical, dental, and optometric clinics throughout their geographic region, serving more than 60,000 Los Angeles children and factory workers annually. He also founded Promotores Comunitarios, a leadership training program that fosters leadership through training and deploying of community health promoters.

Mark was born and lives in Davis, CA, with his wife, Tara, and their two children. Throughout his career, Mark has always been a bold advocate for vulnerable groups, a professional risk taker, and an outstanding community leader.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we honor Mark Diel at this time. He has worked tirelessly to connect underserved communities, children, and others to quality healthcare services, and as a leader in Napa County his work has made our community stronger and healthier.

HONORING GIVE SOMETHING BACK FOUNDATION

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Carr and the Give Something Back Foundation.

In 2003, Lockport, Illinois resident Bob Carr founded the Give Something Back Foundation to give well performing but underprivileged high school students a chance to receive a college education by providing scholarship and mentorship opportunities.

The Give Something Back Foundation's scholarship program is currently supporting 190 students, and has helped many more who would not have been able to afford a college education. The foundation offers full scholarships to students from 21 high schools throughout Will County and partners with local universities to ensure that students receive mentors to help them during their college career.

I would like to thank Bob Carr and the Give Something Back Foundation for their continued dedication to improving lives and building futures for young people in our community.

RECOGNIZING JANIE SACCO, RECIPIENT OF THE WASHINGTON STATE VETERAN SMALL BUSINESS ADVOCATE AWARD

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Ms. Janie Sacco, Vice President and SBA Loan Officer at Kitsap Bank, on receiving the 2015 Washington State Veteran Small Business Advocate Award from the SBA.

For years, Janie's main focus has been assisting military veterans with business loans, with a special focus on women, minority, veteran-owned small businesses and non-profits. Janie works tirelessly to discover qualifying veteran-owned businesses to receive a certification as a veteran-owned business by the Washington State Department of Veteran Affairs (WDVA). These certifications allow businesses to apply for SBA loans and benefit from the additional assistance that veterans deserve. Janie's dedication has resulted in many local businesses qualifying for SBA assistance, which has helped to spur economic growth in the region.

In addition to her work at Kitsap Bank, Janie also works with the SBA's SCORE and VBOC programs, providing classes on financial education, as well as with the SBA's Boots-to-Business program. During her spare time, she volunteers by providing her expertise and services in the South Sound region in order to

strengthen veteran-owned businesses and their finances. Janie has demonstrated—through her career and volunteer service—her dedication to veterans and veteran-owned businesses. Our community and regional economy have benefited greatly as a result and I am proud to call her a constituent.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize and congratulate Janie Sacco on receiving the 2015 Washington State Veteran Small Business Advocate Award from the Small Business Association.

HONORING MR. JOHN RABUN

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. John Rabun for his absolute passion for child safety and his many years of service to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

A graduate of Savannah High School, Mr. Rabun continued his education at Armstrong State University and earned his master's in social work from Mercer University. Following his degree, Mr. Rabun began his career in legal work for the ACLU of Kentucky where he helped ''deinstitutionalize'' children after their time in public homes for non-criminal activity and later worked as a chief probation officer for a county juvenile justice system. In 1980, Mr. Rabun and one of his colleagues formed a local exploited child unit, uniting social workers with police force during a season of high-profile cases of missing children.

Mr. Rabun wrote about the need for a clearinghouse operation for missing and exploited children for the U.S. Department of Justice, and in 1984 wrote a grant that would become the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Mr. Rabun ran the center's operations, built up the staff and trained tens of thousands internationally on preventing abduction, all while continuing to rescue children. He served as the communication link between many government units and helped to reach the public through billboards and news media sources. After nearly 30 years as the executive vice president of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Mr. Rabun now works part-time for the Alexandria, Virginia, office from his home on Tybee Island.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor Mr. John Rabun for his work that led to the rescue of 80,000 children. I am honored to join his colleagues, family and friends in celebrating many years of dedication to the safety of our children.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,151,898,676,069.23. We've added $7,525,021,627,456.15 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE BIRTHDAY OF BOBBY DOLD

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish my son, Bobby Dold, a happy birthday.

Bobby turns eleven years old today. He was born in Evanston, Illinois, and since that day in 2004, has kept me, his mother, Danielle, and his two sisters, Harper and Honor, always on our toes.

Bobby continues to grow and develop as a young man and an athlete. As a member of the Dold family, Bobby excels in multiple sports, including football, hockey, and lacrosse. Bobby brightens every room he walks into and makes friends with everyone he meets. It is clear that he has a true zest for life, and I hope that he continues to grow that enthusiasm in the years to come.

Bobby enjoys visiting the beach of Lake Michigan with his proud grandparents, Nana and Chief, Papa and Granma, his aunts and uncles, and all of his cousins.

I look forward to watching Bobby grow and mature into a fine independent young man. I hope that Bobby will continue to be a shining light to our family and community. Happy Birthday, Bobby.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LOCAL TASK FORCES ON 21ST CENTURY POLICING ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Local Task Forces on 21st Century Policing Act, to assist localities in carrying out some of the recommendations of President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing and the Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, both of which detail the need to strengthen relations between local communities and local law enforcement. The bill would provide grants to local police departments to create local task forces on 21st century policing to bring police, representatives of the community, and public officials together to identify issues in their own communities, best policing practices for local police, and other ways to strengthen relations between the community and police departments. Existing funds from the Department of Justice's Grant Program would support local governments establishing the task forces.

The task forces, modeled after President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, would allow local communities to identify the best ways to create an effective partnership between local law enforcement and the community they serve while reducing crime and increasing trust. The task forces could serve as a resource to address racial profiling in the Unites States by creating a partnership that encourages each party to take ownership of the issues and then proceeding to implement practical policing practices acceptable to all concerned.

The creation of task forces could be an important step toward easing the tensions between local law enforcement and the community. In addition, the task forces would serve to engage local law enforcement and local stakeholders in a transparent public process instead of being at odds. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

RECOGNIZING HELEN LEUZZI

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the founding Executive Director of The Sophia Way, Helen Leuzzi, for being recognized by Seattle CityClub as a recipient of the 2015 Washington State Jefferson Award.

The Jefferson Award is given to the unsung heroes who are making a difference in their community through public service. Also known as the ''Nobel Prize'' of social service, the Seattle CityClub awards the Jefferson Award to community leaders who exemplify an exceptional amount of volunteerism and action to better their communities.

In 2006, Helen began serving as the Outreach Chair at the Bellevue First Congregational Church, where her passion was ignited to help meet the needs of the eastside's homeless and low-income women. In collaboration with other community organizations, Helen helped to create a women's day center known as Angeline's Day, which eventually inspired her to create a center that would serve the needs of women at all hours of the day. This day center would later grow into what is known today as The Sophia Way.

Today, The Sophia Way offers life skills training, social services, shelter, and additional resources to help women gain stability and independence. As the founding Executive Director, Helen has demonstrated an unyielding commitment to combating issues faced by homeless and low income women in our community. Her dedication and selflessness have paved the way for the success and growth of this organization, which has become an important asset to the region.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize Helen Leuzzi for receiving Seattle CityClub's Washington State Jefferson Award and for her commitment to serving vulnerable populations in our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF DOROTHY PETERSON

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Dorothy ''Dot'' Peterson as she celebrates her 100th birthday this year. It is my honor to join with her family and friends in marking this incredible milestone and wishing her many more years of health and happiness.

Born in Brooklyn, New York on May 15, 1915, Dot was the sixth of eight children. Her parents, Hannah and Kristian Nilson, had immigrated to the United States from Norway. In 1919, their family moved to North Long Branch, New Jersey where Dot spent most of her childhood. She graduated from Long Branch High School in 1931 and earned her teaching degree from Newark Normal School (now Kean University) in 1935.

In 1939, Dot married her beloved husband Harold Peterson of Monmouth Beach, New Jersey. Together they had 6 children and lived in Long Branch for 11 years before moving to Monmouth Beach in 1950. In 2005, Dot and Harold moved from their cherished family home to Kensington Court in Tinton Falls, New Jersey where Dot still resides today.

Dot's dynamic spirit and love of life is reflected in her family. She is proud of her children, eleven grandchildren and 15 great-grandchildren with which she can share her accomplished and fulfilling life.

In addition to raising a beautiful family, Dot has always been an active member of her community, looking to improve the well-being of others. She taught first grade at the Broadway School in Long Branch for seven years and was a member of the parent-teacher associations at Monmouth Beach School, Long Branch High School and Shore Regional High School. She was also part of a group of women who helped create the first free-standing library in Monmouth Beach and she served as a long-time member of the Ladies Auxiliary of Monmouth Beach. Dot continues to remain involved and energetic at Kensington Court, participating in art and exercise classes, prayer group and the Resident Board.

Dot is also an engaged, life-long member of Asbury United Methodist Church in North Long Branch, where she has served as president of the Women's Society of Christian Service (later renamed the United Methodist Women) and a church trustee. She was also involved with the Sunday School and played in the bell choir. Family, community and church continue to be of utmost importance to Dot and her remarkable involvement is truly admirable.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring Mrs. Dorothy Peterson as she celebrates her 100th birthday.

RECOGNIZING CHAPIN HIGH SCHOOL GOVERNMENT STUDENTS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am grateful to extend my sincere appreciation to Chapin High School's senior Government class. As part of their study on the legislative branch, these bright young men and women sent informed questions to my office about timely and important topics such as redistricting and immigration.

I appreciate Lucas Barnes, Kenly Derrick, Heather Dominick, Shelby Green, Trent Hodges, Abby Malcom, Katherine Meyers, Stephen Page, and Keely Wilson for their interest in and study of the federal government. I support Mr. Jody Haltiwanger, the Advanced American Government teacher at Chapin High School, who inspired his students to fully engage in the legislative process by contacting their elected officials.

I am honored to represent these young Americans in the Second Congressional District of South Carolina, and am confident of their future success.

A TRIBUTE TO GENERAL JANET WOLFENBARGER

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to pay tribute to General Janet Wolfenbarger, the first female four-star general for the United States Air Force, for her 35 years of distinguished and honorable service in the United States Air Force and to our Nation.

General Wolfenbarger has had a distinguished career, beginning with her graduation from the United States Air Force Academy. She has held a variety of assignments at headquarters Electronic Security Command and Air Force Systems Command. The General has held several positions in the F–22 System Program office, served as the F–22 Lead Program Element Monitor and was the B–2 System Program Director for the Aeronautical Systems Center. She commanded the Aeronautical Systems Center's C–17 Systems Group, Mobility Systems Wing. She was the Service's Director of the Air Force Acquisition Center of Excellence at the Pentagon, and then served as Director of the Headquarters AFMC Intelligence and Requirements Directorate. She served as AFMC Vice Commander and as the Military Deputy to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisitions.

As Commander of AFMC, General Wolfenbarger authorized and directed groundbreaking initiatives, revolutionizing how the Air Force and AFMC will conduct business for years to come. Gen Wolfenbarger oversaw the successful reorganization of AFMC from 12-Centers to 5-Centers. This dramatic reinvention of the Command led to a myriad of innovative mission and cost effectiveness programs, such as the Air Force Life Cycle Management Center's Should Cost initiative and the Air Force Sustainment Center's Road to a Billion and Beyond. Furthermore, she collaborated with the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Acquisition) to develop the Bending the Cost Curve initiative, an effort designed to improve internal Air Force acquisition processes, enhance industry interactions throughout the acquisition lifecycle, and expand competition among traditional and non-traditional industry partners. Finally, she fulfilled the Secretary of the Air Force's vision for the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center reorganization effort and guided the stand-up of the Air Force Installation and Mission Support Center.

She received numerous military awards for her service including the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal, and the Air Force Achievement Medal. She also received the highest honor from the Air Force enlisted corps, the Order of the Sword.

I have known General Wolfenbarger for many years and deeply value the service she provided to our country. Although she will be sorely missed, I wish her nothing but the best in her future endeavors. General Wolfenbarger encompasses a myriad of noble traits but her honesty, her ability to provide straight assessment and her uncompromising ethical character have truly set her apart from the rest in her distinguished career. Her service and her dedication to duty honor the Air Force and our great nation. General Wolfenbarger truly exemplifies the core values of the Air Force, ''Integrity First, Service Before Self, Excellence in All We Do.''

COMMENDING THE SEATTLE TIMES

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Seattle Times on winning a Pulitzer Prize for ''Breaking News Reporting'' this year for their coverage of the Oso, Washington mudslide. This is the third time in just five years that the Seattle Times has received this prestigious honor, and their tenth total Pulitzer Prize. Although Editor Kathy Best said that the paper simply ''did what any good newsroom should do when a big story breaks'', it is clear that they went above and beyond and raised the bar for reporters and news publications across the country.

The Seattle Times is the largest daily paper in Washington State and has been serving the greater Seattle area since 1891. This latest achievement only adds to their legacy of community service and I look forward to many more years of them reporting the news of my home state.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF DR. QUINTARD TAYLOR

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Dr. Quintard Taylor of the University of Washington on receiving the 2015 Washington State Jefferson Award from Seattle CityClub.

The Jefferson Award is given to the unsung heroes who make a difference in their community through public service. Also known as the ''Nobel Prize'' of social service, the Seattle CityClub presents the Jefferson Award to community leaders who exemplify volunteerism and action to better their communities.

Today, Dr. Taylor is the Scott and Dorothy Bullitt Professor of American History at the University of Washington's Seattle campus, and has taught in Washington, Oregon, California, and Nigeria over the course of almost 40 years. He has edited, written and published multiple writings on African American History, providing his expertise on African American history specific to the American West.

In addition to his commitment to teaching, Dr. Taylor created a website resource called BlackPast.org, a non-profit website that features over 10,000 pages of information on African American history. In particular, this resource features voluntary academic contributions from various scholars verified through a rigorous process. This site is the largest reference center of its type and is a testament to his dedication to providing citizens with vital information on American history.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize and congratulate Dr. Quintard Taylor on receiving Seattle CityClub's 2015 Jefferson Award.

RECOGNIZING MERCEDES SANTANA

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mercedes Santana, a talented young lady and athlete.

Born on August 30, 2003, Mercedes has studied the martial art of Tae Kwon Do at Mechelle's Way Tae Kwon Do in Schenectady, New York for the last several years. During this time, she successfully earned the level of Red Belt, and she continues to pursue her goal of earning a Black Belt as well as completion of martial arts weapons training.

Mr. Speaker, in July of 2013, Mercedes attended and competed in the 2013 Junior Olympics, held in Detroit, Michigan. At this event Mercedes earned a Bronze Medal in Tae Kwon Do, a feat which currently makes her the only Junior Olympian in Schenectady, New York. This accomplishment has proven Mercedes to be an impressive role model for her peers and fellow New Yorkers.

Outside of Tae Kwon Do, Mercedes holds a diverse range of interests, including playing the drums, painting and reading.

Mr. Speaker, the Junior Olympics have been held over 30 times since their inception in 1967. The event has included over 20 sports in this time span and the 2013 event alone had over 12,000 athletes in attendance. By winning a Bronze Medal, Mercedes has truly proven herself to be an impressive student of Tae Kwon Do and overall athlete.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other congressional colleagues join me in recognizing Mercedes Santana for her tremendous accomplishments, and to encourage Mercedes to continue to inspire those around her.

CELEBRATING BETHESDA ACADEMY'S 275TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EARL L. ''BUDDY'' CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 275th Anniversary of Bethesda Academy, Savannah's iconic boarding and day school for boys in grades six through 12.

Bethesda Academy was founded in 1740 by Reverend George Whitefield as a home for boys, and it has the distinction of being America's oldest child caring institute. This values-laden educational institution has raised the bar when it comes to educating Georgia's young men, strongly emphasizing Whitefield's founding mission to teach ''a love for God, a love of learning and a strong work ethic.'' Today, Bethesda Academy is an AdvancEd accredited institute with 95 percent of its students graduating on time and 87 percent going on to higher education.

Designing its curriculum around the way that the boys learn most effectively, Bethesda Academy features a wildlife management program, an on-site video production studio, an organic farming program and a nationally-ranked chess team. Bethesda does not receive any state funding to operate and depends largely on private donations, external scholarship programs such as the Georgia GOAL Scholarship Program, annual fundraising, and a collection of on-campus business enterprises that cumulatively help meet the school's annual budget. Though the school has faced many challenges over the years due to funding, Bethesda has evolved into a thriving and award-winning middle and high school.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to commemorate the 275th Anniversary of Bethesda Academy. With a wide range of academic, athletic, vocational and spiritual development opportunities, there is no doubt that Bethesda is preparing these young men for future success in life.

THE GLOBAL MAGNITSKY HUMAN RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I recently chaired a hearing on the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 directed the President to publish and update a list of each person the President had reason to conclude was responsible for the detention, abuse, or death of Sergei Magnitsky, a legal and accounting adviser with Firestone Duncan, an international law and accounting firm with offices in Moscow and London.

William Browder, Chief Executive Officer of Hermitage Capital Management Ltd., who was one of the witnesses at the hearing, has provided a detailed account of the violent expropriation of the assets of Hermitage—the largest foreign investment brokerage in Russia—by rampant Russian Government corruption, bribery, fraud, forgery, cronyism, and outright theft.

Magnitsky had documented Hermitage's losses and other illicit financial dealings, including draining $230 million from the Russian treasury by tax fraud. He was arrested in November 2008, reportedly for tax evasion, and denied medical care, family visits, or due legal process, in custody. He was beaten and tortured, and died in prison in November 2009. He was 37 years old and married with two young children.

The Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 targeted those who participated in related liability concealment efforts, financially benefited from Sergei Magnitsky's detention, abuse, or death, or were involved in the criminal conspiracy uncovered by Magnitsky, or were responsible for extrajudicial killings, torture, or other human rights violations committed against individuals seeking to expose illegal activity carried out by Russian officials, or against persons seeking to promote human rights and freedoms. The Act directed the Secretaries of State and Treasury to annually report to Congress on actions taken to implement the Act, including rejecting visa applications, revoking existing visas, and blocking property transactions, for persons the President put on the Magnitsky List.

The United States is a land of opportunity, but it should not be for those who misused and murdered Sergei Magnitsky. Without the original Magnitsky Act, the government officials and businesspeople who perpetrated crimes against a young man, against a major international firm, and against even the Russian people themselves by stealing from them, could have taken their ill-gotten gains and come to this country to purchase property and live the good life that the United States offers.

The hearing examined the need for H.R. 624, ''The Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act,'' which extends these human rights and anti-corruption tools to other countries. The House passed the 2012 act by a vote of 365–43, and there is now strong Majority and Minority co-sponsorship for H.R. 624.

Since the original Magnitsky Act became law on December 14, 2012, human rights victims and advocates from around the world, and anti-corruption champions, have asked for a Magnitsky Act for their specific country. H.R. 624 ensures—with minimal cost or burden on the United States—that our government gives some justice to victims and stands in solidarity with them in a tangible way, shines a spotlight

on perpetrators, making them pariahs, and pressures governments to prosecute perpetrators who are their citizens.

The Global Magnitsky Act is intended to disrupt the impunity and comfort that far too many international human rights violators currently enjoy and to keep their tainted money out of our financial systems. It also fights the human rights abuses and corruption that generate national security, terrorism, and economic threats to the United States.

A few years ago, Teodorin Obiang Mangue son of the President of Equatorial Guinea, visited the United States regularly. Using funds siphoned from American companies operating in his country, he lived a glamorous life in Malibu, California, dating celebrities and collecting expensive cars. When France issued a warrant for his arrest after he refused to appear at a money-laundering hearing, his father provided him with diplomatic immunity to escape prosecution.

In June 2012, after years of trying to track Teodorin's wealth, the U.S. Department of Justice finally filed a lawsuit in a California court alleging massive money-laundering and listing, among the scandalous catalog of assets, his $35 million Malibu mansion, with a four-hole golf course, tennis court and two swimming pools. That's just one of the acquisitions he made in the U.S.

The financial manipulations of young Mr. Obiang's family led in part to the closing of Riggs Bank in Washington, one of the capital's premier financial institutions. Such people should not be able to steal from foreign firms and their own people and use these funds to live lavishly in our country.

Similarly, those who torture and otherwise commit the worst human rights violations against others should not be welcome here either and I have written legislation over the years to enforce that principle. The Ethiopia Freedom, Democracy, and Human Rights Advancement Act of 2006 would have prevented officials who ordered the callous shooting of peaceful demonstrators in Ethiopia from entering this country. The Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 became law and required the U.S. Government to impose visa bans on any foreign national the Secretary of State has determined is directly involved in establishing or enforcing population control policies that force a woman to undergo abortions against her will or force a man or woman to undergo sterilization against his or her will. The Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2006 also became law and imposed visa bans and asset freezes on government officials from the Government of Belarus because of their violations of basic human rights and freedoms.

If we stand by quietly when governments refuse to prosecute human rights abusers and financial fraudsters, and then welcome those guilty of such crimes into the United States and into our financial systems, we are enabling their crimes. The 2012 Magnitsky Act was a major step in freeing ourselves from aiding and abetting international perpetrators. H.R. 624 makes the next step in taking a stand against their crimes. If we are serious about rejecting their deeds, perhaps their governments, and other governments, will become more serious as well.

SHANNA PEEPLES OF AMARILLO NAMED 2015 NATIONAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents, Shanna Peeples, who has been named the 2015 National Teacher of the Year by the Council of Chief State School Officers. She is the first Texas teacher to win the award since 1957.

Ms. Peeples is a high school English teacher at Palo Duro High School in Amarillo, Texas. She graduated from West Texas A&M University in 1997. After working as a disc jockey, medical assistant, pet sitter, and journalist at the Amarillo Globe-News covering education, the mother of three children began teaching 12 years ago.

Ms. Peeples was exposed to alcoholism, domestic violence, and poverty as a child. Those hardships help her empathize with her students, 85 percent of whom live below the poverty line and many having fled violent homelands from around the world. Just as her teachers made school her safe place where she could escape her fears through reading and writing, Ms. Peeples strives to give her students a sense of belonging. She wants them to know she is invested in their lives and in their futures. So much so, that she has had to help refugee parents who wanted their children to work rather than go to school understand the importance of education.

In addition to serving as the chair of her English department, she is a mentor and instructional coach for other teachers at her school. As she travels the nation over the next year, she plans to emphasize effective teaching methods for students in poverty or facing extreme challenges.

Ms. Peeples is the type of educator all parents want teaching our children. She is a shining example of the best of her profession. The fact that she has already been recognized as the Teacher of the Year for Texas and has now become the Teacher of the Year for the entire country makes everyone in our area—and especially our teachers and school systems—very proud.

RECOGNIZING SOUTH SEATTLE COLLEGE STUDENT, DAVID YAMA

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to offer special recognition to David Yama, a South Seattle College student from the great state of Washington. Mr. Yama received national attention for his exemplary character in and out of the classroom.

As a member of the All-Washington Academic team, David was named a ''New Century Scholar'' which is given to the top-community college scholar in each state. From there, David landed the top spot on the All-USA academic team, made up of the top-20 community college students from across the country. On April 20, 2015 the National Honor Society, Phi Theta Kappa, held a celebration to recognize David and his All-USA teammates in San Antonio, Texas. Of the top 20 in the nation, David was selected as the sole recipient of PTK's David R. Pierce Scholarship and served as the speaker at the event where he shared his story of tragedy and triumph. Days later, his success was further recognized with a Jack Kent Cooke Foundation Scholarship—awarded to the nation's top community college students to complete their bachelor's degree at a four-year college or university.

Growing up in Ocean Shores, a small coastal city in Washington, David and his family—which includes his four siblings—lived in a one-bedroom hotel. David struggled in school and his parents were told that he needed behavioral drugs. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, his parents could not afford that type of medication for David. After receiving straight F's, David dropped out of high school at the age of 14. One year later, David set sail—quite literally. After convincing his mother and the captain of the *Lady Washington*, he volunteered on a sailing trip to California. From there he worked on other ships and as David put it, jumped from ''one dead-end job to another.''

At the age of 27, David came to the realization that an education was the key to a life of stability and greener pastures. As a West Seattle resident, David started taking prep classes to receive his GED at his local community college, South Seattle College.

With the encouragement of his GED instructor, Jane Harness, David quickly began to rebuild his confidence and his scores improved. As Jane put it, ''this little switch turned on for him, and he became really determined.''

So determined, in fact, that after David earned his GED he continued his academic pursuits and will be earning an associate degree this spring. From there, David will continue his studies earning a bachelor's degree and ultimately a Ph.D. in bio engineering.

In addition to holding a 3.96 GPA, David volunteers his time as a tutor and an environmentalist cleaning up West Seattle's Duwamish River. He is quick to give credit to South Seattle College as the key to his success as he told the Seattle Times: ''Once I started here—the environment was right, it was a 180 from what I thought I was capable of,'' Yama said.

His academic achievements have been recognized in USA Today, Seattle's NBC Affiliate (KING 5) and on the front page of the Seattle Times.

David's story is one of inspiration and determination. He is just one of many students who have had to overcome seemingly impossible odds but met those challenges head-on and came out on top. He is living proof that the power of hope, determination and the human spirit are alive and well in this country. I'm proud that South Seattle College and David Yama are from the District that I represent. Please join me in recognizing their success.

THE EVENTS IN BALTIMORE

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my friend and chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, G. K. BUTTERFIELD, in offering condolences to the parents and family members of Freddie Gray.

I also want to say to Ms. Toya Graham that I feel and can appreciate her anguish and the pain that she showed the world a few days ago.

I want to say to her son, Michael, that I have also felt his pain and anguish, having been on the receiving end of such discipline from my mother. But I want to say to him that he can rest assured that the love of his mother, her passion for his future, will pay great dividends if he continues to show the deference to her love and affection and her concern that he showed several days ago when he was the object of her frustrations.

Mr. Speaker, responding to the situation in Baltimore several days ago, President Obama said: ''We can't just leave this to the police. I think there are Police Departments that have to do some soul-searching. I think there are some communities that have to do some soul-searching.''

But, he went on to say: ''I think we, as a country, have to do some soul-searching.'' I want to join President Obama in calling for the country to do some soul-searching.

Let's take a look at just a few of the institutions of learning in the Baltimore Community.

I would like to call attention to one school, Frederick Douglass High School, a school that lists among its graduates the likes of Cab Calloway, Thurgood Marshall, and as I understand it the school the father of the current mayor of Baltimore also attended.

I understand there are 789 students at Frederick Douglass High School today. Eighty-three percent of them are listed in U.S. News & World Report's index as economically disadvantaged, and only 53 percent of them are listed as proficient in English, only 44 percent proficient in algebra.

I understand that Carver Vocational Technical High is 100 percent minority, with 79 percent of the students economically disadvantaged. Coppin Academy, 100 percent minority, with 77 percent economically disadvantaged.

Now, as we listen to all of the pundits, editorial writers reflect on what is taking place or has taken place in Baltimore, I would like to call attention to the lack of soul-searching that is taking place here in this body as we represent the people of America. We have just seen the conference report, or the budget, being proposed by the House Republicans. That conference agreement guts strategic investments in education, workforce training, public health, scientific research, advanced manufacturing, and public safety. It does nothing to help those Americans who are looking for jobs. It does nothing to boost paychecks of working Americans. It disinvests in America.

The Republicans' budget disinvests in America by slashing the nation's commitments to education, research, infrastructure, and other crucial drivers of economic prosperity. It pulls away from the ladders of opportunity that helps hard-working Americans get ahead.

In Education, the Republican Budget kicks 46,000 children out of Head Start, cuts $1.2 billion in Title I education funding (enough for 17,000 teachers and aides serving 1.9 million students); cuts $347 million in funding through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, (enough for 6,000 special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and related staff);

The Republican Budget also decimates job creation. It eliminates job training & employment services for more than 2.4 million workers; and eliminates the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships, which serve 30,000 small manufacturers that contribute to the creation of middle-class jobs and economic growth;

In the area of Housing, the Republican budget takes Housing Choice Vouchers away from 133,000 families and eliminates affordable housing assistance for another 20,000 families in rural America;

The Republican budget shreds the social safety net. It cuts $300 billion from Agriculture Committee programs. The House budget cut roughly $200 billion. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is the largest spending program in this committee's jurisdiction and appears to be the primary target of this cut (despite the fact that 80% of SNAP beneficiaries are children, elderly, disabled, someone caring for a child or disabled person, or are working);

My Republican friends underfund veterans' programs. They are proposing $20 billion below the President's request over the next ten years.

They also increase taxes on hardworking families while giving massive tax cuts to the ultra-wealthy. They increase taxes on a typical working family by $2,000, while giving millionaires an average tax cut of more than $200,000; and let the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), and the Child Tax Credit expire.

Their budget puts college out of reach for millions of students. It freezes the maximum Pell grant and eliminates $89 billion in congressionally approved Pell grant increases; and cuts total overall support for higher education by more than $220 billion in the next decade.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE OF DR. KENNETH MILLER

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize my constituent, Kenneth Miller, PhD, RN, CFNP, FAAN, FAANP, for his service as President this year of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners (AANP).

Dr. Miller has had an exemplary career of service with more than 44 years of nursing experience. He received his BSN from the University of Michigan in 1978, a Master's in Medical/Surgery Nursing in 1980, and a PhD in Clinical Nursing Research from the University of Arizona in 1983. Dr. Miller received his Family Nurse Practitioner post-master's certification from the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences in 1998.

Prior to his term as AANP President, Dr. Miller served as the Associate Dean for Academic Administration at The Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. He was also the Director of the School of Nursing for the University of Delaware and the Vice Dean for Internal Programs and Associate Dean for Research and Clinical Scholarship in the College of Nursing at the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center.

Before his tenure in academia, Dr. Miller held professorial positions at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and as Director of Clinical Nursing Research at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland. Dr. Miller also worked as a clinical nurse in medical centers and hospitals in California, Arizona and Michigan. In addition, he served as a Family Nurse Practitioner in New Mexico, Delaware and the District of Columbia.

The American Association of Nurse Practitioners is a national professional membership organization representing 205,000 nurse practitioners nationally. Under Dr. Miller's tenure, AANP membership has grown to more than 57,000 members, making AANP the largest nurse practitioner organization in the world. Dr. Miller has helped lead nurse practitioners in transforming patient-centered health care and has made tremendous strides in ensuring that policy makers and the public understand the care that nurse practitioners provide to millions of Americans each year.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Miller on a successful term as President of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners and in thanking him for the excellent care he has and continues to provide to his patients and the nurse practitioner profession.

REINTRODUCING DUWAMISH TRIBAL RECOGNITION ACT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reintroduce the Duwamish Tribal Recognition Act. This legislation addresses a longstanding issue that affects the indigenous people of Seattle's metropolitan area. This year marks the 160th year since the Duwamish Tribe signed the Point Elliott Treaty in 1855. In exchange for the reservation and other benefits including hunting and fishing rights promised in the Point Elliott Treaty by the United States government, the Duwamish Tribe ceded 54,000 acres of their homeland. Today, those 54,000 acres include the cities of Bellevue, Mercer Island Renton, Seattle, Tukwila, and much of King County.

The Duwamish people's struggle for federal recognition continues. It was granted to them in 2001, but then denied under dubious circumstances after just eight months. On September 2001, George W. Bush's Interior Department's administration officials denied the recognition of the Duwamish Tribe. U.S. District Judge Coughenour vacated the administration's denial through statements expressing

concern on how ''plaintiffs should not be left to wonder why one administration thought their petition should be considered under both sets of rules, but a second one did not.'' I agree with Judge Coughenour.

It has been a long fight for federal recognition of the Duwamish people. During that time the Interior Department's rules for federal recognition of tribes have changed from the original regulations set in 1978 to those that were revised in 1994. There is significant evidence to support Duwamish recognition that is not included in the current record filed over twenty years ago.

I have asked the Secretary of the Interior, Sally Jewell, to look into this matter as I believe this bill will provide the federal recognition to which the Duwamish Tribe has long been entitled. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

RECOGNIZING LITTLE CAESARS LOVE KITCHEN'S 30 YEARS OF MAKING A DIFFERENCE

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great Michigan family-owned company, Little Caesars Pizza, on a very special anniversary in that company's history and the two wonderful people who started and built that company, Mike and Marion Ilitch. 30 years ago today, on April 30, 1985, Mike and Marion Ilitch started the Little Caesars Love Kitchen, which over the years has provided free meals to nearly three million homeless, hungry and displaced families. Since it provided its first free meal, the Little Caesars big-rig pizza kitchen on wheels has traveled to all 48 states in the continental U.S. providing fresh, hot pizza for the hungry, homeless, victims of natural disasters and terrorist attacks in more than 4,000 American cities.

Mike and Marion Ilitch created the Love Kitchen as a way to demonstrate their deep commitment to helping those in need by giving back to the communities in which it does business. Meals from the Love Kitchen are completely free of charge for everyone served. Local Little Caesars franchise owners and company regional offices donate all the food and labor costs that allows the Love Kitchen to assist those in need. The commitment to helping those in need extends far beyond the Ilitch family and evidence of that fact is that an estimated 50,000 Little Caesars franchise owners and employees have volunteered countless hours of their time over the years to support this program in their local communities. In addition to the local support and participation of franchisees, Little Caesars Enterprises contributes nationally and has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars per year to operate the program, including an investment of $350,000 in 2014 to launch a second Love Kitchen allowing them to double the number of people they can help.

The Little Caesars Love Kitchen works with local shelters and community leaders across this nation every day to feed the hungry and homeless. When communities are struck by disasters, you can be nearly certain that the Love Kitchen will be rolling into town to provide relief to victims and rescue workers. Just a few of the many examples are that the Love Kitchen has fed families after devastating tornadoes in Oklahoma and Alabama, provided hot meals after Hurricane Sandy and Hurricane Katrina and helped feed rescue workers in the aftermath of the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center and the bombing of the Alfred Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City.

I commend Little Caesars founders Mike and Marion Ilitch, their entire family, and the many Little Caesars workers and franchisees for their unwavering commitment to supporting and comforting those in communities across this nation at times of greatest need. I also want to applaud the leadership of the President and CEO of Ilitch Holdings Christopher Ilitch and Little Caesars President and CEO Dave Scrivano for their important work to continue Little Caesars legacy as an outstanding corporate citizen. I salute the Little Caesars Love Kitchen on the occasion of its 30th anniversary and thank everyone at Little Caesars for spreading love, kindness, and hope in so many communities across our great nation.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, today, April 30th, marks the 40th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War. As Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to honor more than 58,000 American service men and women who lost their lives in the war, to honor the Vietnam veterans, and to honor the Vietnamese armed forces who fought alongside us to defend freedom, liberty, and democracy.

Their sacrifices will never be forgotten.

However, just as we remember those brave men and women, we should also recognize the millions of Vietnamese refugees that arrived in the United States following the fall of South Vietnam. Uprooted in a refugee crisis of enormous proportions, these Vietnamese have become an integral part of our society.

I take great pride in representing a part of Orange County's thriving Vietnamese-American community, and I have witnessed the community's growth over the years. Having represented ''Little Saigon,'' I saw much of this growth up close.

I have seen the community grow not only economically but politically as well. Janet Nguyen—who as a five year old left Vietnam by boat—has risen to California State Senate in 2014. Her story of success exemplifies this generation of Vietnamese Americans.

I am sorry to say, however, that in the 40 years since the end of the Vietnam War, much work remains to be done. Political, religious and economic freedoms have been systematically squashed. This is a government that continues to deny citizens of Vietnam the right to change their government.

When I visited Vietnam, I saw firsthand the Communist Party's harassment of those Vietnamese citizens who decided to peacefully set forth dissenting political and religious views. When I met with the venerable Thich Quang Do and Le Quang Liem, I was immediately denounced by that Communist government.

The Vietnamese-American community has not lost sight of the struggle in their original homeland for freedom, for religious freedom, for freedom of speech, even for the right of young people to sit down in an Internet cafe and have a dialogue without censorship.

They are a part of this effort to make certain that those ideals stay alive so that in the same way that eastern Europe came to evolve into a democratic, market-oriented, tolerant society, that there will be that opportunity in the future for Vietnam.

RECOGNIZING APRAXIA AWARENESS

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to Childhood Apraxia of Speech, a speech and communication disorder that causes extreme difficulty in learning to speak, which can affect literacy and school performance. Often times, children with Childhood Apraxia of Speech require frequent and aggressive speech therapy to improve their ability to communicate. Sadly, the cause of this disorder is unknown. More progress must be made to understand this complex condition.

Fortunately, the Childhood Apraxia of Speech Association located in Pittsburgh, PA continues to work tirelessly to raise awareness about this condition and to provide support to families of affected children. Thanks to their hard work, great strides have been made toward educating the public, as well as local, state, and federal officials.

Children with apraxia and their families confront tremendous obstacles with determination and persistence. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing these individuals on Apraxia Awareness Day this May and in thanking the Childhood Apraxia of Speech Association for their important contribution to our community.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM LEWIS TROGDON

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize William Lewis Trogdon, also known as William Least Heat-Moon, an author and native Missourian who was recently awarded for his Distinguished Literary Achievement by the Missouri Humanities Council.

The Missouri Humanities Council (MHC) promotes humanities education and engages

the public in dialogue about important issues, bridging the gap between ideas and participatory democracy. Each year MHC recognizes Missouri authors producing exemplary literary works that make a significant contribution to our understanding and appreciation of Missouri's history and culture. Mr. Heat-Moon's body of work displays poignant accounts of traveling through rural America whether by car, boat, or foot with a particular emphasis on Missouri's local geography. His book Blue Highways: A Journey Into America records his trip through rural towns across 38 states, and was a New York Times Bestseller for 42 weeks.

As a former teacher, I understand the importance of arts and humanities education in shaping our understanding of history and culture. Again, I would like to congratulate Mr. Heat-Moon for his lifetime of literary achievements and his artistic contributions to the state of Missouri, and express my desire that other authors follow Mr. Heat-Moon's footsteps, exemplifying Missouri's culture in their literary and creative works.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, May 1, 2015*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. Lead us this day in Your ways that our Nation might be guided along the roads of peace, justice, and goodwill.

Grant strength and wisdom to our Speaker and the Members of both the people's House and the Senate, to our President and his Cabinet, and to our Supreme Court.

We thank You for the inspiration granted to the Members of this House, who have worked long hours in recent days to produce legislation which has been debated vigorously. May all their efforts issue forth to the benefit of our Nation and its people.

Bless them with rest and re-creation as they return to their home districts. Bless also all our mothers whom we celebrate in a special way in another week's time.

May all that is done within the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GUINTA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015, introduced by my friend and colleague, Chairman BILL SHUSTER.

Enacted in 1972, the Clean Water Act established a Federal-State partnership to protect our Nation's navigable waterways. The administration has maintained that the proposed Waters of the U.S. rule would have no impact on waters historically not under the Clean Water Act's jurisdiction and is needed simply to provide legal clarity.

While I agree that the boundaries of the Clean Water Act need to be better defined in statute, this proposal provides no such clarity or certainty, creating far more problems than it can solve. Conversely, rather than clarifying the law, the rule would actually create more confusion about where the law stops.

Back in March, the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, which I chair, held its second hearing to review the proposed rule and its impact on rural America. The various witnesses spoke loud and clear that the rule would have far-reaching and unprecedented impacts on permitting costs and regulatory uncertainty for land use activities, such as agriculture and forestry.

With the significant challenges already before farmers, ranchers, foresters, and landowners, there is too much on the line to continue down the path of nonsensical overregulation. The Corps of Engineers and the EPA must withdraw this rule, and go back to the drawing board.

HOLD THE VOTE

(Mr. HECK of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, next week we will be out of session and back in our districts, and many of us will be visiting small businesses, appropriately because it is National Small Business Week. We should visit small businesses; we should, frankly, whenever we are home.

Meanwhile, only 25 legislative days remain before a tool used and cherished by America's small businesses disappears. Only 25 more legislative days before this business tool for small businesses vanishes altogether. Only 25 more legislative days, and the Export-Import Bank will shut its doors to our Nation's small businesses unless we hold the vote.

Mr. Speaker, hold the vote. Hold the vote today. Hold the vote if you champion America's small businesses succeeding in global competition. The votes are here. Mr. Speaker, hold the vote.

HELPING GRANITE STATE FISHERMEN

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of New Hampshire's most historically important enterprise: our fishing industry. For nearly 400 years, our fishermen have provided the Granite State with a steady source of jobs and revenue. Their passion and livelihood is woven into the fabric of New England's rich heritage.

Today our fishermen face a host of challenges, most of which are due to the heavy hand of government intervention and regulation. Our government must help—not hinder—our State's fishermen.

That is why this week I join my colleague, Congressman BILL KEATING, from Cape Cod, to introduce H.R. 2106, a bipartisan bill to redirect more than $100 million in existing funds to programs of crucial importance to our fisheries, our fishermen, and the region at large.

Granite State fishermen deserve the resources and tools necessary to assist with their jobs, cope with government mandates, and increase their ability to put food on the table for millions of Americans around the United States. This bipartisan legislation represents

one step we can take to ensure this industry that is so important to the history of our State and our region and our country can last for another 400 years.

RECOGNIZING 2015 AS THE YEAR OF THE MILITARY DIVER

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize 2015 as the Year of the Military Diver, to honor the hard work and sacrifice of divers from all of our Nation's service branches.

Within north Florida's Second Congressional District is Naval Support Activity Panama City, the home of military diving in the United States. Today, led by Commanding Officer Hung Cao, the Naval Diving and Salvage Training Center at NSA PC is training the world's most advanced divers. I have seen firsthand how hard the men and women of our Armed Forces train at the diving center to keep our Nation safe, and today I would like to thank them for their service and officially recognize 2015 as the Year of the Military Diver.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2028.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2028.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 0910

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 57, line 11.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. For an additional amount for ''Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army—Investigations'', there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Departmental Administration'' is hereby reduced by, $2,500,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, before I start, I just want to thank the gentleman from Idaho, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies appropriations for all his exemplary work on this and allowing the open process to actually work. I know that my colleagues that have offered amendments appreciate the time that they have been able to do that, and I want to thank him for that.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. This amendment takes dollars out of the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., and puts it to work for the American people, helping ports and harbors like the Charleston Port in my home State of South Carolina do the important work necessary to begin the deepening of those harbors.

Last month, I had the pleasure of visiting the Panama Canal when I led a House delegation to the Summit of the Americas. The lock and dam system in that canal is being upgraded, and it was very interesting to see the work that they are doing there. Once that work is complete, larger ships will be able to come through the canal and deliver goods to and from Atlantic and Gulf ports along the eastern seaboard. This will be one of the key economic drivers in the 21st century.

If America is going to compete on the global stage, we need to be ready for this transformation. My amendment seeks to speed that readiness, helping to transform critical ports like Charleston's to the depth that will allow these bigger ships to navigate those harbors more often.

This amendment is about this House setting our government's spending priorities, just like every family does at home. We are rapidly approaching a $20 trillion debt, and we have a moral responsibility to use every tax dollar wisely.

I am grateful that my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations were able to negotiate this amendment to increase funding for vital infrastructure projects like the Port of Charleston and pay for it by forcing bureaucratic agencies to operate more efficiently. I urge the passage of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 0915

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. ROTHFUS of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 12 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

An amendment by Mr. LAMALFA of California.

An amendment by Mr. LAMALFA of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 172, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—232

Abraham	Brat	Comstock
Aderholt	Bridenstine	Conaway
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Cook
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Costello (PA)
Babin	Buchanan	Cramer
Barletta	Bucshon	Crawford
Barr	Burgess	Crenshaw
Barton	Byrne	Cuellar
Benishek	Calvert	Curbelo (FL)
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	Denham
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Dent
Black	Chaffetz	DeSantis
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	DesJarlais
Blum	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Bost	Cole	Dold
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Duffy
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—172

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—27

Amodei
Bass
Becerra
Buck
Clay
Crowley
Culberson
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Langevin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lummis
Payne
Pelosi
Rogers (AL)
Sarbanes
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Visclosky
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

□ 0957

Messrs. GARAMENDI, HANNA, JEFFRIES, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. VELA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. WALDEN, SHUSTER, and GRAVES of Louisiana changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 184, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—224

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zinke

NOES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel

Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—23

Amodei
Becerra
Buck
Clay
Crowley
Culberson
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Langevin
Lewis
Lummis
Payne
Pelosi
Rogers (AL)
Sarbanes
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1002

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 248, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

AYES—159

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zinke

NOES—248

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—24

Amodei
Becerra
Blum
Buck
Clay
Crowley
Culberson
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Langevin
Lewis
Lummis
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Sarbanes
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1006

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 183, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

AYES—228

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)

Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—183

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Amodei
Buck
Clay
Crowley
Culberson
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Langevin
Lewis
McDermott
Pelosi
Roskam
Sarbanes
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1010

Mr. TROTT changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chair, I was unable to vote on rollcall vote No. 211 because I was answering a question on the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall votes 208–211, I was unavoidably detained. If I had been present, I would have voted "no" on each of those votes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LA MALFA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 174, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

AYES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—174

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra

Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Amodei
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Clay
Crowley
Culberson
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Lewis
Roskam
Sarbanes
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1015

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 212, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 183, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

AYES—228

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—183

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Amodei
Buck
Clay
Crowley
Culberson
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Lewis
Maloney, Carolyn
Price (NC)
Roskam
Sarbanes
Smith (WA)
Vargas
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1018

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained this morning and unable to vote on rollcalls 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, and 213. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye''

on rollcalls 208, 209, 211, 212, and 213. I would have voted "no" on rollcall 210.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016''.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BERA. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bera moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2028 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

(1) ''WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES''.—Page 13, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

(2) ''POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION''.—Page 15, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

(3) ''ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY''.—Page 21, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of the worst drought we have ever experienced in California, in my home State, and across the Western United States. This is the fourth year of unprecedented drought conditions. Two-thirds of California is in extreme or exceptional drought. Almost twice the area as this time last year is experiencing exceptional drought. This is critical.

When I go back to my district and talk to farmers, small-business owners, individuals, they are worried; they are worried about what the summer is going to bring. We are about to enter the driest part of the year.

I have got a picture here. This is the Sierra Nevadas, one of the most beautiful regions in our country. When my wife and I first moved to northern California, we would scrimp and save so we could go on vacation and go skiing up here—beautiful snow. In fact, the 1960 Winter Olympics were held up here.

But it is not a recreational area. What the Sierra Nevadas mean to California, this is our biggest reservoir of water. The snow falls in the winter, and in the springtime you get this melt-off. It fills our reservoirs; it nourishes our farmers; it allows the fishermen to go fish the salmon in the Sacramento River. This is what a normal snowfall would look like.

But let's fast-forward to where we are today. There is no snow. The snowpack just last month was 5 percent of normal—the worst conditions that we have ever seen.

This is dramatic. What that means is our reservoirs are going to be empty. That means the farmers in central California are going to struggle to feed their crops. California's farms are the breadbasket not just of our Nation, but of the world; some of the most productive farms, incredibly important to our economy. But the water is not there.

Now, what we are asking for is not a lot. We face critical times here. These aren't Republican or Democratic issues, because a farmer or consumer doesn't look at drinking water or the water to nourish their crops as Democrats or Republicans. They are looking at their business, their livelihoods, their very existence. We are just asking for a small amount of emergency drought relief.

Now, in my own district, a large part of my population depends on drinking water from Folsom Lake. Do you want to see what Folsom Lake looked like 1 year ago? Dry. Dry to the bone. This should all be under water. We are not going to fill this reservoir because it depends on the snowmelt.

Now, these families are going to struggle. We are doing what we can to save water. We are doing what we can as consumers to better conserve. I know the farmers are stepping up to do what they can.

We are not asking for a lot, though, here. My colleagues will talk about increasing surge capacity. Great. Let's do that. But that is not going to relieve the impact of this summer. It is going to be devastating.

And it is not just my State. It is affecting Nevada. It is affecting Oregon. It is affecting Washington State. The funding that we are asking for is not just for California. All 50 States could ask for emergency drought relief to help families, to help businesses.

We have got to address this. The climate is changing. We have noticed now for 4 years we haven't had that snow. More of it is coming down as rain, so we have got to capture that rain. We certainly have to store it, and we have got to move that water to where we grow our foods.

But for this summer, in these emergency conditions, our families need relief. I am not asking for us to change the bill. I am asking for a bit of relief for families that are struggling. In fact, this will help them. It will help them get through it. It will help any of the 50 States plan for emergency conditions like this.

In addition, we are asking for a brief bit of funding to help us beef up our cybersecurity for our electrical grid. We are vulnerable here. Can you imagine what would happen if those that want to harm us attacked our electrical grid?

We are not asking for a lot. We are not asking for anything that is unreasonable here. We are Americans. Let's help each other. Let's do what is right. Let's amend the bill. Let's pass it, and let's provide relief for these families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks that the gentleman just made. It would have been helpful, if he was so concerned about the drought—which I am sure you are. I don't mean to imply that you are not. But it would have been helpful if you would have actually voted for some of the amendments that might have addressed the problem, like the McClintock amendment that just passed that said you can't take water and buy it and flush fish down the river when people need it.

The reality is this motion to recommit will not help with the drought conditions in California at all. There are only two things that will help relieve the drought. One of them we have no control over. It comes from a higher power. It is called rain and snow. We can't legislate that.

□ 1030

The second thing is that maybe we could start listening to some of the people who have been advocating to address this problem for several years—Congressman NUNES, Congressman CALVERT, Congressman VALADAO, Congressman MCCARTHY, Congressman MCCLINTOCK, Congressman LAMALFA. They have made real proposals that would require the operation of the complex California water system so that it considered the lives and jobs and families of people before it did fish.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment doesn't do anything. It won't help the drought conditions in California. We have already put money into the grid issue to try to make sure that we secure the grid so that it is not subject to attacks.

The other thing I would say is that this has been a balanced bill. We have got over 60 amendments we have considered from Members on both sides of the aisle. We have adopted many of them, and some of them have been rejected. It has been an open process. It has been the way Speaker BOEHNER has wanted the appropriations process to work so that all Members could work their will on the appropriations bills.

I don't need to go through the bill. What I would tell you is to reject this MTR and to support the underlying bill. Be happy, smile, and enjoy next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 235, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—180

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Amodei
Boyle, Brendan F.
Buck
Crowley
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Joyce
Lewis
Roskam
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1039

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 177, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—177

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Amodei
Buck
Crowley
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1044

Mr. ASHFORD changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 2015 I was absent for recorded votes No. 208–215. I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here: on rollcall No. 208 I would have voted ''no,'' on rollcall No. 209 I would have voted ''no,'' on rollcall No. 210 I would have voted ''no,'' on rollcall No. 211 I would have voted ''no,'' on rollcall No. 212 I would have voted ''no,'' on rollcall No. 213 I would have voted ''no,'' on rollcall No. 214 I would have voted ''yes,'' on rollcall No. 215 I would have voted ''no.''

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 21

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 21.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 1, 2015, TO TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 5, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

HONORING SHIRLEY VERDE AS VILLAGE OF PINECREST POLICE DEPARTMENT'S OFFICER OF THE FIRST QUARTER OF 2015

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize police officer Shirley Verde on being named the Village of Pinecrest Police Department's Officer of the First Quarter of 2015.

Officer Verde has consistently shown her commitment to her community and her fellow officers through her professionalism and dedicated service. She also has proven herself as an invaluable member of the Pinecrest police DUI enforcement program.

A perfect example: in the early morning hours of March 1 of this year, Officer Verde successfully and safely resolved a situation where an impaired driver was traveling in the wrong direction on heavily trafficked U.S. 1. There is no doubt that her quick and decisive actions saved many lives.

Officer Verde is incredibly worthy of this honor, and I thank her for her dedication and service to the people of my hometown, the Village of Pinecrest.

STEM TO STEAM RESOLUTION

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I introduced the STEM to STEAM Resolution. We all know how important science, technology, engineering, and mathematics is to our system of education, but it is also important that we recognize that art and design are critical and complementary to the traditional STEM fields. This is what my resolution accomplishes.

Art and design are key parts of the innovative process, and I urge all of my colleagues to keep this in mind as we consider education legislation. In classrooms and laboratories across the country, the innovative nature of art and design play an essential role in improving STEM education and advancing STEM research. In my home State,

the Rhode Island School of Design continues to be a leader in this field, and I commend their efforts to unlock our full creative potential.

STEAM is a strategy for investing in job creation and ensuring that we have the best educated and creative college graduates on the planet. It is wonderful to see a growing interest in STEAM, and I hope we can turn this energy into policy changes this Congress.

HONORING THE HARD-WORKING MEN AND WOMEN OF THE OIL FIELDS OF WEST TEXAS

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the hard-working men and women of the oil patches of west Texas. I have lived most of my life around those oil fields. I grew up in Odessa, Texas, where my dad was a roughneck. I have seen up close the hard work these good men and women do and the risks they face every day.

These individuals, from wildcatters to roustabouts and roughnecks and company men and women, have led the charge in the American energy revolution. Each has played an integral part in rewriting America's energy story and changing our Nation's course toward energy independence.

We have witnessed the impact of their strong entrepreneurial spirit and innovative technological advances that have grown our economy, created jobs, and bolstered our national security. We depend on their exhaustive and dangerous work to power our homes, pave our roads, fuel our cars, farm our lands, and everything in between that keeps this Nation running.

It is imperative that Congress support energy policies that are as adaptive and innovative as these hard-working men and women. Our policies must cut through bureaucratic red tape to encourage exploration here at home, reduce job-killing regulations, and repeal the antiquated crude oil export ban of a bygone era.

To that end, I am introducing H. Res. 243 that will pledge the House's support to these criteria. I hope my colleagues will join me in this show of support for a hard-working industry.

HONORING JANE PHIPPS FOR 30 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, in April 1985, Jane Phipps began her first job as a receptionist for the office of John Murtha at the age of 19.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jane Phipps for her 30 years of service to the United States House of Representatives. Jane Phipps has seen many historical and great Members move through the House of Congress here and has done a great job serving many Members honorably, but most of the time was spent working for Mr. Murtha for 25 years until he passed. After that, Jane continued her service with Congressman Mark Critz, and then she joined my office in 2013, which was my freshman year.

Jane is known in the office and around the House as someone who is very caring, very committed and passionate about her work, and she loves Maryland and knows so much about the history of the hometown where she is from. She has a great sense of humor and love of her family, including her father, who served honorably in World War II in the Marines.

I would like to take this moment to thank Jane Phipps for 30 years of service to the House and to personally thank her for all of her hard work for so many Members, including myself.

Our office has benefited greatly from her presence.

TOMORROW'S SOUTH DADE

(Mr. CURBELO of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the work being done to rejuvenate the South Dade neighborhoods in Florida's 26th Congressional District. Prepared by more than 300 residents and businesses, the plan entitled ''Tomorrow's South Dade'' is a community-driven effort to provide a vision for the future of the region over the next several decades.

South Dade has a rich history based in agriculture and military and is home to one of our country's great natural treasures, Everglades National Park. The leaders of Tomorrow's South Dade program have established nine committees to focus on different areas in which to strengthen the economy, including infrastructure, agriculture, and education.

I commend the bold leadership of Homestead Mayor Jeff Porter and Florida City Mayor Otis Wallace, and with the help of Bill Durquette of Homestead Hospital and Bob Epling of Community Bank of Florida, I am confident local government and businesses can work in unison for the betterment of our community.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress to promote Tomorrow's South Dade and ensure future generations have a community they are proud to call home.

REMEMBERING ROCHELLE TATRAI RAY

(Mr. JOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my deepest condolences and those of Florida's 13th Congressional District to the family and friends of Rochelle Tatrai Ray. No words can truly convey the loss that has been felt since Rochelle's most tragic passing.

Rochelle was the president and CEO of Gulf Coast Jewish Family & Community Services and had been with the agency for 12 years. She was responsible for managing the organization's 600 employees, working with 60 different programs, covering 32 counties of the State of Florida.

She worked tirelessly to help those with serious physical disabilities and impacted many families around the country as an advocate for children's mental health policies. She frequently spoke around the country to share her passion for the welfare of children.

Rochelle's life was tragically cut short in an abhorrent case of domestic violence last December. Rochelle was just 46 years old. I wish to honor the life of Rochelle, who is survived by her two daughters, Marisa and Selena; her parents, Louis and Gai Linn Tatrai; and her sisters, Dana and Gai Linn. Rochelle will be greatly missed, but her memory will live on through those she has touched and influenced throughout her life.

May God bless Rochelle Tatrai Ray; may God bless her family, and may God bless the family of Gulf Coast Jewish Family & Community Services.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF WILLCOX, ARIZONA

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the people of Willcox, Arizona, in my district, on their city's upcoming 100 years of incorporation on May 3.

Willcox is rich in history of the Southwest. Incorporated in 1915, the city was founded over 30 years earlier as a construction camp of the Southern Pacific Railroad. The railroad contributed greatly to Willcox's development as one of America's busiest ranching towns. In 1936, Willcox shipped more cattle directly from the range than any other shipping point in the U.S., and ranching is still an important part of that community today.

The city is the birthplace of Rex Allen, known as the Arizona Cowboy, and is home to the Headquarters Saloon, where the youngest of the fabled Earp brothers, Warren, was killed.

Today, the city lies at the heart of the region's blossoming wine industry, where three-quarters of all wine grapes produced in Arizona are grown.

Mr. Speaker, on this historic centennial, I congratulate the people of

Willcox on preserving this gem of the Old West and wish them many years of future success.

WE NEED TO DO MORE TO BUILD THE WATER SUPPLY FOR THE WEST

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this week, we made some important strides on water in the West, especially in the time of drought we have in California.

We need to do much more to build the kind of supply that is necessary to get out of the drought. Unfortunately, the bureaucracy doesn't reward that with slow permit process or even some of the things we had to battle this week, such as deferring more water for fish that isn't even in records of decision or been feasibly shown to be scientifically sound.

At the same time we have to curb the bureaucracy, we have to be positive moving forward with new storage projects, such as Sites Reservoir, such as other obstacles we have in the State of California and throughout the West to address this drought, not just take it to the ''church of climate change'' and think that is the whole problem.

We are going to have to be proactive, as we have been in previous generations.

□ 1100

FOSTER CARE MONTH

(Ms. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join President Obama in recognizing May as National Foster Care Month.

The goal of this special month is to raise awareness about the experiences of more than 400,000 youth in the foster care system and to recognize the essential work that foster parents, social workers, and advocates have in the lives of children in foster care throughout the United States.

Foster care was created as a temporary placement for children who have been abused or neglected. The act of removing a child, even from an abusive home, is traumatic; yet, even in the face of these challenges, the resiliency of foster youth remains strong.

For example, Maurissa, a young woman who spent most of her high school years in a residential facility in Los Angeles, was able to graduate high school with honors and go on to Oxnard College. It took Maurissa almost 10 years to complete community college. She explains: ''I was living on my own and working a minimum of 40 hours per week, and I had to take algebra nine times to pass.''

Maurissa struggled to get past her experiences but was able to find someone who believed in her. Dr. Adam Grudberg, a faculty member at the residential facility, encouraged her to reach her dreams.

When Dr. Grudberg died at the young age of 30, Maurissa knew she couldn't let him down. She went on to graduate from California State University with her undergraduate degree in psychology and then on to Harvard Graduate School of Education to receive her master's degree in human development and psychology.

In honor of Maurissa's courage and Dr. Grudberg's inspiration, I invite my colleagues to join the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth and cosponsor the bipartisan resolution in recognition of National Foster Care Month.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GUILLERMO OCHOA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of a beloved leader in the Ceres community, former Ceres City Councilmember Guillermo Ochoa. The beloved father, son, son-in-law, brother, and uncle died at the age of 54 on Monday, March 2.

Guillermo was born on August 29, 1960. He immigrated to Ceres, California, from Mexico when he was 9 and became an American citizen. He attended school in Ceres at Caswell Elementary School, Mae Hensley Junior High School, and Ceres High School.

After graduating from Ceres High in 1979, Guillermo attended Modesto Junior College and transferred to St. Mary's College of California. He earned a B.S. in business administration and economics from St. Mary's in 1984.

Over the course of 17 years, Guillermo was employed in an administrative capacity for several employers, including Campbell's Soup, Diamond of California, Yellow Roadway, and ConAgra Foods.

Guillermo became a dedicated public servant in 2005, when he was appointed to the Ceres City Council. He ran for a seat on the city council 2 years later and won, making him the first Latino immigrant to become an elected city councilmember in Ceres.

''Working and succeeding together'' was a slogan Guillermo lived by. He demonstrated his dedication to community service through the many committees, boards, and organizations he was a member of.

The list includes the Ceres Chamber of Commerce, the Society for Human Resources Management, the StanCOG Policy Board, the Tuolumne River Regional Park committee, the Mello-Roos joint powers authority board, the City-School Committees, the Ceres Partnership for Healthy Children Committee, the Howard Stevenson Memorial Committee, the Daniel Whitmore House Preservation Committee, and the Latino Community Roundtable. He also served as president and vice president of the Hispanic Leadership Council during various periods of his life.

He was a true servant to the public and a strong community leader. He motivated Ceres students to actively learn, working diligently with a Modesto group of students in an HLC organization called Hispanic Youth Leadership Council. The council has had a lasting impact on the educational success of students in both communities.

Although he was not reelected again in 2011, a few years later, he achieved his true dream of opening his own business, Garcia's Market, a new grocery store in Empire, California. To this day, Garcia's Market remains a vibrant testament to the economic vitality of the American free enterprise system.

One has to admire men like Guillermo Ochoa, who display consistent dedication to public service. He remained active in the community even after he was unseated from the city council.

Guillermo was once asked what sets him apart. His response was: ''My business and professional experience, as well as being a product of two diverse cultures, which helps me understand the issues that face our community as a whole.''

Guillermo has set a loving standard of humanity for us all to remember him by. Guillermo leaves behind his wife, Martha Ochoa; a daughter, Kimberly Ochoa; and a son, Christian Ochoa—each of them from Ceres, California.

Also from Ceres, he leaves behind his father, Guillermo Ochoa, Sr.; mother, Maria Ochoa; sister, Luz Ochoa; nephew, Alexis Ochoa; sister, Irma Ochoa; brother-in-law, Rosendo Ruiz; nieces, Kassandra Ruiz and Clarissa Ruiz; and nephew, Angel Ruiz.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing my very, very good friend for his unwavering leadership and many accomplishments and contributions to our community.

He had a genuine love for the people and community he worked so hard to help. We will have a long memory of him.

I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

SYRIAN ATROCITIES

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend a voice to the people of Syria, many of whom have been silenced by a cruel and oppressive dictator.

This very moment, 5,500 miles from this Chamber, in the country of Syria, innocent people are suffering under a regime bent on crushing freedom.

I met recently with a group of Syrian Americans in Charleston, West Virginia, my congressional district. Many of them have family members and loved ones in Syria. The stories I heard are alarming.

Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad is waging an all-out war against his own people, with one goal in mind, to muzzle any voice that speaks out in opposition to his regime.

People are suffering. Four out of five Syrians live in poverty. More than 200,000 people have been killed; 1 million have been wounded, and more than 3 million Syrians have fled the country.

Assad has shown that he will use any means necessary to maintain his dictatorship. He has rained down chemical weapons from the sky onto neighborhoods. He has dropped cluster bombs and barrel bombs into residential buildings occupied by women and children.

He has placed entire communities under siege, starving peaceful residents into submission. He has even bombed hospitals full of people recovering from his attacks.

I would now like to share a few stories that I have heard from my constituents, with whom I met just this previous Monday.

First, Dana Ashbani has family that lives in Syria. Several of her cousins were brutally killed by the Assad regime.

One summer night, in 2013, gunfire rang out in the streets of the neighborhood in which Dana's cousin lived. Fearing for her life, she grabbed her husband and her three young children and rushed toward a nearby basement for safety; but they were met by Assad's thugs and mercilessly gunned down, their bodies mutilated beyond recognition.

Dr. Rhagda Sahloul is an endocrinologist in Charleston. Her sister Dalia lives in Syria with her husband and their two children, Shahed and Omar, aged 7 and 11. Their town fell under siege by the Assad military in 2013.

The residents are running low on food and are surviving on a diet of dry noodles and, if they are lucky, vegetables that they grow on their rooftops and balconies. Without electricity, they have stripped their streets bare of trees to keep themselves warm on cold nights. No one even wants to think about next winter.

Recently, a foreign humanitarian organization dropped relief materials for the town, and Dalia's husband set up a marketplace in his home to facilitate the bartering of goods, but it didn't last long. The Assad regime bombed their home, destroying their little market and killing three people.

Dr. Khaled was an orthopedic surgeon in Aleppo before the conflict in Syria began, but he was forced to flee to Idlib, as he was targeted by the government. In Idlib, he worked in several field hospitals and witnessed numerous aerial attacks.

One of these attacks occurred on a new orthopedic center on the day of its opening in March 2013. The missile struck the hospital, killing one patient, injuring several people, and forcing the facility to shut down.

In June 2012, government forces entered Douma, a suburb of Damascus, and ordered everyone out of their apartments. Citizens were lined up and told to face the wall.

Mattessem, an 11-month-old baby at the time, was held by his mother, with his father and 10-year-old sister Fatima by her side. Fatima asked the soldiers to spare the life of her baby brother, offering $2, all the money she had in her pocket. The soldiers shot anyway.

As Fatima's father was shot, he fell onto Fatima, protecting her from the bullets. One bullet went through Mattessem and killed their mother. In a family of 25, only four survived.

These are just a few of the stories that I have heard, but they should be a call to action.

The Commander in Chief of our powerful military, President Obama, appropriately recognized the severity of the situation in Syria, drawing a red line at chemical weapons; but Assad has crossed that red line repeatedly, with impunity, and the President has failed to rise to the challenge. According to press reports, Assad's regime launched another chemical weapon on the Syrian people just this past week.

We need leadership from the President in the face of grave human rights violations in Syria, not faux red lines and empty threats. President Obama is not providing that leadership, and people in Syria are suffering because of it.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SUPREME COURT NEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this has been an interesting week, with all the activity here on the Hill. The Prime Minister of Japan came and spoke. He did a very admirable job. There has been a lot of activity across the street at the Supreme Court. It was rather interesting.

If you look at the history of the Supreme Court, until 1810 or thereabouts, the Supreme Court did not have a courtroom here in the Capital—or anywhere, really—and they often had to borrow a room from the House and Senate in order to have oral arguments.

They were thrilled on the Supreme Court in 1810 when the Senate Chamber on the second floor was open, what is now referred to as the Old Senate Chamber. The Senate moved up to that Chamber just straight down the hall out here, and the Old Senate Chamber downstairs was converted into a Supreme Court courtroom.

The Justices were thrilled. They were thrilled that they finally had their own nice courtroom. Now, it is not much more than a museum room. People can tour that room. There were some important decisions that were considered down there, some very poor decisions that were made in that room and some very good decisions that were made in that room.

One of them involved the Spanish ship the *Amistad*. It was a great movie. A guy who grew up in Longview, Texas, in my district, Matthew McConaughey, played the trial lawyer in the case.

□ 1115

Anthony Hopkins did a great job playing John Quincy Adams, and I commend that movie to anyone that cares to see it. I don't think as many people saw it as have seen McConaughey's other movies. He didn't take off his shirt in this one.

The basic story can be found in the likes of history books—unfortunately, not many that you can find in any school in America these days. But it was a very important case in establishing propriety in America.

There was a group of Africans who were captured by other Africans, taken to the coast of Africa, sold into slavery, put in chains, sailed across the sea to the Atlantic, to the Caribbean. There, this particular group of Africans was put on a Spanish ship called the *Amistad*.

After they sailed, the Africans were able to get free, take over control of the ship. They didn't know anything about sailing a ship like that and ended up landing in the United States, on the United States coast.

Immediately, the Spaniards began proclaiming that the Africans were their property. They were slaves. They were their property, as was the ship, and they wanted to take their ship. What they said were slaves, or were actually Africans, should have been free, but they wanted to go and leave with them. So there was a lawsuit.

It took a while to find someone who could speak the Africans' native tongue. Their version was a little different. They were minding their own business. They were free Africans, and that is what they wanted to be. They are not anybody's property. But fellow Africans had sold them into slavery, and they just wanted to be free like they started.

So the lawsuit went on. There were a couple of trials, some apparent improprieties in the process, but it made its way to the Supreme Court in the 1830s.

By that time, John Quincy Adams had become the first son of a former

President to be elected President. Someone told me it has happened since then, but he was the first son of a former President to be elected President. He had argued cases before the Supreme Court before, including just 2 or 3 years before he got elected President. In 1828, he was defeated, so he never got a second term.

Two years after that, he did, for a President, what was fairly unthinkable. He ran for the House of Representatives. No President has ever run for Congress before or since John Quincy Adams. But he had an abiding sense that he had a calling, like William Wilberforce in England, with whom he had corresponded, that like Wilberforce was doing in England, trying to fight to bring an end to slavery there and all the injustice that came with it, he had a calling to do that in America.

So he ran for the House of Representatives. He was elected nine times, beginning in 1830. So the little plaque where his desk was, just down the hall in the old House Chamber, says, 1831–1848. He had a massive stroke in 1848. But, over the course of his time in the House, he repeatedly filed bills to end slavery in America, to free specific slaves, and, at times, he made the Rules Committee furious because of the number of bills he filed.

When he was recognized, in essence, he would give a hellfire brimstone sermon about the evils of slavery and how could we expect God to bless America when we were treating brothers and sisters the way slaves were treated.

Well, he never got a win on any of his votes to end slavery, but in the 1830s, after the *Amistad* case made its way to the Supreme Court, he was eventually convinced to take over the case, to argue it before the Supreme Court. He had originally been reluctant, but decided that was something he should do, and so he did. He argued the case.

Back in those days, there was no limit on length of oral argument, and so he went on and on, not as long as the 3 days Daniel Webster took in one case, but over 1 day and another, and of course they broke for lunch and in the evenings. But before the oral arguments ended, one of the Justices died, so that kind of throws a kink in oral argument.

But on the last day in his argument, after having argued the law, tried to argue precedents, tried to argue the facts, he apparently didn't feel good about the Supreme Court's position. He didn't feel like they were with him.

Mr. Speaker, if you can put yourself in the place of John Quincy Adams, knowing how wrong slavery was and how we could never reach our potential as a nation if we continued the course of slavery, and yet knowing if you are not up to the job in this case, arguing before these Justices, nine and then eight, and you don't do a good enough job, then the Africans will remain in chains, and most likely their children, grandchildren will wear chains because you didn't do a good enough job as the attorney, so the pressure was immense.

You can find his oral argument online. We don't have days for that to all be recited. But you can find, toward the end of the oral argument—and I don't have it here before me. I don't have it verbatim. But the process he used toward the end might be offensive to some judges now. If somebody had done it before me, as a judge, it might have been offensive to me.

But he was desperate to convince the Justices to think carefully about what they were about to decide: whether free Africans, Africans that started as free Africans, should remain free Africans or whether they should be considered no more than property to the people that bought them from the Africans that sold them.

So his argument turned, right at the end, to a recitation of Justices who had been on the Court and who were no longer alive, saying, in essence, you know: Where is Chief Justice John Marshall? Where is this Justice, that Justice? He called them by name. He knew them. Through his father, through himself, personally, he knew the Justices, all those that had passed away. Then he called every one of their names.

He said: The solicitor general that last argued a case against me before this Court—this was back in the early twenties—where is he? He had passed away.

And he went on naming the names of Justices who had been on the Supreme Court and died, and then came around and he said: Even the Justice that started this case, where is he? He is not with us. They have all gone to meet their Maker, their Judge.

Then he said: The biggest thing about—the biggest question about their lives is, when they met their Maker, their Judge, did they hear the words, ''Well done, good and faithful servant?''

That was an argument before the Supreme Court. Like I said, that is not verbatim, but the question that he said was so critical about their lives was verbatim because he knew that came from Scripture that he believed with his heart, like the Apostle Paul is saying that he hoped that he would hear that, ''Well done, good and faithful servant.''

Now, he didn't go the extra step and insult the Justices by saying: Are you going to hear it if you die tonight? But the implication was very clear. And fortunately, not just for the Africans, but for people of conscience back in that day, the Supreme Court made a good decision, unlike what they did in the Dred Scott case, making an abysmal decision. But that was also heard and decided while the Supreme Court met in that same room that tourists—it is not as easy to go on the tour as it used to be throughout the Capitol, but you can see that courtroom where that occurred.

The Supreme Court did the right thing. They decided the free Africans should be free Africans—a good decision—that they were not anyone's property, that they did not have to leave in shackles. They are free Africans. They were free people. This actually goes right back to the Declaration of Independence, and the Founders believed that we were endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights and that we were created equal.

One of the great questions about those days was how even Thomas Jefferson, who had put in the Declaration of Independence, one of the longest grievances was actually King George having allowed slavery to exist in America, he, himself, had slaves.

But you get the gist. They understood it really was not a good thing. It didn't end up in the final draft of the Declaration of Independence, but it held our country back, because any country that treats people like that is going to never reach their potential as a country.

It is interesting, though, in our history, that if you go there in what's called Statuary Hall because all these statues have been placed in there now, but it was the House Chamber until the late 1850s, the place where they had church for the majority of the 1800s. Thomas Jefferson went to church in there most Sundays.

The guy that coined the phrase in a letter to the Danbury Baptist, separation of church and state, there should be a wall of separation, he saw it as a one-way wall, that the government should not interfere with religion and religious beliefs, but he thought it would be perfectly fine for religion to participate in government, and had no problem. He even brought the Marine Band just down the hall to play hymns on many occasions on Sundays. For many years, it was the largest Christian church in Washington, D.C. Right down the hall, in the U.S. Capitol, in the House of Representatives, is where they met.

James Madison, who gets so much credit in accumulating the provisions of the Constitution, he should know what the Constitution meant in the First Amendment that was to come. He saw no problem with coming to church in the U.S. Capitol each Sunday while he was President.

Congressional Research Service, when I inquired, they indicated that usually when Jefferson came to church here in the Capitol each Sunday, he would normally ride his horse. Madison, when he came to church each Sunday here in the Capitol, he would normally come up here in a horse-drawn carriage.

But that is part of our history. There was no way that any of those Founders

were ever going to try to interfere with the religious beliefs of, especially, Christians in America. That would have been unfathomable to them.

□ 1130

Yet that is the very thing that was being argued right across the street this week, that the government should be able to compel people with very strong religious beliefs, compel them to violate their most strongly held religious beliefs, and compel them basically to become slaves to the government and the nonbelief, the amoral beliefs of people who may be on the Supreme Court.

Now, I bring this up because, as you look at the history of the Supreme Court, you find that when the Senate moved at the beginning of their term in the year 1860, as they started that Senate year, they started it down the hall in the current Chamber where they are.

So in 1860, the Supreme Court moved up from the floor below to the beautiful old Senate Chamber, as it is called now, but it was actually the Supreme Court chamber from 1860 to 1935.

I think it was in 1931 the current Supreme Court building was built because before that, the Supreme Court got hand-me-downs for most everything. And, of course, after a decision like Dred Scott, they probably deserved nothing but hand-me-downs.

But nonetheless, our only President to have been President and also be on the Supreme Court, William Howard Taft, because of his political ties, he was in a position to seek and get funding for a new building. He didn't get to be Chief Justice in the new building.

But in a documentary that was done not too long ago—I was not aware—it pointed out that when the Justices of the Supreme Court were taken through this new Supreme Court building in 1935, showing them their new chambers, the new Court, many of them were appalled. They were shocked because it appeared to them to be a palace. They didn't even have a room for a while. Then they got the hand-me-down from the old, old Senate chamber. Then they got the old Senate. And now they are looking at a palace that they, as Justices, weren't supposed to have.

The documentary pointed out that there were some Justices who didn't move into offices for a long time because they just felt it was inappropriate for Justices in the United States of America to be in a palace.

Mr. Speaker, some may not be aware, but they are comfortable with the palace now, of course. But it was interesting that for a while, some of them felt that it looked too much like a palace, and it sent the wrong message.

When I was a judge, when I was a chief justice, we had many programs on ethics to teach, you know, what the general feeling on ethics was, what the rules are. And generally, if there was a case in which it appeared a justice had already made a decision in advance, that was a judge or a justice who should, in order to remain ethical, recuse themselves or recuse him- or herself.

Well, we have two Justices, I read, that had performed marriage ceremonies for couples that were the same sex. There could be no more clearer evidence that a Justice had decided whether or not same-sex marriage was appropriate when such Justice was performing that.

But one of the flaws in our Supreme Court justice system that only exists for the Supreme Court of the United States—no other court in the land has this problem—they have no one to whom anybody in America using the court system can appeal on ethical issues. Congress can impeach after the fact if something is done inappropriately. But, for example, if someone made a motion to recuse me as a judge, then I could hear it. But then that could be appealed to another judge, and there were methods of appeal.

But if you believe that a judge, or a Justice in the Supreme Court's case, making their views very clear that they have very strong feelings for same-sex marriage and that they believe it is perfectly appropriate before the case comes before them, and yet they decide, I am not doing anything unethical, should stay on the Court—because they have come so far from those days when they didn't even have a courtroom for about 21 years to where they now have a lovely palace—there is no one else that they allow an appeal to. They could set up a panel to make decisions about ethical issues.

But when you, as a Court, began replacing God with your own decisions, when you began to replace the laws of human nature with what you think the laws should be, then naturally you are not going to set up a panel that second-guesses your decision on ethics because you are the be-all and end-all for such decisions.

So it grieves me very much for our court system to have Justices who have made their positions very clear, sit on a case as if they hadn't, decide a case as if they are fair and unbiased, and then say this is justice in America.

We have badly regressed. The days of humility for some Justices are gone. There was a time when Justices had such a sense of humility that they thought this was a palace they should not be in. Those days are gone. There was a time when Justices could be embarrassed about such a horrendous decision, like Dred Scott. I fear those days are gone as well.

But they will make a decision, and they will decide either—I hope they decide that this is a decision for each State, that since the Constitution does not speak to the issue of marriage and the 10th Amendment makes very clear any power not specifically enumerated is reserved to the States and the people, that they will ensure that they are not the arbiters of morality in America any longer, at least not on this issue; that they will decide that they are not going to go so far as to condemn people who believe firmly in the teachings of the Bible, Old Testament and New Testament, people who believe in the Commandments; that the man depicted as the only full face in this whole gallery above these doors, the man who was considered the greatest lawgiver of all time when this was decorated in this way, Moses—that is the same Moses that, if you go into the Supreme Court and you are looking at the Supreme Court, and you are seeing them struggling to become God in their decisions about religion, if you look up at the marble wall above you, to the right, you will see Moses depicted, holding the Ten Commandments and looking down.

They will decide whether they are going to inject themselves and tell people what the Pilgrims heard in Europe, what Christians heard around the world who came to America so they would not be persecuted as Christians. They will tell America very clearly: We don't care what your religious views are. This Supreme Court is going to decide that we are going to prohibit the free exercise of religion because we are more important, and our views are more important than the clear language of the First Amendment when it says that the government will not prohibit the free exercise of religion.

Well, we will find out. I hope and pray that the Supreme Court has a time of humility; that their hearts are touched to the point that they will not decide that the Pope is an idiot, that they, as the popes of America, know what is best for the people, more than any religious leader in the country, that they will substitute their judgment for those of the Bible.

It is kind of hard to get around Romans 1, if you really believe the New Testament.

Nonetheless, that decision is coming. Mr. Speaker, I am truly hopeful that Americans will realize the seriousness of this decision and the ultimate breakdown that it will be. And I hope we don't degenerate in this country into more violence.

But we see what happens around this country when we don't even want God mentioned anywhere, even though, for this country's history, the Bible has been the most quoted book right here in this Chamber, the Chamber down the hall, the most quoted book ever in our government's history.

So when I am talking like this on the floor, we usually get calls from people that are going berserk, how dare him mention God.

Just in the last week or two, I have quoted from Abraham Lincoln, who wrote an official United States Government proclamation, begging, imploring the people to have a time of prayer, humility, and fasting. And in the proclamation, he makes clear that the problem at that point, as slavery was a huge problem, the Civil War was ongoing at the time of this proclamation. But he knew those were symptoms of what happens when you turn from the religious morality of the Bible. And he said, We have forgotten God.

I hope the Supreme Court will not, once again, inject themselves as gods but that they will observe the true meaning of the First Amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1145

THE COURAGEOUS LADY FROM BALTIMORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, within the last hour or so, there was a decision by the Baltimore City State's Attorney Marilyn Mosby in the investigation of the death of Freddie Gray, a Black man who died under questionable circumstances; circumstances that kind of made us all wonder where the truth lies; circumstances that cause young people and others to take to the streets across this Nation; circumstances that brought into a sharp, bright light the question of justice in America, the question of police misconduct in America, the question of mayhem in America, the question of poverty in America, and the question of bias in America.

Freddie Gray's murder, Freddie Gray's death, and the questionable circumstances around his death brought into sharp relief all of these issues of race and living in an urban center—brought into sharp relief, Mr. Speaker, 50 years or more of abject, determined, and callous disinvestment in our urban areas, 50 years or more of joblessness, bad schools, bad housing, bad health care, and 50 years of hopelessness.

In the last few minutes, Mr. Speaker, this brilliant, young, African American woman, Baltimore City State's Attorney Marilyn Mosby, made a decision; and she decided that, yes, notwithstanding all the differences of opinion, the changed stories, the moving target, notwithstanding all of these things that happened, she decided that Freddie Gray was murdered—Freddie Gray was murdered—and that she would indict the police officers who were responsible.

By indicting the Baltimore City police officers who were responsible for Mr. Gray's murder, she made a giant, enormous step for justice for young people, young African American men and women, young people who live in our urban areas.

By her decision today, just a few moments ago, she has done this Nation an invaluable service, especially for young people, especially for the African American and other minority youth. These young people have, for decades now, sought and yearned for justice as it relates to police misconduct, police brutality, and, yes, police murder.

This new standard for justice is a standard that now transcends Baltimore and transcends even the entire State of Maryland. It transcends and it reaches to other points all across this Nation—Ferguson, New York City, Chicago, Cleveland, and other places all throughout this country.

Mr. Speaker, as an African American male who represents the South Side of the city of Chicago, I know firsthand about police misconduct, police mayhem, and police murder.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that, in my 68 years living mostly in the city of Chicago, I have never seen the wheels of justice move so profoundly, so pointedly, and so purposefully as I have witnessed with Baltimore City State's Attorney Marilyn Mosby's actions.

She has raised all kinds of standards. She has captured the imagination of all of us who fight for justice, who want to see justice delivered in the true American way, and who want to see an end to all the machinations, excuses, turning away, and closing our eyes to police misconduct in our urban areas.

This wonderful, courageous, young city State's attorney has raised the standard for prosecutors all across our great Nation. She has raised the standards for mayors, chiefs of police, and other law enforcement officials. She has raised the standard for even those who are in this body. Open your minds, open your eyes, and see the truth.

Let me just say right now, Mr. Speaker, that the police officers of this Nation, the overwhelming majority of them, are good, hard-working defenders of the community. They are not lawbreakers. They are there to serve and protect.

We honor them, and we lift them up; but there are a few who think that they can get away with all kinds of illegal actions just because they can get away with it because the system has a tendency and a habit of rising to protect even those who violate not only the laws of the Nation, but the spirit of the laws of this Nation, these laws that keep this Nation together, these laws that make us have an identity as one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

These police officers, this minority of those on the urban police forces across this Nation, these are the ones that abrogate the Constitution, short-circuit our Constitution, short-circuit our quest for justice, our appeal for justice, our right for justice, and short-circuit those just for their thrill of the moment.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, being handcuffed and leg-cuffed, laying down facedown in the back of a paddy wagon driven not accidentally recklessly, determined by those police officers who were driving, who had him in custody, to maim, harm, and brutalize him, different speeds driven by the driver of that van, tossed about because of sudden stops?

You are in the back of a paddy wagon, handcuffed and leg-cuffed, and these police officers are getting a thrill out of tossing you around in a steel-encased paddy wagon, not caring about the broken parts of your body that might occur, not caring about whether you really live or die, not even caring about their oath that they were sworn to when they were hired and when they took that oath to serve and protect.

All those things became secondary to their thrill of seeing how much havoc and harm they could cause to this Black man in Baltimore. Yeah, they thought they would get away with it, that no one would even think to question their decisions, their thrill-seeking, their conduct.

Thank God there is a woman in Baltimore who said to them, to all the police officers who are like minded such as them, said to this Nation: No more. No more, not this time. You are going to be indicted, and you are going to be charged, and that is the way it is.

Grieving mothers, Mr. Gray's mother, his father, his relatives, his loved ones, his friends, and his neighbors can all now say that there will be justice for Freddie Gray. I said, in Chicago, there will be justice for Freddie Gray. From this Nation's borders, young people are rejoicing now. The day is soon to be justice for Freddie Gray.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Mosby's actions, her courage, her dedication, her commitment, and her decisiveness have spoken to the idea that is creating this movement for justice all across this Nation.

□ 1200

She has very clearly and profoundly and without hesitation spoken to all of us, to this Nation. Her actions have shouted out that Black lives do matter, that Black lives do matter, that all lives in America matter, and that Black lives matter also.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 5, 2015, at 11:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1348. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Kenneth E. Floyd, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1349. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Accomack County, VA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8379] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1350. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Minority and Women Inclusion Amendments (RIN: 2590-AA67) received April 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2014 Medical Device User Fee Financial Report required by the Medical Device User Fee Amendments of 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1352. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Communications Reliability Standards [Docket No.: RM14-13-000; Order No.: 808] received April 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1353. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Australia, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-26; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1354. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Australia, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-22; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1355. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to India, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-15; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1356. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed items to two different end users in the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to Sec. 1512 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-261), as amended by Sec. 146 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-277), and the President's September 29, 2009, delegation of authority (74 Fed. Reg. 50,913 (Oct. 2, 2009)); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1357. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List [Docket No.: 150318286-5286-01] (RIN: 0694-AG58) received April 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1358. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Sec. 804 of the Palestine Liberation Organization Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 (Title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246)), as amended, and Secs. 603-604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002) and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 (''the Act'', Pub. L. 107-228); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243) and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), for the December 15, 2014 to February 13, 2015 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1360. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to Congress within sixty days in accordance with the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1361. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-129; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1362. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-142; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1363. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-148; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1364. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1365. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1366. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1367. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1368. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1369. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1370. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1371. A letter from the Counsel to the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, United States v. White, No. 14-7031, 2015 WL 1516385 (10th Cir. Apr. 6, 2015); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1372. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; (H. Doc. No. 114–32); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1373. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 114–33); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1374. A letter from the Chief Impact Analyst, Regulation Policy Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Driving Distance Eligibility for the Veterans Choice Program (RIN: 2900-AP24) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1375. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 115th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in St. Louis, Missouri, July 20-23, 2014; (H. Doc. No. 114–31); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1376. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting notification of the Commission's March 18, 2015

public hearing on ''Looking West: China and Central Asia'' pursuant to the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act, amended by Pub. L. 109-108, Sec. 635(a) and amended by Pub. L. 113-291, Sec. 1259 B; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1890. A bill to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–100, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1891. A bill to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Rules and the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1890 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 2195. A bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to eliminate exceptions to the limitations imposed on the authority of the Secretary of the Army to take certain actions in connection with the transfer of AH-64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 2196. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the limit on the length of an agreement under the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 2197. A bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JONES, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2198. A bill to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the rental of motor vehicles that contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 2199. A bill to require the Department of Homeland Security to improve discipline, accountability, and transparency in acquisition program management; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 2200. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2201. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to establish a committee of the National Security Council on hostage recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on greenhouse gas emissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 2203. A bill to remove the Kosovo Liberation Army from treatment as a terrorist organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2204. A bill to clarify the authority of States and political subdivisions thereof to regulate liquefied petroleum gas rail transload facilities that are owned or operated by or on behalf of a rail carrier; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 2205. A bill to protect financial information relating to consumers, to require notice of security breaches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCCAUL, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 2206. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require recipients of State Homeland Security Grant Program funding to preserve and strengthen interoperable emergency communications capabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California (for herself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 2207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the dollar limitation on contributions to flexible spending accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2208. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 2209. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as level 2A liquid assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 2210. A bill to prohibit the use of funds provided for the official travel expenses of Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the legislative branch for airline accommodations which are not coach-class accommodations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 2211. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to high priority corridors on the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 2212. A bill to take certain Federal lands located in Lassen County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Susanville Indian Rancheria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2213. A bill to provide for a temporary safe harbor from the enforcement of integrated disclosure requirements for mortgage

loan transactions under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 and the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 2214. A bill to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with private physicians to conduct medical disability examinations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 2215. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to broaden an exemption to the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of that Act for certain seasonal workers in national parks and forests; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2216. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2217. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to promote trauma-informed practices, age-appropriate positive behavioral intervention and support, services for young children who have experienced trauma or toxic stress, and improved coordination between Head Start agencies and other programs that serve very young children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2218. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to set-aside community development block grant amounts in each fiscal year for grants to local chapters of veterans service organizations for rehabilitation of, and technology for, their facilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 2219. A bill to ensure that individuals who are in an authorized job training program or completing work for a degree or certificate remain eligible for regular unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2220. A bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 2221. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the allowance of a deduction to Members of Congress for ordinary and necessary business expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2223. A bill to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2224. A bill to establish a pilot program to promote public-private partnerships among apprenticeships or other job training programs, local educational agencies, and community colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a temporary dividends received deduction for repatriated foreign earnings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 2226. A bill to authorize appropriations for assistance under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2227. A bill to minimize the economic and social costs resulting from losses of life, property, well-being, business activity, and economic growth associated with extreme weather events by ensuring that the United States is more resilient to the impacts of extreme weather events in the short- and long-term, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 2228. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the personal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2229. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently modify the limitations on the deduction of interest by financial institutions which hold tax-exempt bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for amounts contributed to disaster savings accounts to help defray the cost of preparing their homes to withstand a disaster and to repair or replace property damaged or destroyed in a disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2231. A bill to transform neighborhoods of extreme poverty by reforming the public housing demolition and disposition rules to require one-for-one replacement and tenant protections, and to provide public housing agencies with additional resources and flexibility to preserve public housing units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2232. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to condition receipt by States (and political subdivisions and public entities of States) of preventive health services grants on the establishment of a State requirement for students in public elementary and secondary schools to be vaccinated in accordance with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the 1915 Panama-California Exposition and the establishment of Balboa Park in San Diego, California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H. Res. 243. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representative in respect to promoting a strong national energy policy that supports the innovative and hard-working men and women in the oil and gas industry who have led the charge in a United States energy revolution; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. FARR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESTY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. NUGENT):

H. Res. 244. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2015 as ''Mental Health Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H. Res. 245. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that domestically grown flowers support the farmers, small businesses, jobs, and economy of the United States, enhance the ability of the people of the United States to honor their mothers on Mother's Day, and that the White House should strive to showcase domestically grown flowers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BLUM, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H. Res. 246. A resolution honoring the vital role of small business and the passion of entrepreneurs in the United States during ''National Small Business Week'', beginning on May 4, through May 8, 2015; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 247. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that adding art and design into Federal programs that target the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields encourages innovation and economic growth in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H. Res. 248. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should initiate preparatory work to begin negotiations to enter into a free trade agreement with Tunisia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H. Res. 249. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 2015 as ''Health and Fitness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BABIN, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. WALKER):

H. Res. 250. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should pass no law that would exempt from its obligations or provide any other special consideration to elected or appointed Federal officials or any other Federal employee; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

26. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate Memorial No. 3, requesting that Congress repeal the marriage penalty for people with disabilities and others who rely on supplemental security income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 2195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18- To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constituion.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution that the Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers nested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

The Congress shall have Power ***

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California:

H.R. 2207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is constitutionally appropriate pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 (the Spending Clause).

The Supreme Court, in South Dakota v. Dole (1987), reasoned that conditions and limitations on funds were constitutional and within the power of Congress under the Spending Clause.

Thus, conditioning the use of federal funds in order to direct appropriate spending goals and purposes are constitutionally permissible. As the spending is national in scope and pertains to all employees in the Legislative Branch, and the conditions are clear, the limitation is constitutional.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 2211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 2212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, as this legislation regulates commerce with foreign nations, between the states, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 2213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which allows Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states. Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 provides Congress and the President with the power to codify bills into law. Therefore, Congress has the implicit right to modify or repeal any codified law with new legislation.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 2214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 2215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause under Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 2221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States:''

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 2223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 2228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United Stastes; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PERRY, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 91: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 114: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 131: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 160: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 167: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 169: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 184: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 197: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 235: Mr. RUSH, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KIND, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BARR, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 250: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 266: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 292: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 379: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 381: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. YOHO, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 382: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 427: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 465: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 466: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 597: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 616: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 686: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 702: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 711: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 721: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 742: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 793: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 799: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 817: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 825: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 855: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 880: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 893: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. YOHO, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MESSER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. REED, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 918: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 921: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 928: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 973: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 985: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 986: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BOST, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 997: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1000: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1002: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1019: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1037: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1096: Mr. OLSON and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1101: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1142: Mr. GIBSON, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 1159: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1170: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1190: Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COLE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1197: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1209: Mr. POCAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1210: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1233: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LATTA, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1258: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 1270: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1284: Mr. POLIS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1288: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 1289: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1300: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1309: Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 1322: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1378: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1389: Mr. ROSS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1462: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1486: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 1504: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 1519: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 1549: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1576: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1578: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1608: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1610: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1618: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1622: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1624: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1655: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1680: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1701: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1717: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1721: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. LEE, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1733: Mr. COHEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1734: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1758: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1784: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1800: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1844: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 1845: Mr. TONKO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1877: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1886: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1893: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 1894: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1900: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1901: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1910: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1926: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1941: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1942: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HIMES, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1971: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1981: Mr. COOK, Mr. NUNES, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MILLER of FLORIDA, and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1994: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2008: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2031: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2051: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 2058: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2059: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. NEAL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MICA, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2181: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2192: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 140: Mr. BABIN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 154: Mr. NEAL.
H. Res. 157: Mr. KIND.
H. Res. 178: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FARR, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Res. 184: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 185: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 209: Mr. SALMON.
H. Res. 233: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SIRES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HARPER.
H. Res. 240: Ms. LOFGREN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

8. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Warren City Council, Ohio, relative to Resolution No. 4585/15, urging the Congress, and in particular the Ohio Congressional delegation, to vote against Fast Track Legislation; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 1, April 30, 2015, by Mr. HECK of Washington on the bill H.R. 1031, was signed by the following Members: Mr. Heck of Washington, Ms. Maxine Waters of California, Ms. Moore, Mr. Hoyer, Mr. Tonko, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. Hahn, Mr. McNerney, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Hastings, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Takano, Mrs. Torres, Mr. Crowley, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. DelBene, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Pelosi, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Peters, Mr. Walz, Mr. Yarmuth, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Levin, Mr. Hinojosa, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Himes, Mr. Loebsack, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Becerra, Ms. Kuster, Ms. Sinema, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Lynch, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. Ashford, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Veasey, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Matsui, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Rush, Mr. Clay, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Ms. Esty, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Ben Ray Luján of New Mexico, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Sires, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Takai, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Ms. Meng, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Butterfield, Ms. Edwards, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. Bass, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Vargas, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Deutch, Ms. Bonamici, Mrs. Napolitano, Mrs. Lawrence, Ms. Titus, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Honda, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Foster, Mr. Farr, Ms. Schakowsky, Ms. Lee, Mr. Courtney, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Israel, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Schiff, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Kennedy, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Ms. Adams, Mr. Delaney, Ms. Castor of Florida, Ms. Pingree, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Keating, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Polis, Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Bera, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Carney, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Meeks, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Huffman, Mr. O'Rourke, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Murphy of Florida, Mr. Kind, Mr. Sherman, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Engel, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Kildee, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Welch, Mr. Cummings, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Grijalva, Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Mr. Vela, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Ellison, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Gutiérrez, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Ms. Brown of Florida, Mr. Payne, Mr. Costa, Mr. Richmond, Mr. DeSaulnier, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Ms. Velázquez, and Mr. Fattah.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE CAREER OF JAN ALDERTON

HON. JOHN K. DELANEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and honor Mr. Jan Alderton, Managing Editor at the Cumberland Times-News, for his incredible career and his retirement after nearly 48 years of journalism.

Jan started at the Cumberland News in 1967 as a proofreader. Eventually, he worked his way through almost every newsroom position. From his coverage of the Maryland General Assembly in the 1970s, to his work as a sports reporter, Jan showed true commitment to his craft, and worked hard to publish the best stories each day.

In 1987, Jan was named Managing Editor of the Times-News for the first time. There, Jan strived to make sure readers of the Times-News had access to breaking stories and the best reporting. His service to the people of Allegany County will be dearly missed.

Local journalism, like that at the Cumberland Times-News, provides a critical service for communities nationwide, highlighting events that aren't covered elsewhere. When it comes to reading hometown news, there's only one place to find it, and that's your hometown paper.

I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues help me in honoring Mr. Jan Alderton, for his dedication to honest reporting and his commitment to the people of Cumberland. Let's wish Jan a happy and healthy retirement.

RECOGNIZING HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS, FLORIDA

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Howey-in-the-Hills, Florida as the town celebrates its 90th anniversary. Howey-in-the-Hills is a small town with deep roots in the Florida citrus industry.

Howey-in-the-Hills' rich history began in 1916 with the purchase of 60,000 acres of land in Lake County by William John Howey. With a vision to build a citrus empire, Mr. Howey planted citrus on the majority of his land, and in 1921 he built Florida's first citrus plant. To serve as the commercial hub for the citrus industry, Mr. Howey founded Howey in 1925. A landscape with rolling hills and beautiful lakes, Mr. Howey nicknamed the area 'the Florida Alps' and in 1927 he officially changed the name to Howey-in-the-Hills to better characterize the natural beauty of the community.

Today, Howey-in-the Hills remains a beautiful, scenic small town. Situated on the picturesque shores of Little Lake Harris and dotted with many smaller bodies of water, the town has developed itself into a resort town with the acclaimed Mission Inn Resort and Club. Howey-in-the-Hills is truly a gem worth discovering in Central Florida.

I congratulate Mayor Chris Sears, Mayor Pro-Tem John Ernest, Councilors Joseph Mabry, Ed Conroy, and David Nebel, and most of all, the people that live and work in Howey-in-the-Hills. It is truly an honor to serve the residents of Howey-in-the-Hills, and I thank them for their tremendous contributions to the Central Florida community.

IN RECOGNITION OF GOLIAD, TEXAS AND CINCO DE MAYO

HON. FILEMON VELA
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the upcoming 153rd anniversary of Cinco de Mayo. In May I will join my constituents in Goliad, Texas, to celebrate Cinco de Mayo. The holiday has come to represent a day of celebration of Mexican culture around the world.

Goliad, Texas is the birthplace of the young Mexican general, and the hero of Cinco de Mayo—Ignacio Seguin Zaragoza. He initially studied for priesthood, yet took up arms in defense of his country when Mexico slid into the War of the Reform. As the conflict came to a close in the late 1850s, General Zaragoza joined federalist troops with the legendary Benito Juarez and fought in numerous battles, including the Battle of Calpulalpan, which ended the War of the Reform. His strategic acumen in those four years led to his rapid promotion to general.

After the war, Mexico's European debt suffocated the economy, forcing then Mexican President Benito Juarez to declare a moratorium on debt payments. In retaliation, Spain, England, and France sent their fleets and forced the surrender of Veracruz, Mexico. President Juarez sent one of his generals to Veracruz in response. When that general observed the forces of the great European powers displayed in front of Veracruz, he resigned. President Juarez turned to General Zaragoza to lead the fight.

The Spanish and English withdrew their forces after negotiations with President Juarez, but the French army, arguably the best during that time, marched on to Mexico City. The intent was to conquer Mexico, join forces with the Confederate Army, and attack the Union. However, General Zaragoza stopped this invasion, in Puebla, Mexico.

The Battle of Puebla lasted most of May 5, 1862. Despite a severe imbalance in forces, the Mexican army held. General Zaragoza was lauded on his return. Later, while visiting his own sick troops, he contracted typhoid fever and died on September 8, 1862, at the young age of 33. He was honored with a state funeral, and three days later, President Benito Juarez declared May 5, or Cinco de Mayo, a national holiday.

Citizens of Goliad maintain a rich cultural heritage, and are fiercely proud of their legacy. Today, festivities center around Zaragoza Plaza, which is located adjacent to the birthplace of Ignacio Seguin Zaragoza. The Texas Legislature has designated this beautiful plaza as the official celebration site for Cinco de Mayo so that future generations may understand its historical significance.

IN HONOR OF WARREN WEINSTEIN

HON. SAM FARR
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the tragic death of Warren Weinstein, a U.S. development worker who was held captive by Al Qaeda from 2011 until 2015.

Last week, we learned that Mr. Weinstein was an accidental victim of a U.S. drone strike that took place in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region in January of this year. This tragedy has deprived a family of their loving husband, father, and grandfather, and it has deprived our country of a tireless champion of human rights and economic development among some of the world's poorest populations.

Warren Weinstein dedicated over 40 years of his life to international development work. Throughout his career, he worked with vulnerable populations throughout Africa and South Asia. He served as Peace Corps country director in Togo and the Ivory Coast. Most recently, he spent 10 years working on economic development projects as an adviser to J.E. Austin Associates, a U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) contractor, in Pakistan.

Mr. Weinstein's life and approach to development work showcased the ideals of the institutions that he served: USAID, the Peace Corps, and others. He left the comforts of home and dedicated his career to improving the lives of others in countries that were not his own. He spoke seven languages and immersed himself in the local culture of the countries in which he worked. By all accounts, he had a warm, outgoing personality and a deep commitment to solving some of the world's most difficult problems.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in offering our deepest condolences to Mr. Weinstein's family and friends, especially his wife Elaine, their daughters Alisa and Jennifer, and their families. His legacy will live on

in Pakistan, Togo, the Ivory Coast, and the entire range of countries in which he worked, and his service to our country and the world will never be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO MATTHEW CHOW, MINKU LEE, AND HELEN WU MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL YOUTH ORCHESTRA OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Matthew Chow, Minku Lee and Helen Wu on being selected to represent the United States in New York City and seven cities in China this summer as part of the National Youth Orchestra of the United States of America.

Each year, Carnegie Hall selects the most talented young musicians from across our country to assemble an orchestra which shares music with the world. In 2015, the National Youth Orchestra will consist of 114 members and three of them are from the 18th Congressional District of California which I'm privileged to represent.

Matthew Chow, a violist from Los Altos, Minku Lee, a cellist from Palo Alto, and Helen Wu, a violist from Saratoga, are three of the nation's finest young musicians selected to play for the National Youth Orchestra. That each of them were selected is a testament to their superb skills. That a congressional district would produce more than one orchestra member is extraordinary. After training and performing in New York City, Matthew, Minku and Helen will represent the United States this summer, performing in seven cities in China. Each musician is a source of great pride to their families, their schools, their teachers, our entire community and their Congresswoman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Matthew Chow, Minku Lee and Helen Wu on their extraordinary accomplishments. I congratulate and wish each of them every success as they perform with the National Youth Orchestra in New York City and China, proudly representing the best of the United States of America.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LORTON COMMUNITY ACTION CENTER AND IN HONOR OF FOUNDER'S AWARD RECIPIENT MOLLY LYNCH

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 40th Anniversary of the Lorton Community Action Center and join the Center in honoring this year's Founder's Award recipient, Molly Lynch.

Since 1975, Lorton Community Action Center (LCAC) has served the residents of Fort Belvoir, Lorton, Newington, and other portions of southeast Fairfax County by providing access to basic needs and the opportunity to empower themselves through self-sufficiency programs.

LCAC began as an all-volunteer organization, working out of a local school and a church basement. The organization was founded in response to the needs of low-income families in southeast Fairfax, which was an under-served area. For LCAC's first 15 years, the agency served as a resource for information and collected and distributed food for individuals and families. Today, LCAC has a professional staff of five full-time and five part-time employees, who serve a diverse population of ages and ethnic backgrounds.

LCAC aims to break the cycle of poverty and prevent homelessness through a variety of services and programs. LCAC's food program distributes between eight and ten tons of food every month. Clients who need clothing can shop at Lorton's Attic, LCAC's thrift store. Small grants assist families with utilities, rent, mortgage, medical services, and other essential needs.

When LCAC cannot help directly, it works closely with other agencies and organizations in our area that may be able to provide assistance. Perhaps most important, LCAC helps people achieve self-sufficiency through case management, ESL classes, nutrition classes, pro bono legal services, and tutoring. All this would not have been possible without the dedication of time, talent, and resources by the thousands of community volunteers and supporters.

Molly Lynch served on LCAC's Board from 1981–82 and again from 1991–2003. Mrs. Lynch was a part of the all-volunteer organization that operated out of a small building on Gunston Elementary School property in her early board service, providing a variety of much needed services to families in the Lorton community. When Molly rejoined the board in 1991 she helped LCAC pursue new funding opportunities through participation in the Combined Federal Campaign, United Way giving, and Fairfax County Community Funding Pool grants. In 2011, a generous gift from Molly and her husband, Bill, allowed LCAC to open a 2,000 square-foot pantry that doubled LCAC's space and consolidated food operations from five locations to one.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending the staff, volunteers, supporters, and partners of LCAC for 40 years of assistance to the Lorton community's most vulnerable residents and in thanking Molly Lynch for her dedication to helping our neighbors in need.

RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOUTHEAST ASIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution that recognizes and celebrates the 40th Anniversary of the Southeast Asian American community in the U.S.

Over the past 40 years, Southeast Asian Americans have become an integral part of the social and economic fabric of our country.

They left war-torn nations, tyrannical regimes, and even genocide, to make better lives for themselves and their children.

Today, over 2.5 million Southeast Asian Americans trace their heritage to Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.

In these four decades, they have contributed to our armed forces, arts, business, and politics.

In fact, I have seen firsthand their enormous impact in my own district of Silicon Valley.

This resolution honors their struggles in coming to America, and thanks them for all they've done—and continue to do—for our country.

H.R. 2028 AND H.R. 2029

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.R. 2028, the FY16 Energy and Water Appropriations Act and H.R. 2029, the FY16 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, because they failed to provide funding for programs that help our veterans, protect the environment, and grow a clean energy economy. We should be able to do better than this.

The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill is usually something that we can all find common ground on—the importance of standing up for our nation's veterans transcends partisan battles. This year, however, the bill Republican leadership put on the floor not only shortchanged our veterans and servicemen and women, but the modest increase in spending over last year's bill will require cuts to critical public spending on education, health care, and infrastructure in later appropriations bills. Even veterans service organizations like Veterans of Foreign Wars urged opposition. The bill also included a policy rider preventing the transfer of detainees from the Guantanamo Bay detention facility, a prison whose very existence undermines America's security and international standing. Further, part of the spending of this bill is through the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) fund, an unrelated war slush-fund that is exempt from all budget caps.

During consideration of this bill, I offered an amendment that would have allowed VA doctors to recommend medical marijuana to their patients in the states where it was legal if they so choose. Our veterans should have the same medicines available to them as everyone else, and we should not prohibit VA doctors from consulting with their patients in accordance with their medical training and state law. I am disappointed that my amendment very narrowly failed, but I remain encouraged that we continue to build momentum in this issue, and gained significantly more bipartisan support than last year.

The Energy and Water appropriations bill, while it contains some infrastructure funds that

are critical to ports, waterways and freight movement integral to Oregon's economy, ultimately contained too many provisions bad for the environment for me to support. It prohibits the Army Corps of Engineers from finalizing and implementing rules to ensure clean water in streams and wetlands that provide drinking water for one in three Americans. It dramatically underfunds renewable energy support programs, while propping up fossil fuels and nuclear weapons spending, and delivers deep cuts to programs that assist low income families with energy bills. It also contains nonsense amendments, such as a measure to prevent the Department of Energy from implementing a law requiring incandescent light bulbs to be more energy efficient, even though American manufacturers have already adopted the new standard.

In addition, both of these bills adhere to the Republican budget's overall spending caps that account for sequestration. These caps reflect the lowest discretionary spending we've seen in ten years, and we simply cannot continue to cut government programs that are so critical to environmental protection, health, education, economic stability and defense.

RECOGNIZING THE 2014 RESTON ASSOCIATION SERVICE AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recipients of the 2014 Reston Association Service Awards. The Reston Association (RA) is the largest homeowners' association in Virginia and one of the largest in the country with more than 21,000 homes under its jurisdiction. Among other roles, RA serves as the steward of Reston's architectural aesthetics, recreational amenities, and environmental resources.

RA relies on hundreds of volunteers and dedicated staff who serve on boards, committees, and projects to carry out its mission to keep Reston a model community where all can ''Live, Work, Play, and Get Involved.'' I am pleased to submit the names of the outstanding 2014 honorees.

2014 Reston Association Volunteer of the Year—Mark Elder

Mark Elder has volunteered his time as a tennis instructor for the last two years. He fills the gaps and works interchangeably with RA staff instructors. Mark gives his time willingly, energetically and consistently to the youth tennis community to ensure programs like this and many others are successful.

2014 Reston Association Volunteer Group of the Year—Senior Movie Day Volunteers (Laura & John Cole, Pat Coshland, Michelina Johnson, Kurt McJilton, Otto & Rosemarie Tubito)

This dynamic group of volunteers is the backbone of Senior Movie Day in Reston Town Center, which benefits up to 400 seniors each month. The group has been volunteering since 2007 and contributes 150 hours annually, thereby reducing staff time needed to put on this great community event for the seniors in our community.

2014 Reston Association Community Partner of the Year—Clarke

For three consecutive years, Clarke has selected Reston for the Annual Clarke Day of Caring. Clarke employees monitor for mosquito larvae in Reston's restored streams and help educate RA's watershed staff on mosquito collection and identification. More than a dozen Clarke employees spend a full day removing invasive plants and removing trash from streams and other natural areas. This commitment to Reston and corporate volunteerism makes Clarke a standout partner.

2014 Employee of the Year—Rob Tucker

For 15 years Reston community members have been fortunate to see the smiling face of Rob Tucker on RA tennis courts. His passion for tennis is equal to his commitment to the community and the RA staff. He provides top-notch customer service, personalized instruction, and overall cheerleading for the RA tennis programs. RA and the entire community couldn't find a better advocate for the tennis and recreation programs available to Reston members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the recipients of the 2014 Reston Association Service Awards and in thanking them for dedicating their time, energy, and resources to the improvement of the quality of life and health of the Reston community.

RECOGNIZING THE LAKE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Lake County Chamber of Commerce which is celebrating its one hundredth anniversary this year. Established in 1915 as the Waukegan Chamber of Commerce, the Lake County Chamber of Commerce has undergone significant change and has prospered despite difficulties over the past one hundred years.

Today the Chamber assists businesses and citizens through weekly events catered to improving opportunities for networking and marketing. In short, Mr. Speaker, the Chamber successfully works to advance the overall welfare and prosperity of Lake County citizens and small businesses.

I offer my most sincere congratulations to The Lake County Chamber of Commerce for its success in helping to strengthen our community and wish them continued success in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 30 and Friday, May 1, 2015, I was proud to join my son, Raymond Wagner, III in Fort Campbell, Kentucky and participate in the ceremony marking his promotion to Captain in the United States Army.

Due to the extraordinary nature of this event, I was unable to be in Washington, D.C. and vote on legislative business during this time.

On Adoption of the Conference Report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11—FY2016 Budget Resolution (Roll Call Vote #183), had I been present I would have voted yes.

On Passage of H.R. 2029—Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (Roll Call Vote #193), had I been present I would have voted yes.

On Passage of H.J. Res. 43—Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (Roll Call Vote #194), had I been present I would have voted yes.

On Passage of H.R. 2028—Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (Roll Call Vote #215), had I been present I would have voted yes.

RECOGNIZING THE 24TH ANNUAL BEST OF RESTON AWARDS FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recipients of the 24th Annual Best of Reston Awards for Community Service. These awards are the result of collaboration between Cornerstones (formerly Reston Interfaith) and the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce and are presented to individuals, organizations, and businesses whose extraordinary efforts make our community a better place. I am pleased to submit the names of the following recipients of the 2015 Best of Reston Awards:

Civic/Community Organization: His Hidden Treasures (Troy and Lois Hughes)—Working in partnership with organizations dedicated to ending homelessness, His Hidden Treasures transforms transitional rental housing into homes for families, personalized with lovingly restored furniture, donated store floor samples and new housewares.

Small Business Leader: Maid Bright (Maria Fedick, Yusuf and Zeynep Mehmetoglu)—Maid Bright has made a difference by providing free house cleaning services to women with cancer, catering dinners for the hypothermia shelter, performing cleaning for Cornerstones' transitional housing units, offering discounts to seniors, veterans, firefighters, and teachers, and donating funds to help the homeless and Syrian refugees.

Corporate Business Leader: Leidos (Mike Coogan, Director, Corporate Responsibility)—Since establishing its headquarters in Reston two years ago, Leidos—a worldwide leader in science and technology—immediately made broad and deep connections in the community. Leidos employees have provided more

than 32,000 volunteer hours benefitting a wide range of organizations. The company also has contributed significant financial support to the community. Leidos has lent its support to meeting basic human needs, and supports training, education, and employment opportunities for returning veterans.

Corporate Business Leader: MAXIMUS (Susan Boren, Mark Andrekovich, Tom Romeo)—MAXIMUS provides health and human service programs to a diverse array of communities. MAXIMUS and its employees have supported a wide range of organizations that work locally to strengthen the safety net for homeless and at-risk families, or those with special needs.

Individual Community Leader: Francis C. Steinbauer—A true Reston Pioneer, Fran Steinbauer has been an integral part of the community's history and success for five decades. In 1964, Mr. Steinbauer became the Design Engineer responsible for the creation and government approval of plans for Reston's buildings and infrastructure, and he remained professionally involved in the development of Reston until the 1980s. As a volunteer to this day, he has played a vital role in making sure Reston's economy, community, and inclusive culture were as well developed as its physical environment. At Cornerstones, he is revered as the architect of its successful affordable housing program, and he continues to work for the ideal that anyone can live in our community.

Vade Bolton-Ann Rodriguez Legacy Award: Casey Veatch—A dedicated volunteer for many different organizations, Casey leads by example and inspires others to follow suit. He has generously supported and cultivated leadership through his work with Leadership Fairfax, Reston Bible Church, Northern Virginia Family Service, the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce, and numerous children's sports teams.

Individual Community Leader: Larry Butler—The Reston Association's Senior Director of Parks, Recreation, and Community Resources, Larry's lifelong passion for the outdoors and physically active lifestyle has inspired his tireless volunteer work. In more than 30 years with Reston Association, Larry has been instrumental in the success of Reston's many outdoors and athletics activities. These events help create environmental awareness, build community spirit, promote healthy lifestyles, and raise funds for a wide variety of causes.

2015 Robert E. Simon Community Service Award: Lynn Lillienthal—A Restonian for more than forty years, Ms. Lillienthal was named a Best of Reston recipient in 1998, and has certainly not rested on that accolade. She has served on the board of directors of virtually every major nonprofit institution in Reston, including Reston Interfaith, the Embry Rucker Community Shelter Citizens Support Committee, Greater Reston Arts Center, and the Reston Historic Trust, just to name a few. Her decades of service have touched thousands of lives in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the 2015 Best of Reston honorees for their tremendous contributions to our community. I express my sincere gratitude to these individuals, businesses, and organizations for lending their time and energy to the betterment of our community.

HONORING THE CITY OF CAPE MAY AS A UNITED STATES COAST GUARD COMMUNITY

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the County of Cape May on its designation as a ''Coast Guard Community'' on October 1, 2014 by the United States Coast Guard and the United States Congress.

In 1924, the Coast Guard established operations to support U.S. Customs efforts in Sewell's Point. By 1948, the Training Center, which is the only recruit training facility in the country, became the entry-level training facility for all of the East Coast and eventually the entire country. Today, the base has more than 860 military and civilian personnel, and graduates an average of more than 2,300 recruits yearly.

This new designation reflects the mutually beneficial relationship between the Coast Guard and Cape May County. Over the years, the recruits and military and civilian personnel have become part of our Cape May County family. And nothing says family more than Operation Fireside. Since the program's inception in 1981, Operation Fireside places more than 500 recruits with over 180 families each year to celebrate the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays.

On May 8, the people of Cape May County and the United States Coast Guard will celebrate this designation at the Training Center in Cape May. My thanks to all who helped make this designation a reality.

BUILDING SAFETY MONTH

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the occasion of the start of Building Safety Month, to recognize the importance of building safety and to recognize the leadership of the International Code Council (ICC) that develops and publishes the model building safety and energy efficiency model codes used in my home state of Vermont, and each of the other 49 states. Increasingly, these codes, developed in the United States, are being adopted in other nations where safety in construction is desired.

Over the past few years, we have had several sobering reminders about the importance of building codes. In other nations, much like the case in the U.S. before the codes were widely adopted, natural events and poor construction practices still cause catastrophic loss of life. Every year, deadly fires, tornados, windstorms, floods, earthquakes and other events remind us of the critical need for strong buildings. As Congress discusses the need for resilience and greater energy efficiency in our communities, Building Safety Month reminds us that key elements of resilience and energy efficiency are properly enforced building and energy codes.

The theme of this year's Building Safety Month is ''Resilient Communities start with Building Codes.'' I want to congratulate the leaders of the ICC, which has sponsored Building Safety Month in May every year for over 30 years. The leaders of ICC, including President Guy Tomberlin, Branch Chief Residential/Light Commercial Inspections for Fairfax County, Virginia; Vice-President Alex Olszowy III, Building Inspection Supervisor, Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government, Kentucky; Secretary/Treasurer M. Dwayne Garriss, State Fire Marshal, State of Georgia; Past President of the Board of Directors, Stephen Jones, Construction Official, Millburn Township/Short Hills, New Jersey will join ICC's Chief Executive Officer Dominic Sims in Washington the week of May 25th to discuss the critical need to support the adoption and enforcement of current building codes, to make sure Americans are safe at home, at work, at school and at play.

I also want to congratulate the leaders of the Building Safety Association of Vermont ICC, including President Glenn Moore and the other leaders of the Vermont ICC Chapter.

I would also like to thank the thousands of men and women who work every day to make sure our buildings comply with building and fire codes. Their work, largely unseen and often unnoticed, is critical to keeping Americans safe. The model building codes, developed by ICC members from all 50 states, allow every community to share the advantage of adopting building codes that are adaptable to local conditions, but at the same time incorporate the very latest research, materials, and building practices. This is achieved in a private-public partnership, saving local jurisdictions from bearing the large expense of code revision, updating and coordination. These model codes are produced through the cooperation of thousands of local U.S. code officials working with the building industry to produce codes that represent a consensus on what the minimum safety requirements are for various building types, all without a dime of Federal taxpayer money.

Congratulations to the hard working members and leadership of the International Code Council.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 2015, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Call vote number 193, On Passage of Making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Should I have been present I would have voted No.

RECOGNIZING MR. WILLIAM C. PHELON FOR HIS SERVICE

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Corporal William C. Phelon, Jr. and his distinguished contributions to the United States Air Force. Mr. Phelon enlisted in the United States Air Force immediately after graduating from Mineola High School in June of 1943 and entered active service August 16, 1943, at the height of American involvement in World War Two. Mr. Phelon served valiantly until he left the service in March of 1946. Corporal Phelon flew as part of the illustrious 96th Bombardment Group, serving as a Radio Operator Mechanic and Waist Gunner in a B–17 Flying Fortress. He was responsible for all radio equipment aboard the B–17 while in flight.

In his position as Airman, Corporal Phelon participated in Operation Chowhound, a humanitarian mission which delivered over 11,000 tons of food to Nazi-occupied Holland during the Dutch Famine. This mission was so appreciated by the Dutch people that commemorative ceremonies have been held every five years in Holland to remember the men who helped feed their starving people. The Third Air Division of the 8th Air Force was responsible for delivering 4,103 tons of food, of which the 96th Bombardment Group dropped 366 tons. For his efforts, Corporal Phelon was awarded the Conspicuous Service Cross by Governor Thomas Dewey on behalf of the people of New York.

Sadly, Mr. Phelon passed away in December of 2014. I rise today in memory of a brave man who was an exemplary member of the Armed Forces and the community at large, and to posthumously thank him for his years of dedication and service. I hope we all remember the courage and dedication shown by Mr. Phelon in everything he did.

RECOGNIZING THE BURKE VOLUNTEER FIRE AND RESCUE DEPARTMENT'S 67TH ANNUAL BANQUET

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the Burke Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department, which is hosting its 67th Annual Installation of Officers Banquet, and in thanking its volunteers for filling an essential role in keeping the community safe.

The Burke Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department was founded in January 1948, and for more than 6 decades it has provided lifesaving fire suppression/prevention and emergency medical/rescue services to the residents of Burke, Fairfax County, and the surrounding communities. It also provides, houses, and maintains firefighting and emergency medical equipment; provides opportunities for professional growth and development for the membership; and maintains and fosters a strong viable organization.

I am honored to recognize several of the dedicated men and women of the Burke Volunteer Fire Department who have volunteered for extra duty as officers or as members of the board of directors or who are receiving awards for their superlative service to the department and the community. It gives me great pleasure to submit the names of these individuals:

Board of Directors:

President Rich Guarrasi, Vice President John Powers, Treasurer Patrick Owens, Secretary Greg Fedor, Board Members-at-Large Larry Barnett, Larry Bocknek, and Alisha Sunde

Line Officers:

Chief Thomas Warnock, Deputy Chief John Hudak, Deputy Chief Tina Godfrey, Administrative Member Manager Catherine Owens, Captain II Melissa Ashby, Captain II Larry Bockneck, Captain II Keith O'Connor, Lieutenant Kevin Grottle, Sergeant Jennifer Babic, Sergeant Emily Fincher, Team Leader Peter Hamilton, Team Leader James Reyes, Team Leader Paul Stracke, Team Leader Harry Chelpon, Staffing Coordinator Shaun Kurry, Chaplain Harry Chelpon

Length of Service Awards:

5 Years: Richard Guarrasi

10 Years: Harry Chelpon, Ed Gilhooly

15 Years: Tina Godfrey

Life Member: Harry Chelpon

Department Awards:

Founders Award: John Hudak

Rookies of the Year: Caitlin Curran, Megan Bush, Barry Brown

Firefighter of the Year: Peter Hamilton

EMS Provider of the Year: James Reyes

Officer of the Year: Tina Godfrey

Admin. Member of the Year: Becky Dobbs

Career Members of the Year: Tim Barb, David ''Happy'' Gilmore

Team Award: BVFRD Train Team: Melissa Ashby, Kevin Grottle, Shaun Kurry

Chief's Award: Shaun Kerry

President's Awards: Nancy Stone, Charlene Murphy

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the department for 67 years of service and in thanking all of the brave volunteers who do not hesitate to drop everything when the community calls in need of help. To all of these men and women who put themselves in harm's way to protect our residents I say: ''Stay safe''.

HONORING THE COALITION FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ON THEIR 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Coalition for Healthy Communities on their 20th Anniversary. The Cancer Treatment Centers of America at Midwestern Regional Medical Center assembled the Coalition of leaders in the Zion-Benton Township to effectively address the need to improve the health and wellness of our community.

The Coalition's focus is to provide the community with education on ways to access primary health care, sexual education, immunizations for young children, parental education, and adolescent substance abuse. The leaders of the Coalition are working hard to provide healthcare that extends beyond the walls of hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, the Coalition of Healthy Communities is essential to ensuring that Zion, Beach Park and Winthrop Harbor's residents receive the proper tools to lead a healthy, safe and fulfilling life. I offered my sincere thanks to the Coalition for their efforts over the last 20 years and wish them continued success in the future.

HONORING JOHN BROOKS SUPERMARKET AND NETTIE ALVARADO

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Brooks Supermarket, and in particular, Nettie Alvarado for her exceptional customer service and dedicated commitment to our senior citizen community.

Since 1979, John Brooks Supermarket has prided itself as a locally owned and operated establishment. The John Brooks on Candeleria and 12th Street in Albuquerque, New Mexico, certainly takes on this persona; it's a neighborhood corner spot that caters to each of its customers on an individual level and takes great lengths to serve our senior community.

That's how I first heard about Nettie Alvarado, a radiant, compassionate woman who has spent thirty years of dedicated service to John Brooks' customers. Every Monday and Thursday, store owner John Brooks and Nettie trade off delivering groceries to the senior community living at The Good Samaritan Society: Manzano Del Sol Village on 5201 Roma Avenue NE. These are crucial services for many of the seniors there who are unable to drive or take transportation to the grocery store.

Nettie takes this dedication one step further. Customers will inform her of a sick friend, disabled relative or struggling senior and it's not long before numbers are exchanged, a grocery list is filed and Nettie is off making deliveries. Nettie has earned a reputation for her selfless actions and genuine, heartfelt appreciation for others. When asked, Nettie will tell you ''I want them to be taken care of'' and has no qualms about dipping into her free time to ensure her beloved Albuquerque residents receive the services they need.

Nettie's sentiment towards others extends beyond age, gender, race, and socioeconomic status—it's universal. I am inspired to see that we have individuals like Nettie in our community and stores like John Brooks that put people first and serve our ailing seniors. By valuing our community and continuing these practices of goodwill and shared responsibility we will achieve a better tomorrow and build a stronger America.

IN HONOR OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and pleasure to extend my sincerest congratulations to the students, parents, staff, and supporters of the Head Start program as they celebrate 50 remarkable years of eliminating poverty through education, services, and partnerships. Enrichment Services Program, Inc. (ESP) will celebrate Head Start's 50th anniversary on Thursday, May 7, 2015 at noon at the Columbus Convention and Trade Center in Columbus, Georgia.

After President Lyndon B. Johnson declared the War on Poverty in his 1964 State of the Union speech, Sargent Shriver, a key social and political figure, took the lead in assembling a panel of experts to develop a comprehensive child development program that would help communities meet the needs of disadvantaged preschool children. The brainchild of this panel was Head Start, a program designed to help break the cycle of poverty by providing preschool children of low-income families with the tools and resources to meet their emotional, social, nutritional, and psychological needs.

In 1965, the Office of Economic Opportunity launched an eight-week program called Project Head Start. Fifty years later, Head Start has served more than 30 million children, becoming an integral component of America's education system.

Enrichment Services Program, Inc. is a community action agency that provides essential services to alleviate poverty levels, promote family stability, and gradually build self-sufficiency. It was established in 1964 and operated as the Community Action Development Committee. The Agency was incorporated in 1965 as the ''Lower Chattahoochee Community Action Agency, Inc.'' In 1974, when President Gerald Ford signed the Head Start Economic Opportunity and Community Partnership Act, Head Start funding was allocated to local community action agencies such as ESP.

Enrichment Services Program, Inc. administers the Early Head Start and Head Start programs within a nine-county area, including Chattahoochee, Clay, Harris, Muscogee, Quitman, Randolph, Stewart, and Talbot counties, located in Georgia, and Russell County in Alabama. Each year, ESP serves approximately 1,000 children ages 0–5 from low-income families.

The Head Start program has been essential to the early childhood development and forward progression of many children and their families. Head Start evaluates and works to improve six domains of early childhood development: social/emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, and mathematics. Through Head Start, ESP addresses the basic needs of each child and prepares them for entry into kindergarten. ESP also encourages parent involvement by offering services such as family literacy functions and parental input into the curriculum.

In the 2013–2014 program year, children in ESP's Head Start program made remarkable accomplishments. In the Cognitive domain alone, an average of 96% of children exceeded growth range. There were 505 three- and four-year-olds who were ready to read by the end of the school year.

Enrichment Services Program, Inc. has done an outstanding job of administering the Head Start program in the area that it serves. Because of the dedication and commitment of the teachers and the staff, thousands of children have gone on to achieve greater heights in primary, secondary, and higher education than they otherwise would have done. I firmly believe that Head Start's outreach will continue to help preschool children and their families overcome the cycle of poverty to lead successful and productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in expressing our profound gratitude to Enrichment Services Program, Inc. and to Head Start for working to improve educational outcomes for preschool children, which not only produces positive effects throughout their lives but also creates a ripple effect of improvement in the communities in which they live.

RECOGNIZING HERNDON-RESTON FISH, INC. AND THE 2015 ''STAR FISH'' HONOREES

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Herndon-Reston FISH, Inc. and the 2015 ''Star Fish'' Honorees.

Since 1969, Herndon-Reston FISH, Inc. has provided Friendly, Instant, Sympathetic Help for neighbors in need in Reston and Herndon. FISH meets immediate critical needs for rental assistance, furniture, utilities, medical care, and other emergencies. FISH also manages a thrift shop, operates an information and referral service, and offers financial workshops to provide clients with the tools necessary to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency.

During fiscal year 2014, FISH assisted a total of 2,337 families (5,665 people), gave emergency financial assistance to 1,328 families, and helped 180 families by providing them with used furniture and/or other household necessities. FISH collected, assembled, and distributed Thanksgiving food baskets for 965 people and holiday food and gift baskets in December for 967 people. More than 800 volunteer hours were spent working at United Christian Parish on these two projects in coordination with other human service providers in Fairfax County. In addition, volunteer drivers provided 294 free rides for the elderly and other needy individuals to and from their medical appointments.

At its annual gala, FISH recognizes individuals and companies who have made extraordinary contributions over the past year. I am pleased to submit the names of the 2015 ''Star Fish'' honorees:

Jocelyn Colao has been a volunteer pricer at FISH's thrift shop, The Bargain Loft, for over 20 years. Jocelyn specializes in identifying, cleaning, pricing, and displaying donated linens. Her careful handling of vintage lace and fragile fabrics greatly increases their value. In addition to her work with donated linens, Jocelyn's lifetime of traveling makes her an indispensable part of the pricing team. The years she lived in Europe and Africa make her a great resource when identifying unusual and valuable donations.

Jane and Mike Drewes were long-time Reston residents who volunteered in the community in many capacities. In 2007 they moved to Shepherdstown, WV but continued to drive to Reston for volunteer activities. They started volunteering for FISH in 2006, the year of the first FISH Fling Gala and Fundraiser. Jane designed the decorations and they built the huge FISH sign that has been used behind the band at every Fling Gala. Mike created an auction check-out program that accelerates the check-out process and has been used at many charitable events.

Diane Mandel manages the huge tasks of establishing and maintaining the schedule of Assistance Workers who handle the client requests for financial assistance from FISH. These volunteers make FISH's ''Instant'' help a reality. Diane makes certain the volunteers are trained and ready to take calls and she serves as a phone volunteer herself.

Chuck Veatch, owner of Charles A. Veatch & Associates, provided three storage units for FISH free of charge for many years and is well known throughout the community for his support of a wide variety of organizations and causes.

CDW is a leading provider of integrated information technology solutions in the U.S. and Canada and has been a FISH Fling sponsor since 2008. CDW has provided many fabulous electronic products for our games and for both our silent and live auctions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending Herndon-Reston FISH for 46 years of service. I also extend my personal congratulations to this year's honorees and express my sincere appreciation to these individuals for contributing their time and energy to helping the most vulnerable in our community.

HONORING RICHARD ARROWOOD

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Richard Arrowood for 50 years of exceptional winemaking, exclusively in Sonoma County. Mr. Arrowood has been, and continues to be, a tireless advocate and fierce supporter of grape growing and wine making in Sonoma County. We therefore recognize and thank Mr. Arrowood today for his unwavering support and relentless efforts to preserve and promote the Sonoma County wine industry.

Born and educated locally, Mr. Arrowood began his wine-making career in 1965. He got his start at Korbel Champagne Cellars and soon moved on to work with the legendary Rodney Strong. His education and experience

helped his first vintage receive critical acclaim, and each subsequent vintage after that cemented his status as one of the most respected vintners in the area.

A pioneer in the field of viticulture, Mr. Arrowood worked with a wide array of unique varietals, a concept that was ahead of its time. His efforts changed the perception of wine from Sonoma County, and the total number of vineyard acres in the county has increased fivefold over the time he has been in business. He was one of the first to emphasize vineyard designations on his wines, a trend that has since spread across the world. This success and influence on the industry led to an offer from Robert Mondavi to buy Arrowood Winery, which Mr. Arrowood accepted so he could return to focusing on the art of fine winemaking.

Amapola Creek Vineyards is his latest project, which is quite simply Richard's quest to make his greatest wines ever, and is a perfect example of the phrase ''saving the best for last.'' Its main focus is using the special fruit grown on Moon Mountain and its unique terroir. Devoting himself entirely to the new Sonoma vineyard, Richard bought the adjacent land and built a home for his family. The vineyard uses exclusively organic methods to produce just 3,000 hand-crafted cases annually in its state-of-the-art facilities. Here, he continues to showcase Sonoma County in the groundbreaking way he did many years ago when he started his journey.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize Richard Arrowood for his role as an outspoken supporter of the production of high quality wines in Sonoma County. His impact on the growth of Sonoma wine cannot be overstated and for this it is only right that he be honored here today.

HONORING MANUEL PROL ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Manuel Prol, who will turn 100 on April 4, 2015. Manuel is a World War II veteran and cherished father of three, grandfather of three, and great-grandfather of five.

Manuel was born on Easter Sunday in Samieira, a tiny village or ''aldea'' in the northwest corner of Spain in 1915. He was the youngest of four children and only son of Agripina Rodino and Antonio Prol. In 1932, he bade farewell to his mother for the last time and emigrated to the United States. Manuel would also not see his three sisters, Agripina, Peregrina, and Dolores, again until 1960.

He was reunited with his father in New York City, where he settled in a Spanish-speaking neighborhood around 14th Street. Manuel embraced his new home, learning English at Julia Richmond High School in Gramercy Park while working at the Roosevelt Hotel.

In 1941, he married Vicenta Prol and soon after entered the U.S. Army Air Force at the outset of World War II. Manuel saw action on three continents over the course of the war, honorably serving his country in Europe, Africa, and Asia. When he returned home, Manuel and Vicenta settled in the Bronx and had three daughters: Pilar, Victoria, and Consuelo. Over the years, their family has grown and spread out across the country.

Pilar, their oldest daughter, was a nurse for over forty years. She married Charles Sergis in 1964 and had three children: Alicia, Laura, and Charles. They also have five grandchildren: Catie, Noah, Matthew, Juliana, and Grace. Pilar and Charles live in Redondo Beach, California.

Victoria lives in Bronxville, New York. She worked in Westchester County as a high school language teacher for over thirty years.

Consuelo is married to Richard Liebowitz and lives in New York City and Montclair, New Jersey. She retired from the business world after thirty-eight years in sales.

Manuel and Vicenta retired to Southern California in 1982, where they lived happily until Vicenta's death in 1997. Manuel then moved to Montclair, New Jersey, where he currently lives with Consuelo and Richard. He spends winters in Redondo Beach, California with Pilar and Charles.

Next month, Manuel will turn 100 years old—yet shows no signs of slowing down. He still writes letters and reads the newspaper every day. Manuel attributes his longevity to the Mediterranean diet, a glass of red wine every day, and yes, an occasional Rusty Nail, his favorite drink.

I hope all my colleagues will join me in wishing Manuel Prol a happy 100th birthday, and continued health and happiness to him and to his family.

RECOGNIZING THE 2015 ASIAN-AMERICAN CHAMBER ''JEWELS OF ASIA'' AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Asian-American Chamber of Commerce and the recipients of the 2015 Asian-American Chamber Awards.

The Asian-American Chamber of Commerce (AACC) is dedicated to improving economic development opportunities for Asian Pacific American-owned businesses in the Washington, D.C., region. The 11th District of Virginia is blessed by its diversity. About 1 in 4 residents are foreign born and approximately 40% are minorities. Half of our foreign-born population emigrated from Asia, and more than 80,000 of our neighbors speak an Asian language at home.

Northern Virginia has a robust international business community and is home to the largest concentration of minority-owned technology firms in the nation. The AACC and its members contribute greatly to our economic strength and stability; Asian-American businesses generate more than 52% of total revenues generated by all minority owned businesses in this region.

In Fairfax County alone, more than 19,000 businesses are Asian-owned. These businesses generate approximately $5 billion in revenue and create more than 30,000 jobs. Each year, the AACC recognizes businesses and non-profits in the Asian-American community for their outstanding contributions to the Metropolitan Washington community and economy. I congratulate the following honorees:

Small Business Award: The Tu's Group

Champions of Diversity: Morgan Stanley

Asian Business Excellence Award: Zantech IT Services, Inc.

Non-Profit of the Year: Asian-American LEAD

Corporate Partner of the year: Capital Bank

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the honorees of the 2015 Asian-American Chamber of Commerce Awards and in commending the Chamber for its work to support Asian and Pacific Islander owned businesses throughout our region.

HONORING SHANE FENLEY

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to recognize an act of great kindness by one of my constituents, Shane Fenley. Shane lives in Griffin, Georgia and has been a UPS employee since 1999. It was at his job that Shane met Wayne Goree, they've been coworkers and friends ever since. The Goree family lives in Senoia and they have a 14 year old son, Justin. Justin has been sick off and on for some time, and was in need of a kidney transplant. When Shane heard that his friend's child was in need, he volunteered his own kidney.

Shane went through the process of getting tested to see if he was a match. The results showed that he was a 90% match and the doctors knew that wasn't close enough. Next, Shane and Justin entered the Paired Donor Exchange program, where patients and donors are matched together. Because Shane wasn't a match for Justin, he gave his kidney to another person, who in return gave their kidney to Justin. Shane gave his kidney to a complete stranger, so that Justin could receive the kidney he so desperately needed. To give a child the gift of life is one of the most admirable acts a man can do.

My nephew Todd, has also worked at UPS with Shane for many years. When describing Shane, Todd explained that he has always been willing to give the shirt off his back to any one in need. Now he will be known as the man who will literally give you the kidney out of his back and ask for nothing in return. Shane said the reason behind his donation was that he had 41 years of good health under his belt, and Justin, at the age of 14, had not had any. The selflessness and kindness that Shane displayed is lacking in our world today and we could use more people like Shane Fenley.

Shane and Justin—It is an honor to represent you. I wish you both a speedy recovery and that you both live a long and happy life.

TRIBUTE TO SCOTT A. BAILEY

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Scott A. Bailey, an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Moreno Valley, California are exceptional. Moreno Valley has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated people who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Scott Bailey is one of these individuals.

After graduating from Moreno Valley High School as an Eagle Scout, Scott married his wife Beverly and started working as an electrician in 1981. The couple had three children, bought a home in Moreno Valley, and had humble, yet unselfishly universal dreams about putting their children through college and saving enough to retire easily. Living in the economy of the early nineties, Scott and Beverly brainstormed about the best options to keep her from returning to her job in real estate and decided to start their own electrical contracting business out of their own home.

The Baileys had a remarkable vision to create a construction company based on an unwavering commitment to quality and not only did they achieve this goal, but by doing so, everything else seemed to fall into line. Stronghold Engineering built a solid reputation as the go to contractor for civil, design/build, and high voltage electrical projects on both a national and international level. This allowed the company to become ranked and win several awards.

Scott is responsible for day-to-day operations as the Chief Operating Officer and supports all Stronghold Engineering field personnel, resources, and projects. Over the course of the company's 23-year history, he has managed and directed over 450 projects, with the average project sizes ranging from $500,000 to well over $100,000,000.

Scott has always been a hands-on manager making visits to each project site ensuring only the best quality and safety standards are met whether he's making trips to Europe, South Africa, Russia, Canada, or Mexico, he remains humble and true to his roots by giving back to the world community as well as his own. Scott has chaired the ABC Craft Championships Committee, has helped in the rebuilding efforts in devastated New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, and in Mexico, helped to build an orphanage for at risk children. Stronghold recently donated all labor in helping two local Riverside churches switch to solar energy.

In light of all Scott Bailey has done for the community of Moreno Valley, it is clear that he deserves the Distinguished Citizen Award. Scott's tireless passion for the community has contributed immensely to the betterment of Moreno Valley, California. He has been the heart and soul of many community projects, and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he receives this prestigious award.

RECOGNIZING VFW POST 7327 AND THE 2015 AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Springfield Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 7327 and the recipients of its 2015 Annual Awards.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) traces its beginnings to 1899 when veterans of the Spanish American War established local organizations to bring awareness to their service and to advocate for veterans retirement benefits and improved medical care. Annually, the nearly 2 million members of the VFW and its Auxiliaries contribute more than 8.6 million hours of volunteerism in the community, including participation in Make A Difference Day and National Volunteer Week.

With approximately 600 Comrades and 150 Ladies Auxiliary members, the Springfield VFW Post 7327 stands out for the depth of its commitment to our community. Often called ''The Friendliest VFW Post in Virginia,'' Post 7327 has one of the most aggressive ADOPT–A–UNIT programs in the entire VFW organization to support our service members stationed overseas. VFW Post 7327 visits the VA hospital at least quarterly, bringing along goodie bags for our Wounded Warriors. Each Thanksgiving and Christmas, VFW Post 7327 adopts military families in need through the USO and provides them with meal baskets for each holiday, gifts for children, commissary cards for the parents, and a Christmas party where the children can meet Santa and receive a gift-filled stocking. The Ladies Auxiliary members collect, sort, and distribute more than 2,000 pieces of clothing each month to various charitable organizations. VFW Post 7327 is a strong supporter of local youth organizations including the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and Little League Baseball that contribute greatly to the education and well-being of our children.

Each year, VFW Post 7327 bestows awards to local students who have submitted outstanding essays on a theme and to local teachers and public safety officers in recognition of their extraordinary actions and dedication. I am honored to submit the names of the following 2015 honorees:

PATRIOT'S PEN

First Place—Connor Michael Ringvelski

Second Place—Margaret Odom—6th Grade, Keene Mill Elementary School

Third Place—Cameron Garber—6th Grade, Silverbrook Elementary School

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

First Place—Regine Marie Victoria—12th Grade, Mount Vernon High School

TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Tiffany Graczyk—7th Grade History, Edgar Allan Poe Middle School, Annandale, VA

PUBLIC SAFETY

Dr. Jeffrey Alton—Franconia Volunteer Fire Department. Nomination

Officer Christopher F. Cosgriff—West Springfield Police District Station

PFC James Lopez—Mount Vernon District Police Station

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the 2015 Awardees and in thanking the members, Ladies Auxiliary, program sponsors, and supporters of VFW Post 7327 for their continued service to our country and our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF LTC JOEL DAVIS, JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a terrific educator, strong civic leader, and outstanding citizen, Lieutenant Colonel Joel Davis, Jr. (U.S. Army). LTC Davis will be retiring from his post as Professor of Military Science and Commander of the Senior ROTC Wildcat Battalion at the Fort Valley State University (FVSU). He will be honored by the administration, faculty, students, and supporters at FVSU's 2015 Spring Commencement Ceremony on Saturday, May 2, 2015 in Fort Valley, Georgia.

A native of Swainsboro, Georgia, LTC Joel Davis, Jr. graduated as a Distinguished Military Graduate and earned a bachelor of science degree in Criminal Justice from Savannah State College, now Savannah State University, in 1990. In 2004, he earned a master's degree in Military Operational Art and Science from Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, Alabama, and a master of science degree in Human Resource Management from Troy University in Troy, Alabama.

LTC Davis' overseas tours of duty include the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Panama, Marshall Islands, Guam, Kuwait, Baghdad, Iraq, and Haiti. His most recent assignments include serving as Chief of Intelligence for the United Nations Humanitarian Assistance Mission in Haiti, where he served as the Senior Military Intelligence Advisor to the Force Commander, Contingent Commanders, and staff in support of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. In 2007–2009, he served as the Chief of Intelligence/G2 for the 8th Theater Sustainment Command, the Brigade S3/Operations Officer, 500th Military Intelligence Brigade and the Battalion Executive Officer, 205th Military Battalion in Fort Shafter, Hawaii. LTC Davis has held several other Command and key billets during his 30 years of military service, including his time as an Infantryman in the U.S. Marine Corps.

The Second Congressional District of Georgia gained a respected and compassionate leader when LTC Davis arrived in Fort Valley, Georgia in June 2011 to serve as Professor of Military Science and Commander of the Senior ROTC Wildcat Battalion at Fort Valley State University, with partnerships at Albany State University and Darton College in Albany, Georgia. In this capacity, LTC Davis provided command and control over recruiting, developing, training, and retaining more than 155 Cadets, as well as the commissioning of 13 second lieutenants annually. He developed guidance and program objectives for 10

Cadre/Staff members to meet annual training and mission requirements. As the Department Head, LTC Davis managed an effective and efficient military science program that exceeded the high standards set by the U.S. Army and Fort Valley State University.

During his time at FVSU, LTC Davis has fostered valuable relationships with the University administration, faculty, community partners, and external centers of influence, as well as with Army recruiting organizations, the U.S. Army Reserve, and the Army National Guard. He supports numerous JROTC units and high schools throughout the state of Georgia and beyond to help motivate America's youth to become better citizens. An excellent role model and mentor, LTC Davis is a loyal and altruistic leader who is committed to assisting young command members develop life skills and realize their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the Fort Valley State University community in honoring Lieutenant Colonel Joel Davis, Jr. for his contributions to the Fort Valley State University and to our great nation.

HONORING RABBI LEONID FELDMAN OF TEMPLE BETH EL IN WEST PALM BEACH

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Leonid Feldman, who is the rabbi of Temple Beth El in West Palm Beach, Florida. Rabbi Feldman has led a remarkable life. Growing up in the Soviet Republic of Moldavia, where the open practice of Judaism was forbidden, he was unaware that he was Jewish. At age 21, he had learned enough to become a passionate Zionist and applied for a visa to emigrate. For this, he was imprisoned by Soviet authorities as a ''refusenik.''

Eventually, Rabbi Feldman was allowed to leave the Soviet Union and emigrated to Israel, where he became a citizen and served honorably in the Israeli army. Following his time in Israel, he became Director of Education for Soviet Emigres in Italy. Rabbi Feldman eventually came to the United States, where he decided to attend the Jewish Theological Seminary, becoming the first and still the only Soviet-born Conservative rabbi in America.

Rabbi Feldman has testified in front of the U.S. Congress and the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (the Helsinki Commission). A respected and much in demand lecturer, he has spoken to audiences in 37 states and 19 countries and authored featured articles in national newspapers. Rabbi Feldman has been a visiting professor at the Jewish University of Moscow and the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, his alma mater.

Since 2004, he has been the spiritual leader of Temple Beth El in West Palm Beach where, in 2013, he was bar mitzvahed at age 60. Rabbi Leonid Feldman is widely known and much loved by the members of his congregation, his fellow clerics of all denominations and people throughout Palm Beach County. I am pleased to honor this remarkable man, who is truly deserving of being recognized in the annals of our nation.

RECOGNIZING DEAN KLEIN FOR RECEIPT OF LEADERSHIP FAIRFAX'S KATHERINE K. HANLEY PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD FOR 2015

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize this year's recipient of Leadership Fairfax's Katherine K. Hanley Public Service Award. This year's award goes to Dean Klein, a 1997 graduate of Leadership Fairfax.

Leadership Fairfax is a nonprofit corporation dedicated to finding, training, and growing leaders in Northern Virginia. Leadership Fairfax seeks to build leaders who raise the tide not only in their organization or local community but also across the whole Northern Virginia region. Graduates from its programs become part of and stay connected to a fast growing number of civic leaders. I've always said, ''When you walk into a room, it's easy to spot the Leadership Fairfax graduates—they just stand out!''

Northern Virginia is blessed with many leaders who have given their time and service to make a difference in our community. To recognize these outstanding leaders among us, Leadership Fairfax instituted the Katherine K. Hanley Public Service Award. This annual award, now in its 12th year, honors an individual for his or her outstanding accomplishments in the areas of public service employment or service on a public board, authority, or commission and for lasting contributions to the quality of life in the community.

Dean Klein has stood out in our community for many years. He currently serves as Director of the Office to Prevent and End Homelessness in Fairfax County since being appointed by the Board of Supervisors in March 2009. I was pleased to help establish that office under the 10-year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, an initiative the County launched when I served as Chairman of the Board. Under Mr. Klein's leadership, Fairfax has partnered with the neighboring City of Falls Church so that these jurisdictions can take a regional approach to the problem of homelessness. One of his many successes has been to increase the number of individuals moving out of emergency shelters to permanent housing. He grew this number from 243 in 2010 to 926 individuals in 2014. As a result of that and other efforts, Fairfax has actually reduced the number of people experiencing homelessness by more than one-third, becoming a standout model for success for those communities still struggling to break the cycle of homelessness. For his accomplishments Mr. Klein was recognized in 2014 with Fairfax County's highest employee honor, the A. Heath Onthank Award.

Prior to working in his current position he served as the Senior Community Relations Manager at the Freddie Mac Foundation, the metropolitan area's largest corporate philanthropic funder. He oversaw the Foundation's support for housing programs throughout the United States and oversaw the Foundation's investments in the Gulf Coast area after Hurricane Katrina. Mr. Klein came to the Foundation from Doorways for Women and Families in Arlington, where he was executive director and oversaw all operations for the organization including a Safehouse for Domestic Violence, Emergency Shelter for homeless families, a Thrift Store, and transitional housing for families. Mr. Klein also served for six years as executive director of Shelter House, overseeing this organization and serving homeless families in our community. He earned a master of social work degree from Howard University, and a bachelor of arts degree in Journalism and Advertising from Ohio State University.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dean Klein for receiving the Katherine K. Hanley Public Service Award and in thanking Leadership Fairfax for continuing to develop such talented and passionate leaders for Northern Virginia.

IN RECOGNITION OF THETA BOULÉ OF SIGMA PI PHI FRATERNITY

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to recognize a significant milestone in one of the pre-eminent organizations, not only in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri, which I proudly represent, but throughout the region—Theta Boulé of Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity. I am especially proud to be a member of Theta Boulé. The milestone I mentioned is the celebration of its Centennial observance that will be held June 4–6, 2015 in Kansas City.

Theta Boulé was chartered on May 22, 1915 with fourteen founding Archons who laid a strong foundation of fraternal fellowship in the Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area. Dr. William J. Thompkins met Grand Sire Archon William C. McCard while traveling in the eastern part of the country and was authorized by the Grand Sire Archon to plan the organization of a member Boulé in Kansas City. With the cooperation of Archons from Beta Boulé in Chicago and Eta Boulé in St. Louis, Dr. Thompkins and his colleague, Dr. Lloyd E. Bailer organized Theta Boulé. The charter Archons of Theta Boulé were all outstanding members of the Kansas City community and of their respective professions. Faced with cultural realities of the early Twentieth Century, these Archons found in each other a source of mutual support, enlightenment and a retreat of friendship and fraternity. Each sensed a significant void created by the pervasive permanence of American institutional racism and exclusionary practices predominant during that era. Throughout its history, the Archons of Theta Boulé have upheld the high standards of Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity.

Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity, also known as ''The Boulé'', was founded in 1904 in Philadelphia.

Theta Boulé was the 8th Member Boulé founded on May 22, 1915 with 14 outstanding Archons. Our founding members included Lloyd E. Bailer, Gideon W. Brown, Charles H. Calloway, T.C. Chapman, John A. Hodge, W.C. Hueston, Woody Jacobs, J.P. King, J.E. Perry, J.D. Shannon, M.H. Thompkins, W.J. Thompkins, S.H. Thompson, and Homer Wilburn.

Theta has been privileged to host the Seventh Grand Boulé in 1921 and the Forty-First Grand Boulé in 1992. Many outstanding Archons have been privileged to sit within the august council of Theta Boulé. One of Theta's charter members, Charles H. Calloway served as Grand Sire Archon, from 1921 to 1923. Archon Calloway was also a founding member of the National Bar Association in 1925 and served as its second President. Another founding member mentioned previously was Dr. William J. Thompkins, an outstanding physician and civic leader, who later became a resident of the District of Columbia after he accepted the appointment of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1934 to serve as Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. Dr. Thompkins was also instrumental in the establishment of General Hospital No. 2 in 1908.

Theta Boulé of Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity is led today by Randall C. Ferguson, Jr., who serves as Sire Archon; Ralph D. Reid is Sire Archon-elect; and Dr. Roger C. Williams, Jr. who serves as Grammateus. The remaining officers are: Thesauristes, Nikki Newton; Agogos, Stewart S. Myers; Rhetoricos, Kelvin Simmons; and Grapter, Lonnie Powell. The Membership Council is Chaired by Judge Jon R. Gray, (Ret.) and includes Herbert Hardwick and Robert Hughes, Jr. as Members.

One hundred years in the life of any person, organization or institution is a significant milestone and serves as a testament of fidelity to principles, seriousness of purpose and devotion to goals and objectives.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and our colleagues in expressing our collective congratulations to Theta Boulé of Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity and extending our heartfelt wishes for even greater success as it begins its second century.

TRIBUTE TO A. ALFRED TAUBMAN

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to A. Alfred Taubman, who made immeasurable contributions to my home state of Michigan and to our nation. Mr. Taubman passed away on April 17, 2015.

Mr. Taubman, known to many of us as Al, loomed large in the business, cultural and religious life of Southeast Michigan and far beyond, but his beginnings were far more modest. The son of Jewish German immigrants, Mr. Taubman began working at the age of 9 after his father's business went bankrupt during the Great Depression. After serving in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II, Mr. Taubman attended the University of Michigan, where he studied architecture.

The seeds of Al Taubman's success were watered by these experiences—his father's construction company, his studies in architecture, and the drive to work hard from a very young age. He also had a keen understanding of the needs and wants of people in America's postwar economy, a period in which people migrated from cities to what would become thriving suburbs. Rather than building homes as his father did, Mr. Taubman focused on the shopping needs of suburban families, and helped to pioneer the growth of shopping malls.

Over the years, Mr. Taubman's company designed, built, and operated shopping malls throughout the country. These malls, and other investments, brought him significant wealth—wealth he decided to put to use not just in his business endeavors, but in a vast array of worthy causes. Dr. Mark Schlissel, President of the University of Michigan, quoted Mr. Taubman as having said that his father taught him that ''If I make a donation, I have given once. If I then solicit monies, I gave twice. And if my contribution has inspired others to support a good cause, I will have given three times.'' The University of Michigan and its missions were especially close to Al Taubman's heart, as Dr. Schlissel and the entire U of M community would attest. While it is not possible to list each and every institution which benefited so greatly from Mr. Taubman's philanthropy, some of those which did in addition to the University of Michigan are Lawrence Technological University (where he also studied), Wayne State University, the College for Creative Studies, Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School, Brown University, the Detroit Institute of Arts, the Detroit Symphony Orchestra, the Jewish Federation, United Jewish Foundation of Metro Detroit and the Damon J. Keith Center for Civil Rights.

Simply listing the institutions to which Al Taubman contributed so much does not provide the full measure of the person he was. On his death I communicated these thoughts: ''Al Taubman impacted the well-being of millions who never met him because of his unwavering support for the health and education needs of all Americans. He earned great wealth but never forgot his roots. He reached the top but maintained compassion for the underdog. He could be very blunt but even more sensitive about the feelings of the others. He was much beloved by all of us privileged to know him over many years.''

His commitment and active participation in the issues he cared about was on full display in the successful effort in 2008 to amend Michigan's Constitution to legalize expanded embryonic stem cell research in my state. Mr. Taubman was not only a vital financial contributor to the campaign, but as the Detroit Free Press noted, ''. . . he crusaded in ways that couldn't be measured by dollar signs, arguably providing stem cell advocates with their loudest voice during the 2008 campaign.'' He organized a fundraiser with former President Bill Clinton, hosted meetings where people could learn more about the science involved, and weighed in with the press and with elected officials on the merits of embryonic stem cell research and the need for the constitutional amendment. The measure passed. There is no doubt that had Al Taubman not so fully invested his time, talents, and resources into the effort the present pioneering efforts now being undertaken at the University of Michigan would not be happening.

Mr. Speaker, the research at the A. Alfred Taubman Medical Research Institute on stems cells and beyond is a legacy of Al Taubman's and is likely to benefit untold numbers of people in our lives facing chronic disease who will never have heard his name, but fame is not what he sought. His many endeavors have touched and will touch the lives of countless Americans. I encourage my colleagues to join in paying tribute to his many contributions to our country, and in offering condolences to his family, including his wife, Judith Taubman; his children William Taubman, Robert Taubman, and Gayle Taubman Kalisman; his stepchildren Tiffany Dubin and Christopher Rounick; and to his nine grandchildren and great-grandchild.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. ISAAC J. CRUMBLY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a terrific educator and outstanding citizen, Dr. Isaac ''Ike'' Crumbly, who will be celebrating 50 remarkable years of teaching at the Fort Valley State University (FVSU) in Fort Valley, Georgia. He will be honored by the administration, faculty, students, and supporters at FVSU's 2015 Spring Commencement Ceremony on Saturday, May 2, 2015 in Fort Valley, Georgia.

Before earning two degrees in horticulture and a Ph.D. in botany, Dr. Isaac J. Crumbly was picking cotton to help support his ten brothers and sisters. With an inherent knowledge of the art of cultivation and the science of plant life, Dr. Crumbly was destined to end up at Fort Valley State University, a state and land-grant university founded in 1895 that has made significant contributions to agriculture and related fields.

Dr. Crumbly joined the faculty of Fort Valley State College, now Fort Valley State University, in 1965 as a Professor in the Biology Department. In the 50 intervening years, his role at the University has grown to include Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Director of the Cooperative Developmental Energy Program.

In 1983, Dr. Crumbly founded the one-of-a-kind Cooperative Developmental Energy Program (CDEP), a dual-degree STEM education program, in response to a call for proposals from the U.S. Department of Energy. The program's primary objective is to increase the number of minorities and women pursuing careers in the energy industry. With more than $4 million dollars to support their education, students in the program have logged over 250,000 hours of hands-on experience. CDEP has been recognized by the University System of Georgia, the Georgia House of Representatives, and two U.S. Presidents, Ronald Reagan and Barack Obama, for its success.

Always striving to help his students achieve greater heights, Dr. Crumbly has given of his

time and talents to mentor thousands of FVSU students in his STEM classes. Through CDEP, he is responsible for the education, employment, and successful careers of over 126 CDEP graduates who are engineers, geoscientists, and health physicists.

Dr. Crumbly's impact has stretched far beyond his immediate students, however. A skilled grantsman, Dr. Crumbly has helped bring in over $30 million for the University and its students through funded grants, internships, and scholarships. He also has helped established partnerships with over 70 corporate, private, and university entities. Dr. Crumbly has been recognized numerous times by various professional and scholarly organizations for his work in educating students in STEM.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the Fort Valley State University community in honoring Dr. Isaac J. Crumbly for 50 outstanding years of contributing to the education and success of students at the Fort Valley State University.

CONGRATULATING MARION STILLSON FOR RECOGNITION AS THE RESTON CITIZEN ASSOCIATION'S CITIZEN OF THE YEAR FOR 2014

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Marion Stillson of Reston on being recognized as the 2014 Citizen of the Year by the Reston Citizens Association.

The Reston Citizens Association was founded in 1967 to promote and protect Reston's founding principles by serving as a non-partisan forum for all residents and as an advocate for the community with County and State governments.

The RCA Citizen of the Year Award dates back to 1976 and honors an individual whose actions are consistent with the goals of Reston and the RCA. Recipients are recognized for contributing to the quality of life in Reston and for providing assistance to our neighbors in need. Marion and her husband Dick arrived in the Reston area in 1973. Marion's service to the community began in October 1980 when she was selected as one of the first members of the Reston Community Center's Board of Governors and provided valuable input on accessibility issues. Since then, she has been involved in a wide variety of issues important to Reston, the region, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation.

Marion was elected Vice-President of RCA in 2009 and President in 2010 and served our community in that role over two terms. During her tenure, RCA established the Reston Accessibility Committee, which helps ensure that local businesses provide access to retail, office and public amenity locations for those with mobility impairments, created the Reston 2020 Committee to analyze and advocate on land use issues, and implemented the Sustainable Reston Initiative to raise awareness of the need to address the effects on the Reston community of peak oil, global climate change and economic disruption.

At the county level, Marion has been appointed to the Election Improvement Commission, the Wiehle Avenue Steering Committee, the Hunter Mill District Budget Committee and has served as an elections officer.

Marion's passion for fairness and justice have been reflected in her distinguished professional career which has included serving as a lobbyist for the American Association of University Women; Staff Attorney National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws; Staff Attorney for the National Labor Relations Board; Director of the Criminal Justice Advocacy Project for the DC Coalition Against Domestic Violence; Attorney/Counselor/Mediator for the Architect of the Capitol Fair Employment Practices Office. In these roles, she directly influenced and in some instances created national policy in numerous areas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Marion Stillson for this award and thanking her for her committed and selfless service to our community.

IN HONOR OF THE ROTARY CLUB OF THE WOODLANDS, TEXAS

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor the 40th anniversary of The Rotary Club of The Woodlands, Texas. Across our nation and world, service organizations make communities stronger through educational, vocational and community health programs. Since its formation, the leaders and members of this Rotary Club, of which I'm a proud member, has achieved all that—and more.

As the Vietnam war was ending, 20 local business leaders stepped forward to find solutions and make a positive difference in a new master planned community known as The Woodlands, Texas. Within two months of their first meeting, Rotary International approved their charter on May 9, 1975.

Over the last four decades, much has changed both within our Rotary and world, but the Rotary Club of the Woodlands continues to grow and serve. Today 174 business and community leaders keep the Club moving forward by putting servant leadership first. The number of service projects and programs has increased, while educational scholarships for local students remain at the heart of it all.

Before this new century the Club's Scholarship fund reached $250,000, necessitating the creation of a foundation. Over $1.3 million has been raised for deserving students—and many new community leaders credit their Rotary scholarships for making their education dreams a reality.

Our Rotary Club sponsors five Interact clubs at local high schools where future Rotarians and community leaders connect with mentors, develop leadership skills and make connections through service projects and club meetings.

Our club works with Interfaith of the The Woodlands on a program called ''Serving Our Seniors.'' Twice annually, Rotarians, Interact students, Interfaith staff and volunteers come together to help seniors with a variety of home repair, improvement and landscaping chores.

Our Club annually supports an international exchange student who attends high school in the community. This cultural and educational exchange benefits the hosted student, their home country and local students who get to know more about other cultures.

The Club also provides layettes for the care of newborns in a South American medical clinic near the areas known for the Children of the Dump. This project ensures many lives begin in a sanitary environment and involves out local Interact Clubs who put together the layettes from supplies purchased by the Club with matching funds from Rotary International.

Our club also holds mock interview sessions with local community college students. The ''Show Me the Money'' project pairs up Rotarians with students in a positive, affirming environment. Our sessions include making the right first impression and financial literacy.

There are truly too many service projects this Club has completed over the past forty years to share them all, but a conservative estimate is that Rotarians from The Woodlands Club have put in tens of thousands of service hours.

So, to my fellow Rotarians I thank you for 40 years of living the Rotary motto of ''Service before Self'' in thought, word, and most importantly, in deeds. May your exemplary servant leadership continue to bless our community.

I know my Rotarian pride shines through when I share what my home Rotary club does for our community. Today I want all of America to join with us in celebrating 40 great years. I can't wait to see what the future holds for The Rotary Club of The Woodlands.

HONORING GUILFORD NATIVE NICK FRADIANI, JR., AMERICAN IDOL SEASON XIV FINALIST

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to join the community of Guilford, Connecticut, as well as the Fradiani family, friends, and fans of all ages in extending my heartfelt congratulations to Connecticut's own Nick Fradiani, Jr. who this week became a finalist on Season XIV of the reality television series American Idol.

With his musician father, Nick Fradiani, Sr., bringing him to gigs as a child and blessed with a special talent all his own it is not hard to believe that Nick developed a passion for music. Though he has really only focused on music as a career over the last decade, it is that passion that makes Nick's performances so special and why he has been able to build such a strong fan base in Connecticut.

A performer, singer, and songwriter, he has taken American Idol Season XIV by storm and, in the process, has sparked a unique enthusiasm across his home state of Connecticut. Bringing his own style to fan favorites like Tom Petty and the Heartbreakers' ''American Girl,'' Billy Joel's ''Only the Good Die

Young,'' Maroon 5's ''Harder To Breathe,'' Rod Stewart's ''Maggie May,'' Matchbox Twenty's ''Bright Lights,'' and Rascall Flatts ''What Hurts the Most'' he has impressed American Idol judges and, more importantly, won the hearts and minds of millions across the country who have voted to ensure his continued appearances.

Nick has created quite the fervor in Connecticut—reflected in the thousands of fans across the state who crowd into viewing parties or watch from each week to see him perform and vote for him to advance. I am honored to have this opportunity to join his parents Nick and Liz, along with his sister, Kristen, his extended family, friends and the Guilford community in wishing Nick Fradiani, Jr. the best of luck in the last weeks of the American Idol competition.

Nick—win or lose you have made us all proud and we are with you.

HONORING ESCALADE SPORTS

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Escalade Sports, a fantastic Hoosier business in my home district.

Escalade Sports is being awarded the President's ''E'' Award, the highest recognition a U.S. Company can receive for significantly contributing to the expansion of U.S. exports.

This award was created in 1961 to provide recognition of the work that America's exporters undertake, and honors 45 companies every year for their contributions to the American economy.

Escalade Sports embodies the spirit of this award as it produces many high quality American sporting and gaming products that range from basketball hoops, to table tennis equipment, to archery supplies. These products are then exported and sold to athletes and sports enthusiasts across the globe to enjoy and use.

Escalade Sports is headquartered in Evansville, where it provides quality jobs to Hoosiers here in Southwest Indiana and many more across the United States in its various production and distribution facilities. The company's exports not only help show the world what amazing products are made here in America, but also keep Americans employed and help expand our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be grateful for the fine work of Escalade Sports, and the other ''E'' Award recipients across the United States for their contributions to the American economy.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. MARK P. THOMAS FOR 30 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE SCHUYLKILL CHORAL SOCIETY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Mark P. Thomas, who will be honored for his service to the Schuylkill Choral Society on May 9. Dr. Thomas has served as the music director and conductor of the Schuylkill Choral Society for three decades.

Under his leadership, the Schuylkill County Choral Society has gained worldwide recognition. Dr. Thomas has been recognized in the United States and Europe for his contribution to the performing arts. In addition to his duties with the Choral Society, Dr. Thomas is a founder of both the Anthracite Philharmonic and Schuylkill County's first children's chorus, Minor Notes Chorale.

Dr. Thomas has been a guest artist and conductor for many organizations including the Prague Radio Symphony, the New York Pops, and the Schuylkill Symphony Orchestra. He has made multiple tours throughout Europe and North America which have included multiple performances at Carnegie Hall, the Lincoln Center and the Riverside Cathedral in New York, Orchestra Hall in Chicago, the State Opera House and the Cathedral of St. Mary and Paul in Prague, and the Cathedral of St. Stephen in Vienna. Thomas has served as a guest conductor with the Ocean Grove Choral Festival Choir, at Reading's Music-fest, and for PMEA choral festivals throughout Pennsylvania. He has also toured and conducted in Russia, Finland, and Estonia with members of the State Orchestra of St. Petersburg and members of the Eastern Pennsylvania Choral Society. In 2016, he will be leading the Schuylkill Choral Society on a tour to Italy and France which will include performances in Rome, Florence, Paris, and Normandy. Dr. Thomas has appeared nationally on the NPR and PBS as well as local appearances on Comcast Tonight and Comcast Newsmakers. He has served as a music consultant for Maryland Educational Television and as an adjunct professor at Alvernia University, Penn State University, and Bucks County Community College. Thomas and his choirs are also featured performers of the National Anthem for the Philadelphia sports community, including regular performances for the Phillies, Sixers, and Flyers.

Dr. Thomas is deservedly listed in the Who's Who in the World, Who's Who in America, Who's Who in Education, and Who's Who among American Teachers. He has received recognition from former President Bill Clinton on behalf of a music program he designed honoring World War II veterans. He has also received recognition from the U.S. House of Representatives, the Pennsylvania House and Senate, the Schuylkill County Board of Commissioners, and the Austrian and German governments. Thomas was named by Philadelphia Magazine as ''Best Choral Director'' in the Philadelphia region. He has also been recognized by the St. David's Society as a ''Citizen of the Year,'' was Pennsylvania finalist for ''Teacher of the Year,'' and was the first musician inducted into the Upper Perkiomen Valley Academic Hall of Fame.

It is an honor to recognize Dr. Mark Thomas for his work in the musical arts. His passion for music is evident in his impressive body of work, which has touched countless individuals over the years. I applaud him for his service to the greater artistic good, and I wish him continued success in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 2015

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on Wednesday, April 29. Had I been present, I would have voted ''No'' on Roll Call 176, ''Yes'' on Roll Call 177, and ''No'' on Roll Call vote 178.

SENATE—*Monday, May 4, 2015*

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Lord God Omnipotent, Your power and love destroyed the darkness of death and sin. Thank You for hardships that keep us humble and for misfortunes that keep us aware of Your power and goodness.

Lord, rule the wills of our lawmakers by Your might as You use them to do Your work on Earth. Give them faith to look beyond today's challenges and trials, believing that neither life nor death can separate them from Your love. May they not become bogged down in self-made cares as they continue to look to You, the Author and Finisher of our faith.

Help us all to prove our gratitude to You by selfless service for those who need our love and care.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The minority leader is recognized.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. REID. Madam President, every Member of this body wants to keep Iran from getting a nuclear weapon—everyone—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. But I have to say, a number of my Republican friends have shown an unusual way of showing this. The chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee worked to find a middle ground on this bill that satisfies congressional Democrats, Republicans, and the administration. It wasn't easy. In fact, it was a long and difficult process. That bill came out of the committee 19 to 0. But these two good men, the junior Senator from Maryland and the junior Senator from Tennessee, were able to strike a delicate balance that allows Congress to vote on a final Iran agreement. They were able to build a consensus along the way.

The Corker-Cardin bill was reported out of committee unanimously. Yet before this compromise even came to the floor, certain Senate Republicans were determined to destroy it. A number of Senate Republicans are prioritizing Presidential politics over national security. Others are simply trying to undermine President Obama.

For example, the junior Senator from Arkansas has been on record for months stating his desire to see this negotiation fail. Back in January, before there was a framework of an agreement, he said the following about the ongoing negotiations to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon:

The end of these negotiations isn't an unintended consequence of congressional action. It is very much an intended consequence.

It is there what he said, just as clear as day. The junior Senator from Arkansas and other Republicans want to see any potential agreement with Iran crash and burn, even before we know what is in the final agreement.

Some Republicans have proposed poison pills—poison pill after poison pill—to what was a noble compromise between the leaders of the Foreign Relations Committee. Republicans have proposed 67 amendments as of right now. If they could, they would offer more. Democrats, on the other hand, do not want to upset this delicate balance. We have offered no amendments. Instead, we have striven to preserve the Corker-Cardin bill.

The difference, as usual, is that Democrats want to be constructive and Republicans continue to want to be destructive. Democrats want to pass this bipartisan bill right now, even as the junior Senators from Arkansas, Florida, Texas, and others work to ruin it.

The Senate has already voted on two poisonous amendments, and we will vote on more if we have to, but we don't have to. It is not necessary. It is now clear opponents of the bill aren't interested in being reasonable. The opponents of the Corker-Cardin legislation aren't concerned with finding a middle ground. That is why the majority leader should file cloture now to preserve this legislation. Destructive Members within his own party have forced his hand.

I support the majority leader in taking this step because it is the only path forward to passing this meritorious legislation. The exemplary work done by the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee is too important to be undone by Senators who are putting politics before national and global security.

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, today I rise to continue an effort to honor the memory of the 198 North Dakotans who died while serving our country in Vietnam. As I have said in the past, we are in a period of 13 years of recognition of the sacrifices of those Vietnam vets based on a proclamation signed by the President. I think it is only appropriate that we recognize not only those who were killed in action but also our living Vietnam vets who add so strongly to the fabric of our society and our culture.

First, I would like to recognize a Vietnam veteran who is making a difference each and every day, my good friend Rick Olek. He served in the U.S. Army in Vietnam. He spent 20 years in the National Guard and over 30 years as a U.S. Postal Service letter carrier. He served on North Dakota's Administrative Committee on Veterans Affairs and as president of the North Dakota

Veterans Coordinating Council. Today, he grills a top-notch steak at the AMVETS.

I also want to again thank the Bismarck High School 11th graders and their teachers for helping me to research these fallen heroes and to reach out to their families. These students contacted the family of George Valker III as part of their project and shared their research with my office. I know that this experience for these students has enriched not only my efforts here but enriched their lives as well.

I want the family members, friends, and fellow veterans of the men I honor today to know that it is not easy to narrow the facts of each man's life. In fact, I believe a book could be written about every one of them. I am touched that so many family and friends have opened up to us to talk about their loved ones.

GERALD COULTHART

We are going to start with Gerald Coulthart. Gerald was from Hamilton. He was born June 5, 1947. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Gerald was 21 years old when he died on April 28, 1969. He was the youngest of six children. His brother Raymond also served in the Army.

In high school, Gerald participated in wrestling. After graduation, he attended the Hanson Trade School in Fargo. Before leaving for Vietnam, Gerald shared a premonition with his sister Serene that he would not be alive the next time they would be together. Despite his feeling, Gerald was glad to go, saying it was better it be he than a guy with kids and a family and a wife.

Gerald's fellow soldier, Michael Matthews, recounted that Gerald died 6 weeks into his tour in Vietnam, when Firebase Carolyn came under rocket attack.

STEPHEN EICHELBERGER

Stephen Eichelberger was from Fargo and was born September 26, 1946. He served in the Marine Corps in the 2nd Battalion, 26th Marines. Stephen died on May 16, 1967. He was 20 years old. He was one of five children. Stephen's brother Richard served in the Army.

Stephen's siblings remember him teaching them about the real world. They say Stephen was the best brother anyone could ask for. They appreciated his dedication to them, including attending their sporting events and even buying them a bike.

In addition to his parents and siblings, Stephen left behind his wife Janet and one son John.

FRANCIS ''ED'' GEIGER

Francis ''Ed'' Geiger was from Dickinson. He was born on December 23, 1936. He served in the Air Force as a pilot. Ed was 28 years old when he died on July 23, 1965. He was the eighth of 10 children. Only three of them are living today: Monica, Florence, and Leonard.

Ed became an Air Force captain and flight instructor who was very careful about deciding whether or not to certify other officers to fly. He was a stickler for the rules.

Ed left behind his wife Joan and daughter Lynn.

Faith was very important to Ed. While in Vietnam, he worked with the chaplain to provide a daily Catholic mass for those who wished to attend.

Two Air Force memorials honor Ed: Geiger Hall at Minot Air Force Base and a memorial wall at Memorial Park in Colorado Springs for forward air controllers killed in action.

STEPHEN GROTH, JR.

Stephen Groth, Jr., was from Enderlin and was born January 12, 1945. He served in the Army's 4th Infantry Division. Stephen was 22 years old when he went missing July 12, 1967.

In high school, Stephen was well liked. He enjoyed golf and baseball. He attended both North Dakota State University and the State School of Science in Wahpeton before joining the service.

His sister Kathy remembers how Stephen spent his last days before leaving for Vietnam visiting the people he loved. Kathy has always believed he was using this time to say good-bye. Throughout the years, people have left photos, letters, and other memorials at his grave in Enderlin.

MELVIN LEMBKE

Melvin Lembke was from Grand Forks and was born March 23, 1944. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. On December 11, 1968, Melvin died. He was 24 years old.

Melvin was one of four boys, and three of them served in the military at the same time. One brother, Raymond, also served in the Army, and another brother, William, served in the Marine Corps.

Melvin was an accomplished wrestler, earning second in the State high school championship, and later made the wrestling team at the University of North Dakota.

Melvin's brothers remembered how he excelled in math and science and loved life. Melvin was survived by his wife, son, brothers, and parents.

THOMAS NARUM

Thomas Narum was from Amidon and was born on May 13, 1946. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. He was only 20 years old when he died on January 18, 1967.

Thomas was 1 of 11 children. His sister closest in age, Margaret, remembers Thomas as a kind, gentle young man. She told of how he would often scrub the floors in their home to help his mother.

Thomas was such an important part of the sports teams in high school that after he fell off a scaffolding while working on the family's house, the school superintendent was upset that Thomas chose to have surgery for the chipped bone in his arm and wouldn't be able to play.

RICHARD ORSUND

Richard Orsund was from Grafton and was born on July 19, 1947. He served in the Army's 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment. Richard died on March 27, 1968. He was 20 years old.

Richard was the second of four children. His father served in the Army in World War II, and his older brother served in the North Dakota National Guard.

Richard's sister Shirley remembers him as a well-respected young man. He was the president of the student council, and he was an outstanding athlete in track and football. He worked a part-time job after school. So, in order to practice for track, he woke up early every morning and ran 4 miles around the family's section of land.

Richard believed he would eventually be drafted. So after 1 year of college, he enlisted in the Army.

At Richard's funeral, the church and basement were both overflowing, with some people standing outside listening.

RONALD ''RONNIE'' STOLTENOW

Ronald ''Ronnie'' Stoltenow was from Hankinson and was born on June 29, 1947. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. Ronnie was 20 years old when he died on November 7, 1967.

His family and friends say he was respectful, loyal, humble, compassionate, friendly, hardworking, willing to learn, and spontaneous.

Ronnie served as a medic in Vietnam. During an ambush, he was wounded but he continued to give aid to his fellow soldiers until he was eventually shot and killed.

His family believes his bravery, deep sense of duty to his country, and compassion for others led Ronnie to become a fallen hero.

GEORGE TONGEN

George Tongen was from Walhalla and was born on August 7, 1947. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. George died May 21, 1968. He was 20 years old.

George was the middle child of seven children. Three of George's brothers also served our country. Robert served in the Marine Corps, and Daniel and John served in the Army.

George's father was not able to finish high school, so he made sure his children understood the importance of education. George was the only child in their family who didn't earn a college degree because he chose to enlist after his sophomore year of college. George's siblings completed their college education, some earning master's and doctoral degrees.

George's family remembers him as a bright, avid reader and music lover. He was a positive role model to the kids he encountered while working as a lifeguard and camp counselor.

RICHARD ''DICK'' TRISKE

Richard ''Dick'' Triske was from Fargo. He was born on January 3, 1949.

He served in the Marine Corps' India Company, 3rd Battalion, 7th Marines. Dick was 19 years old when he died on June 2, 1968.

Dick had two brothers and two sisters. His siblings remember that Dick was a fun-loving person who always enjoyed making jokes. He loved boxing and fixing cars.

Dick enlisted before graduating from high school. Three of his friends also died while serving in Vietnam, two of them before Dick and one after.

GEORGE ''GREG'' VALKER III

George ''Greg'' Valker III was from Fargo and was born on October 24, 1946. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division. Greg was 21 years old when he died on August 10, 1968.

Greg had a younger brother, Bryan, and a younger sister, Vicki. Their parents ran a floral shop, and Greg was an important part of that flower business. While serving in Vietnam, he helped fellow soldiers send floral arrangements to their families on the holidays and made sure that moms were remembered on Mother's Day.

Greg's plans after completing his service was to become a third-generation florist in the family business.

His family and friends remember Greg as being fun and full of love and kindness. Greg was his brother Bryan's best friend and confidant, and his sister Vicki's teacher and protector.

In talking with the Bismarck High School students and my staff about her brother Greg, Vicki found that after all of these long years of mourning the loss of her big brother, this opportunity to share what a wonderful person he was allowed her to find some closure on a painful loss.

MURRAY VIDLER

Murray Vidler was from Canada but enlisted in Fargo. He was born on May 6, 1946. He served in the Marine Corps' Mike Company, 3rd Battalion, 5th Marines. Murray died on December 19, 1967. He was 21 years old.

One of Murray's friends had served in Vietnam, which inspired Murray and another friend to enlist in the U.S. Marine Corps. When he went home on leave, he told his siblings of the friendships he had made in the U.S. Armed Forces and how much he cared about the children of Vietnam.

GORDON WENAAS

Gordon Wenaas was from Mayville and was born on March 2, 1932. He served in the Air Force's 314th Tactical Airlift Wing. Gordon was 35 years old when he went missing on December 29, 1967. While missing, he was promoted to lieutenant colonel.

He was one of eight children. Gordon and all of his four brothers served our country in the military.

Gordon has four children of his own: Kenny, Pam, Ronny, and Ricky.

His remains were recovered in the 1990s and identified in 2000. He is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

DAN NEUENSCHWANDER

Dan Neuenschwander was from Fessenden and was born on October 3, 1945. He served in the Marine Corps' India Company, 3rd Battalion, 5th Marines. Dan died on May 15, 1968. He was only 22 years old.

Dan was the youngest of four children. His oldest sister, Nedra, said that the family babied him and that he was a tough, yet sensitive person. Nedra is proud of her brother and remembers that while he was studying at the University of North Dakota, he had mono but fought to get a clean bill of health so he could enlist in the Marines.

Shortly after Dan's death, his family received a letter he wrote them describing why he believed in the Vietnam war.

NORMAN WILLIAMS

Norman Williams was born July 11, 1947. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Norman was 20 years old when he died on December 6, 1967.

He was one of four children. Six of Norman's uncles served in World War II.

Norman's brother Roger said that in high school Norman's friends called him Will or Willy. His active high school career included playing football and participating in the FFA as a member of the crop judging team, a chapter officer, and a member of the parliamentary procedure team.

Norman chose to enlist in the Army in 1966 to serve his country.

All of these young men—as we think about their lives and their sacrifice, we can only imagine what they would have accomplished and what they would have done in our country. We are so grateful for their sacrifice, and it is so important that we remember this sacrifice during this period of remembrance of the Vietnam war.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Madam President, today I return to the floor of the Senate for my ninth installment of ''Waste of the Week.'' I think the Presiding Officer has been here for most of those nine installments.

My purpose has been straightforward: to highlight waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal spending. So far, we have reached a potential taxpayer savings of almost $50 billion. I have a chart here which shows the ever-increasing amount of red ink, representing waste of taxpayers' dollars, caused by fraud and abuse and waste from programs that simply haven't proven their effectiveness. We are on the way to $100 billion. Today we are going to reach and go over the halfway mark. We are going to continue to do this, and, hopefully, we will be extending this chart in the future, which now shows just some examples of what we have provided before.

The largest example of waste, fraud, and abuse disclosed was found in the refundable child care tax credit to the tune of $20 billion in potential savings. These are from people who did not qualify—they were ineligible for receipt—yet over a 10-year period of time, they will receive $20 billion which they are not entitled to.

The smallest but by far the most inexplicable—and even laughable and ludicrous—example of waste was a $387,000 grant for a study to determine whether massages on New Zealand rabbits after strenuous exercise would help their recovery time. Now, anybody who has been out in the yard, fixing around the house doing strenuous activity, when asked if they think a massage would help them recover, probably is going to say yes. In fact, the rabbits were getting it four times a day. While they couldn't say yes, I think the response clearly was that this is a pretty good deal. Unfortunately, it costs the taxpayer $387,000 in grant money to prove that, yes, the massages helped after strenuous exercises. It is not exactly what the taxpayer had in mind. When they sent their tax dollars to Washington. When they paid their taxes on April 15 and filed their return—that is not exactly what they were sending their money to Washington to do. Is it laughable? Yes. Is it tragic? Yes. We are spending significant amounts of money and it is going to waste, fraud, and abuse. By the way, the rabbits were all euthanized after the results, so they enjoyed the massages, but it didn't last and they are no longer with us.

Perhaps the most important example of waste was to protect Americans from identity theft and taxpayers from fraud. By correcting Social Security records, we could save at least $2 billion. This is the famous Methuselah example. The Social Security Administration had not deleted the Social Security numbers of those who had died. The number is staggering. It was 6.5 million, I believe—the number of people who would have exceeded the age of 112 years. In other words, they applied for Social Security back in the early 1930s or mid-1930s when the program began, but their numbers were never erased. They were then used for fraud. The savings, if we could correct that problem—and I have proposed legislation to do so—would be $2 billion.

This week, I wish to speak about the Department of Agriculture. Now, being from a State such as Indiana, agriculture is obviously very important and I am a strong supporter of Hoosier

farming. I fight for family farms as they seek to survive from generation to generation. I support cutting red-tape and Federal mandates that unnecessarily burden Hoosier farmers.

As a broader issue, I recognize that food production is extremely important not only for our own benefit but rises to the level of even being an issue of national security. But that is not what I am talking about today.

Today, I wish to speak about taxpayer dollars that are being used to fund grants not for farming but for marketing. Let me give some examples. U.S. law currently on the books creates a grant program requiring that the ''Secretary of Agriculture shall award competitive grants in developing a business plan for viable marketing opportunities.'' Well, there is a real question as to whether this ought to be mandated through the Federal Government; that is, should the government select those who apply for grants to develop a marketing program. The problem is that very few end up with the grants, but for those who do, it is a special deal for them. Winners and losers really shouldn't be selected by the Federal Government for a grant that doesn't go directly to production but actually goes to marketing of agricultural goods.

Let me give an example. One of the winners was a single farm that received a $44,700 grant to increase sales of its pumpkins and squash, including pumpkin doughnuts. I am not making this up. The grant was there to promote the marketing of pumpkin doughnuts—they probably taste pretty good—as a nutritious, locally produced food.

The farmer down the road didn't get his grant. Maybe he was growing corn. The farmer on the other side of the road was growing soybeans, another was growing wheat, another might be growing tomatoes, another might be growing different types of fruit, and so forth and so on, but the one who was growing pumpkins somehow qualified. The government said: Hey, that is a winner. Let's put a marketing plan together. Here is $44,700 to do so.

That is one example.

Through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, taxpayers are funding things such as helping to process olives into olive oil. I think that is a practice that goes back a few thousand years—just ask the Italians. I don't know that we needed a grant to do that. There is a grant for helping to develop and market sparkling wine and hard cider. We have been drinking wine since the beginning of time. I think the French know how to market sparkling wines. Maybe we can read how to do it rather than putting a grant together to promote that. There are grants for the marketing of goat's milk, cheese, and soaps and providing organic chicken meat for restaurants. Look, I am not against the agriculture community marketing its products. Every product maker markets their products. But do we need all this expenditure of taxpayer money to prove whether there can be a better marketing program for a select few? What about the many who don't have any basis or ability to claim these grants?

Over the past 10 years, grantees under this program have received over $290 million. It is a pretty sweet deal for the grant recipients, but it is a pretty expensive deal for the taxpayer. And what does this grant process say about the losers, those not selected? In essence, what we are doing is promoting a few select products. Why are we promoting pumpkin doughnuts over banana nut muffins? What about watermelons and not cantaloupes, carrots, turnips—and on and on we go.

Well, the Federal Government is here to protect farmers and entrepreneurs so they can compete in a fair and dependable economic climate. But at the end of the day, these government-selected projects are not the best use of taxpayer money and are in stark contrast to what the government ought to be doing. After all, when taxpayers send their hard-earned tax dollars to Washington, they rightly expect their leaders to steward those resources responsibly. I would argue that taxpayer-funded pumpkin doughnuts are not a good use of taxpayer dollars.

I support agriculture, but let's actually support farming, not just pumping up the sales and profits of a select few. We can do better.

Today, I am adding $290 million to our taxpayer savings gauge, which puts us over the halfway mark of $50 billion. That is a small amount compared to our budget. That is a small amount in terms of the money that comes flowing into Washington from taxpayers. But we have not been able to address the larger issue, the issue that has to be addressed and is continually pushed down the road, continually pushed back to the next election, and that is the unbelievable growth of entitlement programs that are squeezing out many essential and necessary things the government needs to do, such as health care research.

This morning, I was listening to a committee meeting with Francis Collins, who heads up NIH, who was talking about the medical breakthroughs they could have if they just had some more funds and weren't being sequestered with less and less money each year. We need to always—but particularly in difficult fiscal times—direct taxpayers' funding in the most responsible way we can.

With that, I will add some more money to our gauge, and we will be back next week for ''Waste of the Week'' No. 10.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, in Congress we should be working on ways to build an economy that works for all of our families—not just the wealthiest few. Unfortunately, once again, instead of standing up for workers, some of my Republican colleagues are bound and determined to defend the biggest corporations that have an interest in keeping wages low and denying workers a voice to improve their workplace.

President Obama vetoed this resolution. I urge my colleagues to sustain that veto to ensure workers are able to exercise that right. The National Labor Relations Board, the NLRB, helps to ensure that workers have a fair up-or-down-vote. Unfortunately, too often big corporations take advantage of loopholes in the current election process to delay a vote on union representation.

The NLRB was absolutely right to carry out its mission to review and streamline its election process to bring down those barriers for workers who want a fair vote. These updates will make modest but important changes to modernize and streamline the process. They will reduce unnecessary litigation on issues that will not affect the outcome of the election. The new process will bring the election process into the 21st century by letting employers and unions file forms electronically. Instead of attacking workers who just want a voice in the workplace, I hope my colleagues will support President Obama's veto.

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

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5:20 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 76, Willie May to be an Under Secretary of Commerce, and that at 5:30 p.m. the Senate vote on the nomination; further, that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be

considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF WILLIE E. MAY TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Willie E. May, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I support President Obama's nomination of Dr. Willie May as the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, at the Department of Commerce.

NIST sets the standards for innovation in technology from mammograms to motorcycles. NIST scientists have won a MacArthur Genius Award and four Nobel prizes—more than any other Federal agency—including one in my State of Maryland. In the 44 years that Dr. May has spent at NIST, including serving as Acting Director since last June, he has set his own standard for service, dedication, and leadership in this great agency.

Dr. May grew up in Birmingham, AL, graduated from Knoxville College in 1968, and upon graduating with a bachelor of science degree in chemistry, took a job with a Federal laboratory in Oak Ridge, TN. In 1971, Dr. May came to Maryland to work for NIST's predecessor, which was then called the National Standards Bureau. He completed his Ph.D. in chemistry at the University of Maryland while working full-time at NIST and earned his doctorate in 1977. His research on trace organic analytical chemistry has been covered in more than 100 peer-reviewed journals around the world.

His colleagues know him not only for his brilliance in the lab but for his commitment to NIST's mission and employees. He is respected by the scientists at NIST but also by the engineers, lab workers, IT experts, and building staff. His vision will help NIST's 3,000 dedicated employees continue to be the world's leading experts in innovation, from quantum cryptography to 5G communications.

I join my colleagues in supporting Dr. Willie E. May as Director of NIST.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Willie E. May, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 169 Ex.]

YEAS—93

Ayotte	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blumenthal	Graham	Peters
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boxer	Heinrich	Reid
Brown	Heitkamp	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Cantwell	Hirono	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Cardin	Inhofe	Sanders
Carper	Isakson	Sasse
Casey	Johnson	Schatz
Cassidy	Kaine	Schumer
Coats	King	Scott
Cochran	Kirk	Sessions
Collins	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coons	Lankford	Shelby
Corker	Leahy	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Manchin	Tester
Crapo	Markey	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall
Durbin	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Merkley	Warren
Ernst	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Menendez	Vitter
Boozman	Murkowski	
Cruz	Toomey	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CHICAGO COMMUNITY TRUST 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DURBIN. For 100 years, the Chicago Community Trust has connected the generosity of Chicagoans with the needs of the community.

In 1915, 6 years after Daniel Burnham unveiled his visionary plan for the city of Chicago, Norman Harris and his son Albert recognized how much could be achieved by combining the philanthropy of business and community leaders who cared deeply about the future of Chicago. They founded The Chicago Community Trust. As brilliant as Burnham's plan was, Norman and Albert Harris understood that it takes more than steel, glass, and concrete to make a great city. A great city needs healthy, hopeful people, good schools, culture, and arts—all things that the trust has helped nurture for 100 years.

Whether its economic opportunity, education, housing, conservation, or health care—the list of important causes in which the Chicago Community Trust is involved is remarkable. Since its founding, the trust has granted more than $2 billion to nonprofit organizations working to improve the quality of life in the community. The trust has helped develop new audiences to sustain arts organizations, protected the human services safety net for those hardest hit by economic challenges, eased the devastating effects of foreclosures in Chicago neighborhoods, and elevated teaching to meet world-class standards.

In the wake of the worst recession since the Great Depression, the trust

stepped up and distributed $11.4 million in Unity Challenge grants to meet the needs of Chicago's most vulnerable citizens. The grants supplied food to more than 800 soup kitchens and food pantries. The trust helped expand capacity at homeless shelters and bought winter coats for children. The trust put money in community health centers and helped seniors pay for their prescription medications. The recession was hard on Chicago, but the business and community leaders at the Chicago Community Trust made sure that the community took care of its own.

This month, the trust is launching its centennial campaign, starting with the return of ''On the Table,'' a forum that brings together thousands of Chicago residents to share a meal and talk about how they can work together to make the community stronger, safer, and more dynamic. Last year, nearly 12,000 people participated from every Chicago neighborhood and 11 neighboring counties. This year, the trust is expecting to at least double the number of people participating.

I congratulate the Chicago Community Trust on 100 years strengthening the community. Thank you for all you have done and continue to do to make Chicago a great and caring community.

VOTER REGISTRATION MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senator GILLIBRAND in support of the introduction of the Voter Registration Modernization Act of 2015. This bill would improve the fabric of our democracy and bring our election procedures into the 21st century by eradicating barriers to voter registration and expanding access to the franchise for millions of voters who were previously unregistered to vote. I thank Senator GILLIBRAND for her leadership on this issue.

The right to vote is the bedrock of our democracy. In our representative form of government, the right to participate in the democratic process is fundamental to who we are and what we believe. That is, our belief in being a nation grounded in the idea of equal justice under law. Voting is a fundamental right because it is preservative of all other rights. Without access to the ballot, our civil rights and freedoms of religion, speech, and press could be eroded and our faith that those rights will be fully protected lost.

In 2012, our Nation witnessed cracks in the foundation of our democracy. Millions of people watched television coverage of our presidential election in disgust as voters stood in lines for hours, mainly due to problems with the paper-based voter registration system. No American in the 21st century should have to use paper ballots or stand in lines for hours in order to exercise their fundamental right to vote. The President's bipartisan commission to improve the election process concluded that no voter should have to wait more than 30 minutes to vote. We should be making voting easier, not harder. We can begin that process by ensuring that States modernize their voter registration process and give citizens the choice to register to vote online.

When the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 was passed two decades ago, the revolution in data sharing and integration was just beginning. It is time to incorporate the commonplace experience of online transactions into the election process. By implementing online voter registration, the Voter Registration Modernization Act addresses a key problem with paper-based systems—the inaccurate transfer of information to election authorities. This bill would ensure that voters' votes count and help election authorities who rely on accurate voter registration lists to better detect problems.

Currently, 20 States have online voter registration systems. One of the greatest benefits we have seen so far is the saving of taxpayers' money. Arizona, for example, which launched the Nation's first online voter registration system, saved its taxpayers almost $1.4 million. Kansas noted no expenses at all. It is now time for the Federal Government to follow their lead and adopt these common-sense, cost cutting reforms.

The Voter Registration Modernization Act amends the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for online voter registration systems. It provides funding for States to implement the bill and directs the National Institute of Standards and Technology to conduct an ongoing study on best practices for Internet registration. With passage of this bill, States are required to adopt pro-technology measures, including taking steps to ensure the online availability of voter registration forms, provide online assistance, and allow voters to update registration information online.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said ''The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.'' But that arc does not bend towards justice without effort. We must put in the necessary hard work—and build the foundation and infrastructure—for justice to prevail. We can improve the health of our democracy by supporting this critical legislation, which would expand the ballot and update our voting technology. I urge all Senators to support the Voter Registration Modernization Act of 2015.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:07 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2029. An act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2029. An act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 261. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse.

S. 612. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the ''George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

S. 1034. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''Charles Clark United States Courthouse''.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1179. A bill to exempt the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1180. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to modernize the integrated public alert and warning system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1181. A bill to expand the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program to include commercial trucks and United States flagged vessels, to return unspent funds and loan proceeds to the United States Treasury to reduce the national debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1182. A bill to exempt application of JSA attribution rule in case of existing agreements; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1183. A bill to increase the participation of women, girls, and underrepresented minorities in STEM fields, to encourage and support students from all economic backgrounds to pursue STEM career opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1184. A bill to establish a grant program to promote the development of career education programs in computer science in secondary and postsecondary education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1185. A bill to better integrate STEM education into elementary and secondary instruction and curricula, to encourage high-quality STEM professional development, and to expand current mathematics and science education research to include engineering education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Move America bonds and to allow such bonds to be converted into tax credits to support public-private partnerships; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1187. A bill to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 166. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that domestically grown flowers support the farmers, small businesses, jobs, and economy of the United States, enhance the ability of the people of the United States to honor their mothers on Mother's Day, and that the White House should strive to showcase domestically grown flowers; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. Con. Res. 15. A concurrent resolution commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the 1915 Panama-California Exposition and the establishment of Balboa Park in San Diego, California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 125

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 125, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 125, supra.

S. 141

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 141, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 142

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 142, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 235, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 377

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to ambulance services under the Medicare program and to reform payments for such services under such program, and for other purposes.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 434

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to strengthen the accountability of individuals involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of background investigations, to update guidelines for security clearances, to prevent conflicts of interest relating to contractors providing background investigation fieldwork services and investigative support services, and for other purposes.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 471

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 471, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 621

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 621, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety and effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials approved for use in the prevention and control of animal diseases, in order to minimize the development of antibiotic-resistant bacteria.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 689, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 711

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 711, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Service Health Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, supra.

S. 780

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 780, a bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 843

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

S. 862

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 876

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 876, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions.

S. 962

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 962, a bill to extend the same Federal benefits to law enforcement officers serving private institutions of higher education and rail carriers that apply to law enforcement officers serving units of State and local government.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1002, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 1049

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to allow the financing by United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1073

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1073, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1131

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1131, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the incidence of diabetes among Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1179. A bill to exempt the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this past Saturday, May 2, saw the running of the 141st Kentucky Derby, the most exciting 2 minutes in sports. Derby Day is a cause for celebration across the State and Derby celebrations often feature Kentucky's native spirit of bourbon. Bourbon is a key ingredient in the legendary Mint Julep, the official drink of the Derby. Fittingly, today marks the 51st anniversary of the original congressional bourbon resolution that designated bourbon as a distinctive product of America.

Kentucky is the birthplace of bourbon. The drink is named for Bourbon County, KY, where the product first emerged, and today Kentucky produces 95 percent of the world's supply. The bourbon industry generates 15,400 jobs with an annual payroll of $707 million statewide. It is a $3 billion industry in Kentucky and a vital part of the State's tourism and economy. Simply put, the bourbon industry is a signature industry for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

That is why the legislation I introduce today is so important. I rise to introduce the Advancing Growth in the Economy through Distilled Spirits Act, or the AGED Spirits Act. Cosponsored by my friend Senator RAND PAUL, it will correct a provision in the tax code to ensure that Kentucky's bourbon producers are no longer at a disadvantage with their global competitors.

Under current law, unlike most other spirits, bourbon, and whiskey producers in America must capitalize the interest expense incurred to finance inventories, and it is not deductible until the product is sold, which could be as long as 23 years after a lengthy aging process.

In the United Kingdom, however, all spirit producers are permitted to deduct interest expense the year it is capitalized. This discrepancy is harmful to American makers of distilled spirits as it contributes to increased costs that directly create a competitive disadvantage for American products in the global marketplace.

My bill would fix this discrepancy by permitting American bourbon and whiskey producers to deduct interest expense associated with production in the year it is paid by exempting the natural aging process in the determination of the production period for distilled spirits. This legislation will not only put Kentucky's bourbon industry on a level playing field with its global competitors, it is also a pro-growth measure that will help provide a boost to our economy and help create jobs in Kentucky.

Making this change in law is a matter of common sense. The situation under current law, where American bourbon and whiskey producers are not allowed to deduct the expenses related to storing and aging their product until it is bottled and sold, is akin to a homeowner not being able to deduct the interest on a home mortgage until the sale of the house.

Over the last several years, high-end premium American bourbons and whiskeys have enjoyed significant growth in volume both here in the U.S. and in international markets. Bourbon production has increased more than 150 percent since 1999. Given equitable tax treatment, American bourbon and whiskey products, as well as related jobs, could grow even more. Finally, this problem reveals just one of the many flaws in our Nation's broken tax code, which ultimately needs to be comprehensively reformed to promote even greater job creation and economic growth in our country.

So I hope my colleagues will join me in advancing growth in Kentucky's and America's economy by leveling the tax playing field for America's distilled spirits. Fifty-one years after its official recognition, bourbon is responsibly enjoyed by adults all over the world, and not just on Derby Day. The industry has grown and thrived, and I am sure it will continue to do so. I want to thank and congratulate all the hard-working Kentuckians who have contributed to building our State's vibrant bourbon industry.

I urge my colleagues to support the AGED Spirits Act, and I look forward to its swift passage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1179

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Advancing Growth in the Economy through Distilled Spirits Act'' or the ''AGED Spirits Act''.

SEC. 2. PRODUCTION PERIOD OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263A(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) EXEMPTION FOR AGING PROCESS OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.—For purposes of this subsection, the production period shall not include the aging period for distilled spirits (as described in section 5002(a)(8)).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to the production of distilled spirits that begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Move America bonds and to allow such bonds to be converted into tax credits to support public-private partnerships; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, modern transportation infrastructure is a critical building block to ensure that the U.S. economy is in a position for long term growth and prosperity. It creates jobs, draws investment and supports overall global competitiveness. With the deadline for the Highway Trust Fund reauthorization looming just a month away, we are faced with the reality that our crumbling transportation systems simply are not up to the job.

Our aging infrastructure impacts everyone. Every day, Americans leave their homes to commute to work or school only to be faced with more than just snarled traffic, but roads in dire need of repair. More than one-fifth of U.S. roads are in poor condition, with nearly one-half trillion dollars in needed repairs across the country over the next decade.

U.S. ports, a critical economic doorway, are struggling under the weight of increased cargo traffic, leading to congestion and slowing exports. They now require nearly $30 billion in landside investment alone to keep up with the general demands they are under. Our national infrastructure is in a clear state of decline, demanding $3.6 trillion in total investment by 2020, according to the American Society of Civil Engineers.

For one of the largest economies in the world known for its strength and leadership, we are falling behind other countries. Our infrastructure spending has continued to decline since 1960. It is now at less than two percent of GDP annually. That falls behind China's nine percent and Europe's five. Meanwhile, our population continues to grow, placing new demands on our aging transportation system.

How do we get back on track and safeguard the health of our transportation infrastructure? The first step is for Congress to ensure the solvency of the trust funds for highways, transit, airports, ports, and waterways. Critical infrastructure projects demand long term planning and certainty, not a continual cycle of start-stop efforts. We must aim for a long-term, bipartisan solution so that every year states don't have to put projects on hold for fear of running out of funds.

Second, its time Congress looked beyond Washington and bring the private sector to the table to spur new financing partnerships that support our infrastructure needs.

There is an untapped opportunity here: Standard and Poor's estimates that private investors could provide more than $100 billion in infrastructure investment each year. Public-private partnerships, P3s, are unique in that they offer upfront capital financing, along with the transfer of risk to the private partner, allowing for more efficient project design, construction and maintenance. P3s have been successful in the U.S., as well as other countries around the world.

Recognizing this pressing need and opportunity, today Senator HOEVEN and I are introducing the Move America program. Move America is designed to strengthen our transportation system by making it easier for the states to put together P3s and draw private investment. This unique, bipartisan driven proposal complements federal funding efforts, by creating cheaper and more effective financing tools to expand investment in roads, bridges, transit, ports, rail, and airports.

Move America expands tax exempt private activity bonds and creates a new infrastructure tax credit, giving stakeholders significant flexibility to pursue infrastructure projects that are badly needed in states and localities. And these tools are available for use regardless of who owns the project—government or private groups—making financing, management, and leasing arrangements much simpler. The bonds also exempt the interest income from the alternative minimum tax, making it an attractive proposal to investors.

For states that are hesitant to issue more debt, or that are looking to leverage more private equity, Move America credits would be available for the state to attract equity investors for infrastructure projects. The credits are available to the extent there is at least twice as much private investment in

the project. This one-to-one match leverages additional equity investment at a lower cost to states and cities, lowering their capital costs or allowing them to reduce tolls or other revenues required for the project.

Critical transportation projects come to life in less time and at less cost to taxpayers. Americans can travel on safer footing. The private sector finds a new investment opportunity.

Strengthening our country's transportation infrastructure shouldn't be a political issue. It is time we come together and create a path to move America forward and build the 21st century infrastructure that our country deserves.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 166—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT DOMESTICALLY GROWN FLOWERS SUPPORT THE FARMERS, SMALL BUSINESSES, JOBS, AND ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES, ENHANCE THE ABILITY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES TO HONOR THEIR MOTHERS ON MOTHER'S DAY, AND THAT THE WHITE HOUSE SHOULD STRIVE TO SHOWCASE DOMESTICALLY GROWN FLOWERS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 166

Whereas the people of the United States have a long history of using flowers and greens grown in the United States to bring beauty to important events and express affection for loved ones;

Whereas consumers spend more than $25,000,000,000 each year on floral products, including garden plants, bedding, indoor plants, and cut flowers;

Whereas 30 percent of households in the United States purchase fresh cut flowers and greens from more than 16,000 florists and floral establishments each year;

Whereas the people of the United States increasingly want to support domestically produced foods and agricultural products, yet 74 percent of the people of the United States do not know where the flowers they purchase are grown, and 58 percent would prefer to buy locally grown flowers given the choice;

Whereas in response to increased demand, the ''Certified American Grown Flowers'' logo was created in July 2014, in order to educate and empower consumers to purchase flowers from domestic producers;

Whereas as of April 2015, millions of stems of domestically grown flowers are now Certified American Grown;

Whereas domestic flower farmers produce thousands of varieties of flowers across the United States, such as peonies in Alaska, Gerbera daisies in California, lupines in Maine, tulips in Washington, lilies in Oregon, and larkspur in Texas;

Whereas the 5 flower varieties with the highest United States production are tulips, Gerbera daisies, lilies, irises, and gladiolas;

Whereas people in every State have access to domestically grown flowers, yet only 1 of 5 flowers sold in the United States is domestically grown;

Whereas the domestic cut flower industry creates almost $42,000,000 in economic impact daily and supports hundreds of growers, thousands of small businesses, and tens of thousands of jobs in the United States;

Whereas more people in the United States are expressing interest in growing flowers locally, which has resulted in an approximately 20 percent increase in the number of domestic cut flower farms since 2007;

Whereas most domestic cut flowers and greens are sold in the United States within 24 to 48 hours after harvest and last longer than flowers shipped longer distances;

Whereas in 2014, President Barack Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama highlighted their support for domestically grown flowers at the White House State Dinner with French President François Hollande, the only White House State Dinner that year;

Whereas the 2014 White House State Dinner featured quince branch from Mississippi, weeping willow from New Jersey, Scotch broom from Virginia, iris from California, and alocasia, equisetum, nandina, and green liriope from Florida;

Whereas flower-giving has been a holiday tradition in the United States for generations;

Whereas Mother's Day and Valentine's Day are 2 of the 3 top flower-giving holidays in the United States;

Whereas 38 percent of the people in the United States, spending more than $2,000,000,000, buy flowers on Valentine's Day; and

Whereas flowers are even more popular on Mother's Day than on Valentine's Day, and in 2014, ⅔ of people in the United States celebrating Mother's Day purchased flowers, spending more than $2,300,000,000: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) purchasing flowers grown in the United States supports the farmers, small businesses, jobs, and economy of the United States;

(2) flowers and greens grown in the United States are a vital and integral part of the agricultural industry of the United States;

(3) flowers grown in the United States enhance the ability of Americans to honor their mothers on Mother's Day; and

(4) the White House should strive to showcase flowers and greens grown in the United States to show support for the flower breeders, farmers, processors, and distributors of the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15—COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1915 PANAMA-CALIFORNIA EXPOSITION AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BALBOA PARK IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. CON. RES. 15

Whereas in 1868, San Diego civic leaders set aside 1,400 acres of land, which became known as City Park;

Whereas in 1910, in preparation for the Panama-California Exposition hosted by San Diego, that park was named ''Balboa Park'' in honor of Spanish-born Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, the first European to see the Pacific Ocean while exploring in present-day Panama;

Whereas the 1915–1916 Panama-California Exposition commemorated the opening of the Panama Canal and was the first of two expositions that added to Balboa Park's dramatic architecture;

Whereas in 1914, John D. and Adolph Spreckels donated the Spreckels Organ, one of the world's largest outdoor pipe organs, to the City of San Diego for the Panama-California Exposition, and this unique organ contains 4,530 pipes ranging in length from the size of a pencil to 32 feet and is housed in an ornate vaulted structure with highly embellished gables;

Whereas the San Diego Zoo was established in Balboa Park at the close of the Exposition in the fall of 1916, when Dr. Harry Wegeforth, a local physician, conceived the idea of starting a zoo after hearing the roar of a lion, one of the few wild animals displayed in cages at the Exposition, and the Balboa Zoo is now home to more than 3,700 rare and endangered animals representing over 660 species and subspecies and a prominent botanical collection with more than 700,000 plants—a world famous conservation organization where visitors view exotic animals in habitat environments;

Whereas in 1926, the Fine Arts Gallery of San Diego, now The San Diego Museum of Art, opened to the public, and its renowned holdings include a fine selection of European old masters, 19th and 20th-century American art, an encyclopedic Asian collection, and growing collections of contemporary and Latin American art;

Whereas in 1933, the San Diego Natural History Museum opened within the park and is housed in a building created with Works Project Administration assistance;

Whereas in 1935–1936, Balboa Park hosted its second major exposition, the California Pacific International Exposition, which helped boost the local economy during the depression and added additional structures and landscaping, many of which now host cultural institutions and events;

Whereas the internationally acclaimed, Tony Award-winning Old Globe, one of the most esteemed regional theaters in the country, was founded within Balboa Park in 1935, and now boasts three unique venues: the historic Old Globe Theatre (built for the 1935 exposition and expanded and rebuilt in 1978), the intimate Sheryl and Harvey White Theatre, and the outdoor Lowell Davies Festival Theatre;

Whereas Balboa Park helped support military efforts in World War I and World War II, when most of the buildings on the Central Mesa became adjuncts to the adjacent Naval hospital, the House of Hospitality became a nurses' dormitory, the Lily Pond became a rehabilitation pool, and 400 hospital beds were placed in the San Diego Fine Arts Gallery;

Whereas on December 25, 1946, the California Tower carillon was installed; whose chimes are still heard across the park on every quarter hour;

Whereas in 1978, two devastating fires struck Balboa Park, resulting in the destruction of the Electric Building, including the San Diego Aerospace Museum collection, and the 1935 Old Globe Theatre, both of which were rebuilt with private donations;

Whereas in the 1980's, the San Diego Model Railroad Museum, the Museum of Photographic Arts, the San Diego Automotive Museum and the Veterans Museum and Memorial Center all opened within Balboa Park;

Whereas in the 1990's, the beautiful Japanese Friendship Garden, the Mingei International Museum, the San Diego Art Institute: Museum of the Living Artist, the WorldBeat Center, and the Hall of Champions Sports Museum opened;

Whereas Balboa Park has grown to become the one of the nation's largest urban cultural parks, encompassing more than 1,172 acres, including 14 formal gardens, and the park is home to 15 major museums, nearly 100 arts, education, recreational, social and sports organizations, renowned performing arts venues, as well as the world famous San Diego Zoo;

Whereas Balboa Park celebrates history, art, music, science, and culture and has been a city treasure for one century; and

Whereas the 2015 centennial anniversary of the Panama-California Exposition and the establishment of Balboa Park is an achievement of historic proportions for the City of San Diego, the State of California, and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress commemorates the 100th anniversary of the Panama-California Exposition and the founding of Balboa Park in San Diego, California on May 9, 2015.

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Debbie Stabenow:									
Cuba	Peso		822.00						822.00
Christopher Adamo:									
Cuba	Peso		822.00						822.00
Total			1,644.00						1,644.00

SENATOR PAT ROBERTS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Apr. 24, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
Cuba	Peso		822.00						822.00
Tim Rieser:									
Cuba	Peso		822.00						822.00
Kevin McDonald:									
Cuba	Peso		822.00						822.00
Senator Richard Durbin:									
Cuba	Peso		305.00						305.00
United States	Dollar		3.00		1,543.60		1.25		1,547.85
Chris Homan:									
Cuba	Peso		305.00						305.00
United States	Dollar		151.44		873.10				1,024.54
Paul Grove:									
Liberia	Dollar		780.00						780.00
Sierra Leone	Leone		488.00						488.00
Brussels	Euro		499.00						499.00
United States	Dollar				7,336.40				7,336.40
Laura Friedel:									
Liberia	Dollar		780.00						780.00
Sierra Leone	Leone		488.00						488.00
Brussels	Euro		499.00						499.00
United States	Dollar				9,997.40				9,997.40
Adam Yezerski:									
Liberia	Dollar		780.00						780.00
Sierra Leone	Leone		488.00						488.00
Brussels	Euro		499.00						499.00
United States	Dollar				7,336.40				7,336.40
Delegation Expenses:*									
Cuba	Peso						4,728.00		4,728.00
Delegation Expenses:*									
Liberia	Dollar				800.00		94.92		894.92
Delegation Expenses:*									
Sierra Leone	Leone				2,800.00		1,170.00		3,970.00
Delegation Expenses:*									
Brussels	Euro						762.33		762.33
Total			8,531.44		30,686.90		6,756.50		45,974.84

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Apr. 20, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar				19,675.00				19,675.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		33.77						33.77
Israel	Shekel		57.23						57.23
Delegation Expenses: *									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						926.37		926.37
Israel	Shekel						3,565.76		3,565.76
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				16,336.52				16,336.52
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		334.09						334.09
Qatar	Riyal		253.45						253.45
Israel	Shekel		511.97						511.97
Elizabeth O'Bagy:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		333.42						333.42
Qatar	Riyal		337.57						337.57
Israel	Shekel		547.31						547.31
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		38.27						38.27
Qatar	Riyal		27.28						27.28
Israel	Shekel		31.82						31.82
Matthew Rimkunas:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		127.97						127.97
Qatar	Riyal		27.64						27.64
Israel	Shekel		81.64						81.64
Senator Tim Kaine:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		336.09						336.09
Qatar	Riyal		253.45						253.45
Israel	Shekel		511.97						511.97
Senator Joe Donnelly:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		333.42						333.42
Qatar	Riyal		261.69						261.69
Israel	Shekel		701.97						701.97
Senator Angus King:									
United States	Dollar		70.33						70.33
Qatar	Riyal		27.64						27.64
Israel	Shekel		81.64						81.64
Delegation Expenses: *									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal						3,099.06		3,099.06
Qatar	Riyal						2,405.37		2,405.37
Israel	Shekel						12,913.84		12,913.84
Senator John McCain:									
Germany	Euro		805.30						805.30
Christian Brose:									
Germany	Euro		775.71						775.71
Elizabeth O'Bagy:									
Germany	Euro		765.03						765.03
Senator Kelly Ayotte:									
Germany	Euro		667.49						667.49
Senator Joni Ernst:									
Germany	Euro		93.25						93.25
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
Germany	Euro		147.07						147.07
Senator Jeanne Shaheen:									
Germany	Euro		862.87						862.87
Senator Ted Cruz:									
Germany	Euro		671.34						671.34
Delegation Expenses:									
Germany	Euro				5,565.40		12,594.16		18,159.56
Tunisia	Dinar				304.21				304.21
Ozge Guzelsu:									
United States	Dollar				19,237.73				19,237.73
Pakistan	Rupee		1,088.00						1,088.00
India	Rupee		300.00						300.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
India	Rupee						865.52		865.52
Kathryn Wheelbarger:									
United States	Dollar				13,046.00				13,046.00
Turkey	Lira		374.40						374.40
Qatar	Riyal		944.24						944.24
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		333.42						333.42
Kuwait	Dinar		527.93						527.93
Thomas Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				13,046.00				13,046.00
Turkey	Lira		374.70						374.70
Qatar	Riyal		554.58						554.58
Adam Barker:									
United States	Dollar				13,046.00				13,046.00
Turkey	Lira		374.40						374.40
Qatar	Riyal		951.16						951.16
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		333.43						333.43
Kuwait	Dinar		531.90						531.90
Michael Noblet:									
United States	Dollar				13,046.00				13,046.00
Turkey	Lira		353.70						353.70
Qatar	Riyal		906.60						906.60
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		340.42						340.42
Kuwait	Dinar		484.90						484.90
Michael Kuiken:									
United States	Dollar				13,046.00				13,046.00
Turkey	Lira		374.40						374.40
Qatar	Riyal		925.16						925.16
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		524.46						524.46
Kuwait	Dinar		333.42						333.42
Delegation Expenses: *									
Turkey	Lira						61.32		61.32
Qatar	Riyal						827.84		827.84
Saudi Arabia	Riyal						752.81		752.81
Kuwait	Dinar						314.50		314.50
Senator Tim Kaine:									
United States	Dollar				5,486.82				5,486.82
Mexico	Peso		702.13						702.13

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Honduras	Lempira		362.29						362.29
Colombia	Peso		845.07						845.07
Mary Naylor:									
United States	Dollar				4,206.00				4,206.00
Mexico	Peso		726.35						726.35
Honduras	Lempira		362.29						362.29
Colombia	Peso		843.60						843.60
Amy Dudley:									
United States	Dollar				2,626.32				2,626.32
Honduras	Lempira		397.34						397.34
Delegation Expenses:*									
Mexico	Peso						2,290.60		2,290.60
Honduras	Lempira						12,380.50		12,380.50
Colombia	Peso						2,511.33		2,511.33
Senator Jack Reed:									
United States	Dollar				12,363.20				12,363.20
Elizabeth King:									
United States	Dollar				12,363.20				12,363.20
William Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				12,363.20				12,363.20
Delegation Expenses:*									
Afghanistan	Afghani						636.00		636.00
Iraq	Dinar				62,675.00		183.00		62,858.00
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
United States	Dollar				11,330.40				11,330.40
Belgium	Euro		890.31						890.31
Sandra Luff:									
United States	Dollar				11,330.40				11,330.40
Belgium	Euro		1,133.16						1,133.16
Delegation Expenses:*									
Belgium	Euro						587.00		587.00
Total			27,313.45		261,093.40		56,914.98		345,321.83

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOHN McCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Apr. 24, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Gillers:									
United States	Dollar				15,524.70				15,524.70
Qatar	Qatari Riyal		1,377.10						1,377.10
Total			1,377.10		15,524.70				16,901.80

SENATOR LISA MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Apr. 21, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Christopher Campbell:									
Belgium	Euro		944.98						944.98
United States	Dollar				10,953.90				10,953.90
Delegation Expenses:*									
United States	Dollar						267.47		267.47
Total			944.98		10,953.90		267.47		12,166.35

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Apr. 20, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Israel	Shekel		701.97						701.97
Qatar	Riyal		225.81						225.81
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		333.42						333.42
Delegation Expenses:*									
Israel	Shekel						1,844.83		1,844.83

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Qatar	Riyal						343.62		343.62
Saudi Arabia	Riyal						442.72		442.72
Senator Bob Corker:									
Israel	Shekel		853.42						853.42
United States	Dollar				6,013.40				6,013.40
Michael Gallagher:									
Israel	Shekel		902.78						902.78
United States	Dollar				7,126.30				7,126.30
Delegation Expenses: *									
Israel	Shekel						3,689.66		3,689.66
Senator Bob Corker:									
Germany	Euro		702.36						702.36
Senator Christopher Murphy:									
Germany	Euro		822.00						822.00
United States	Dollar				5,676.80				5,676.80
Jessica Elledge:									
Germany	Euro		822.00						822.00
United States	Dollar				1,063.80				1,063.80
Delegation Expenses: *									
Germany	Euro						6,526.09		6,526.09
Senator Bob Corker:									
Kuwait	Riyal		590.61						590.61
Iraq	Dollar		93.33						93.33
Turkey	Lira		559.99						559.99
United States	Dollar				17,250.60				17,250.60
Todd Womack:									
Kuwait	Dinar		590.61						590.61
Iraq	Dollar		93.33						93.33
Turkey	Lira		664.87						664.87
United States	Dollar				17,250.60				17,250.60
Michael Gallagher:									
Kuwait	Dinar		385.34						385.34
Iraq	Dollar		115.79						115.79
Turkey	Lira		589.66						589.66
United States	Dollar				13,262.30				13,262.30
Delegation Expenses: *									
Kuwait	Dinar						381.09		381.09
Iraq	Dollar						3,450.00		3,450.00
Turkey	Lira						400.06		400.06
Senator Christopher Murphy:									
Belgium	Euro		839.58						839.58
United States	Dollar				15,166.90				15,166.90
Jessica Elledge:									
Belgium	Euro		1,666.00						1,666.00
United States	Dollar				6,923.20				6,923.20
Chris Socha:									
Belgium	Euro		913.25						913.25
United States	Dollar				2,445.20				2,445.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Belgium	Euro						587.50		587.50
Leah Cato:									
Mexico	Peso		726.35						726.35
Honduras	Lempira		693.29						693.29
Colombia	Peso		501.12						501.12
United States	Dollar				5,486.82				5,486.82
Delegation Expenses: *									
Mexico	Peso						377.33		377.33
Honduras	Lempira						1,084.83		1,084.83
Colombia	Peso						570.66		570.66
Jodi Herman:									
Egypt	Pound		1,009.47						1,009.47
United States	Dollar				3,632.90				3,632.90
Dana Stroul:									
Egypt	Pound		1,164.00						1,164.00
Czech Republic	Koruna		507.60						507.60
United States	Dollar				4,790.00				4,790.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Egypt	Pound						175.00		175.00
Chris Socha:									
Moldova	Leu		402.00						402.00
Hungary	Forint		496.93						496.93
Montenegro	Euro		486.00						486.00
United States	Dollar				5,449.00				5,449.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Hungary	Forint						30.00		30.00
Montenegro	Euro						152.00		152.00
Total			18,452.88		111,537.82		20,055.39		150,046.09

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Apr. 24, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Thomas R. Carper:									
United States	Dollar				2,229.39				2,229.39
Mexico	Peso		724.00						724.00
Honduras	Lempira		342.00						342.00
Blas Nunez-Neto:									
United States	Dollar				1,529.39				1,529.39

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mexico	Peso		724.00						724.00
Honduras	Lempira		226.00						226.00
Holly Idelson:									
United States	Dollar				1,514.39				1,514.39
Mexico	Peso		577.00						577.00
Honduras	Lempira		223.48						223.48
Delegation Expenses: *									
Mexico	Peso						492.00		492.00
Honduras	Lempira						1,112.00		1,112.00
Total			2,816.48		5,273.17		1,604.00		9,693.65

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RON JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs,
Mar. 4, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Cory A. Booker:									
Germany	Euro		620.00				74.32		694.32
Total			620.00				74.32		694.32

SENATOR RON JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,
Apr. 28, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:									
Cuba	Peso		660.30						660.30
Lacy Dwyer:									
Cuba	Peso		624.00						624.00
Delegation Expenses:									
Cuba	Peso						945.60		945.60
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:									
Germany	Euro		749.46						749.46
Lacy Dwyer:									
Germany	Euro		739.46						739.46
Delegation Expenses: *									
Germany	Euro						4,539.89		4,539.89
Tunisia	Dinar						26.45		26.45
Senator John Cornyn:									
United States	Dollar				6,240.72				6,240.72
Mexico	Peso		779.36						779.36
Honduras	Lempira		362.29						362.29
David Hanke:									
United States	Dollar				6,066.84				6,066.84
Mexico	Peso		729.97						729.97
Honduras	Lempira		362.29						362.29
Delegation Expenses: *									
Mexico	Peso						2,290.67		2,290.67
Honduras	Lempira						2,169.67		2,169.67
Total:			5,007.13		12,307.56		9,972.28		27,286.97

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, Apr. 28, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Tressa Guenov:	Dollar		342.00						342.00
	Dollar		252.00						252.00
					11,789.00				11,789.00
Ryan Tully:	Dollar		342.00						342.00
	Dollar		252.00						252.00
					11,789.00				11,789.00
Brian Walsh:	Dollar		342.00						342.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
	Dollar		252.00						252.00
					11,789.00				11,789.00
Senator James Lankford:	Dollar		382.00						382.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Senator Thomas Cotton:	Dollar		382.00						382.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Senator Daniel Coats:	Dollar		382.00						382.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Senator Roy Blunt:	Dollar		382.00						382.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Senator Richard Burr:	Dollar		382.00						382.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Robert Kadlac:	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Ryan Tully:	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Thomas Hawkins:	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Christian Cook:	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Matthew Pollard:	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Tyler Stephens:	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Brian Miller:	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar		288.00						288.00
Randy Bookout:	Dollar		382.00						382.00
	Dollar		348.00						348.00
					12,544.00				12,544.00
Paul Matulic:	Dollar		348.00						348.00
					9,433.30				9,433.30
Christian Cook:	Dollar		348.00						348.00
	Dollar		382.00						382.00
					9,433.30				9,433.30
Total			10,930.00		66,777.60				77,707.60

SENATOR RICHARD BURR,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Apr. 24, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Killion:									
Austria	Euro		1,548.58						1,548.58
United States	Dollar				11,745.50				11,745.50
Total			1,548.58		11,745.50				13,294.08

SENATOR ROGER WICKER,
Co-Chairman, Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Apr. 23, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dr. Brian Monahan:									
Germany	Dollar		780.85						780.85
Total			780.85						780.85

SENATOR MITCH McCONNELL,
Chairman, Committee on Majority Leader, Apr. 1, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON DEMOCRATIC LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dr. Brian Monahan:									
Cuba	Peso		738.43						738.43
Total			738.43						738.43

SENATOR HARRY REID,
Chairman, Committee on Democratic Leader, Apr. 16, 2015.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT DOMESTICALLY GROWN FLOWERS SUPPORT THE FARMERS, SMALL BUSINESSES, JOBS, AND ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 166, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 166) expressing the sense of the Senate that domestically grown flowers support the farmers, small businesses, jobs, and economy of the United States, enhance the ability of the people of the United States to honor their mothers on Mother's Day, and that the White House should strive to showcase domestically grown flowers.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for American flower growers, having submitted a resolution designating Mother's Day, May 10, 2015, as a special day to honor the role that domestically grown flowers play in the ability of Americans to honor their mothers. This resolution is cosponsored by Senators BARBARA BOXER and LISA MURKOWSKI.

Americans truly care about where the goods they purchase and the foods they eat are produced. They have a strong desire to support their local economies and help their communities thrive. And purchasing agricultural products grown in our country supports American farmers. American-grown agricultural products are often fresher and last longer than imports because they are not shipped as far as products grown abroad.

This is also the case for American-grown flowers. The majority of Americans would prefer to buy more locally grown flowers if given the choice, yet only one out of every five flowers sold in the United States is grown in the country.

Every State has access to domestically grown flowers, but three-quarters of Americans do not know where the flowers they purchase are grown.

American-grown flowers create almost $42 million in economic impact per day. These flowers not only support the flower growers but also the 16,000 florists and floral establishments across the country that sell them.

Many of these growers and florists run small businesses that are critical to our Nation's economic strength. They create jobs and contribute to the economy of their respective communities. These businesses produce flowers that provide a beautiful and elegant way for Americans to show affection for their family members and loved ones.

The popularity of American-grown flowers is increasing, and I am pleased to see that the White House is involved in promoting American-grown flowers as well. Last year, the First Lady highlighted the beauty of domestic flowers by displaying a number of varieties at the only State Dinner of the year. The dinner featured flowers from Mississippi, New Jersey, Virginia, Florida, and, I am proud to say, California.

California is the largest cut flower producer in the Nation. The State grows more than 116 types of flowers, including roses, irises, lilies, tulips, and gerbera. At my home in San Francisco, I maintain a garden filled with many of the flowers and plants that flourish across California. My garden has beautiful magnolias, azaleas, pansies, and dahlias. I also have drought-resistant gazanias, which is more important than ever given the severe water shortage in the State.

When you give someone a California-grown flower, it was most likely harvested within the last 48 hours. I am delighted that my State is home to the flowers that help Americans show their loved ones how much they care.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring American-grown flowers this Mother's Day. I hope that this resolution will remind consumers about how they can support local farmers when they shop for flowers this Mother's Day.

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 166) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 5; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Senators should expect a vote on the motion to proceed to the budget conference report at approximately 10:15 tomorrow morning.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:36 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 5, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

ELIZABETH ANN COPELAND, OF TEXAS, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE DIANE L. KROUPA, RETIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL X. GARRETT

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MATTHEW P. BEEVERS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN N. CHRISTENSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SHOSHANA S. CHATFIELD

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 4, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

WILLIE E. MAY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Monday, May 4, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 5

10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security
To hold hearings to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on the importance of a long term reauthorization.
SR–253
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings to examine the Federal government's role in wildfire management, the impact of fires on communities, and potential improvements to be made in fire operations.
SD–366
Committee on Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety
To hold hearings to examine the legal implications of the Clean Power Plan.
SD–406
United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control
To hold hearings to examine improving management of the controlled substances quota process.
SD–226

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2016 for the Securities and Exchange Commission and Commodity Futures Trading Commission.
SD–138

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the U.S. Grain Standards Act.
SR–328A
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine precision medicine for patients.
SD–430
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.
SR–418
Select Committee on Intelligence
To receive closed briefings on certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of State.
SD–419

MAY 6

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the Fish and Wildlife Service, and S. 1036, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to provide certain Western States assistance in the development of statewide conservation and management plans or the protection and recovery of sage-grouse species, S. 855, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to permit Governors of States to regulate intrastate endangered species and intrastate threatened species, S. 736, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in decisionmaking under such Act, S. 655, to prohibit the use of funds by the Secretary of the Interior to make a final determination on the listing of the northern long-eared bat under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, S. 468, to provide a categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to allow the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and the Chief of the Forest Service to remove Pinyon-Juniper trees to conserve and restore the habitat of the greater sage-grouse and the mule deer, S. 293, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements, S. 292, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, S. 112, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require the Secretary of the Interior to publish and make available for public comment a draft economic analysis at the time a proposed rule to designate critical habitat is published, and S. 1081, to end the use of body-gripping traps in the National Wildlife Refuge System.
SD–406
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine ensuring an informed citizenry, focusing on examining the Administration's efforts to improve open government.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs
To hold hearings to examine global health problems.
SD–124
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Daniel R. Elliott III, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board, and Mario Cordero, of California, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner.
SR–253
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on the role of consumer information in college choice.
SD–430
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to consider S. 280, to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, S. 1180, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to modernize the integrated public alert and warning system of the United States, S. 750, to achieve border security on certain Federal lands along the Southern border, S. 282, to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, S. 1109, to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, S. 1172, to improve the process of presidential transition, S. 434, to strengthen the accountability of individuals involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of background investigations, to update guidelines for

security clearances, to prevent conflicts of interest relating to contractors providing background investigation fieldwork services and investigative support services, H.R. 623, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Department of Homeland Security to establish a social media working group, S. 179, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building'', S. 994, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building'', and the nominations of David Michael Bennett, of North Carolina, Mickey D. Barnett, of New Mexico, Stephen Crawford, of Maryland, and James C. Miller, III, of Virginia, each to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service.

SD–342

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense.

SD–192

2 p.m.
Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine aging in place, focusing on advances in technology that help seniors live independently.

SH–216

2:15 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Dale A. Drozd, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, Lawrence Joseph Vilardo, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, and LaShann Moutique DeArcy Hall, and Ann Donnelly, both to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy
To hold oversight hearings to examine multilateral and bilateral international development programs and policies.

SD–419

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine the impact of federal labor and safety laws on the U.S. seafood industry.

SR–428A

MAY 7

10 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine child nutrition programs.

SH–216

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine rural health.

SD–124

Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine safeguarding American interests in the East and South China Seas.

SD–419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine social media in the next evolution of terrorist recruitment.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine S. 1137, to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections.

SD–226

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Justice.

SD–192

2:30 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
To receive closed briefings on certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

MAY 11

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SR–222

MAY 12

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SR–222

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 883, to facilitate the reestablishment of domestic, critical mineral designation, assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, workforce, education, and research capabilities in the United States.

SD–366

11 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SR–222

2 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SD–106

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SD–106

5:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SD–106

MAY 13

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SR–222

2:15 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider S. 986, to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Indian Education, focusing on organizational challenges in transforming educational opportunities for Indian children.

SD–628

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SR–222

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SR–222

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, May 5, 2015*

The House met at 11:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MESSER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 5, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LUKE MESSER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Anthony Craig, Diocese of Duluth, Pequot Lakes, Minnesota, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, we know that You are here with us, that You see us, and that You hear us.

We thank You and praise You for this day, which is Your gift to us. You are indestructible truth, all-encompassing goodness, and perfection of all beauty. We adore You with profound reverence.

We ask pardon from our sins. We ask You to make this session fruitful in Your service. Help us to be faithful to our marriages, to our families, and to our duties in our state in life. Give us the strength of grace in our hearts so that we might radiate Your image and likeness today.

May we also one day enter our true fatherland of Heaven. There, we hope to enjoy forever the fullness of satisfied desire, eternal gladness, consummate delight, and perfect happiness through Christ, our Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 223, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 4, 2015 at 2:47 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 665.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 665. An act to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 12, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1213. To make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 223, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Friday, May 8, 2015.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, May 8, 2015, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1377. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Apples From China [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0003] (RIN: 0579-AD89) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1378. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Papayas From Peru [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0014] (RIN: 0579-AD68) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1379. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Regulatory Review Group, Office of the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Conservation Compliance (RIN: 0560-AI26) received May 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1380. A letter from the Chairman, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, transmitting an addendum to the final Report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1381. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Weapons Council, Department of Defense, transmitting a certification, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 179(f), that the amounts requested for the National Nuclear Security Administration in the President's budget for FY 2016, meets nuclear stockpile and stockpile stewardship program requirements for such fiscal year and over such four fiscal years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1382. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on U.S. support for Taiwan's participation as an Observer at the 68th World Health Assembly and in the work of the World Health Organization, pursuant to Public Law 108-235, 1(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1383. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on the Millennium Challenge Corporation's FY 2014 obligations and expenditures for assistance provided to each eligible country as required under the Millennium Challenge Act, Pub. L. 108-199, Sec. 613; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1384. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on the status of the Government of Cuba's compliance with the United States-Cuba September 1994 ''Joint Communique'' and the treatment by the Government of Cuba of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 ''Joint Statement'', together known as the Migration Accords, pursuant to Sec. 2245 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1999, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1385. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1386. A letter from the Director, Office of Information Policy, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Department's Freedom of Information Act Regulations [Docket No.: OAG 140; AG Order No.: 3517-2015] (RIN: 1105-AB27) received May 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1387. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Bryce Canyon National Park, Bicycling [NPS-BRCA-17884; PA.PD191235A.00.3] (RIN: 1024-AE23) received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1388. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers employed at the St. Louis Airport Storage Site in St. Louis, Missouri to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 and 42 C.F.R. pt. 83; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1389. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report required by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq., and Sec. 118 of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109-177 (2006), providing information regarding all applications made by the Government during calendar year 2014 for authority to conduct electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence purposes under the Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1390. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wage Methodology for the Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment H-2B Program [Docket No.: ETA-2013-0003] (RIN: 1205-AB69) received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1391. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill to authorize $997,600,000 for major medical facility construction projects for FY 2015, as well as to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs' Enhanced-Use Lease authority; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1392. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''Finalizing Medicare Rules under Section 902 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 for Calendar Year 2014'', detailing the instances in which the Department of Health and Human Services failed to publish a final Medicare rule within the timeline established for the final rule; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1393. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''Open Payments Program Report to Congress'', describing the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' program integrity Open Payments Program; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1735. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 2233. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to clarify the prohibition on warrantless searching of collections of communications for United States persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 2234. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for contracting preferences and other benefits for emerging business enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 2235. A bill to ensure the continuation of successful fisheries mitigation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2236. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, to submit to Congress, and make available to the public on the Internet, a report on the animals killed under the Wildlife Services program of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2237. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs a center of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of health conditions relating to exposure to burn pits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove bond requirements and extend filing periods for certain taxpayers with limited excise tax liability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2239. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to increase the target financing of exports by small business concerns; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 2240. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SIRES (for himself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 2241. A bill to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 2242. A bill to protect the internationally recognized right of free expression, ensure the free flow of information, and protect journalists and media personnel globally; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. HAHN, Mr. COOK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. COOPER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PETERS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. POCAN, Mr.

FATTAH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BLUM, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HILL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. POLIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BABIN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HARDY, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H. Res. 251. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster-care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster-care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H. Res. 252. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the national Job Corps program as it celebrates 50 years of educating and training the Nation's economically disadvantaged youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

4th Amendment to the Constitution

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and clause 18 of Article I of section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 2237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) (1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.J. Res. 49.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congess has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following, Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 306: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 317: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 423: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 452: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 600: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 602: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 706: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 711: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 721: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 745: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 766: Mr. ROSS and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 863: Mr. OLSON and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 864: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 880: Mr. DOLD and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 909: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 969: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DENT, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 970: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1062: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1150: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1174: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1185: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BARR, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JONES, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1221: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KIND, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1233: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1247: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1258: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1269: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1270: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1283: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1309: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1342: Mr. RENACCI, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1343: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1462: Mr. DOLD, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1475: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1552: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1568: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1594: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1608: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1610: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 1658: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1696: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1728: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1733: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1739: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 1854: Mr. YODER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1855: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1869: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1887: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1908: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1910: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1921: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2008: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2033: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2041: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 2042: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2046: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2047: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2059: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2061: Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 2096: Mr. DOLD, Mr. ASHFORD, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2098: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2100: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 2109: Mr. JONES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 2139: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2149: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2156: Mr. HARPER and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H. Res. 12: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 208: Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 233: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. PERRY.

SENATE—*Tuesday, May 5, 2015*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O sovereign Lord, You alone are God. Thank You for another day to do Your bidding. Lord, You have given each of us the same number of hours and minutes to serve You and humankind. Teach us to seize each opportunity we have to live for Your glory. Deliver us from anxieties about yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

Strengthen our lawmakers in their work. Give them understanding and courage to act on their convictions. When they are tempted to doubt, increase their faith. Guide their lives by Your unfolding providence, enabling them to use the gift of time to work so that peace will rule in our world.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today not only will Congress pass a budget for the first time in 6 years, it will pass a balanced budget for the first time in recent memory. This is something many Americans have been waiting a long time to see. It is something they deserve, and it is just the latest example of a new Congress that is back to work—back to work on behalf of Americans who work hard and expect Washington to do the same.

No budget will ever be perfect, but this is a budget that sensibly addresses the concerns of many different Members. It reflects honest compromise from many different Members with many, many different priorities.

It includes additional resources and flexibility for national defense. It reduces spending, and it balances without raising taxes. That is especially impressive when one considers the type of budget the White House proposed—one that never balanced—ever—but still tried to raise taxes by nearly $2 trillion.

That White House budget was so unserious that only a single Member of the President's party could be persuaded to publicly support it here in the Senate. Perhaps that is because it proposed to double down on the failed policies of the past: more overspending, more debt, more taxes, and hardly any reform.

So the White House fantasy budget may have made the left happy, but the new Congress believed the American people deserved better. We offered a budget that is more than just balanced; it is also oriented toward growth. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the budget we will approve today contains ideas that could boost jobs and grow our economy.

It would embrace the energy revolution and provide for more environmentally responsible innovation. It would repeal unfair taxes, such as those in ObamaCare, and set the table for more comprehensive reform of our outdated Tax Code.

Because this budget is about embracing the future, it also gives us the tools to leave ObamaCare's broken promises and higher costs where they belong—in the past—in favor of a fresh start with the opportunity for real health reform.

This budget is also about protecting the vulnerable. It aims responsibly to improve and modernize programs such as Medicare, so they will continue to be there when Americans need them. After all, we know that failing to make commonsense improvements to save these types of programs today will mean allowing draconian cuts to fall on the vulnerable in the years to come.

The balanced budget before us went through the normal committee process. Members of both parties debated it vigorously on the floor. They offered more amendments than just about anyone can count, and then a conference committee met to work out the differences between the version of this balanced budget passed by the House and the one we passed here in the Senate. That is the way the process is supposed to work. That is the way Congress is supposed to function.

The budget reflects a lot of hard work from a lot of individuals. I would particularly like to thank Chairman MIKE ENZI and his counterpart in the House, Chairman TOM PRICE, as well as every member of the conference committee, for their tireless efforts to agree on a framework that can pass.

The balanced budget they produced won't solve every challenge, but it is a measure that will move us further down the path of positive reform. It is a budget that aims to make government more efficient, more effective, and more accountable to the middle class. And it is a reminder that the new Republican majority is getting Congress back to work for the American people.

BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL TRADE PRIORITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, once the budget is approved, we will continue our work on the bipartisan Iran bill. Then it is my hope to turn to another bipartisan measure, the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act—TPA.

This bill would enhance Congress's role in the trade process while ensuring Presidents of either party have the necessary tools to secure strong, enforceable trade agreements for American workers. Here is why that is important. Without this bipartisan legislation, American workers and farmers, including from my home State of Kentucky, will not be able to reap the rewards of selling more made-in-America goods to places such as Europe and the Pacific.

This is a bill we should all want to support. So it won't surprise anyone to hear this bill has substantial bipartisan support. It even passed the Committee on Finance on an overwhelming vote of 20 to 6—20 to 6.

But of course we have already heard of an attempt to stand in the way of this bipartisan effort to debate this legislation. We have already heard of yet another effort to make a partisan stand against a bipartisan accomplishment that would help grow opportunities for our constituents.

So yes, some may oppose allowing American workers to compete and win in new markets. Some may not be all that excited about selling more products stamped ''Made in America'' to places such as Europe and the Pacific. But the reality is the American people deserve more opportunities, not more special interest roadblocks.

That is why I plan, with the support of Members of both parties, to turn to the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act once we finish the Iran bill.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CINCO DE MAYO

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the history of Cinco de Mayo is one that is largely unfamiliar to most Americans, but to Mexican Americans it is very familiar. It is a shame we don't know more about it because the story of Cinco de Mayo is one of inspiration. It is the tale of a small military force that was vastly outnumbered but refused to capitulate.

At the Battle of Puebla, 153 years ago, a small Mexican Army force found itself outnumbered two to one by the French. The outmatched soldiers refused to give up. They couldn't. That was not in their makeup. The future of Mexico rested on their shoulders. Unbelievably, in spite of seemingly insurmountable odds, the Mexican Army refused to give up.

That is what we celebrate today—Cinco de Mayo. It is not just Mexican culture and history, but also the resilient spirit that refuses to capitulate. Our United States is better off because of that spirit engendered by millions of Mexican Americans and, indeed, the entire Latino community. It is that same spirit today that injects new life into our communities. It is that same spirit possessed by generations of Mexican Americans that has fueled the economics and vibrancy of communities throughout the Southwest. It is that same spirit that empowers Latino students to push themselves to new heights. And it is that same indomitable spirit that inspires Hispanic Americans to defend our country on the front lines around the world, as they have done for many, many decades.

Hispanic heritage in this country has never been stronger. Now it falls upon us, as Members of Congress, to support Mexican Americans and the greater Latino community to reach the promise of the American dream. We can do that by investing in working American families, not by kicking families off their health insurance, as my friend the Republican leader spoke of in this budget that is balanced in name only. Really, you can keep talking about how balanced something is, but if it is unbalanced, it is still unbalanced.

The Republicans want to repeal ObamaCare for 16.5 million people—and on and on with all the things that are good in that legislation and that have so changed America. In this budget, they want to strip children's financial aid to go to college or cut job training programs—and on and on with what they want to do in this budget.

They talk about this great meeting that took place to come up with this final bill in conference. That conference took about 10 minutes. They knew what they wanted to do, and they did it very quickly. The Republican budget is unfair, it is unbalanced, it is unwise, and, as some have said, it is immoral.

So as we celebrate Cinco de Mayo today, I hope we will remember that unrelenting Mexican spirit that prevailed on the battlefield 153 years ago. But more importantly, I hope we will recognize that the same spirit is among us today, in the homes of Mexican Americans across America.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AND FISA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on another matter, the Senate has a lot to do before the recess for Memorial Day. We need to finish the Corker-Cardin Iran legislation. We need to wrap up work on the budget resolution. But in addition to those two important pieces of legislation, there are other pressing needs. Surface transportation expires while we are on recess.

The highway trust fund runs out of money, and the authorization for the Federal highway program expires later this month. There are 63,500 bridges that are structurally deficient, and more than 50 percent of our roads are in disrepair. That is according to the Federal Highway Administration. Without reliable funding, our highways and bridges will only get worse, and that is an understatement.

Six States already are delaying or canceling important transportation projects because of questions over future funding—Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

The ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Vermont, said today that in Vermont—this tiny State, area-wise and population-wise, with about 600,000 people in it—their construction timeframe is very, very narrow. They can't do construction during most of the year. They need to plan way ahead of time, and they can't do that if there is nothing to plan. States need certainty from Washington that they will receive their highway dollars before construction leaders put shovels in the ground.

Nevada needs that certainty. Tourism in Nevada welcomes over 50 million visitors annually, resulting in 17 billion miles traveled over our roads and highways. Nevada has $47.3 billion in statewide transportation needs. That is just one State.

We must ensure our Nation's highway system has the necessary funds to address the pressing needs, and they are not there. Transportation would be the first easy place to find agreement in Congress, and it is hard to comprehend, but the Republican majority in the Senate has not held a single hearing on this most important piece of legislation—not a single hearing, nothing.

We want to work with Republicans to address our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. We understand the importance of transportation investment for working families across the country. Yet, stunningly, Republicans have effectively put our Nation's transportation system on the back burner. Hearing the Republican leader's statement this morning, I guess that is going to continue. Procrastination is dangerous to American drivers and hurtful to our economy. The U.S. highway system is central to our Nation's economic competitiveness. It is how we move goods and services. It is central to American families who use our roads and bridges each day to go to work and take their child to school. Congress should do more to support these working families and businesses.

For every $1 billion we spend on infrastructure projects, we create 47,500 jobs. Without strong Federal infrastructure funding, the American Society of Civil Engineers predicts that our country could lose $1 trillion in sales. That is almost 3.5 million jobs. Putting critical transportation investments on the back burner is not an effective way to govern, and I would hope we can have something done on highways before we go home for our recess. How can we be home in good conscience and say we tried but couldn't get it done?

We also have to reform and reauthorize FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. It is one thing that has kept us safe. The FISA provisions were expanded in the PATRIOT Act and they expire June 1. Senators LEAHY and LEE, a bipartisan team of Senators, have introduced a bill that would reform these important provisions so they strike the right balance between protecting our Nation's security and preserving America's civil liberties. An identical bill was reported out of the House Judiciary Committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 25 to 2. The House is out this week, but I hope they take it up next week. I am told they are going to. This is an issue that warrants our full debate and deserves the Senate's attention before we leave. We have a lot to do and not much time. I hope Senate Republicans will help us move these important pieces of legislation without allowing either one to lapse. That is going out of business.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the veto message

to accompany S.J. Res. 8, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, the budget resolution, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Leg.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Mikulski	Vitter

The motion was agreed to.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed having been agreed to, the Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, having met, have agreed that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, and the House agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of April 29, 2015.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to section 305(c) of the Congressional Budget Act, there will now be up to 10 hours of debate equally divided.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, today we have the historic opportunity to put our country on not just another course but a better course. This is because Congress is poised to approve its first balanced 10-year budget since 2001. This balanced budget represents a ''lean in'' moment for a Congress under new management to confront rapidly growing deficits borne from our government's habitual overspending which plagues America and its taxpayers.

Understanding this historical context is critical because our Nation currently faces one of the largest forecasted deficits since the end of World War II. The joint Senate-House budget agreement, which produces billion-dollar surpluses in its final years, would be an accomplishment unequaled since 1947.

The new leadership in the Senate is committed to getting back to work, which will allow us to begin rebuilding the trust of working Americans. Instead of allowing political points and partisan gridlock to take precedence over responsible governing, we are once again doing the people's business.

Make no mistake—America faces overwhelming odds as we work to steer our ship of state to more sustainable and fiscally responsible waters. Even as we take in record revenues and taxes, our Nation is still unable to live within its means. As some of America's greatest leaders have previously noted, these challenges are not undertaken because they are easy but because they are hard.

Americans who work every day to pay their taxes and provide for their families understand that it is time for the Federal Government to live within its means, just as they do. Just imagine if these families spent and borrowed the way the Federal Government does. It would mean that a family with a median income of $52,000 would spend $61,000 a year. The family would add an additional $9,000 to the $311,000 they already would owe on their credit card. American families know they cannot live on borrowed money, and neither can the Federal Government. This balanced budget shows these families that if they can do it, so can we.

As with any budget, it is important to let the numbers speak on how this proposal helps make America stronger and more secure. This joint Senate-House congressional budget balances the budget within 10 years without raising taxes. It achieves more than $5 trillion in savings. It produces a $32 billion surplus in 2024 and a $24 billion surplus in 2025 and stays in balance. It boosts the Nation's economy by more than $400 billion in additional economic growth over the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. It is expected to grow 1.2 million additional jobs over the next 10 years, again based on the Congressional Budget Office data.

This balanced budget achieves real results and allows the Federal Government to support Americans when it must and get out of the way when it should.

Let me tell you about some of the highlights of this budget agreement.

The balanced budget ensures a strong national defense. It invests in our military personnel and the readiness of our Armed Forces in the current global threat environment. It ensures that defense spending reflects the commitment of Congress to keep America safe and ensure that our military personnel are prepared to tackle all challenges, both at home and abroad.

The balanced budget provides for repeal and replacement of ObamaCare. It provides for the repeal of ObamaCare, including all of its taxes, regulations, and mandates. It paves the way for real health care reforms to strengthen the doctor-patient relationship, expand choices, lower health care costs, and improve access to quality, affordable, innovative health care. In other words, it delivers on what the President promised but never delivered. It focuses reconciliation instructions on the key congressional committees with jurisdiction over ObamaCare: the Senate Finance Committee; the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee; the House Energy and Commerce Committee; the House Education and the Workforce Committee; and the House Ways and Means Committee.

The balanced budget preserves Medicare. It preserves Medicare and protects seniors' access to health care by extending the life of the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund. It repeals the Independent Payment Advisory Board—IPAB—the unelected, unaccountable board of 15 bureaucrats created by the President's health care law that will make decisions on benefit cuts. It accounts for the recent enactment of legislation that addressed the Medicare Program's sustainable growth rate—SGR—or more commonly called the doc fix.

The balanced budget supports stronger economic growth. It boosts U.S. economic growth and private sector job creation by balancing the budget, reducing the debt, and putting a halt to government overspending to reduce the cost of work and investment, as well as the cost of starting and growing a business.

It expands the Nation's economy by more than $400 billion over the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, under the old way of doing the accounting.

It provides an estimated 1.2 million jobs for the U.S. economy by 2025, based on data provided by the Congressional Budget Office in its traditional ways of evaluating.

It boosts the Nation's gross national product by 1.4 percent per person after accounting for inflation by 2025, according to the Congressional Budget Office. This boost in economic growth will all come from the private sector. Government spending does not contribute to its growth. As my fellow Budget Committee member and businessman Senator PERDUE notes, expanding government does not help grow the economy.

The balanced budget improves accountability and effectiveness of government. It is important to note that a balanced budget will help make our government more efficient, effective, and accountable. If government programs are not delivering results, they should be improved, and if they are not needed, they ought to be eliminated.

This agreement between the Senate and House will help Congress prioritize and demand results from our government programs. There is no doubt that this will be challenging for every single Member of Congress, but I believe we are up to the task because the American people are counting on us.

This budget agreement improves transparency, efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of the Federal Government by cutting waste, eliminating redundancies, and enacting regulatory reform, and there is plenty of that out there we have not looked at yet.

It calls for modernizing Medicaid by increasing State flexibility and protecting those most in need of assistance.

It improves honest and responsible accounting practices as part of the Federal budget process by ensuring that fair-value accounting estimates are used, which provide a more honest accounting method. This is in addition to the honest, dynamic scoring method that more accurately tells us what legislation will cost hard-working taxpayers.

It improves the administration and coordination of benefits, and it increases employment opportunities for disabled workers.

This budget also calls on Congress to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. That point is especially important because we must show taxpayers that Congress is committed to a balanced budget and not to overspending, so we can make our government more effective. But we are running out of time.

Currently, lawmakers in 27 States have passed applications for a convention to approve a balanced budget amendment and new applications in 9 other States are close behind. If we had 34 States, that would cause us to have a constitutional convention to balance the budget. If just seven of those nine States approve moving forward on the balanced budget issue, it will bring the total number of applications to 34 States. This would meet the two-thirds requirement under article V of the Constitution and force Congress to take action.

The other side often says they cut the Federal deficit in half during the President's term in office, but I think using the word ''deficit'' is meant to be confusing. People think he reduced the debt by one-half. Actually, the President has increased the Nation's debt dramatically. What we are talking about when we say ''deficit'' is the amount of overspending, the amount we spend compared to what we bring in. Yes, that is deficit, but it is overspending, and if we call it overspending, it will not be confused with bringing down the national debt, which is not even touched and which under the President's budget only gets worse.

In his most recent budget released earlier this year, the President proposed a plan that never balances and includes huge spending increases. It also includes a $2.1 trillion tax increase—that is $2,100 billion of tax increases—while it adds $8.5 billion—or $8,500 million—to the national debt. The Senate recently voted on his budget, and it was rejected 99 to 1.

There is no question that balancing the budget is a daunting task. Last year, our Nation overspent by $468 billion, which, if left unchecked, is set to rise to $1,000 billion. We are in control of $1,100 billion in discretionary spending, and this year we will spend $468 billion more than we take in. I will repeat that. We are only in control of $1,100 billion in discretionary spending, and this year we will spend $468 billion more than we take in.

This is an unsustainable financial path, and if Congress did what every American family has to do—live within our means—we would have to cut our annual discretionary spending in half. That would be a 50-percent cut.

This is because we spend 1½ times what we take in for items on which we can make decisions. No family or State government can do that for very long, but the Federal Government does it every year.

Our budget is not perfect, but it is a start. It provides Congress and the Nation with a fiscal blueprint that challenges lawmakers to examine every dollar we spend.

This is crucial because we currently spend over $230 billion in interest on our debt every year, and that is at an interest rate of 1.7 percent. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that every 1 percentage point that our interest rates rise will increase America's overspending by $1,745 billion over the next 10 years.

We have a looming debt of $18 trillion on its way to $27 trillion. If our interest rates were to rise to 5 percent, which is the historical norm, we will have to spend almost $700 billion annually, out of the $1,100 billion we get to make decisions on, to pay the interest on our debt. This would be catastrophic for our Nation's economy. It is vital that we address this situation now while we still have some choices.

To provide a clearer picture of how dire our Nation's fiscal outlook is, if we were forced to balance the budget in 1 year, we would have to eliminate most of our defense spending, most of our highway spending, and most of our education spending. This drastic 50-percent cut would be needed because of our consistent overspending and our interest payments, which are set to explode.

What are the two best ways to make a difference?

First, Congress should look at the more than 260 programs whose authorization—the right to spend money—has expired. Some of these government programs expired in 1983, but we are still spending money on them every year. That means we have been paying for these expired programs for more than 30 years. In some cases, we spend as much as four times the spending authority that has expired. We have to look at those programs.

For the 260 programs that have expired, we are spending $293 billion a year. Normally, we talk about over a 10-year period. Over a 10-year period, that would be $2,935 billion. Eliminating those programs would almost balance the budget. They can't be eliminated, but they should be looked at regularly. That is why we have authorizations that expire. That is so we are forced to take a look at them. No, that is so we should be forced to take a look at them; obviously, we don't. We

don't do that because we want the committees of jurisdiction to have a hard look at the expired authorizations and make them current or, if there are duplications, eliminate the programs that are not needed after all or, with duplication, we ought to be able to at least get rid of half of the administrative bureaucracy on it and make sure the money gets out into the country where we promised it.

Now, there is a second way. The other way we can balance the budget is to grow the economy. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that if we were to increase the gross domestic product, private sector growth—again, this is not referring to government GDP; that is just private sector growth—if we were to increase the private sector growth by 1 percent, that would provide an additional $300 billion in additional tax revenue every year. I think that could balance the budget. But first we must get our overspending under control because Congress is already spending more tax revenue than at any point in history. When we take the tax revenue from the individuals and from the businesses, we slow down this growth that would provide the additional $300 billion in tax revenue every year. If we grow the economy, we will expand opportunity for each and every American.

Now, I know in their speeches our friends from across the aisle will criticize us for not being finished by April 15. But think of it this way: We did something in 4 months that they could only accomplish once in 4 years, and that is produce a budget—let alone a budget that actually balances.

While they were in charge, they often didn't produce a budget by April 15 or October 1 or even January 1. In fact, they produced only one budget conference agreement in the last 6 years, so don't criticize us for what we are doing. While we may have taken a few extra days, we did get it done, and this budget is poised to play a vital role in helping Congress get back to the work of doing the people's business. And when we get it done on time, the spending committees can begin on time. Hopefully, that will give the spending committees time to look at this duplication and the unauthorized spending we have.

Now, some point out that the President was able to get his budget out on time. That is true, but the last time I checked, he didn't have to run it by 535 elected officials as we do; he just had to run it past one elected official—himself. I should mention that is the first time in 6 years he has gotten a budget to us on time. We even had to have a rollcall vote today to proceed to this privileged conference report. I don't understand that.

The Senate Budget Committee is tasked with the responsibility of setting spending goals. Congress has other committees that authorize government programs and they are charged with overseeing their efficiency and effectiveness. We also have committees that allocate the exact dollars for these programs every year, but the Senate Budget Committee sets the spending goals. In other words, we set limits and we set some enforcement.

This is why passing a budget is so important for our Nation. It lets the congressional policymakers who actually allocate the dollars get to work by following our spending limits. This year, we are giving them an early start. Leader MCCONNELL is committed to allowing the Senate to do its job, and that means debate and votes on the 12 appropriations bills—the 12 spending bills. This is an important occurrence in the Senate, because over the past 8 years, appropriations bills have been as rare as ice cubes in the desert.

I wish to thank my colleagues in both the Senate and the House for all their hard work in producing a joint budget agreement that balances within 10 years, does not raise taxes, strengthens our Nation's defense, protects our most vulnerable citizens, improves economic growth and opportunity for hard-working families, and stops the Federal Government's out-of-control spending. These important steps, and still others to come, show Congress is back working for the American people to deliver on the promise of a government that is more accountable. This is something each and every American expects and deserves from its leaders in Washington. With action on our balanced budget, we will deliver.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me thank Senator ENZI for his civility and his humor. I have enjoyed the process by which we have gotten to where we are today. But I must say that anyone who takes an objective look at this Republican budget can do nothing else but conclude that this is an absolute disaster for the working families of this country. In fact, one of the problems I have had in describing the Republican budget is that it is so bad—it is so far out of touch with where the American people are—that people really don't even believe us when we talk about what is in this budget, which is what I am going to do in a moment.

Before I do that, I think we can all agree that what a budget is about is a development of priorities to address problems. We look at what is going on in our country as we assess the needs of the American people, and we build a budget around those needs. So let me begin by assessing what I believe are the needs of the American people.

The fundamental economic reality of today is that for the last 40 years—not the last 6 years, not the last 20 years but the last 40 years—the middle class of this country has been disappearing. Today, we have more people living in poverty than at almost any time in the modern history of America, and yet while that is going on, the gap between the very, very, very rich and everybody else is growing wider and wider.

Today, in fact, in America, we have more income and wealth inequality than any other major country on Earth. I know many people think that in the United Kingdom, they have the Queen and dukes and lords and all of this aristocracy; clearly, their distribution of wealth and income must be a lot worse than it is in the United States. That is not the case. Today, compared to every other major country on Earth, our distribution of wealth and income is the worst, and it is worse in this country today than at any time since the late 1920s.

It is hard to believe but true: Today, 99 percent of all new income goes to the top 1 percent. Since the Wall Street crash of 2008, 99 percent of all new income goes to the top 1 percent. What that means is all over this country we have people working not one job but two jobs, three jobs; people working longer hours for lower wages. Yet 99 percent of all of the new income generated is going to the top 1 percent. In the midst of that reality, our Republican colleagues say, Well, only 99 percent of all new income goes to the top 1 percent, but what can we do to make the richest people even richer?

Median family income in this country since 1999 has gone down by almost $5,000. Families are struggling to put bread on the table, to send their kids to college, to take care of their basic needs. But the Republican budget says the middle class is shrinking, people are struggling; what can we do to make life even harder for the working families of our country.

When we talk about unemployment in America, the official unemployment rate is 5.5 percent. The true unemployment—real unemployment—however, is 10.9 percent, if we include those people who have given up looking for work and people who are working part-time when they want to work full-time. Youth unemployment, which we never talk about, is over 17 percent, and African-American youth unemployment is literally off of the charts. Does the Republican budget say: How do we put the American people back to work or how do we help our young people who are desperately looking for jobs or looking for education? Quite the contrary. The Republican budget cuts virtually every program out there that is designed to help working families and unemployed workers.

The typical male worker—that male worker in the middle of the American economy—incredibly made $783 less last year than he did 42 years ago. In other words, the middle class in this country is moving, unfortunately, in the wrong direction.

Does the Republican budget say that we are going to raise the minimum wage so that everybody in this country who works 40 hours a week can live with dignity? No, it does not. Again, it moves us in exactly the wrong direction.

While unemployment is much too high, while median family income has gone down, when millions of people are working longer hours for lower wages, there is another phenomenon taking place in this country, and that is that the wealthiest people and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well—not good, not pretty good—phenomenally well. Today, we live in a society where the top 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent.

Here is the chart. The top 1 percent owns almost as much wealth—here at the top is the 1 percent. Here is the bottom 90 percent, going down. That is reality.

The Republican budget says: Wow, look at that extraordinary disparity in wealth. We are going to do something about it.

Yes, they do something about it. Their proposals will make the rich even richer and working people even poorer. Not only do we have a situation today where—as incredible as it may sound—the wealthiest 14 people in this country—the wealthiest 14—not 1,400, not 14,000, but the wealthiest 14 people in this country—in the last 2 years have seen their wealth increase by $157 billion. So 14 people have seen their wealth increase by $157 billion. That is more wealth than the total wealth of the bottom 130 million Americans.

Here is a chart showing Bill Gates, Warren Buffett, an increase of $19 billion. Larry Ellison's wealth increased by $11 billion. This is just an increase over a 2-year period. Do you know what the Republican budget says to these guys? Hey, $157 billion in increase in 2 years? That is not enough. We are going to give your families a very significant tax break by ending the estate tax.

We have a situation where one family in this country—the Walton families, which own Walmart—that one family owns more wealth than the bottom 42 percent of the American people.

Given the huge disparity of wealth and income, given the fact that millions of Americans today are struggling to put food on the table, given the fact that working families don't know how they can afford quality child care for their kids and middle class families don't know how they are able to send their kids to college, the Republican budget in virtually every instance moves us in exactly the wrong direction.

The United States of America, sadly, is the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee health care to all people as a right—something that I believe should occur. I think health care is a right and not a privilege. Today, we have made some gains under the Affordable Care Act. We have more people who have health insurance than was the case a number of years ago. That is a good thing. This is what the Republican budget does: The Republican budget, by ending the Affordable Care Act and by cutting Medicaid by over $400 billion, throws 27 million Americans off of health insurance. That is it—27 million Americans—men, women, kids—off of health insurance. What happens to those people? How many of those 27 million people will die? Certainly thousands, because when they get sick they are not going to be able to go to a doctor. How many of those people will suffer because they had illnesses that could have been treated or cured, but they can't go to a doctor? This budget knocks 27 million people off of health insurance. When you ask the Republicans what happens to those people, they have no response at all—none, zero. So instead of moving us in the direction of having health care for all of our people, they increase the number of uninsured by 27 million Americans.

At a time when senior poverty is increasing, the Republican budget calls for ending Medicare as we know it by turning it into a voucher program. What does that mean? The Republican idea is that we give people a voucher. I don't know that they have an exact amount for their voucher—maybe $8,000—whatever. They say: Here is a check for $8,000. You are 85 years of age and you are struggling with cancer. Here is your check for $8,000, and you go out to a private insurance company and get the best deal you can.

If you are 85 years of age and you are struggling with cancer or heart disease and somebody gives you a check for $8,000, you tell me what kind of private insurance you are going to be able to get. How many days will it last you in the hospital? This is an effort to undermine and destroy Medicare. It is a disastrous idea. That is exactly what is in the Republican proposal.

At a time when millions of disabled people are trying to survive on less than $14,000 a year, the Republican budget would pave the way for a massive cut to Social Security Disability Insurance. Instead of making college more affordable—and I know that in the State of Vermont, my State, and I expect in States all over this country, young people are really wondering whether they want to go to college, because they are so nervous about the debt they will have when they come out—what is the Republican response to the crisis of the lack of affordability of college? Here is their response. They would cut Pell grants by more than $85 billion over the next decade, which would make the cost of college education more expensive for some 8 million Americans. In other words, instead of addressing this crisis, instead of helping make us competitive in a global economy by giving us the best-educated workforce, what they do is to move us in the wrong direction.

We are as a nation the wealthiest Nation in the history of the world. Most people don't know it, because almost all of that wealth goes to a handful of people on top. In the midst of this extremely wealthy Nation, disgracefully, today, we have millions and millions of families who literally are worried about how they are going to put food on the table and feed their kids tomorrow and next week.

I can tell you that in the State of Vermont—and I expect in States around this country—we have people working 40 and 50 hours a week but, because their wages are so low, they don't earn enough money to buy the food they need to properly take care of their kids and feed their kids well. Those families literally go to emergency food shelters all over America. These are working people who never in their lives thought they would have to go to an emergency food shelter. That is what they are doing all over America.

What is the Republican response to hunger in America, taking care of the most basic needs we have? The Republican response is massive cuts—massive cuts—to food stamps and the WIC Program. The WIC Program is a wonderful program to ensure that low-income pregnant women get good nutrition and that their babies have good nutrition. How basic can it get? Cut those programs. Cut the Meals On Wheels programs for fragile seniors.

In the midst of throwing 27 million Americans off of health insurance, in the midst of cutting $85 billion for Pell grants to make it harder for our kids to go to college, in the midst of making massive cuts in nutrition programs which would increase hunger and suffering in the United States of America, Republicans do something else that is literally remarkable—and I know people think I am not telling the truth. I am.

What they say is that when the rich are getting richer, when almost all new income and wealth is going to the people on top, what they have decided to do for the wealthiest 6,000 families in America—the top two-tenths of 1 percent—what they say to these billionaire families is that we are going to give you a massive tax break by repealing the estate tax. What we are going to do is give you a $269 billion tax break that goes to the top two-tenths of 1 percent, and 99.8 percent of the American people will not gain one nickel in benefits from the repeal of the estate tax. It only goes to the wealthiest of the wealthy.

But to add insult to injury, while giving a huge tax break for the billionaire

class, the Republican budget also says: Let's see if we can raise taxes on lower-income and working-class families by allowing the expanded earned-income tax credit and child tax credit to expire. These are tax credits that go to working families and lower-income families who have kids. We added a more generous benefit a few years ago, and they are going to allow that to expire at the same time as they give a massive tax break to the wealthiest families in this country.

My friend from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, talks repeatedly about the deficit. I agree that the deficit is a problem. But he will acknowledge that under the last 6 years under President Obama, we have made significant progress in reducing the deficit—about two-thirds. But it remains very high. We have an $18 trillion debt and that is a real issue. There is no denying it. One of the reasons that we have a huge debt—not the only reason but one of the reasons—is that the United States under President Bush went to war in Iraq and went to war in Afghanistan.

Now nobody knows what the end cost of that war will be by the time we take care of the last veteran 50 or 60 years from now, but the best guesses are that those wars will cost us $4 to $6 trillion by the time we take care of the needs of our last veteran who served in those wars.

How do we pay for those wars? How do we pay for those wars? In every other war that this country fought, Presidents had the courage to go forward and say: Wars are expensive. We are going to raise taxes. Not in this case—those wars were put on the credit card—$4 to $6 trillion and we didn't pay for it.

Apparently, my Republican colleagues haven't learned a simple lesson—that you can't be honest and worry about the deficit, and then go to war and not pay for it. What they have done in this budget is to increase Pentagon spending by another $38 billion next year and $186 billion over the next 10 years.

And how is that paid for? Oh, it is not paid for. It goes on the credit card. They put it all into the so-called OCO account, and this is, by the way, an account that many of my conservative friends have called an accounting gimmick.

So here we are. Here we are at a time when this country probably faces more serious problems than at any time since the Great Depression. The middle class is disappearing. Poverty is much too high. The gap between the very, very, very rich and everybody else is growing wider and wider. Real unemployment is much too high. Young people are unable to afford to go to college. On every one of those issues, the Republican budget does exactly the opposite of what we should be doing.

In the year 2015, we should not be voting or bringing forth a budget which makes the billionaires even richer while cutting programs for people who are struggling. With an $18 trillion debt, we should not be increasing military spending by simply adding that money to the deficit.

So I would hope that people in this body, in the Senate, will take a deep breath, and appreciate, in fact, what is going on with working families in this country and will vote no on this disastrous budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, thank you very much.

I want to thank Senator SANDERS for laying out the budget in a way that makes sense. It is a document that is supposed to reflect our values, who we are. It is supposed to be a roadmap for the future. What Mr. SANDERS has just said is that it is a roadmap to disaster, and I intend to pick up on that theme.

I want also to say that I know how hard it is to get a budget out. I was on the House Budget Committee for years and on the Senate Budget Committee. I want to compliment Senator ENZI. I know it is hard to put together a coalition, even within your own party. He has said that the Senate is under new management and he is very excited about it, and I understand that. I get it. I have been in both the majority and the minority and I like the majority a lot better.

But the bottom line is, if this is the first big action of the new management, let's bring back the old one, because in this budget, the people who benefit are the very tippy top maybe two-tenths of 1 percent. It is unreal. I am not going to stand on the floor and just throw out barbs, I am going to give definite numbers so everybody sees what we mean.

The only time we have had a balanced budget in recent history was when Bill Clinton was President and the Democrats controlled the Senate. I remember it well because we didn't get one Republican vote for that budget that was so critical.

I remember my colleague Senator Bob Kerrey was thinking about it so hard. He saw all sides. He went to the movies, and during the movie he came to a—this was the right budget—he came back and voted and it got done.

Now, that was a Democratic budget that invested in the people of the United States of America, invested in their infrastructure, invested in their education, invested in their health care, and invested in them. It invested in them.

Remember, President Clinton said: Put America's families first. And it worked because we invested in our people. We headed into a period of unprecedented growth—23 million jobs created under Bill Clinton and the budget balanced.

As soon as George W. Bush took over, he did enormous tax cuts for the wealthiest at the top, got us into two wars—put them on a credit card—and we have been battling our way back after the worst economic downturn. If you look at the job creation under ''W,'' it is just shocking. Now, under President Obama, we have fought tooth and nail and we are coming back. This budget is an unmitigated disaster.

Let's start. At a time when 16 million people have finally been able to get health insurance thanks to the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, they want to repeal this law and throw these people out. They will not have health care, and then what will happen? They will suffer, their families will suffer, and the economy will suffer. At a time when nearly 70 million Americans rely on Medicaid and CHIP for health coverage—Medicaid, we know is for the working poor, CHIP is for children—they want to block grant that program and, while they are doing it, impose cuts of more than $1.3 trillion.

So you have to ask this question—this isn't just a matter of putting a number on an easel—what will it mean for maternity care when half of all of our births in the United States are financed by Medicaid? Half of all births in the United States are financed by Medicaid, and they are cutting Medicaid by $1.3 trillion. So they will fight for your right to be born, but, boy, don't count on getting any help if you wind up in a maternity ward.

At a time when more than 50 million senior citizens and disabled Americans are in the Medicare Program and baby boomers continue to age in, they propose cutting the program by $430 billion by placing the burden on the backs of seniors and privatizing that program through vouchers. They are going to end Medicare: Senior citizens, you are under new management here, and they are ending Medicare as we know it, as we know that great program.

So after years of being the most successful program—and if you ask people on Medicare if they like it, they not only like it, they love it—they are ending it.

As Senator SANDERS pointed out, eloquently, I thought, they are saying to a sick person—you know, people are living longer. Thank God. So let's say a person is 85, 90 years old, having a hard time functioning and then gets a desperate cancer on top of it: Here is money. Go out and find the best insurance you can. Oh, yes, we know you are 90. Here is a Web site.

Oh, I don't have a computer.

Too bad. We are under new management over here. Oh, great. Bring back the old management. That is what I think.

The old management wasn't perfect, but the old management had a heart, had a soul. No one will hear.

Now, how is this: In case you are not sold about how devastating this budget

is, the Republican budget resolution eliminates opportunities for the neediest students from preschool to college by cutting $270 billion from education and job training investments over the next decade. So while the Republican leadership is pushing for free trade, free trade, whatever, what is happening to training our workers? They are cut.

At a time when less than one-half of eligible preschool-aged children are able to participate in Head Start, half of our eligible kids cannot get in. The Republican budget cuts the program by over $4 billion, resulting in over 400,000 children losing access to Head Start over the next decade.

Now, tell me I am dreaming. This is the new management. We are going to take 400,000 children over the next decade and say: Sorry, no room for you. The door is closed.

We all know Head Start is critical.

We know the cost of college continues to rise. We all know it—because we are alive, we have a heartbeat and a pulse, and everybody alive today knows what it is. I have met people who are still paying off their student loan debt when they are on Social Security. That is the new reality. What did they do? They cut Pell grant funding by more than one-third, making college less affordable for many of the more than 8 million students receiving aid.

So let's see who is now in their line of fire: middle class, seniors, little babies, students, and workers. At a time when student loan debt has reached $1.2 trillion and students are graduating with over $28,000 in student loan debt, on average, the Republican budget resolution eliminates the in-school interest subsidy for need-based student loans, causing student loan debt to increase by nearly $4,000 for an estimated 30 million students.

So it isn't bad enough for them to know that people are paying off their student loans when they are on Social Security, now they are increasing the cost of student loans even more, instead of working with us to decrease the cost to students. I will tell you, if every taxpayer in America is a shareholder, it is time to call a meeting and change this management.

Now, if you are a renter, one in four renters is paying more than half their income on housing, placing them one paycheck away from homelessness—half your income. The Republican budget resolution eliminates housing assistance for 450,000 families due to a 14-percent cut to the section 8 rental assistance program—beautiful.

At a time when 45.3 million people are living in poverty, the Republican budget resolution cuts about $800 billion from income security programs over 10 years. This category includes SNAP, Supplemental Security Income for low-income seniors and people with disabilities, and heating assistance for low-income families—lovely, lovely. Welcome to the new management that is the Senate.

Here is the thing, this is even hard to imagine they did it. It upset them so much that the wealthiest 14 families might get hit with a little bit of the tax—and I am talking about people who are worth over $10 million, way more, 20, 30, 40, 50—you name it, the highest level. They give them a $3 million tax cut.

They actually raised taxes by an average of $900 on 16 million low- and moderate-income families by allowing expansions to the EITC and child tax credit to expire, so there is no expansion of that program.

Now, whom else could we hit? Well, maybe we could hit some of our States that are suffering from the realities of climate change, such as the Western States that are undergoing the longest recorded drought in history.

Come talk to my farmers, ask them how happy they are that you are proposing dramatic cuts—and have imposed them in this budget—to the EPA, to the Department of Interior, DOE, and to NOAA—the agencies best equipped to steward our precious natural resources, develop a clean energy future, enforce our water laws, and protect our health.

But wait a minute. There are a few people who were left—away from this budget knife. Well, if you drive a car or you drive a truck or you get on a bus, you get hit too.

Listen to this one. At a time when 63,500 of our bridges are structurally deficient and 50 percent of our roads are in less than good condition, this budget cuts transportation and infrastructure investment by more than $200 billion over 10 years, a cut of 40 percent.

I just had a press conference a couple of weeks ago with Republican business leaders and Democratic workers, and they have come together against this new management idea. They are looking to fund the highway trust fund.

The whole fund expires this month. I haven't heard one word about how we are going to have a multiyear funding bill. We have six States today that have stopped spending on infrastructure.

The last I checked, we are still the greatest Nation in the world. Tell me, how do you remain a great power if your bridges are structurally deficient—63,500 of them. How do you remain a world power when you cannot move goods efficiently or people efficiently?

I will say, in all my years here, I have had the best relationship on infrastructure spending with my colleague Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma. This budget predicts a 40-percent decrease in infrastructure spending, so pretty much everyone—everyone who is impacted by this new management, which is all of us—is getting hit hard by this budget. A budget is a reflection of whom you fight for, whom you believe in, and what your values are. This budget will bring pain to middle-class families, to our working poor, to our children, to our seniors, to our students, to our drought-plagued or flood-plagued areas, and to the people who use their automobiles to go to work.

In essence, this budget hurts the very people we should be fighting for. Instead of checking with those who actually balanced the budget—when Bill Clinton was President—they go off on an opposite tear, which is to take away investments—which is what led to the prosperity, which is what led to the balanced budget, which is what led to 23 million jobs—and put in place austerity.

I gave you just a little look at some of these cuts. But, guess what, America, there is a secret in the budget. There is another $900 billion of cuts over the next 10 years in a secret little package, unspecified cuts, almost $1 trillion, because they don't even know where to go to cut. So if you didn't like the cuts I talked about, wait until they get to the unspecified cuts.

Who do you think is going to get those cuts? Not the wealthy few families, it is going to be more pain for the middle class, more pain for the working poor, and more pain for the workers and businesses of the transportation sector. We are not going to see cures for Alzheimer's or cancer because, believe me, that is not going to happen, no initiatives there.

This budget does not belong on the Senate floor. This budget is too painful to be enacted. This budget ought to be redone with an eye toward the balance we achieved those years ago by making smart investments in our people and by cutting back on wasteful spending but not bringing political vendettas to the table when already so many millions of our people have health insurance. You are going to take that away? You fought so hard for the chance to govern—you did, believe me—just as we are going to fight to get it back. That is what politics is. But now it is time to work together.

This is a radical budget. This doesn't reflect any coming together. And as soon as we wake up America to the fact that this budget hurts them, maybe we will have a chance to fix it. I really hope so because our middle class can't take any more pain. Our drivers can't take any more pain. Our students can't take any more pain. Our seniors can't take any more pain. Our children can't fend for themselves.

So I hope we will have a big ''no'' vote on this budget. I also hope, after we have our vote, that we come together and fix some of these major problems, starting with the highway trust fund, where already six of our States have stopped spending. There

are still 800,000 unemployed construction workers and thousands of businesses suffering because we don't have a long-term solution to the highway trust fund. Why don't we take care of that? No, we are going to take up some fast-track, speedy trade bill that includes countries that pay their people 52 cents an hour. That is what we are going to do. We are going to rush to that.

Why don't we fix the problems here? Why don't we fix the student loan rate so people aren't paying off student loans when they are on Social Security? Why don't we make sure people can afford to get educated? Why don't we improve the health care system and not throw people off the rolls? Let's do it the right way. Let's not do it ''my way or the highway'' because that only is going to wind up hurting the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am glad I had a chance to come to the floor and listen to the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on the Budget and the senior Senator from California talk about this budget, but I feel like it is two ships passing in the night when I see this remarkable accomplishment under the leadership of Chairman ENZI on the Committee on the Budget and the entire Committee on the Budget.

This is a congressional budget that balances within 10 years. It doesn't raise taxes. It reprioritizes our Nation's defense. It protects our most vulnerable citizens. It improves economic growth, which is literally the rising tide that lifts all boats in a growing economy. That is something our economy has not been doing very well lately. And it stops the Federal Government's out-of-control Federal spending. This is really a remarkable accomplishment. As a matter of fact, this is the first joint 10-year balanced budget resolution since 2001.

I think what drives our friends across the aisle crazy is the fact they haven't passed a budget since 2009. Now, with the new leadership here in the Senate, in the 114th Congress, we have done the basic work of governing, which is to propose—and this afternoon we will pass—a balanced budget.

I know there are differences across the aisle. Clearly, there are reasons why people choose to be a Democratic Senator or a Republican Senator. But, to me, the differences are pretty stark. Our friends across the aisle don't think that the government should have to live within its means but that we should continue borrowing money we don't have and overspending and hand the bill to our kids and grandkids. I personally think that is a moral hazard. That is really unconscionable—to keep spending money and then to send the bill to our kids and grandkids and say: You pay. We had a good time. Good luck.

Our friends across the aisle think the Federal Government is not big enough because they want to continue to feed the beast with more of Americans' hard-earned tax dollars so it can get bigger and intrude further into everyone's freedoms and choices that should be left to individuals and their families.

It sounds to me as though the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, the Senator from Vermont, thinks the government ought to simply take more of the money Americans have earned and give it to somebody else who didn't earn it.

I can only conclude that our friends across the aisle think an $18 trillion debt is not a problem. It is. When interest rates start creeping back up, as they eventually will, more and more of our tax dollars are going to be spent sending interest payments to the Chinese and other holders of our sovereign debt to service that debt. That is going to crowd out not only national security spending, it is going to crowd out the safety net spending we all agree is necessary for people who can't protect themselves.

So there are real differences.

This budget, I am proud to say—which we will pass this afternoon thanks to the heroic work of our Committee on the Budget—is a real accomplishment. I guess what would be a real embarrassment is if we didn't pass a budget. But we will pass a budget.

People listening at home may say: Why are you patting yourselves on the back for passing a budget? We have a budget in our business. We have a budget at home. So why is it such a big deal for the new Congress to actually pass a budget?

Well, I guess it shouldn't be a big deal. It should be something we do routinely because it is really the most basic demonstration of the ability to govern. But what makes it remarkable is the fact that it hasn't happened in a long time. So that is why I am so glad.

We actually have seen under the new leadership in the 114th Congress some real progress. We have actually seen Democrats and Republicans working together to accomplish some important things. That is something which I think the American people appreciate and which all Members of the Senate have come to enjoy. The mood has changed. The ability of Senators to participate in the process and actually come up with solutions has gotten so much better in just the first 100 days of the 114th Congress, I think we are slowly starting to develop some momentum.

We passed a bill that lets Medicare beneficiaries see the doctors they need. That is a good thing. We also passed an important piece of legislation that provides aid to victims of human trafficking. Through the end of this week, we will continue to work our way through another important piece of legislation, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which was unanimously voted out of committee a few weeks ago. This is very important not only to the region in the Middle East but also to us and the world. This bill will guarantee that Congress will have an opportunity to review and potentially block any final deal with Iran that President Obama reaches during the so-called P5+1 negotiations.

After we conclude the consideration of that important piece of legislation, we are going to move on to consider something else I think will help grow the economy and actually end up bringing more revenue into the Federal Treasury, help us with some of our deficits and debt, and that is to pass trade promotion authority and then to take up the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement.

My State happens to export more than any other State in the Nation, and our economy reflects that because just our binational trade with Mexico creates about 6 million jobs. It is a good thing to have more markets in which to sell the things our farmers grow or sell the livestock our ranchers raise or the manufactured goods Americans make. It is a good thing.

This bill would make sure the United States gets the best deal in pending trade agreements with countries from Asia, to South America, to Europe, and it would help make sure that Texas's products and, more generally, American products and industries find new markets, which will in turn raise wages for hard-working families. That is something we all support.

With all these other signs of progress, I think that writing and passing a budget is one of the most fundamental responsibilities we have. While that should be pretty obvious—families across the country sit around the table each month and do the same thing—it is a fact that was lost on many of our Democratic colleagues when they controlled the Chamber.

While listening to the Senator from California, I was reminded once again of what a cut in Washington, DC, is. It is not a cut in the amount of spending in a program at current levels, it is a reduction in the rate of increase. That is what they call a cut. What this budget does is it begins to cut the rate of increase of spending in a way that helps us control the deficits and take the first important step toward dealing with our long-term debt.

When we vote on this budget today, it will be the first time both Chambers have actually voted for an agreed-upon spending bill since 2009. As I said earlier, it will be the first balanced 10-year budget since 2001, and that is despite 4 consecutive years of trillion-dollar deficits under President Obama—trillion-dollar deficits. Those deficits, as the chairman has appropriately pointed out, add up to debt, the deficit being the difference between what the government brings in and what it spends in a given year. Four years of consecutive trillion-dollar deficits has done grave damage to our national debt, with a downgrade in America's credit rating by Standard & Poor's.

It would be one thing if the President and our friends across the aisle had a good record when it comes to their budgets and their proposals, but they do not. Just look at what the President has proposed.

President Obama has missed statutory deadlines to propose a budget so often that it became more notable when he actually did fulfill that responsibility than when he did not.

When the President's budget was voted on in 2011, it was unanimously rejected by Democrats and Republicans. It didn't receive a single vote. The same was true in 2012. If the President had proposed a responsible budget, I am certain Members of his own party would have at least voted for it. In 2011 and 2012, no Democrat voted for the President's budget. Last year, in the House of Representatives, all but two Members voted against the President's budget when given the chance. It went down by a resounding 413 to 2. That was the President's budget proposal. We saw history repeat itself in March as well. One by one, nearly every Member of this body came to the floor and gave a thumbs down to President Obama's budget proposal. As a matter of fact, it got one vote; it went down 98 to 1.

Whether it is offering a completely irresponsible budget that is rejected by both parties or the failure to offer any budget at all, our friends across the aisle are living in a glass house. And when you live in a glass house, you really shouldn't throw stones. But the most important point is that the American people deserve better.

We had an important election in November, and it changed the majority in the Senate. It established new management.

In that last election cycle we made promises we intend to keep, and we were elected on our promise to be different and to govern responsibly. That promise includes passing a budget that protects taxpayers and sets the Nation on a path toward sound fiscal footing. Fortunately for the American people, we are keeping our campaign pledges, and this budget does reflect their confidence in the new leadership of the Congress.

This budget leaves our country with a surplus after 10 years. It puts us on a path to begin to pay down our national debt, and it does not raise taxes.

By balancing the budget without tax hikes, like we do in Texas with our budget, we can protect taxpayers and foster an economic environment that allows jobs and opportunity to blossom.

But protecting our taxpayers is not our only priority. I believe our No. 1 priority in the Federal Government is national security. I believe Congress needs to make sure that is unmistakably clear, and we do so in this budget.

The budget also provides the military with the necessary flexibility to react to changing threats and to make additional investments as necessary in a way that does not add to overspending.

Not only does this send a message to our troops that they will have the support they need in order to do the job they volunteered to do but also to our families, our military families who serve as well in our all-volunteer military system.

This prioritization of national security also sends a very important message to our Nation's adversaries. We know that weakness is a provocation to the bullies and the tyrants around the world. When people such as Vladimir Putin see the United States retreating, pulling back, not prioritizing our national security, and not maintaining our role in the world as a preeminent power, it is a provocation and it is an encouragement. We see that happening around the world as we see now a greater security threat environment than perhaps we have seen in many, many years. But this budget sends a message to our adversaries around the world that America will not shrink and will not retreat from our leadership role.

The budget under consideration was passed just a few days ago in the House of Representatives because it serves the American people by providing for our national defense and balancing the budget within 10 years. And it doesn't raise taxes—something Congress hasn't done for almost 15 years.

This afternoon, the Senate will keep its part of the bargain. We will follow through on our promise, and we will make clear to the American people that we are committed to getting our fiscal house in order with this important first step.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, a budget is far more than a series of numbers on a piece of paper. A budget really is a statement of values and priorities, a statement of the kind of Nation we are and the kind of Nation we want to be.

For many of us, these values and priorities are clear. We believe that a budget should help us move toward an economy that is built from the middle out—not from the top down—and a government that works for all of our families—not just the wealthiest few. But the Republican budget that we are here debating today would move us in the opposite direction.

Instead of working with us to build on the bipartisan budget deal we struck last Congress, Republicans have introduced a budget that would lock in sequestration. It would hollow out defense and nondefense investments and use gimmicks and games to paper over the problems.

Instead of putting jobs, wages, and economic security first by prioritizing policies such as paid sick leave, which shouldn't be partisan issues, the Republican budget would cut taxes for the rich and leave working families behind. Instead of building on the work we have done to make health care more affordable and accessible, the Republican budget would take us back to the bad old days when insurance companies called all the shots and when fewer Americans had access to the care they need.

I will take a few minutes today to talk about each of these issues and to urge my Republican friends to take a different approach, to put politics aside, to come back to the table, and to work with us on a responsible budget that puts the middle class first and will actually work for families and communities that we all represent.

The first issue I want to talk about is the automatic cuts from sequestration and the failure of this budget to address an issue Democrats and Republicans agree needs to be solved.

I am proud that coming out of the terrible government shutdown at the end of 2013, we were finally able to break through the gridlock and dysfunction to reach a bipartisan budget deal that prevented another government shutdown, restored investments in education, in research, and in defense jobs and really laid down a foundation for continued bipartisan work.

That deal wasn't the budget I would have written on my own, and it wasn't the one Republicans would have written on their own, but it did end the lurching from crisis to crisis. It helped workers and our economy and made it clear that there is bipartisan support for rolling back sequestration in a balanced way.

Our bipartisan deal was a strong step in the right direction, and I was hopeful that we could work together to build on it, because we know there is bipartisan support to replace sequestration in a balanced and fair way.

Not only did we prove that with our bipartisan budget deal, but Democrats and Republicans across the country have continued to come out against the senseless cuts to defense and nondefense investments. But Republicans

went the opposite way with their budget this year.

They were able to cut trillions of dollars of programs that support families and fight poverty—nearly $1 trillion cut from Medicare and Medicaid and more than $5 trillion overall. But they refused to dedicate a single penny of that to roll back the automatic cuts to education, research or defense investments.

To put that in perspective, we were able to roll back sequestration for 2 years in the Bipartisan Budget Act with $85 billion in savings. But the Republican budget won't fix the problem even for this coming year with more than 50 times that amount of savings.

Instead of using just a tiny fraction of the enormous cuts this budget has in it to pay for investments that both Republicans and Democrats agree must be made, this budget uses a gimmick by increasing OCO funding to appear to patch over the problem on the defense side without raising the cap on defense funding and doing nothing at all for nondefense investments such as education, research, jobs, and infrastructure.

We know the automatic cuts are terrible policy, and we know the President has said he would veto spending bills at sequester levels. I also know there are Republicans who have seen the impact of sequestration in their States, as I have seen it in my State of Washington, and I know there are Republicans who look at this budget and wonder why it couldn't use some of the trillions of dollars in cuts to reinvest in American innovation or in our defense investments.

So I am hopeful that instead of continuing to kick the can down the road or relying on gimmicks that don't actually solve this problem, Republicans will come back to the table and work with us to build on our bipartisan budget deal in a balanced and responsible way, will allow the Appropriations subcommittees to actually do their work and not wait for another crisis before they push the tea party aside and work with us to get this done.

Instead of rehashing old debates and lurching us toward another completely avoidable crisis, we should be working together to put in place policies that boost the economy and help our working families—policies such as allowing workers to earn paid sick days. No worker should have to sacrifice a day's pay or their job altogether just to take care of themselves or their sick child. But today, in this country, 43 million Americans do not have access to paid sick days.

Making sure more workers have this basic worker protection will give more families some much-needed economic stability. And, by the way, it is probusiness. Access to paid sick days boosts productivity, and it reduces turnover—two huge benefits for employers.

Businesses that want to help their workers stay healthy should have a level playing field so they aren't at a disadvantage when they do the right thing. A strong bipartisan majority of Senators affirmed their support for allowing workers to earn paid sick days during the budget amendment process, and I was hopeful we could build on that momentum and keep working together to increase the economic security for millions of workers and families.

So I was very disappointed that the conference report does not reflect that provision. Instead of keeping our bipartisan amendment and providing paid sick days to help workers and families, this conference report instead allows for tax credits for employers that would not guarantee access to paid leave. That is a step in the wrong direction. But it doesn't have to be the last step this Congress takes.

So I urge our colleagues to work with me to pass the Healthy Families Act, legislation that would move this debate beyond budget amendments and make paid sick days a reality for millions of Americans. Allowing workers to earn paid sick days is one way we can ensure our workplaces are working for all families—not just the wealthiest few.

I also want to talk about one more way this budget would be devastating for families across the country. The Affordable Care Act was a critical step forward in our efforts to build a health care system that puts patients first, and it allows every family to get the affordable, high quality health care they need. But the work didn't end when this law passed—far from it.

Families across the country are expecting us to keep working to build on this progress and continue making health care more affordable, more accessible, and with higher quality, and that is what Democrats are focused on. Unfortunately, this Republican budget would do the exact opposite. It would roll back all the progress we have made, take us back to the bad old days when insurance companies called all the shots, when being a woman was a preexisting condition, when far fewer families could afford to get the health care they need. In fact, this Republican approach could even mean an average tax hike of $3,200 a year on working families who would have to pay more for their care.

Families are tired of Republicans playing games with their health care. So I hope my Republican colleagues will listen to the millions of people across the country who have more affordable, quality health care and to the vast majority of our constituents, who want us to work together to solve problems and not rehash old fights, and that they will finally drop the political games and work with us to move our health care system forward—not backward—for the communities we serve.

Republicans control Congress. It is their job to write and pass a budget. But our constituents actually sent us here to work together—not simply to argue with each other. People across the country are expecting us to break through the gridlock once again, like we were able to do last Congress, and deliver results for their families and the communities we represent.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget that would be devastating to middle-class families, seniors, investments in our future, and the economy. I really hope that Republicans decide to come back to the table and work with us on policies that grow the economy from the middle out—not from the top down—and that moves us towards a government that works for all families—not just the wealthiest few.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator ENZI and members of the Budget Committee for the 2016 budget conference agreement that we are currently considering in the Senate. Included in the budget conference agreement are policy provisions that I believe begin to move this country in the right fiscal direction, including balancing the budget within 10 years without the need to raise taxes on the hard-working American taxpayer—something the administration's budget fails to do. In addition, the budget agreement provides a pathway to repeal the failed policies of ObamaCare.

I am pleased the resolution does provide some relief from sequestration's devastating cuts to our national defense. The good news is that there is some relief. Providing additional resources for defense through the Overseas Contingency Operations account, known as OCO, is a good one, but it is temporary and it is a Band-Aid.

Again, I thank Senator ENZI for the great job he has done, but the fact is that this body and this Congress is guilty—is guilty—of not repealing sequestration, which is devastating our military and destroying our ability to defend this Nation in these most perilous and difficult times.

Before the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 29, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger testified:

> As we look around the world, we encounter upheaval and conflict. The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War.

What are we doing? We are slashing defense year after year through something called sequestration, which was never intended to happen. That is a devastating indictment of the Congress

of the United States in our first priority, which is protecting this nation.

Gen. Mark Welsh, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, stated:

We are now the smallest Air Force we've ever been. When we deployed to Operation Desert Storm in 1990, the Air Force had 188 fighter squadrons. Today, we have 54, and we're headed to 49 in the next couple of years. In 1990, there were 511,000 active duty airmen alone. Today, we have 200,000 fewer. . . . We currently have 12 fleets of airplanes that qualify for antique license plates in the state of Virginia.

General Odierno, Chief of Staff of the Army, said:

In the last three years, the Army's active component and strength has been reduced by 80,000; the reserve component by 18,000. We have 13 less active component brigade combat teams. We've eliminated three active aviation brigades. . . . We have already slashed investments in modernization by 25 percent.

He went on to say:

The number one thing that keeps me up at night is that if we're asked to respond to an unknown contingency, I will send soldiers to that contingency not properly trained and ready. We simply are not used to doing that.

Admiral Greenert, the Chief Of Naval Operations:

[D]ue to sequestration of 2013, our contingency response force, that's what's on call from the United States, is one-third of what it should be and what it needs to be.

Gen. Joseph Dunford, Commandant of the Marine Corps, now nominated to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Of Staff, testified:

We're investing in modernization at a historically low level. We know that we must maintain at least 10 percent to 12 percent of our resources on modernization to field a ready force for tomorrow. To pay today's bills, we're currently investing 7 percent to 8 percent.

I asked every single one of our service chiefs and our area commanders the same question: If we do not repeal sequestration, will it put the lives of our men and women who are serving in the military in greater danger? The answer by every single one of these uniformed leaders—not just civilian leaders—was, yes, we will put the lives of the men and women who are serving in the military in greater danger unless we repeal sequestration on defense.

I say to my colleagues of the United States Senate, this is not acceptable. It is not acceptable for us to ask the young men and women who are serving in our military in uniform to put their lives in greater danger because we copped out, we failed to address the issue of increasing an unsustainable deficit. We are making them pay the price.

Thirteen percent of the budget is allocated to defense; defense is taking 50 percent of the cuts.

The Ryan-Murray agreement was something that was welcomed. We need another Ryan-Murray. We need the men and women who are serving as Members of Congress to understand that we have no greater responsibility than the defense of this Nation.

I can assure my colleagues that, working with my friend Senator REED of Rhode Island, the ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, we will be working. We will reduce waste and mismanagement. We will address acquisition. We will reform acquisition and the terrible cost overruns that plague our ability to do business in the defense business. We will be cutting the size of these huge staffs that have grown and grown. We will be making significant reforms in the way the military does business, but these reforms will not have the impact that is necessary in the short term, and that is that we are putting the lives of American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in greater danger.

I come to the floor to thank my colleague from Wyoming, Senator ENZI, for the great job he has done on this budget. But I would tell my colleagues that we must work together in a bipartisan fashion to fix the damage sequestration is doing.

I will only add one other point that is very important. Some of us have forgotten that in the days after the Vietnam war, the military was in terrible disarray. Ronald Reagan came to the Presidency on the slogan ''Peace through strength.'' We rebuilt the military. We put it back in the condition of being the greatest military and effective force in the world, and we won the Cold War.

Right now, if you look at a map of the world in 2011 and look at a map of the world today—in 2011 when we enacted sequestration—you will find that Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, Madeleine Albright, Brent Scowcroft, and every person who is respected on national security in this country will tell you that we are in grave danger. Whether it be from ISIS, whether it be from Iran, whether it be aggressive behavior by the Chinese—no matter what it is, there are severe crises, no matter where it is in the world. We are in the midst of serious challenges to our national security, and the last place—the last place—we should continue to cut is on our defense and capability to defend this nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I first wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his leadership and echo his words that we need a bipartisan solution on this issue, and hopefully we will be able to address it, not only supporting our men and women when they are actively in harm's way but supporting them as veterans, which I know he cares deeply about as well. That is why we need a bipartisan and balanced solution like we had before. I thank the Senator for his leadership.

Mr. President, the reality is that this budget—any budget for the United States—is about our values and our priorities. That is what it is all about as a country. I have to say, as a senior member of the Budget Committee, I am deeply concerned about the values portrayed in this budget. I greatly respect the chairman and ranking member and thank them for their service, but when we look at this budget in total, this goes opposite to what the majority of Members talk about every day because this particular budget keeps the system rigged in favor of the wealthy and well-connected against the interests of hard-working, middle-class Americans.

Picture this: In this budget, if you are a family with assets of $10 million or more, you hit the jackpot: You get at least a $3 million bonus tax cut in this bill, in terms of the policies laid out in the bill. How is it paid for? It is paid for by everybody else. Sixteen million hard-working Americans will see a tax increase of at least $900 based on these policies. We will see critical investments and services cut. There is nothing done to address jobs going overseas. There is not one loophole proposed to be closed that is sending our jobs overseas. We want to create an economy and really balance the budget? Let's bring those jobs home. There is nothing in this budget about that. If you have wealth of over $10 million, it is your lucky day—$3 million or more in your pocket. There is Christmas in this budget for very wealthy multimillionaires, but if you are everybody else, you are in trouble.

There is no focus on creating jobs. And God help you if your family has a mom or dad or grandpa or grandma who has Alzheimer's disease and is in a nursing home because this budget guts nursing home care for millions of Americans, a lot of folks who desperately need that care.

One out of five Medicare dollars today goes to treat Alzheimer's. This is an area I have been deeply involved in and I am partnering with Senator SUSAN COLLINS on, important work that needs to be done. But if you have someone who has Alzheimer's disease and who needs long-term care, you are out of luck in this budget.

This morning, I talked to a group of women who are in town for breast cancer research. This is the month that focuses on breast cancer research. If you care about breast cancer research, in this budget, you are out of luck. If you want to make sure we are investing in cures and treatments—we are now so close in so many areas. American research, innovation, and the best minds in the world are working on opportunities to us to solve Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease and cancers and all kinds of other areas of concern. But the budget is cut for NIH, the National Institutes of Health. What kinds of priorities does this reflect?

On top of that, for 16.4 million people who now have affordable insurance, it will be gone.

What is interesting about the budget is it is very creative because all the revenue, all the fees to pay for health care stay to help balance the budget; it is the health care that goes away. So for those breast cancer patients whom I talked to this morning who are now so grateful that if they need go out and get new insurance, they will not be called someone with a pre-existing condition, that goes away in this budget.

If you have a child who is 22, 23, just graduated—I spoke at graduation ceremonies this last weekend—and they are on your insurance right now while they are trying to get themselves together and get that first job, that goes away.

This budget attacks health care, which, by the way, is not a frill. We do not control when and how we get sick or if our children get sick or if our parents or grandparents need a nursing home or what may happen in terms of medical issues in our families, but health care is directly attacked. The Affordable Care Act—gone. Gutting inpatient care in nursing homes for Alzheimer's patients and others. Research—gone.

We are hearing from our Republican friends that they are making government work. But I will tell you what—it is not working for middle-class families. It is working for you if you are making over $10 million a year or have more than $10 million in assets, but it is not working for you if you are holding down two or three jobs and you are just trying to make it for your family.

We believe as Democrats that this ought to be a middle-class budget because everybody deserves a fair shot to get ahead and have a chance to have a better future. For us, that means this budget should have a major focus on creating millions of jobs by rebuilding our roads, rebuilding our bridges, our infrastructure.

By the way, the funding for that—the authorization for the highway trust fund—runs out at the end of May. There is nothing in here to address that, no funding in here to address that. We are going to see all kinds of jobs eliminated all across the country if that funding is eliminated. We believe in rebuilding our roads and bridges and creating millions of jobs.

We stand up for Social Security and Medicare. This budget has $430 billion in cuts to Medicare, and it doesn't say where they come from. It is proposing a structure that would actually eliminate Medicare as we know it and turn it into some kind of a voucher system or some other kind of system that is not guaranteed care under Medicare. We believe in protecting Medicare and Social Security.

We believe everybody ought to have a fair chance to work hard and make it and go to college. This does nothing but increase costs for students going to college. We believe costs ought to go down so that when students leave college, they do not end up with so much debt that they cannot go out and buy a house. People cannot buy a house, as realtors in Michigan have told me, because they have so much debt. They cannot qualify to get a loan for a house or to start a new business.

We, as Democrats, want to make sure everybody has a chance to go to college, that it is affordable, that we are protecting Social Security and Medicare, and that we are creating jobs, rebuilding our roads and our highways and the opportunity to invest in America.

Finally, we want to bring jobs home. It is insane that we still have a Tax Code that rewards those—sometimes only on paper—who leave this country. They still breathe the air, drink the water, drive on the roads, they just don't have to pay their fair share of taxes as businesses because on paper they are based somewhere else. That is not fair to every small business in Michigan that is working hard every day. It is not fair to every taxpayer across this country and every business we have that is really an American business. There is nothing in this budget which addresses that.

I conclude by saying we should resoundingly object and vote no on the priorities and the values set out in this budget. They do not reflect what is good to create and grow a middle class and create opportunity in this country.

If you are one of the privileged few, hallelujah. Break out the champagne after this passes. But if you are the majority of Americans, hold on to your seats and put on your seatbelt, because if this is, in fact, put into place, it will be a rough ride for America. Our side is going to do everything humanly possible to make sure that does not happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my great colleague from Michigan for her outstanding words and leadership. She is a senior member of the Budget Committee. She knows just what is wrong with this budget and she knows how to reach the American people in terms of revealing and showing just that. I thank her.

I thank my dear friend Senator SANDERS, a fellow graduate of James Madison High School in Brooklyn, for his great leadership on the Budget Committee as well.

Look, in a certain sense, this Republican budget is a gift to us and to the American people because it shows their real priorities, and their priorities are so far away from what average Americans want that this budget will resound from one end of the country to the other between now and November of 2016.

The budget the House and Senate Republicans have put together helps the very wealthy and powerful in our country who, frankly, don't need any help. This idea that cutting taxes on the very wealthy will somehow make America a better place, how many Americans actually believe that? We understand a lot of our colleagues do. They hang out with these people, I guess. But that is not what most Americans think, that is for sure.

The budget should reflect the economic reality right now. Middle-class incomes are declining. It is harder to stay in the middle class. It is harder to reach the middle class. A budget should help those folks who are in the middle class stay there, and it should help those who are trying to get to the middle class create ladders so they can get there.

Again, this budget seems to focus all of its attention and all of its goodies on the very wealthy. The economy is getting stronger but mainly at the very high end. So we need to cut their taxes because they are hurting? And at the same time we need to raise taxes on 16 million Americans who are working and making $20,000, $30,000, $40,000 a year—raise their taxes by $900? How many Americans would say we should cut taxes on the 4,000 wealthiest people an average of $3 million, at the cost of $260 billion over 10 years, and raise taxes by $900 on people making $20,000, $30,000, $40,000 a year? Is it 1 percent of America who thinks that way? Maybe. But it seems our colleagues on the other side of the aisle followed that Pied Piper, that 1 percent, in putting together their budget. It makes no sense.

The Republican budget is a document of willful ignorance. It was constructed in an ideological house of mirrors where no one sees reality. No one who put together this budget sees any reality. They don't see middle-class people struggling.

Making it harder to pay for college? What the heck is going on here in this great America? Our colleagues are trying to pass a budget that says we should make it harder to pay for college, that veterans should lose food stamps—veterans, the people who served us. I am sure the vast majority of them are looking for jobs and income. That is who veterans are. They don't want a handout. But when they are down on their luck—maybe they had injuries, maybe it was rough adjusting to family life back home again—you cut their food stamps? Wow. What kind of budget is this? As I said, it is a budget in an ideological house of mirrors.

Cap student loan payments? There are 30- and 40-year-olds with huge burdens of debt. They cannot even buy a home. Maybe they even put off having kids. In this budget, our Republican friends are saying we should eliminate

and cut programs so we can reduce some of that debt burden. Wow. What world are you folks living in? It sure isn't the world of reality. It is an ideological house of mirrors. It is a budget document of willful ignorance.

I could go on and on and on with this budget. How many families have elderly parents in nursing homes who have Alzheimer's? We know that tragedy. This budget makes it harder for those people to stay in those nursing homes by cutting Medicaid, which many of them are on. And then these young families are going to have the burden of taking their dear parents, their loved ones, back into their homes. Do we want that?

Well, you say, we have to cut somewhere. How about not giving the 4,000 richest families $260 billion over 10 years and putting some of the money into cancer research, putting some of the money into helping veterans feed themselves, putting some of the money into helping make it easier to pay for college?

Republicans are going to have to figure out a way to convince the American people that they are doing something, anything, to help the middle class. So far they are striking out.

There is only one bit of good news. Our colleagues, when they are forced to actually put real numbers to these budget numbers in the appropriations process, will not be able to do it. They will not dare do it. I hope—this will be up to our ranking member Senator MIKULSKI and the members of our Appropriations Committee—they take this budget and actually craft it into the appropriations bill and put it out there, and let's see how many of our colleagues actually vote for it.

How many of our colleagues will vote to make it harder to pay for college? How many of our colleagues will make it harder for veterans to feed themselves when they are out of luck? How many of our colleagues will vote to raise taxes by $900 on people making $30,000, $40,000 a year? I doubt many.

This is a fun day for our Republican colleagues. They get to beat their ideological breasts, show the hard right they really mean it, and then maybe we can go back to governing the country and helping the middle class.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to speak as well about the budget that is before the Senate. I want to point out something I believe the Senator from New York failed to mention in his comments. We are actually doing a budget. That is what is pretty historic about this.

A few years back, I got on the Budget Committee because I thought it would be the place where a lot of action was going to occur and where we were going to be doing big, consequential things for the country. I asked our leaders, when they made committee assignments, if I could serve on the Budget Committee. I served on the Budget Committee for 4 years. In the 4 years I was on the Budget Committee, when the Democrats controlled this Chamber, we did not write a budget—not a single year. It was like being on a committee that was completely irrelevant around here. We did not do a budget for 4 years. This year, we are finally going to pass a budget. They only did do one in 2009 so they could pass ObamaCare with 51 votes.

The last time we actually had a 10-year balanced budget was in 2001. So we are talking about something that is pretty historic. This is the first time this has happened in 14 years. I will repeat that. The last time Congress passed a joint 10-year balanced budget resolution was 14 years ago, in 2001—the year Apple released the first iPod.

This year, the President has, once again, proposed a budget that never balances—not in 10 years, not in 25 years, not ever. When the other side gets up and talks about the Republican budget and attacks it, at least Republicans in this Chamber recognize the importance of having a budget and putting in place a pathway, if you will, for how we are going to get the fiscal situation of this country in a better place, and it sets out our priorities because that is really what the budget process does. It says this is what we are for.

What the Democrats argue—and we heard the Senator from New York making the argument—is that we are not spending enough and that this is about spending more. I believe the American people realize that if we want to solve middle-class wage stagnation—they talk about the middle-class wages being lower, and they are lower. They have been significantly lower since this President took office. As I was saying, if we want to solve middle-class wage stagnation, we have to have an expanding economy.

The way to help people into a better place economically and to raise the income of people in this country is to get a growing, vibrant, robust, expanding economy that is growing at a faster rate than the anemic 1- to 2-percent growth we have seen in the last few years. The way we achieve that is not by growing the government. It is not about growing the government. We have to grow the economy. When the economy is growing, that is when we start to see people in this country, middle-class income families, benefit.

As I said, the President proposed a budget that never balanced, and he proposed increasing spending by a staggering 65 percent over the next 10 years. I don't need to tell the American people that kind of spending is unsustainable. For too long the attitude in Washington has been to spend now, pay later. That only works for so long. Sooner or later your spending catches up with you.

Six years ago, when the President took office, our national debt was already a massive $10.6 trillion. Over the past 6 years, during the President's administration, our national debt has increased by more than $7.5 trillion, and today it is at a dangerously high $18.2 trillion. That is the size of our economy. In fact, that is larger than our economy. That is a 1-to-1 ratio. That kind of debt slows economic growth, threatens government programs, such as Social Security and Medicare, and jeopardizes our Nation's future.

In 2011, then-chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen, the highest ranking military official in our country, said, ''I've said many times that I believe the single, biggest threat to our national security is our debt.'' I have heard him say that. I served on the Armed Services Committee for 6 years. I heard the chairman of the Joint Chiefs say that repeatedly in front of committees at various hearings and at various times. That is quite a statement from the country's top-ranking military official: the greatest threat to our national security is our debt.

If we keep racking up our debt the way we have been doing, we will not be able to pay for our priorities, such as Social Security, Medicare, national defense, and infrastructure. All of those priorities could face huge cuts if we don't get our Nation on a sound fiscal footing.

When the Republicans took control of the Senate in January, we were determined to get Washington working again. We knew that one of the most important steps in that process was passing a balanced budget resolution. Republicans understand what every American family knows; that you cannot keep racking up debt indefinitely and that the solution to being in debt is not to increase spending.

In March, we introduced a budget blueprint that would balance the budget in 10 years and put our Nation on a path to fiscal health. House Republicans introduced a similar balanced budget resolution. During the month of April, the two Houses came together to iron out the differences in our blueprints and produced the final document that we will be voting on today.

It is not a perfect document. It does not solve every one of our Nation's problems, but at long last it gets us moving in a different direction—in the right direction. Instead of ignoring our Nation's fiscal problems, the Republicans' budget resolution addresses them and promotes spending restraint.

Under our budget blueprint, by the time the 10-year budget closes in 2025, our Nation will be running a surplus of $24 billion instead of racking up another $1.5 trillion in deficits every single year. Unlike some budget plans, our

budget will continue to balance in 2026 and beyond.

In addition to restraining spending, the Republicans' budget resolution focuses on cutting waste and eliminating the inefficiency and redundancy that plagues so many government programs. Our budget also puts in place reforms that will encourage honest accounting. The result of these provisions will be a more efficient, effective, and accountable government that works for the American people.

Our budget also, as I said, makes a healthy economy a priority. Almost 6 years after the recession has ended, millions of Americans are still struggling and opportunities for advancement are still few and far between. A big reason for that is the oppressive, big-government policies and deficit spending of the Obama administration. Our budget will help stop government from strangling the economy by limiting the growth of spending and reducing the debt, which will help reduce the cost of work and investment and the cost of starting and growing a business. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that our budget will result in an additional $400 billion in economic growth over the next 10 years.

The Republicans' budget will also pave the way for the removal of inefficient and ineffective government regulations that are making it difficult for many businesses to hire new workers and create new opportunities and higher paying jobs.

Our budget also addresses another priority of American families, and that is fixing our Nation's broken health care system. Now 5 years on, the President's health care law has resulted in higher costs, lost health care plans, reduced access to doctors, and new burdens on businesses, both large and small. In fact, it has been pretty much one disaster after another.

Just this week, a USA TODAY headline announced that ''contrary to goals, ER visits rise under ObamaCare.'' The article says: ''Three-quarters of emergency physicians say they've seen ER patient visits surge since ObamaCare took effect—just the opposite of what many Americans expected would happen.'' That is from the USA TODAY article. Of course, as we know, ER visits are our most expensive form of health care.

It is no surprise that the majority of the American people continue to oppose the law. Our budget paves the way for a repeal of ObamaCare and the introduction of real, patient-centered health care reforms that will give Americans more health care choices at a lower cost.

Finally, our budget will start the process of putting major entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare on a sounder footing going forward. Right now, the Social Security trust fund is headed toward bankruptcy. If we don't take action, Social Security recipients could be facing a 25-percent cut in benefits by the year 2033. Medicare faces similar challenges to those faced by Social Security. Under the worst-case scenario, the Medicare trust fund could become insolvent by as early as 2021. That is just 6 short years away. The Republican budget would help preserve Medicare by extending the trust fund's solvency for an additional 5 years, which would protect retirees' benefits while giving policymakers additional time to ensure that this program provides support to seniors for decades to come.

I am proud that today the Republicans in Congress will ensure that we have a joint balanced budget resolution for the first time in 14 years, but I also wish to emphasize that is no more than what the American people should expect. The American people, after all, have to live within a budget; their government needs to do so as well.

Going forward, balanced budgets need to be the norm here in Congress. Washington has spent enough time working for its own interests. It is time to get Washington working again for American families.

This is the first time in 14 years that we have actually had a budget resolution and a conference report that balance within 10 years. As I said earlier, during my time here in the Senate, which hasn't been that long but about 10 years now, this is the first time—with the exception of 2009, in which we did a budget simply so the Democrats could pass ObamaCare through reconciliation—this is the first time we have done a budget that passed both chambers in the 10 years I have been here, with the exception perhaps of the first few years.

It is time to get Washington working again for the American people. It starts with passing the budget. That is why I am proud that Senator ENZI and others worked hard to get us where we are. I hope today we will ultimately have the votes necessary to pass this and do something which hasn't been done around here in a very long time but which is really essential for the good of the American people in this country.

RECESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. today for the weekly conference meetings and that the time during the recess count against the majority time on the budget conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time under any quorum call be equally divided between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise today to speak in opposition to the Republican so-called budget. I call it a ''so-called budget'' because I do not believe even Republicans would actually pass appropriations consistent with it. It looks to me like it is just a show to keep extremists on the right happy. My guess is that practical Republicans cannot wait for President Obama to bail them out by negotiating appropriations higher.

Recently, we have seen impressive examples of committee bipartisanship. In Foreign Relations, Senator CORKER brought a unanimously bipartisan Iran resolution out of the poisonous turmoil surrounding that issue. In the HELP Committee, Senator ALEXANDER brought a unanimously bipartisan education bill out of committee on an issue that has long been contested. Even the intensely divided Environment and Public Works Committee brought out a chemical regulation bill with a strong bipartisan majority. But Budget? No chance.

Instead of working with Democrats on a real budget, Republicans produced a partisan ideological showcase. They cut programs for seniors, for low-income families, and for other vulnerable citizens and protected the wealthiest Americans from contributing even one dime in deficit reduction.

As we have seen in the past, Republicans care about deficit reduction only when it involves cutting programs for people who need help. But can they find a single tax loophole to cut? Not one.

This budget follows the Ryan budget off the cliff of shielding every single subsidy and giveaway in the Tax Code. No special interest tax loophole is too

grotesque for them. Big Oil tax subsidies, special low rates for hedge fund managers, private jet depreciation, for goodness' sake—tax giveaways that amount to nothing more than taxpayer subsidies for the wealthy and well connected—this budget loves and protects them all.

Not only do the Republicans protect every tax loophole, they propose eliminating the estate tax—a tax that only affects families worth over $10 million—the top 0.2 percent. You may have heard a lot about the 1 percent. Well, this budget does even better than that. It confers a great, wonderful, fat favor on the top 0.2 percent and, at the same time, the budget will allow the taxes to increase on 13 million lower- and middle-income households—households with 25 million children. That is a $300 billion tax giveaway to that 0.2 percent—to basically 5,000-some of the wealthiest families in America. And that big gift to those 5,000-and-some wealthiest families is paired with a tax hike for millions of families who are just getting by.

And, of course, it is lower-income and middle-class families who would suffer the most from the Republican spending cuts. Medicaid, food stamps, Pell grants, and job training all get axed. They hand Medicare over to private sector vouchers and kick 16 million Americans off of health insurance plans they obtained through the Affordable Care Act.

Today, across this Capitol, breast cancer advocates are asking for our support for investment to help cure that deadly disease. This budget cuts research for breast cancer and other deadly diseases. It slashes funding for nursing homes, including those that care for seniors with Alzheimer's. It even supports a 20-percent across-the-board benefit cut for disabled Americans—a 20-percent benefit cut for disabled Americans—by doubling down on the senseless House rule that can be used to create an artificial crisis and prevent a routine Social Security fix.

As for the investments that keep our Nation competitive in an increasingly global economy, all are attacked. From scientific research to education to infrastructure, the Republicans offer a radical plan of cuts.

In a nutshell, their behavior proves that the deficit is just a pretext for them to cut programs that Republicans have always opposed—programs that create jobs, support the middle class, and offer lifelines to the most vulnerable Americans.

Even transportation infrastructure—our roads and bridges—gets whacked. Much of our highway system dates back to the 1950s, and roads and bridges across the country are in dire need of repair and replacement. This budget fails to provide any new funding for infrastructure. It does not even ensure that current funding levels will be maintained.

This matters because the current funding authorization for highway and transit projects expires at the end of the month. That will imperil construction projects and jobs just as we enter the busy summer highway construction season. There is no plan to deal with that that Republicans have announced—no bill in any committee.

In the budget, Republicans had an opportunity for a big win-win. They could have upgraded America's roads and bridges and supported millions of jobs. Ranking Member SANDERS even offered an amendment that would have paid for infrastructure investments by closing some of these corporate tax loopholes. All Republicans had to do was vote yes. But corporate tax loopholes were too important, and roads and bridges did not matter. They chose to protect their cherished tax giveaways for special interests. Today the clock still ticks toward a looming highway jobs shutdown.

This will hurt a lot of States. It will particularly hurt my home State of Rhode Island. We are a historic and densely populated State. We have aging and heavily used infrastructure. Lots of our roads and bridges are in poor condition. One study found that the average motorist in Rhode Island pays an extra $637 per year for car repairs and operating costs because of potholes and bumps and other bad road conditions. It is not just Rhode Island. This is true also across the country. Nationwide, poor road conditions are estimated to cost our country more than $100 billion a year—over $500 per motorist. The American Society of Civil Engineers gives America's bridges a grade of only C-plus. It gives our roads a D.

Where is the plan to address this? Where is the plan to help the working Americans who have to spend $500 or $637 a year because we do not take care of our roads and highways? There is none.

Well, I understand that the Republicans in the Senate have been in the minority for a long time and old habits die hard. But the responsibility of a majority is to be responsible. Republicans passed up the opportunity to be responsible in their budget with highway funding. This should not be that difficult. They could start by looking at the bipartisan 6-year highway bill approved last year in the Environment and Public Works Committee. My recollection is that it was approved unanimously. That bill would have provided the certainty that our State departments of transportation need to plan for the big multiyear, job-creating projects that our years of deferred maintenance have brought due.

The extremist Republican budget under the Senate rules does not need Democratic support, and it appears that the Republicans do not even want Democratic support. Under the Senate rules, this budget will pass this Chamber. The good news about that is that the budget is merely political theater. The penalty for violating this budget is a 60-vote point of order. Nowadays it takes 60 votes to pass an appropriations bill. So in effect the penalty is a nullity. So there is really nothing to violating the budget.

The real budget will be sent to us through the Appropriations Committee, and the real numbers will be negotiated upwards, and the Republicans will be relieved of the human responsibility for what would happen if this budget were actually to guide our appropriations. That is the good news.

The bad news is that it is a missed opportunity to try to work in any kind of a bipartisan fashion. It is a missed opportunity to address issues that Americans agree on, such as maintaining our bridges and highways.

I hope very much that my friends on the other side of the aisle will begin to work with Democrats on addressing, with some semblance of bipartisanship, our constituents' needs in that regard. With funding set to expire in just a few weeks, and with no Republican plan on the horizon to address it, we should at least begin with a bipartisan conversation about a long-term highway bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise as we are talking about the budget, and I want to talk a little bit about that today, being a member of the Budget Committee and someone very concerned about the fiscal direction of our country. I also want to talk about a trip I took to Israel. Over the last weekend, I was in Israel having meetings with Prime Minister Netanyahu, members of the Knesset, the Minister of Intelligence, the Deputy Foreign Minister, and others, and part of what I want to talk about in the budget relates to that.

This budget, by the way, is the first time in 6 years that we have had the ability for the House and Senate to come together and have a congressional budget. During that 6 years, by the way, I think there has been $8 trillion added to the national debt. During that 6 years, there has not been adequate oversight of the departments and agencies of government, partly because there hasn't been a budget. Without a budget, it is very difficult to go through the appropriations process, which means that not only has spending been high—more money being spent

than coming in, in terms of revenue year after year to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars—but also we haven't had the ability to have the appropriate checks and balances, oversight of the various agencies we have in the appropriations process.

So, after 6 years, it is about time. My constituents, when I say it is the first time in 6 years we have been able to pass a budget, they say, well, what took you so long. Why is it that I have to have a budget in my family, have to have a budget in my business and in our community, the county, and the State, and Congress can't get its act together? So we are, this afternoon, I believe, going to pass this budget, and it does provide this framework for going forward.

What is that framework? Well, it is a balanced budget over 10 years. Although it is the first time Congress would come together in 6 years to have a budget, it is actually the first time since 2001 that there has been a budget that gets to balance that is presented and passed by this Congress. That is important.

Earlier, one of my colleagues was talking about everything that was cut by this budget. Actually, those decisions are going to be made by the Appropriations Committee. That is appropriate. They are the committee responsible for defending every dime. Congress has that responsibility. They are the ones who should look at the priorities. They are the ones who should decide which program is working and which one is not working, which ones should get less money, which ones should get more money, which ones should be reformed and changed. That is the process we are going to be undertaking, and it is exactly what we are hired to do.

Is it an easy vote? No. Yet we see this afternoon we will get the necessary 51 votes to pass this budget and begin to move the country forward. It not only balances the budget in 10 years, it does it without raising taxes. It does it in a way that actually strengthens Medicare, protects Social Security, supports a healthier and stronger economy that we need in this country.

We just had the economic growth numbers come out for the first quarter and, boy, are they disappointing—0.2 percent. We just had some weak numbers in terms of jobs numbers last month. We have to do better. We can and should do better. Part of it starts with better policies here in Washington, DC. We need policies that encourage people to get out there and work hard, take a risk, and let people know that if they do play by the rules and work hard, they can get ahead. There is so much more we can do with tax reform and regulatory relief and coming up with smart ways to deal with health care. That is what this budget does, by the way.

It also improves the efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of government. This is very important. It has a particular provision that I feel strongly about, as the Presiding Officer knows. He has done a great job of shepherding us through the Budget Committee to make sure we could have the information on the floor of the Senate to decide the best tax reform to pursue. We will now have not just what is called the static analysis but also an analysis, that takes into account that tax policy does change people's behavior. We all know that—everybody knows that—but we haven't had that information until now. This macroeconomic scoring of a tax provision is going to make it more likely to come up with good tax reform that will help give this economy the shot in the arm it needs to get moving.

I am pleased with the fact that we are finally going to move forward on a budget. It is discouraging that it took this long—6 years—but with the Republican majority we committed to do this, and I am very pleased that this afternoon we are going to finally see, for the hard-working taxpayers whom I represent, the opportunity to actually have a budget around here and to get individual appropriations bills done.

One other part of the budget that relates to the trip I just took is our defense spending. The budget helps to provide more avenues for increasing defense where needed, and in this dangerous world in which we live, we do have to ensure that we have a strong defense that is up to the challenges we face.

ISRAEL

Mr. President, I just returned from a trip to Israel, where I had very productive meetings with Prime Minister Netanyahu, with the Secretaries, the Ministers of Intelligence, the Deputy Foreign Minister, other Israeli officials, as well as our Ambassador over there and his team.

The reason for going to Israel was the same as with the previous visits; that is, to learn firsthand from those on the ground about the best way forward in a very volatile and dangerous region of the world, to show support for our ally Israel and, finally, to report back to my Ohio constituents and to the Senate as we face these challenging issues we have in the region. I saw when I was there, again, how since its independence in 1948, the people of Israel have not only learned how to survive, how to make do in sometimes a very unforgiving strategic and natural environment, but have also learned how to thrive.

They boast the region's most dynamic economy now. It is also the region's most vibrant democracy, with an open society that promotes the values of freedom, tolerance, and equality. It is a small population. They have very little land and very few natural resources, and they are faced with aggression from all sides. Throughout its history, Israel has faced these challenges through both the power of the head and the heart—knowledge, innovation, grit, and determination—to build and defend the world's one and only Jewish State and the one democracy in the region.

It is against this general backdrop that I wanted to talk to the Prime Minister and other leaders about some really important topics that we face in the Senate; one is the ongoing nuclear talks and how to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon, as well as how to address Iran's current aggression all throughout the region.

Second, I wanted to talk about the insidious campaign going on around the world. It is a campaign to delegitimize Israel through boycotts, divestments, and sanctions. I have been involved in this for years. Ten years ago, I worked on this as the U.S. Trade Representative. Most recently, I joined Senator BEN CARDIN in a bipartisan effort that was successful in adding an amendment to the trade bill that is working its way through the system, to tell our trading partners you cannot boycott, divest, and sanction Israel if you want to do business with us.

Third, I want to talk about the myriad of challenges that face this region and the destabilizing of it right now: ISIS, the civil war in Syria, the immediate challenges Israel faces with the terrorist activities of Hamas in Gaza, Hezbollah in Lebanon and in Syria.

Finally, I wanted to talk about the Israel-Palestinian dialogue, the opportunity for peace and a two-state solution.

Of all these threats, I suppose Israel's greatest threat lies in Iran. Iran has been described, by the way, as a regime that is the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world. Let's remember that, remember whom we are dealing with. This has been true since 1984, when they put Iran on the terrorist list. I think there are only four countries on it, and one is Cuba, that I am sure the administration would like to remove from that list. So this is a small list of countries.

According to the administration, the Iranian regime is able to produce enough material for a nuclear weapon in sometime between 3 months and 1 year, depending on which testimony you hear from the administration. They also acknowledge that it supports terrorist groups such as Hezbollah. It funds other Shiite militias as it seeks regional dominance in Iraq. We have seen this in Yemen most recently, but also in Syria and elsewhere. They also have supported a Sunni group, Hamas, as they lobbed rockets into Israel. Many of those rockets have been provided, apparently, through Iran. Of course, we should not forget that this behavior comes from a regime that has

pledged to ''annihilate,'' ''destroy,'' and ''wipe Israel off the map.''

Like many of my colleagues in the Senate, I have serious concerns about the framework of the nuclear agreement and what may follow in a comprehensive deal. Given the importance of this issue, I feel strongly that Congress should play a role in analyzing any agreement and approving or disapproving it. Our negotiating objective, in my view, should be an enforceable agreement; one that contains concrete and verifiable steps to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons capability.

For years, the international community demanded that Iran dismantle its nuclear program—most notably by halting all enrichment activity. If you look at the U.N. resolution and the activity around that, it is pretty strong language. From what we know, it appears that the so-called framework agreement is still a great distance from that. I hope that can be improved. We are looking at a model of an agreement that aims to freeze the nuclear program but somehow doesn't dismantle it. I certainly would have preferred the dismantlement model, and with the tough sanctions we put in place, I had hoped that was doable. But given where we are and given Israel's expertise and focus, I wanted to learn more about why the Israelis think the framework agreement is inadequate and whether it can be turned into a better agreement.

There are many important questions that remain, and sadly only a few of them have satisfactory answers in the current framework agreement. In fact, the Iranian version and the U.S. version of the text seem to differ on some of the key details. If you hear from them, they say one thing and we say another. In particular, I returned from this trip continuing my focus on what I think is perhaps the most important issue of all, which is the sanctions relief. The U.S. Congress put these sanctions in place, encouraging the administration. If we give the Iranian regime sanctions relief on day one before they have kept their word on any deal, we will be contributing a cash windfall to Iran's ongoing efforts to further destabilize an ever-growing list of countries—think about it—Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Yemen, and so on. Whether it is sanctions relief or whether it is releasing frozen oil revenues in banks that are all around the world, getting the proceeds from sales of oil that are now frozen in banks, if that becomes something the Iranians can use, that kind of financial relief would be a step to fuel war, not peace.

So these are the right areas to focus on when it comes to Iran, not just for Israel's sake, of course, but for the sake of peace and stability in the region and for our sake, our national security, and the world's sake.

I am hopeful we can pass the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act and safeguard Congress's role. I hope we can move to a bipartisan consensus on the floor of the Senate. But what constitutes a good deal? I believe consensus could provide a measuring stick to determine what kind of an agreement would produce a lasting peace and also provide the administration some leverage, give them some leverage to be able to negotiate a more effective agreement by having that debate on the floor of the Senate.

Attacks on Israel, of course, don't always come from rockets, missiles, or other violent means. Increasingly, opponents of Israel are using economic weapons to target Israel. The boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement—also called BDS—is an effort to undermine Israel's sovereignty and further isolate it from the international community, really delegitimize the state.

Senator CARDIN and I recently authored the United States-Israel Trade Enhancement Act of 2015. It has a very simple purpose. It says that the United States will leverage trade to stop efforts to delegitimize Israel, especially when, as I look at it, having just been there, some of these BDS efforts actually harm the Palestinians in the West Bank, whom I think some of these efforts are meant to help.

Our legislation leverages ongoing trade negotiations to discourage our trading partners from engaging in this economic discrimination. I have seen how it works. I know trade can be effective. We did this with Oman when I was in the U.S. Trade Representative's office, as they wanted to negotiate a trade agreement, and the same with Bahrain. Both of those agreements ended up removing their boycotts of Israel. I talked with Saudi Arabia when I negotiated for their accession to the WTO, where again we were able to make progress in providing, in that case, equal treatment to Israel.

I am very proud that the Cardin-Portman amendment was the first and one of only three amendments to pass out of the Finance Committee when we took up the trade promotion authority bill.

In my meetings with U.S. Ambassador to Israel Dan Shapiro, the Foreign Ministry, Israeli national security officials, and in my discussions with the Prime Minister, I gained some additional insight into how BDS actually works in practice, and I came home more resolved than ever to work in a bipartisan way to ensure that we don't have this discrimination and painfully obvious double standard with Israel. For instance, its advocates only insist on isolation and penalties for Israel—not other countries—over territorial disputes and turn a blind eye to other territorial disputes around the world.

Finally, I talked to officials at length about general turmoil in the Middle East and Israel's relationship with its neighbors. This deteriorating regional security environment includes Egypt's battle against Hamas and radicalism in the Sinai, the brutal civil war in Syria, the destabilizing role of Iran-backed Hezbollah fighters in Lebanon and Syria, threats and challenges to our ally Jordan, the brutality of ISIS, and the Israeli-Palestinian dialogue.

So I returned from my trip with my concerns reinforced over the threats to the region, but I also returned with hope because whether I was touching the ancient stones of the Western Wall, walking the Stations of the Cross in the Old City, amidst the Old City Market, standing amidst the worshipers in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, or marveling at the modern hustle and bustle of Tel Aviv, I saw a remarkable phenomenon up close.

A small but determined country that carries within its narrow borders the ancient wisdom of our great faith, the cutting-edge innovations, and the can-do spirit of the modern State of Israel—all of this combines to bring me back to this floor with a greater resolve to meet the challenges we talked about today for our own national security but also for that of our steadfast ally, Israel.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, what is the business pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, with 10 hours of debate equally divided.

Mr. DURBIN. On the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the budget.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I hope some of the comments I make in reference to this product are not taken personally.

I thank the Presiding Officer for all the work he has put into the budget and for his friendship and cooperation on so many different issues.

What is this budget all about? A budget is really like a blueprint. It really says what we want to do and spend in the next fiscal year that starts October 1. As a result of passing a budget, we send a message to the spending committees and tell them how much to spend in different areas. The budget tries to spell out not only the amounts but also the policy we are to follow when we pass these spending bills. It is really a pretty small document by Federal standards, but it really packs a lot of wallop when it comes to what we are going to be doing for the next several months.

Budgets make choices, just as our family budgets make a choice. Can we afford a new car? Is it time to move?

Can we remodel the kitchen? Can we pay for the kids to go to college? These are family budget decisions that are made that really impact the lives of members of the family. Just as those decisions impact lives, so does this, in a large way, for over 300 million Americans.

Sadly, from my perspective—and I have great respect for the Senator from Wyoming, who serves as the Senate Budget Committee chairman—from my perspective, this budget has the wrong priorities. Let me tell you why.

Many times, you are going to hear speeches given on the floor of the Senate about how the government should not pick winners and losers. I have heard that so many times. It basically says: Let's leave it to the free market forces and other forces. Government shouldn't pick winners and losers.

This budget being offered to the Senate picks winners and losers, and we can almost identify those winners by name because what this budget does is it eliminates the Federal estate tax. The Federal estate tax in this circumstance—changes that are called for, reforms in it, will result in tax breaks for the wealthiest people in America. Roughly 4,000 people a year will be spared, if their estates are worth more than $10 million, from paying the estate tax. For these individuals who are that wealthy, it means a $3 million tax break. When you add it up over a 10-year period of time, 4,000 people per year, it comes out to $268 billion. So the wealthiest people in America are declared the winners in the Senate Republican budget.

Who are the losers? The losers are 16 million Americans who will find that they don't have the benefits of the EITC tax credit, as well as the child tax credit that has been proposed. For 16 million Americans, we cut back tax credits which they can use to build and sustain their families in order to give tax breaks to 4,000 people a year who have an estate worth more than $10 million.

We haven't ignored the estate tax. In fact, we substantially reformed it. We indexed it. We made a lot of changes to it. But the Republican budget said we haven't gone far enough. We still have 4,000 people who are so rich that they are going to pay the tax, and this budget says it is time for that to end. I think they are wrong.

In order to deal with reducing the budget deficit, let me tell you where this Republican budget turns. All of us are aware of the fact that student loan debt now is the largest debt in America other than mortgage debt. There is more student loan debt in America than credit card debt. Think about that for a second.

Millions of students are deep in debt and carrying that debt for year after year because higher education—colleges and universities—cost so much. Middle-income families can't afford to pay it. They haven't saved enough. So the kids and sometimes the family have to borrow the money to get it done.

What does this budget do for those student borrowers? First, it reduces the amount of money available in Pell grants. Pell grants are grants—not loans—given to low-income students at colleges and universities. That is money the students don't have to borrow because they come from low-income families. Well, in this bill, we have a 31-percent cut in Pell grant funding; it is about $90 billion over 10 years. Eight million Americans are dependent on Pell grant funding in this current school year. They will find that there is less money available in grants—even though they are from low-income families—to go to college. So what is the alternative? Don't go to college or borrow more money. So the Republican approach to the student loan debt crisis is to decrease the grants and increase the debt of future students.

That isn't all. There is a provision that says: If you borrow money to go to colleges and universities from the Federal Government, then your repayment of those government loans is going to be at least sensitive to your situation in life. In other words, you won't have to pay more than 10 percent of your income each year to pay off the student loan.

They eliminate it. That basically means these students are going to have to pay higher amounts of their earnings on their student loans. Is that a problem? It is a big problem. It is a problem for those fresh out of colleges and universities who want to start their lives. How are they going to start their lives and take the jobs they want and still pay off the student loans? Students are making decisions now about where they go to work and what they do with their lives because of the debt they carry with them out of colleges and universities. The Republican budget before us today makes it more difficult for those students by reducing the Pell grants and increasing the payback cost on student loans.

They do something else for students, too. The Affordable Care Act, which some call ObamaCare, said: If you graduate from college, you can stay on your parents' health insurance plan until age 26. Is that important? Boy, it was in our family.

I can remember when my daughter graduated from college, and I said: Jennifer, do you have health insurance?

She said: Dad, I don't need it. I feel fine.

Really?

Well, now, under the Affordable Care Act, my daughter and other kids can stay on their parents' health insurance plan. So what does the Republican budget do about that? It abolishes the Affordable Care Act. It abolishes that protection for families to keep their kids on their health insurance plans. How can that help families and kids fresh out of college? A lot of kids out of college are not finding jobs right away. They are doing internships. They are working part time. They can't afford health insurance. But they are on the family plan now because of ObamaCare—not according to the Republican budget; they want to get rid of it.

That isn't all. When you take a look at eliminating the Affordable Care Act—at this point, we have 16 million Americans who have the benefit of health insurance because of ObamaCare, and they eliminate it over a period of time. And we believe that number will grow to 27 million Americans who, because of the Republican budget, will not have the opportunity to get health insurance.

They cut back on Medicaid eligibility. Medicaid, of course, is health insurance for those in low-income situations. What will happen to those people? I wonder if the Budget Committee sat down, took a look, and said: Well, what is going to happen if people lose their health insurance, 27 million Americans? It would be naive to say that they just won't get sick. We know they will, and it will go back to the old days. In the old days, sick people who had no health insurance still showed up at the hospital. The hospital took care of them. The doctors took care of them. They were charity patients. Who paid for their care? All of us who have health insurance. I don't want to go back to the old days. I don't think America wants to. But this Republican budget does. It eliminates the Affordable Care Act.

I travel around Illinois and Chicago—I am honored to represent it—and I go to community health centers. They are popping up all over, in rural areas and cities as well, in neighborhoods. I want to say how proud I am that the Affordable Care Act created many of these centers. I have said, and I stand by it, that if I were sick or a member of my family were sick, I would be confident that if they walked into that center, that clinic, they would be treated to professional care. They are popping up all over the place. Elderly people now have someplace close to home to go to a clinic. Those who are on Medicaid—the health insurance from the government—can go in and be treated the same as anybody else.

What do we have in this bill when it comes to these health care clinics? This bill not only kicks 11 million people off Medicaid by taking away States' rights to expand health care to lower income residents, it cuts funding for community health centers by 70 percent—community health centers that are now serving 23 million Americans, which includes 7 million children and

250,000 veterans. How can we be better off by cutting back on the medical care in these health clinics? Do we think people won't get sick? Of course they will, and the cost will be shifted to others, just like the bad old days that we remember when health insurance premiums were going through the roof. But that is the proposal, and I think it is a serious mistake.

When I look at this Republican budget, I wonder if the Members who voted for it have really taken these ideas back home; if they have sat down with people and talked about what the impact will be when working families lose the tax credit of the ITC and child care. I wonder if they have considered what the impact will be by saying they want to perpetuate breaks in the Tax Code which reward companies for taking jobs overseas.

Isn't that the last thing we should be doing? Shouldn't the Tax Code be rewarding American companies that keep quality jobs in the United States, instead of shifting their mailing address to the Cayman Islands or someplace in Europe?

I think it is pretty clear: If you want to build a strong American economy, you stand by the best, most patriotic American corporations that keep people working in the United States. Yet that is not what this budget proposal does. We can do better.

I hope we defeat this budget resolution, and I hope we can then sit down and actually have a bipartisan conversation about the future of this country.

I think the future of this country includes a Tax Code that is fair to working families. I think it rewards American companies that create jobs in the United States. I don't think it gives 4,000 people a year, who happen to be the wealthiest people in America, a winning Power Ball ticket, as this budget proposal we have before us does.

I think we ought to expand the reach of health insurance, not reduce it. We want to give families a chance to be able to send their kids to college and kids not be so burdened with debt they can't chart their own futures. That is an optimistic, positive view of a growing America. This budget resolution is not.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget resolution and say to the Committee on the Budget that we can do better. If we are going to pick winners and losers, let's pick working families right here in America as the winners.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise reluctantly against this budget resolution. I want to pick up exactly where our colleague from Illinois left off with respect to the values that are really important for this debate. As I look at this budget, I see opportunities missed that would bring the Senate together, help us find common ground, and particularly help the middle class.

The reality is there are tens of millions of people in Oregon and across America who day in and day out walk an economic tightrope, stretching every paycheck to the last penny. They want to climb the ladder of opportunity, they want to give their kids a brighter future, and the climb is not easy. My view is we ought to be trying to write a Federal budget that makes it easier for middle-class people to climb that ladder of opportunity and for those who aren't middle class to start moving up the rungs.

This legislation before us misses out on several bipartisan opportunities that reluctantly drive me to say the bill is flawed, because in too many instances, it leaves our working families, our middle class, behind.

Let me be specific. I offered, when the budget came up here, an amendment which stipulated that tax reform be built around the needs of our middle class so employers that would hire workers would have an opportunity to hire more, our workers would be able to get child care, and our students would be able to get educated. It was pretty straightforward. It said tax relief should be built around our middle class.

A number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle asked if this would allow for some approaches that they would be interested in. I said of course.

Chairman ENZI and I both have the honor to serve on the Senate Committee on Finance, so I offered an amendment that was built around some core ideas, recognizing my colleagues might have other approaches. A number of Republicans voted for that. It got more than 70 votes in the Senate.

Today, as we debate this legislation, we don't hear anything about tax relief for middle-class families. As I look at the budget, it sure looks to me, given some of the other priorities, as though there is a real prospect that taxes could go up for our middle-class families, as if they are not getting hammered hard enough. We could be working on a budget proposal today that creates new opportunity for middle-class people, a proposal that includes something such as what was voted on in the Senate that got more than 70 votes. Yet it is not there.

A second example deals with rural America. Again, in a lot of our rural communities there is enormous hurt. Many feel the policies of the Federal Government would pretty much turn them into some kind of economic sacrifice zone. So in the Committee on the Budget, I said: I think we have an opportunity to bring together programs such as the Secure Rural Schools Program, the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and we could adopt a smarter approach to fighting wildfires. The fact is that, too, was bipartisan. In the Committee on the Budget, the vote was 18 to 4—an overwhelming 18-to-4 bipartisan vote for the kind of approach I offered which would bring these programs together and put in the budget secure rural schools alongside these other programs that are a rural lifeline.

Once again, a bipartisan proposal—a bipartisan proposal that got resounding support in the Senate Committee on the Budget—somehow didn't make its way into the legislation we are considering today. So for communities in my home State, the message is: We are not really going to make your communities a priority.

I was just in, for example, Roseburg, OR, which is Southern Oregon, where there are hard-working people who would like to both get the timber harvest up and have the funds for their police and their schools and their roads and basic services. But this budget says that even though in the Committee on the Budget we had something bipartisan to help those communities, gee, we are really not going to follow through. We are just going to have a partisan plan, No. 1; and No. 2, we are going to basically shuffle to the side these bipartisan proposals with respect to middle-class tax relief and rural communities that, in my view, could make a huge difference in the quality of life for millions of American families. Of course, these were bipartisan ideas.

Now, a third area that has concerned me about this budget is the need for supporting programs such as Medicare and Social Security that keep millions of Americans from falling through the cracks. With this budget plan, the Congress ought to be protecting Medicaid so Americans of very limited means can count on having access to health care. Yet the budget that is being considered today would make, in my view, needlessly painful, needlessly arbitrary cuts.

It just seems as if the budget doesn't recognize that weakening Medicaid will hurt the most vulnerable families in Oregon and across the country—those who are struggling so hard to climb that ladder of opportunity. Without Medicaid coverage, those who are vulnerable end up forgoing checkups. They end up passing on the preventive visits. In my view, they will end up with lesser care at a higher overall cost. A massive burden would end up getting shifted to hospitals and doctors and many Americans who simply pay insurance premiums through their employer.

So if we make those kinds of cuts today—the cuts I have described as being arbitrary—we are going to have

higher costs and more economic pain down the road.

Finally, millions of seniors and those with disabilities rely on Medicaid to help cover what otherwise can be crushing costs—crushing costs—in the long-term care area. I was codirector of the Oregon Gray Panthers for a number of years before I was elected to Congress, and what I have seen over the years are nursing home costs going up and up and up. Even those families who worked hard and saved and never took that extra vacation, never bought that special car ended up being impoverished, and they and those who are disabled simply would not be in a position to get long-term care without Medicaid.

Now, we know what used to happen years and years ago. There were poor farms, there were almshouses when savings ran out. It is pretty hard to do that with the demographic revolution of today, with 10,000 people turning 65 every day—10,000 people turning 65 every day for years and years to come.

So my view is Medicaid, this lifeline for the most vulnerable people—a lifeline that keeps so many individuals, particularly seniors, from falling into utter destitution—should be protected rather than filleted, as this budget would do, and it is one of the major reasons I am in opposition.

I will close by way of saying that I have gotten, over the years, to know Chairman ENZI very well. He is a compassionate legislator. He is a talented legislator. My hope is, though I oppose this budget today for the reasons I have described—the bipartisan opportunities missed with respect to tax relief for the middle class and the rejection of a bipartisan plan to help rural America—that in the days ahead, as we go to the Committee on Finance, in particular, and we look at these issues, we can return to what has always been the Senate at its best, which is working in a bipartisan fashion. We can do it on tax relief. We can do it for rural America.

By the way, we can do it in terms of Medicare. We can protect the Medicare guarantee and hold down costs. Our colleague Senator ISAKSON from Georgia has joined me in an important piece of legislation that really starts to transform Medicare into a program that better meets the needs of those who will most need it, which is those with chronic disease—cancer, diabetes, stroke, and heart disease. But we would be protecting the Medicare guarantee, not, in effect, damaging Medicaid the way this budget would do.

Mr. President, I am going to yield the floor now and just state, once again, that I hope we can go back to what makes the Senate function at its best, bipartisanship. We missed that opportunity thus far, and I hope we will return to it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind comments, and I know, as the ranking member of the Committee on Finance, he will be doing a lot of things to see that things in this budget happen, and I suspect they will happen a lot the way they are here.

I would like to mention just a couple of things, though, for him to note because he mentioned the wildfire suppression. I know how passionate he and Senator CRAPO have been on wildfire suppression. I want him to note that section 3208 preserves the wildfire suppression funding.

One of the things that has always concerned me since I got here was that we have these emergencies for all sorts of things. When I first got here, they were $5 billion a year; now they are up to $7 billion a year. But any time you are budgeting and you know something is going to happen every year, it ought to be in the budget. So I put in $7 billion for emergencies, and that will help to provide some of the funding for his suggestion of the wildfire suppression.

A couple of the other paragraphs the Senator from Oregon would be interested in are 4319 and 4320. We did not throw out everything. We did do some combining of ones that were very similar to make sure that in the 183 proposals we had for reserve funds, we could come up with a few fewer that would incorporate the ideas of everyone.

Some of the previous speeches mentioned what we were doing to Medicare. There aren't a lot of specifics on Medicare because, again, the Finance Committee—which Senator HATCH chairs and Senator WYDEN is the ranking member on—will have to make a lot of those actual decisions. In fact, almost everything that is in the budget requires some additional action, and that additional action even has to be signed by the President. So if we are way off, it is not going to happen. But I am thinking there will be a lot of bipartisan action on this.

On Medicare itself, all we in the Senate did was go with the same Medicare cuts that the President suggested in his budget. We made one small change in that. We said those Medicare cuts, the money that will be saved in Medicare, has to stay with Medicare. That is a difference that we have with the President. When we did ObamaCare, there was $714 billion worth of Medicare that was taken out and spent on other parts of the program. We could have done the doc fix back then really easily, but that was spent in other places.

One of the promises we made was that if there were some changes in Medicare—and there ought to be some changes in Medicare. Actually, the government ought to take a look at everything it does on a regular basis and do it better or, if it is not working, do without it. But Medicare does serve a need in this country, and the money that comes from Medicare ought to stay in Medicare but used in better places in Medicare, where it is more needed.

So I hope people will actually take a look at the document that is here.

Incidentally, on the Medicare proposal, the House came to the Senate proposal and eliminated a couple of things they had.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, if we look into this Senate's agenda this month, we will see right away why so many folks are frustrated with Washington. We have now been considering an Iran bill for the last 2 weeks. It has huge bipartisan support, but it is tied up with amendments designed to kill the bill.

Today, the House and Senate Republicans bring forth a budget which reflects some of the worst ideas from each Chamber. Back in March, I raised concerns that the Senate budget put the interests of a few ahead of the future of this country, and that is still true today. The majority insists on spending billions of dollars overseas, and continues the fiction that this spending somehow doesn't count towards the deficit.

Under this budget, every penny proposed in the overseas contingency operations account—that is $187 billion—is going to be borrowed from China, Japan, Saudi Arabia, and others. The majority once again favors tax breaks for the wealthiest among us over plans to strengthen the middle class—a middle class that has been the envy of the world. But under this blueprint, the $2,500 tax credit that helps students with the cost of tuition disappears. The benefit under the child tax credit gets smaller, and American middle-class folks get squeezed. The majority continues to reward companies that ship jobs overseas instead of creating jobs right here in the United States. This budget drastically cuts and ends Medicare as we know it, and it opens up the door to the sale of our public lands.

Finally, this budget fails to invest in basic infrastructure. In fact, it actually calls for a cut of over $200 billion in highway and transit funding over the next decade. The majority is pushing this proposal even though the highway bill funding expires on May 31, 2015. Now we are nearly out of time. In less than 4 weeks, just as millions of

Americans will be getting on the road to enjoy summer vacations, road construction projects around this country will come to a screeching halt.

In my home State of Montana, the State department of transportation will delay nine projects this month due to Congress's failure to pass a long-term highway bill. Four projects that were scheduled to be awarded in April have been postponed to July and may be postponed indefinitely. Five more that were scheduled to be awarded next week will also be delayed. If Congress does another short-term extension, that list will get even longer. If we delay these projects even by a few weeks, we could miss the entire construction season in Montana, a northern-tier State. The snow will start falling, and the potholes will get bigger.

We already know that America's transportation infrastructure has been ignored for far too long. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, more than half of America's major roads and bridges are rated as poor to mediocre. In Montana, 40 percent of our roads are in need of repair or will need fixing soon. When our roads have potholes or can't handle the volume of cars and trucks, safety becomes an issue. Montana routinely leads the Nation in highway fatalities, and thousands of road fatalities each year are the result of bad road conditions.

As far as the economic impact, Federal highway dollars directly impact 11,000 jobs in Montana alone, not to mention the thousands of others who rely on roads for their businesses. These are jobs that cannot be outsourced. Each year, around $60 billion in goods is shipped over Montana's 75,000 miles of roads and highways. That is true economic impact.

So instead of a long-term highway bill that allows States to plan and to get America moving, the next item the majority leader says he is going to take up is trade promotion authority. This will open the door for trade deals that the American public hasn't been allowed to see. While many in Washington see trade promotion as the key to ensuring America's long-term economic viability, we need to make sure that the investments are made right here at home—smart investments.

After all, how are farmers in Montana going to get their crops to Asia if they cannot even get them down the road to the nearest grain elevator?

Our transportation infrastructure affects every industry. Take, for instance, Montana's outdoor economy. Millions of people come to Montana each year to hunt, fish, hike, and enjoy Montana's great outdoors—from Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks to our millions of acres of forest and public lands. Montana's outdoors brings in $6 billion each year and supports some 60,000 jobs.

Passing a highway bill will increase folks' ability to access these outdoor places. But States which oversee these construction projects cannot wait until the end of the month to find out if Congress is going to do its job. Many of them are already pumping the brakes on projects until we step up and pass a highway infrastructure bill.

In the University District in Missoula, an important resurfacing project was scheduled to start next week after classes get out. But thanks to congressional inaction on the highway bill, that project will start no earlier than the third week in July—maybe not at all.

What does that mean? That means the project likely will not be done before students return and traffic in the University District increases exponentially. The Montana Department of Transportation has already announced it will push back the start-up date 3 months for a bridge replacement in Sanders County.

With one in five bridges being in desperate need of repair, delays on projects such as this are irresponsible and only add to the backlog. The need to act could not be more clear. While everyone knows we need a long-term solution, the American people have come to expect the worst from Congress—shortsighted, stopgap measures that will not give businesses or working families the certainty they need and deserve.

The House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee have put forth no solutions to this date. They are anxious to move the trade legislation that seems all too reminiscent of past trade deals—long on promises but short on jobs. Yet they will not produce a long-term highway bill that we know creates jobs here in America.

We must pass a long-term highway bill, and one that is paid for. But instead of working together on a long-term plan, Congress seems resigned to passing another short-term patch. This is shortsighted and we will have negative consequences for folks across this country.

The question I have for my colleagues is this. When did passing a highway bill become political? When did basic investments in our Nation's infrastructure become this difficult? This is a no-brainer. Now we have folks in Congress who think roads build themselves. We have folks in Congress who eagerly swipe the Nation's credit card when it comes to investments in the Middle East. But these same Members of Congress will not even open up the wallet to fill a pothole next to a school in this country.

China will spend more than $400 billion on transportation infrastructure this year. That is eight times more than the United States will spend on the highway trust fund. How do we expect to compete in a global economy if we are not willing to make the investment?

Infrastructure investments are investments in our economy, and they are investments in the future. If we can pass a long-term bill, it will pay for itself by giving businesses the certainty they need to grow, create jobs, and build the kind of economy that our kids and our grandkids deserve.

The clock is ticking, but the Senate is focused on the wrong priorities. It is time to refocus on making smart investments in our economy and being honest with the American people in our budgets. Right now we are doing neither.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to voice my opposition to this budget. Since being elected to the Senate, I have always stressed the importance of responsibly addressing our country's fiscal challenges. We have had bipartisan agreements before when we faced fiscal challenges. At the end of 2013, we passed the bipartisan Murray-Ryan budget agreement which then led to the passage of the omnibus spending bill. I was part of the group of 14 during the shutdown who came together with an idea for a fix that allowed us to get to the budget—seven Democrats and seven Republicans. We also saw some major bipartisan work on the farm bill, the Water Resources Development Act, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, and we reauthorized the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program and, as well as we know, recently, the Medicare sustainable growth rate. But today that is not what this budget is about. That is one of my major focuses today.

I would say, by the way, as a result of some of the bipartisan work that has been done in the past, since 2009 we have seen the deficit as a percent of GDP drop from nearly 10 percent—9.8 percent, exactly—to under 3 percent.

In this economic recovery, we have seen 61 straight months of private sector job growth and added over 12 million private sector jobs. Unemployment is at 5.5 percent nationally and 3.7 percent in my home State of Minnesota. The unemployment rate went down faster in 2014 than it has in any year since 1984.

With this economy not just stabilized but finally starting to show some signs of improvement—not everything that we need, not with everyone sharing in

its growth; we know that—we are no longer governing from crisis. We are finally governing from opportunity—opportunity for the people of this country, opportunity to compete in this global economy. My problem with this budget is that it does not give us that opportunity. This budget would make drastic cuts to the programs we need to seize this opportunity in the global economy, programs such as student loans, transportation, and heating assistance, just to name a few.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the deficit is projected to drop to 2.8 percent of GDP in 2015, a cut of nearly two-thirds. Yet this budget would cut many of the programs that help our middle-class people, our families, our seniors, and those working hard to make ends meet. We have heard about a lot of the cuts in programs, but I want to focus on three key areas that I believe we need to invest in today so we can seize this opportunity when we finally have a stable economy and our country can grow and compete. The first is infrastructure, the second is investing in kids, and the third is research.

One of the best ways to boost our economy and create good-paying jobs is through investing in infrastructure. For far too long we have neglected the roads, the bridges, and the mass transit that millions of Americans rely on every day. According to the Federal Highway Administration, more than 24 percent of the Nation's 600,000 bridges are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers' 2013 report card, the United States scores a D-plus on the overall condition of our Nation's infrastructure.

Compared with other countries, we are falling behind. China and India are spending, respectively, 9 percent and 8 percent of their GDPs on infrastructure. How much are we committing? Just 2 percent. The effects of this shortsighted strategy are increasingly clear. No one knows that better than in my home State of Minnesota, where on August 1, 2007, a major bridge—an eight-lane highway—went crashing into the Mississippi River, and 13 people died. Dozens and dozens were injured. Dozens of cars were submerged in the water. As I said that day, a bridge should not fall down in the middle of America—especially not an eight-lane interstate highway, especially not a bridge that is one of the most traveled bridges in our State, especially not a bridge that is blocks from my house, a bridge that my family goes over every day when we want to go anywhere in our State—rush hour in the heart of a major metropolitan area.

When we have something like that happen in the State, we understand the importance of investing in infrastructure. The last thing we want to see is more cuts. Whether it is roads, bridges, rail, airports or waterways, the need to rebuild our infrastructure is critical to reclaiming our country's competitive edge. We want to get goods to market in this export economy. How do we do it? We do it with roads, with bridges, with rail. We do it with locks and dams. We do it with airports. Yet this budget would cut transportation and infrastructure by more than $200 billion over the next decade—a cut of 40 percent. That is simply unacceptable.

Education funding is something that is so important to me in my life. My grandpa worked 1,500 feet underground in the mines and never graduated from high school. He literally spent his life working, putting money in a coffee can in the basement to send my dad to community college. My dad went to community college and got a 2-year degree and then went on to the University of Minnesota—two public institutions. That is what education is about. Yet, we see cuts to education, cuts to Pell grants in this bill.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides critical funding to help offset education costs for States and local areas that are providing services to kids with disabilities. We are talking about our most vulnerable kids here. Yet this budget would cut Federal education funding by 2 percent in 2017 and 9 percent in 2025. IDEA funding—that funding so critical for kids with disabilities—would be cut by more than $15 million per year on average in Minnesota and more than $950 million nationally. Our kids deserve better than that.

Medical research—no one knows that better than Minnesota, home of the Mayo Clinic, home of the University of Minnesota. Yet what do we see with this budget? The cuts would mean a devastating $8 billion decrease at the National Institutes of Health over the next decade. This is simply unacceptable—cutting investment in medical innovation for cures that could cure Alzheimer's, for cures that could cure childhood diabetes, for cures and for research that could help people with autism; cutting investment in medical innovation is not a path that we can afford to take.

As Newt Gingrich said in an op-ed this last month, investing in health research is both a moral and a financial issue. The NIH is a beacon of hope for people across the Nation and in my home State of Minnesota. Just look at Alzheimer's. Right now, close to 5.2 million Americans are living with Alzheimer's, including nearly 100,000 Minnesotans. These numbers will grow dramatically in the many coming years with the aging of the baby boomer generation. We know there is good research being done through the Human Genome Project and the work that is being done at Mayo, where, if we can catch it earlier, our doctors might be able to figure out exactly what works and does not work. If you do not catch it early, how are they ever going to do the research we need to do to figure out what works and what does not work if you wait too long?

That is some of the groundbreaking work that is being done right now. That is why I have worked with Senator DURBIN on legislation to boost NIH funding. In contrast to this budget, the American Cures Act, of which I am a cosponsor, would reverse the trend of declining Federal investment in medical research and fuel the next generation of biomedical discoveries by providing a 5-percent annual increase at NIH and at other key Federal research agencies.

We need to see this as an investment. We know how expensive Alzheimer's is—and we know the heartbreaking stories of families where a family member gets Alzheimer's. Yet we cannot back away from the research that is going on right now—the research for things such as precision medicine. We are going to have targeted treatments helping patients to live healthier lives.

In conclusion, this budget would make cuts to infrastructure at a time when we need to invest and rebuild. This budget would make cuts to programs that serve kids with disabilities and slow the process of biomedical research and innovation. We have an opportunity now in this country. Through the work of so many businesses and workers across the country, we have been able to stabilize this economy. People in our country did not give up. But now is the moment to seize opportunities, and seizing opportunities means really taking back our place in America as a preeminent researcher, as the country that people go to when they want to cure diseases. We cannot do that by moving backwards. We cannot do that if we are going to cut the funding for our roads and bridges. We cannot afford to have another I–35W bridge collapse.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget and work together on a smarter budget, one that actually allows this country—America—to seize the opportunity before us so we can compete in this global economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the budget that is before the Senate, this combined House-Senate Republican budget. In evaluating this budget proposal, my core question has been this: Is this a budget that works for working America? Or is this a budget designed for powerful special interests and for those best off in our society? A budget is not just about the numbers; it is about the vision that it has for America.

Over 70 years ago, President Franklin Roosevelt issued an economic bill of

rights, proclaiming: In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident: the right to a useful and remunerative job; the right to earn enough to provide adequate food; the right of every family to a decent home; the right to adequate medical care; the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment; and the right to a good education. He closed with these words: ''All of these rights spell security.''

Enacting a budget that advances these economic rights for all Americans is my top priority. That means the budget must create good-paying jobs, improve access to quality, affordable education, ensure retirement security for our seniors, and lower the tax burden on working families. The American people share these priorities. They want a plan, a budget, a vision for our Nation that builds a foundation for middle-class families to thrive.

Two months ago, I stood on the Senate floor to review the budget proposed as the Senate Republican budget. In category after category, that budget earned a failing grade. Unfortunately, I am here today to say that the plan that has come out of the conference committee from the House and Senate Republicans is even worse. It constitutes an egregious assault on working Americans. It slashes investments in infrastructure and education, failing to close tax loopholes and attacking financial reform. It is fundamentally misaligned with the values of working Americans. It is poised to move our Nation in exactly the wrong direction—more tax breaks and corporate welfare for millionaires, billionaires, and large corporations that are already doing phenomenally well and more pain and suffering for the middle class, working families, and the most vulnerable.

With this budget, the GOP is continuing to play games with Americans' health care coverage, claiming we can grow our economy by cutting health care for seniors and children and the poorest in our society. The Senate GOP budget wiped out coverage under the Affordable Care Act, and this budget continues to wreak havoc. It will immediately eliminate health insurance coverage for 16.4 million Americans and swell the ranks of the uninsured by 23 million individuals within a single year. It will deny millions of young adults the right to stay on their parents' health insurance plan until the age of 26. It will deprive 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions the right to purchase affordable health insurance if they lose their jobs or otherwise lose their health insurance. These numbers are appalling.

It puts our seniors back at risk of bankruptcy from unaffordable prescriptions because it wipes out the ACA's effort to fill in the Medicare Part D doughnut hole. In 2014 alone, seniors saved $4.8 billion on prescription drugs, and 39 million seniors will be forced to pay more for preventative services under this budget. The GOP budget takes seniors back to the bad old days where the doughnut hole would force more than 9.4 million seniors and persons with disabilities to pay billions more out of pocket for prescription drugs.

At a time when senior poverty is on the rise, shouldn't we be focused on helping our seniors retire with security and dignity? Instead, the new plan cuts Medicare deeply—$430 billion over 10 years. It cuts Medicaid by at least $400 billion, jeopardizing nursing home care for the most vulnerable senior Americans. It calls for ending Medicare as we know it by turning it into a voucher plan. Finally, it paves the way for a fast-track consideration of a way to repeal the Affordable Care Act through reconciliation.

When you total up these factors, look at the assault on seniors. There is more for prescription drugs and less for nursing home care and Medicaid. Medicare will be cut by $430 billion, and it will be voucherized. Annual wellness checks and preventive services, such as mammograms and prostate cancer screening, will be wiped out. What this budget does is turn security into insecurity. What this budget does is turn dignity into indignity. This is an unacceptable assault on our seniors.

It is also an assault on our children and on education. Both Democrats and Republicans agree that we want a chance for our children to get ahead and to pursue their dreams. Shouldn't the budget tell our children that education is a priority? The Republican plan makes new cuts to Head Start that would kick 400,000 children off the program over a 10-year period—400,000 empty Head Start chairs across America.

This picture is from an event that I held at Oregon's Whitaker School. The cuts in the Senate Republican plan to Head Start would mean 15 empty chairs just at this one location. But now we are talking about a budget that wipes out an opportunity for 400,000 children from struggling families to get a head start through Head Start.

The conference report doesn't just hit early childhood education; it also fails our children with regard to opening the doors of opportunity for higher education. College costs are soaring, so it makes sense to strengthen Pell grant funding. But this Republican budget slashes Pell grant funding by about one-third. Picture one out of every three of our children who use a Pell grant to get through the doors of college, the doors of opportunity, unfortunately having that opportunity taken away. This budget cuts the program by $90 billion over 10 years and will make college out of reach for so many when we should be going in the other direction.

That is not all. It also increases student loan debt by an average of $4,000 for an estimated 30 million students, making the children from struggling families pay more for basic need-based student loans.

I believe in opportunity. I believe in the American dream. I believe that higher education is one of the best pathways to the middle class. We cannot and must not adopt a budget designed to slam the doors of opportunity shut on millions of our children.

There is more to be concerned about. One of the keys to prosperity is infrastructure. My colleague from Minnesota was just illuminating many of the problems in that area. Why shouldn't a budget prioritize improving our Nation's crumbling roads, bridges, dams, water systems, airports, and rail systems?

We have a huge infrastructure deficit. Our highway trust fund is running out of money. Right now Europe is investing 5 percent of its GDP in infrastructure and the United States is investing less than 2 percent. We are vastly underinvesting, and this budget continues and aggravates that underinvestment, hurting the creation of good-paying jobs now and doing enormous damage to the economy of the future.

Our parents did far better for us by putting a massive infusion of funds for infrastructure that strengthened the system and strengthened our economy today. Shouldn't we do the same for the next generation? And then we can turn to food security.

Our country has 40 million hungry Americans. In the wealthiest Nation on Earth, shouldn't our budget make sure families can put food on the table? This Republican budget says no. It supports making massive cuts to programs that provide critical assistance to low-income families. This plan eliminates nutrition assistance for 1.2 million women, infants, and children who rely on the WIC Program through $10 billion in cuts to programs over the next decade. This budget would cut $660 billion over 10 years for programs that support low-income individuals and families, including massive unspecified cuts to food stamps. With this budget, my Republican colleagues are telling the parents of children and financially challenged families: Let them go hungry. And that is just wrong.

Since this budget cuts food, Pell grants, infrastructure, and health care, and since it does so much damage to working families, shouldn't it ask for some small sacrifice from those who are best off? Apparently not. This Republican budget takes from the most vulnerable and gives it to the wealthiest families in America. This Republican budget provides a quarter of a trillion—and, yes, that is trillion with a T—dollar tax break for the wealthiest 0.2 percent of Americans while increasing taxes on 13 million working

families with 25 million children by diminishing the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit, affecting families who earn just a modest amount with an average household income of just $22,000.

I cannot conceive of any economic or moral argument that justifies taking money out of the pockets of struggling families—from Pell grants to Head Start to food on the table—and giving it away to the already wealthiest Americans. Perhaps one of my colleagues who is voting for this budget would like to explain why taking from the poor to give more to the wealthiest families in America is justified, because it is not justified.

Despite the fact that our richest families already pay less in their marginal tax than working families pay, this Republican budget wants to give more away to them from the American Treasury and do it by taking food and education opportunities out of the reach of our struggling families.

This budget removes two amendments that were originally adopted in the Senate budget. Senator MURRAY's amendment would have allowed Americans to earn paid sick leave. It was supported by 61 Senators, including 15 Republicans, but it was eviscerated in this budget. The second amendment was introduced by Senator SCHATZ. It would have ensured that all legally married same-sex spouses have equal access to Social Security and veterans' benefits they have earned. It was broadly supported but wiped out in this joint House-Senate Republican budget.

This budget takes away from hard-working, middle-class Americans, from struggling Americans who are often working two to three minimum-wage jobs, and it gives away to the wealthy and well-connected, not asking them for one slim dime—not one egregious tax loophole closed—and gives them preferred tax cuts, returning millions of dollars to the wealthiest families.

Is this a budget that works for working Americans or is it a budget for the best off? I think it is clear from the topics I have covered that this is a budget for the best off at the expense of everyone else in America in every possible way that provides a foundation.

If we return to the vision laid out by Franklin Roosevelt in 1944 of the self-evident economic truths, of a right to a good job, to earn enough for adequate food, to a decent home, to adequate medical care, and to protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment, this budget fails every test and should be defeated.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the budget resolution conference report that we are considering today.

In my view, this is the worst budget resolution that I have seen in my 22 years in the Senate. It represents a major step backwards for the country, and I believe we need to go back to the drawing board.

Budget resolutions are as much about priorities as they are about numbers, and I believe this budget resolution sets all the wrong priorities.

At a time when millions of families are still struggling to recover from the recession, this budget would raise their taxes while cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans, who have only gotten wealthier in recent years.

The budget calls for the elimination of the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit, which would raise taxes by an average of $900 on 13 million working families. Yet, at the same time, the budget would eliminate the estate tax, which is only paid by 5,400 families each year who inherit estates worth more than $10 million.

Let me repeat that: this budget calls for raising taxes on 13 million low-income families in order to pay for tax cuts for the 5,400 wealthiest families, representing the richest 0.2 percent of our country.

Prioritizing the rich over struggling families is at the heart of what is wrong with this budget.

In addition, this budget calls for dramatic funding cuts for the very Federal programs that these working families rely on most. Nationwide, the cuts required by this budget would: prevent 35,000 low-income children from enrolling in Head Start, an early childhood education program; cut Federal funding for public schools that serve more than 1.9 million low-income students; increase the cost of college for more than 8 million low-income students through cuts to Pell grants; prevent 2.2 million Americans from accessing job training services; and eliminate health coverage through Medicaid for 14 million low-income Americans.

In my view, these cuts are draconian and wholly unnecessary. I also believe that these cuts would only further exacerbate income inequality and economic hopelessness, the very forces that have been fueling unrest throughout the country.

The events in Baltimore that have been broadcast across the Nation in recent weeks are not only a response to years of police brutality, but also the result of whole neighborhoods being left behind economically.

As a former big-city mayor, I remember a time when there was robust Federal and State support for cities to redevelop depressed neighborhoods and provide educational and employment opportunities for their citizens.

That priority no longer exists, certainly not in the austere funding levels of this budget. Instead, we have seen a total abandonment of our cities over the past three decades.

When I was mayor of San Francisco, the Community Development Block Grant program, CDBG, was the primary source of Federal funding to help State and local governments undertake housing, economic development, and neighborhood revitalization projects. During my time at city hall, CDBG funds peaked at $3.7 billion, which would be the equivalent of $10.6 billion in inflation-adjusted 2014 dollars. In 2014, Congress provided only $3.023 billion for CDBG, just 28 percent of that peak inflation-adjusted amount.

For my city, when CDBG was at its prime, it meant we had around $28 million per year to use for police, fire departments, and economic development projects. Under the funding levels in this GOP budget, San Francisco would be slated to receive only around $16 million a year, just 20 percent of what I had when adjusting for inflation.

If you care about our cities and the problems facing them, these are the dollars that can really make a difference. They work; I have seen it. Yet, they would simply not be there under this budget.

At the same time, many States, including California, have cut funding for local redevelopment projects, further straining local government funding for economic development and neighborhood revitalization.

Now, I recognize Congress can't solve all of the country's problems, and pouring money into cities will not cure all of their ills.

But I believe the central role of the Federal Government should be to expand opportunities for the people who need it most, not those who have already succeeded in life.

This budget doesn't do that. Not only does this budget not help working families, it would actually make their situation even worse.

This budget would take away the healthcare of the most vulnerable, make it even harder for Americans to find a job, deny our Nation's youth the opportunity to learn, and raise taxes on those who can least afford it.

The Republican priorities reflected in this budget are morally wrong and terrible for our country's future. It is time to develop a budget that helps all Americans, not just the wealthy few.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the budget conference report before us today charts the wrong course for our country and threatens our economic and national security.

During the consideration of the Republican Senate budget a few weeks ago, I laid out concerns about its most alarming aspects and my reasons for opposing it. My concerns and opposition have not changed because this Republican budget conference report doesn't deviate from the Senate budget's construct.

Indeed, the Republican budget stacks the deck in favor of special interests and makes it harder for middle-class families to get ahead. For example,

their budget would eliminate the estate tax, giving the wealthiest 0.2 percent of Americans a $269 billion tax cut over 10 years. It would pave the way to cut millionaire's top marginal tax rate from 39.6 percent to 25 percent. At the same time, it would raise taxes on 16 million middle-class families by ending the expansion of the earned income tax credit and child tax credit. These choices by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are clear and stand in stark contrast to policies my Democratic colleagues and I fight for that help middle-class families and grow the economy from the middle out.

The Republican budget would also keep the sequester in place, which puts unworkable caps on nondefense and defense spending. Both sides of the ledger need relief from the sequester for our Nation's economic and national security. But it seems that my colleagues on the other side are only willing to use the overseas contingency operations, OCO, account to provide relief to defense spending despite what we have heard from our military leaders on the need to address both sides of the ledger and that using OCO in this manner has its own serious shortcomings.

The Pentagon simply cannot meet the complex set of national security challenges without the help of other government departments and agencies—including State, Justice, Homeland Security, and the intelligence community. In the Armed Services Committee, we have heard compelling testimony on the essential role of other government agencies in ensuring our Nation remains safe and strong. The Department of Defense's share of the burden would surely grow if these agencies were not adequately funded as well.

Adding funds to OCO does not solve the Defense Department's problems. As Army Chief of Staff General Odierno said, ''OCO has limits and it has restrictions and it has very strict rules that have to be followed. And so if we're inhibited by that, it might not help us. What might happen at the end of the year, we have a bunch of money we hand back because we are not able to spend it.''

Making a 1-year plus up to OCO also does not help the Defense Department with the certainty and stability it needs when building its 5-year budget. As General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, testified, ''we need to fix the base budget . . . we won't have the certainty we need'' if there is a year by year OCO fix. Defense Secretary Carter added that raising OCO does not allow the Defense Department to plan ''efficiently or strategically.''

While adding funds to OCO would provide some relief to the Defense Department, it is to defense alone, leaving domestic agencies at sequestration levels. And the truth is that the Defense Department cannot do its job without other departments. As General Mattis said, ''If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition.'' And in recent testimony, the commanders of Northern Command and Southern Command stated they could not accomplish their mission of protecting this country without the Coast Guard, the Border Patrol, DEA, and the intelligence community.

Moving beyond the needs we have to keep the Nation safe, there is a whole list of needs that ensure Americans and our economy stays healthy and thrives. I would like to bring attention to one such need—addressing lead poisoning, a preventable tragedy that dramatically impacts a child's health and ability to learn. This budget would mean cuts to programs that help keep kids healthy like the lead poisoning prevention program. The kinds of physical health issues and developmental delays that stem from lead poisoning have long term effects on our children, our communities, and our economy. Indeed, educational system costs are estimated at $38,000 over 3 years per child with special education needs due to lead poisoning.

The impact is especially pronounced in low-income and minority neighborhoods and populations in cities like Providence or as the Nation has recently seen in the dramatic events unfolding in Baltimore. These lead poisoning prevention programs are the kinds of initiatives that help put disadvantaged communities on an even playing field and, ultimately, work to ensure that our children can grow up to contribute to their families and their communities.

I have mentioned several shortsighted provisions, but this budget is replete with them. We cannot shortchange our Nation's investments in the middle class, in our children, and our national security and expect long-term prosperity. That is why I will vote no and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

RECOGNIZING MONTANA'S SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Montana's thousands of small businesses and for their contributions to our State's economy.

During National Small Business Week, we recognize all of the hard-working Montana men and women who took the risk to start a small business. These men and women have spent countless, sleepless nights working to create jobs and grow their business in a State they love and call home.

Before being elected to Congress, I spent nearly 3 decades in the private sector, and I know firsthand there is no better place to live and work than in Montana. I also know that our small businesses are critical to Montana's economy and our State's future.

According to the Small Business Administration, small businesses represent more than 97 percent of all Montana employers, in turn employing more than 68 percent of Montana's private sector labor force.

I am excited to say there are a lot of small business success stories in Montana. We have countless business leaders and entrepreneurs working to drive our State's economic growth and helping us lead the way in a variety of industries, from tourism and agriculture to technology and resource development.

Look no further than Bozeman, my hometown, where Advanced Electronic Designs is doing incredible things in innovations, helping to build up the Montana high-tech sector. Their team is comprised of 15 Montana State University engineers, and together they have designed more than 70 percent of the LED signs in Times Square—from the NBC ''Today'' show to the Disney store.

I have also had the opportunity to tour ALCOM in Bonner, MT, to see their trailer manufacturing facility. They just won the Small Business Administration's 2015 Small Business Award for Montana Exporter of the Year. This award recognizes ALCOM's achievement in significantly increasing their export sales, profits, and jobs, while encouraging other Montana businesses to find new markets for their goods.

This is an exciting time to do business back home in Montana. From our growing technology sector to our State's diverse natural resources, there is a lot of opportunity to create jobs and grow businesses in Montana. Unfortunately, the Federal Government's out-of-touch policies and bureaucratic overreach continue to prevent Montana's small businesses from reaching their full potential. Too many Montana businesses face regulatory burdens that hinder innovation and block opportunities for growth.

Our Tax Code is too complex and serves as yet another barrier to prosperity. And ObamaCare's burdensome and costly mandates are forcing millions of dollars in new fees and compliance costs upon Montana's small businesses, in turn forcing our job creators to downsize, reduce employee hours, or close their doors altogether.

When I drive around in Montana, I have yet to hear a small business owner ask for more regulations and higher taxes. We need commonsense policies that encourage Montana's job creators to innovate and to grow. We need solutions to lift these regulatory barriers, reduce tax burdens, and create long-term certainty for hard-working Montanans.

I have long said that the best solutions don't come from bureaucrats in Washington, DC; they come from Main Street Montana and our State's hard-working businesses and community

leaders because in Montana, we understand that jobs come from small business, not big government. That is why we need to reduce the redtape that is holding our small businesses back and work toward commonsense regulations that don't place unnecessary burdens on Montana families and Montana small businesses.

We do need comprehensive tax reform that is fair, that is simpler, that promotes economic opportunity, and that works for all Montanans. And we need to repeal and replace ObamaCare with Montana-driven solutions that put patients and their doctors at the center of a health care equation and don't place these job-killing burdens on our small businesses.

Instead of hindering our small businesses, we should reward them with flexibility and with the freedom they need to thrive and empower them with the tools they need to create jobs. That starts with educating Montana's future leaders and ensuring that students have the tools they need to succeed in their future careers.

It is no secret that for many recent college graduates, finding a job in today's economy is harder than ever. This is especially true in Montana, where students are often forced to leave our State to find good-paying and long-lasting careers. It has been said that our top three exports are our grain, our cattle, and our children.

As we work to grow Montana's technology and resources, we need to ensure that our students have the skills they need to get ahead and find jobs at home. From Montana's tribal colleges and vocational schools to the new Jake Jabs College of Business and Entrepreneurship Building at Montana State University, Montana's educational institutions are leading the way in giving our students the head start they need to succeed outside of classrooms and help grow our State's economy because when small businesses succeed, our economy thrives.

We need to continue to find ways to encourage investment, entrepreneurship, and innovation in our State and all across our Nation. Our country was founded on the principles of hard work and entrepreneurialism. I am proud that Montana's small businesses continue to exemplify these pillars of our Nation's heritage and are leading the way in economic innovation.

During this National Small Business Week, I encourage all of my fellow Montanans to shop small and join me in supporting Montana's small businesses and thanking them for the important role they hold in our State—not just this week but every week.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today, for the first time in 6 years, Congress will pass a budget, and we are passing a budget that actually balances. This fulfills another basic responsibility of governing and an important promise Republicans made to the American people.

In advance of this vote, I wish to take a moment to applaud Chairman MIKE ENZI for his leadership on this issue. Because of his strong work, our balanced budget will help grow our economy, reduce the debt, repeal ObamaCare, and rein in Washington overreach. Our balanced budget proves that the Senate is fully working again on behalf of the American people.

OBAMACARE

Mr. President, I wish to speak about another issue that is also important to Americans across the country, an issue which I hear about as I travel the State of Wyoming and which I heard about this weekend.

Last week, the Democratic leader came to the floor of the Senate and he made some very interesting statements about the President's health care law. He said ObamaCare is a smashing success. That was last week.

On Monday, we had this headline in the Wall Street Journal:

U.S. Emergency Room Visits Keep Climbing: People on Medicaid turn to hospital care when doctor access is limited, new survey suggests.

It is interesting to take a look at this large story and learn about how the number of visits to emergency rooms keeps climbing in spite of what the President promised during the debate of the President's health care law.

The article goes on to say:

Emergency room visits continue to climb in the second year of the Affordable Care Act, contradicting the law's supporters who had predicted a decline in traffic as more people gained access to doctors and other health care providers.

This is according to a survey by the American College of Emergency Physicians. They should know; they are the ones in the emergency room treating patients. The group says that people whom the health care law pushed on to Medicaid—pushed on to Medicaid—are having trouble getting appointments or even finding a doctor to take care of them because it is someone who doesn't take their new coverage. Does the Democratic minority leader think that is a smashing success? This is a survey of over 2,000 emergency room doctors. Seventy-five percent of them said they have seen increases in emergency room care since 2014. Only one out of 20 ER doctors said they have seen a decrease.

The article quotes one doctor, Dr. Howard Mell, as saying: ''There was a grand theory the law would reduce ER visits.''

A grand theory? Yes, it was.

He said: ''Well, guess what, it hasn't happened. Visits are going up despite the [law], and in a lot of cases because of it.''

That is according to one emergency room doctor who sees the results of the Obama health care law every day in the emergency room where he takes care of patients.

This really shouldn't surprise anyone. We have seen the warning signs coming now for a while. Back in December, the Department of Health and Human Services found that more than half of the health care providers listed for Medicaid plans—half listed as taking Medicaid patients—couldn't schedule appointments for patients, and they are even listed with Health and Human Services as taking care of Medicaid patients. This is only of the doctors who actually care for Medicaid patients in the first place. We know that about half of doctors won't see Medicaid patients at all because the reimbursement is so low for taking care of them.

For more than one-quarter of the doctors, the wait time for a patient to actually get an appointment is more than a month. Does the Democratic leader think that is a smashing success, waiting more than a month to see a doctor?

Last year, almost half of doctors said they had seen an increase in emergency room visits, and now we see it is much higher. Some supporters of the law last year said that wasn't important. They said: Don't worry, the numbers will drop off after the first year as more people get primary care physicians. Well, it hasn't happened, and it has actually gotten worse. About half of the ER doctors saw an increase in the first year of ObamaCare coverage and 75 percent saw an increase this year, the second year.

It is not getting better. It continues to get worse, to the point that USA TODAY had an article dated May 4, yesterday, page 1: ''ER Visits Surge Despite ObamaCare.''

It says:

Three-quarters of emergency room doctors say they are seeing ER patient visits surge since ObamaCare took effect—just the opposite of what many Americans expected would happen.

It is not what many Americans expected would happen.

Look at what the President said would happen. Back in 2009, the President was trying to pass the law, and President Obama said this: ''If everybody's got coverage, then they're not going to go to the emergency room for treatment.''

That was one of the biggest reasons the law required everyone in America to have insurance coverage. Remember, that is the mandate. It is called the individual mandate, and it remains extremely unpopular today. The President kept saying it over the years. He said it early on, he said it during the debate, and he said it after the law passed. He continues to hold this position in spite of the fact that 75 percent

of emergency room doctors—2,000 doctors who actually work in emergency rooms—are saying: It is not true, Mr. President. The ERs are getting more and more crowded.

We see what happens when an ER gets more crowded: The wait time goes up, the mortality rates for patients trying to get treatment there goes up—because of the health care law.

In 2013, the President told one group of people: ''It means that all the providers around here, instead of having to take in folks in the emergency room, they suddenly have customers who have insurance.''

The President's statements continue to fly in the face of reality. According to the people who really know what is going on, the medical coverage is not keeping people out of emergency rooms. It has become crystal clear that coverage does not equal care. Not only is ObamaCare coverage not delivering care, in many cases the system to provide the coverage isn't even working.

There was an article last Friday in the Washington Post. The headline was ''Nearly half of ObamaCare exchanges are struggling over their future.''

It says: ''Nearly half of the 17 insurance marketplaces set up by the states and the District [of Columbia] under President Obama's health laws are struggling financially.''

Does the minority leader think that is a smashing success?

According to this article, ''many of the online exchanges are wrestling with surging costs, especially for balky technology and expensive consumer call centers—and tepid enrollment numbers.''

It talks about problems in Minnesota, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Colorado. In Oregon, the exchange has failed so spectacularly that the State had to shut it down entirely.

The Washington Post says: ''States have already received nearly $5 billion in Federal grants to establish the online marketplaces.''

That is $5 billion that hard-working American taxpayers had to pay to set up these exchanges, and half of these exchanges, in spite of all of that taxpayer money, are now struggling financially.

This article quotes one expert, Sabrina Corlette, who is a project director at Georgetown University's Center for Health Insurance Reforms. She said: ''A lot of people are going to want to know: What happened to all those taxpayer dollars?''

Well, that is what a lot of Senators want to know. That is exactly what Senators on this side of the aisle have been asking for quite a while now. What happened to all of that hard-earned taxpayer money? How much of that $5 billion was wasted?

The States with these failing exchanges are now looking at raising taxes and raising fees on everybody else's insurance claims. So in half of the States, the exchanges where people are supposed to sign up for coverage are failing. Billions of taxpayer dollars wasted, and States are looking at charging people even more. That is the President's solution for health care in America.

People who do get coverage and want to see a doctor may have to wait for more than a month. They may end up going to the emergency room along with millions of other people since ObamaCare's mandates began.

Does the minority leader, who came to the floor last week calling this health care law a smashing success, really think that is so? This is not what the American people wanted from health care reform. People knew what they wanted, and they wanted something very simple: They wanted the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost. ObamaCare has failed on every one of those things. It is not a smashing success.

It is time for us to finally give Americans the health care they were asking for all along.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, a budget is about building for the future. A budget is about what it takes for our families, our businesses, and our economy to grow and prosper.

The basics are pretty simple: Our kids need access to a good, affordable education. Our workers need good wages and good benefits. Our businesses and our workers need transit—roads and bridges that are safe enough, strong enough, and fast enough to get us to work and keep goods and services moving. Our workers need good jobs here in America, jobs built on 21st-century innovation and technology. And everyone needs to know that we are in this together, that we won't kick people to the ground, that we will help those who need it most, including seniors, children, and families struggling to make ends meet. That is how we build a strong future.

The Republicans have a different vision of how to build a future. The Republican budget plan will make the rich richer and the powerful more powerful while leaving our kids, our college students, our seniors, our workers, and our families to fall further and further behind.

The people of Massachusetts didn't send me here to do what I can to help the richest of the rich; they sent me here to work for them. So I want to talk about what this Republican budget will mean to the people of our State.

Assuming it is applied proportionately, the Republican budget can cut mandatory transportation funding by 40 percent over the next decade. That will be significantly fewer dollars to repair and improve our highways and to help keep our buses and trains moving in Massachusetts. So if you already think we have a crumbling infrastructure, if you are already worried about old buses and whether the T can struggle through another winter, remember that the Republicans want to slash the support for transportation by 40 percent. With these cuts, our crumbling infrastructure will crumble even faster.

These cuts will also cost jobs. Economists estimate that this Republican budget could mean 56,000 fewer jobs in Massachusetts alone.

This budget also takes aim at our kids. Over the next decade, it could eliminate Head Start services for 400,000 children across this country, cutting the program by more than $4 billion. Little kids are under attack, and so are big kids. The Republican budget could also make college more expensive for the 131,000 Massachusetts students who receive Pell grants. And cutting the student loan interest rate? Forget it. The Republican budget keeps sucking billions of dollars in profits off student loans.

The Republican budget puts Massachusetts residents' health at risk, especially the health of our seniors. Today, the Affordable Care Act saves seniors billions of dollars in prescription drugs. The days when seniors had to choose between filling a prescription and paying the rent were over, but under the Republican budget, almost 80,000 seniors in Massachusetts could each pay an average of $920 more per year for prescription drugs.

It gets worse. About 900,000 seniors in Massachusetts could lose free preventive Medicare health services and about 26,000 Massachusetts nursing home residents who rely on Medicaid could face cuts to their care and an uncertain future.

What about medical research and the technologies of the future, the kind of work we are proud to do in Massachusetts? For over 10 years, Congress has decimated medical research funding, reducing the buying power of the National Institutes of Health by nearly 25 percent and choking off support for projects that could lead to the next major breakthrough against cancer, heart disease, ALS, diabetes, or autism.

With people living longer and longer and more and more families desperate for a breakthrough on Alzheimer's, what is the Republican budget solution? Cut the NIH budget. Cut medical research. In fact, compared with the President's budget, the Republican budget could mean 1,400 fewer NIH grants a year.

The Republican budget also cuts $600 billion from income security programs, such as nutrition assistance, potentially jeopardizing food stamps for thousands of Massachusetts families who depend on this program to put food on the table. And just to turn the

knife a little deeper for families in Massachusetts, the Republican budget could cut funding for heating assistance—funding that helps 183,000 Massachusetts families stay warm in the winter.

We know whom this budget would hurt—millions of middle-class families in Massachusetts and all over this country who are busting their tails to try to make ends meet. It will hurt people who work hard and play by the rules but who are seeing opportunity slip away. Why? Why inflict so much damage on hard-working American people, on students and seniors, on kids and construction workers? Why cut back the support for researchers trying to cure Alzheimer's or college kids trying to get an education? Why? One answer. Once again, the Republicans want to give billions of dollars in tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans—and they expect everyone else to pay for it. The Republicans have planned $269 billion in tax cuts that could go to just a few thousand of the richest families. That is not just irresponsible, it is just plain wrong.

A budget is about values. The Republicans' values are on display here. This budget is about making sure that a tilted playing field tilts even further, and everyone else gets left further and further behind. Those aren't American values. We believe and we have always believed in opportunity. We believe that everyone should have a fighting chance to build a better life for themselves and their children.

Mr. President, we weren't sent here just to help the rich get richer. It is time for the Senate to stand up for the values that build a strong middle class, and we can start by voting down this terrible Republican budget.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

CITIZEN UNREST AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the unrest we have seen, especially in Baltimore in the last week and to a lesser extent in several other cities around the country, including the city of Philadelphia in my State of Pennsylvania.

There has been, of course, no shortage of discussions on this matter, going back to last year, to the protests in Ferguson, MO, and those surrounding other flashpoints that have involved law enforcement officials.

We have in one way or another landed on a bit of a national conversation about police practices, and that is a good conversation. I think we should have that. I, for instance, think we should seriously consider body cameras for use by police officers.

I think this conversation is closely related to some other things that we need to be talking about as well, including the problems of urban America that have a number of causes and that certainly deserve our attention and our action. For instance, I think we can and should be talking about how we can create better jobs, better economic growth, and a better economic climate in our cities, especially our big cities. We need to talk about how we can bring down the terrible rate of poverty that has been persistent for decades in our cities. We have to talk about how schools have been letting down too many poor families in our big cities.

We ought to talk about family structure as well because we know that a breakdown of families contributes enormously to all sorts of social pathologies—involvement in gangs and drug use and drug dealing, criminality in general, and poverty itself.

We can talk about guns, too. I remain proud of the work I have done across the aisle to try to make it more difficult for guns to fall into the hands of people who have no right to be using them—criminals and those with mental illness.

These are all things we ought to be talking about in this great debate, and we should be acting on these things in the Senate and in State and local governmental bodies across the country.

There is something in this discussion that we should also be willing to talk about. It is something that hasn't gotten as much attention during this national conversation about police practices, and it is something that has been bothering me for some time. I think it came to a head this week in Baltimore. I am going to talk about this now and I am going to continue to talk about this in the coming weeks and months because I think it is an important part of this national discussion.

My concern specifically is over the growing scapegoating of police officers in America today. Before I go any further, let me be perfectly clear about one central point. If a police officer acts unprofessionally, acts outside the bounds of ethical standards or breaks the law, then by all means that police officer has to be held accountable and punished for his or her transgression. There is no excuse whatsoever for unlawful police conduct. That absolutely cannot be tolerated not even one little bit.

I will be clear about another point. It is true that there are real and horrible cases of police misconduct. No one I know is trying to deny that or sweep it under the rug or pretend it doesn't happen. It does happen, and it should never be tolerated.

Let's also keep this in perspective. There are doctors who break the law. There are accountants who break the law. There are lawyers who break the law. There are elected public officials who break the law. The fact is that there are bad actors in every profession, in every line of work, in every walk of life, and that is true of the police as well. But if you listen to many of the police critics we hear from today, you would think there is some sort of epidemic of crimes perpetrated by the police. That, I assure you, is not true.

In my years in public life, I have spent a lot of time with police officers. I have gotten to know many of them. I have gone on rides with them. I have listened to their concerns. I have met with them. I have supported their community organizations. I have attended the charitable fundraisers they have held. By and large, I can tell you that I don't know of any group of people anywhere in our society who are more dedicated professionals than the policemen and policewomen across our country.

Far from the epidemic of police misdeeds that some claim to be happening out there, I think just the opposite is true. The overwhelming majority of police are honest men and women. They have very high ethical standards. They don't have a racist bone in their body. Our police have incredibly difficult and often dangerous jobs to do, and it is an incredibly important job as well.

Our communities—let's face it—we all depend on the police. That is probably more true in urban areas than anywhere else in the country.

So we need to have a conversation about bad police practices, but we also need to have a conversation about what a great job the vast majority of police are doing across our country and how much they deserve our thanks and our support.

Unfortunately, the scenes we witnessed in Baltimore last week certainly work against the kind of gratitude we ought to show to our law enforcement community. I am not talking about what happened to Freddie Gray. Mr. Gray absolutely deserves justice. If the police in the Gray case committed crimes, then they must be punished. I don't question that in the least. But what happened last week in Baltimore was not only about Freddie Gray. In scenes reminiscent of last year in Ferguson, last week in Baltimore we saw a great American city dissolve into utter lawlessness. We saw riots that destroyed a senior citizen center, a CVS drugstore, numerous cars, all kinds of property. We saw dozens of injuries, including injuries to over 90 police officers.

We had a curfew imposed and the National Guard called in to restore order as though this were some kind of war zone. We even had Major League Baseball cancel two games and conduct one game where no fans were permitted to attend. They played before an empty stadium. How is that allowed to happen in a great American city?

Some people excuse this lawlessness and point to the difficult underlying conditions in the local community, but let's ask ourselves who gets hurt the most by these riots.

Well, we know it is the very poor people from these communities who now have no senior center to go to. They cannot go to CVS to get their prescriptions filled or to pick up necessities for their kids. And, of course, there is this big, red, flashing neon sign telling businesses, large and small—they could provide jobs and economic activity there—to stay away.

So where do the police come in on this? Well, President Obama called the looters and rioters in Baltimore thugs, and President Obama has received some criticism for that. I just would use an objective, indisputable term. These people are ''criminals.''

It is a serious crime to set a fire to a car or to a building. It is a serious crime to throw a rock or a bottle at a police officer. Assault and battery is a serious crime. It is a serious crime to engage in looting, and people who commit those acts are criminals. They should be arrested, they should be charged, and they should be prosecuted and punished to the full extent of the law, but in order for that to happen, we need the police. We need them to be actively engaged.

The Baltimore police officers have reported that they were ordered to stand down last week as the city was being destroyed. That is pretty tough to take—especially, I assume, for the law-abiding Baltimore citizens who need that police protection.

Instead of standing down in the face of wanton criminal acts, the police need to be allowed to do their job. They should make arrests. They should restore order. There should never be another American city that looks the way Baltimore did last week.

Now, when six police officers were charged on Friday in the death of Freddie Gray, there were celebrations in the streets in Baltimore. At a certain level, that is completely understandable. Whatever Mr. Gray did on that day, the day he was arrested, he certainly did not deserve to die, and his death cries out for answers. We need to have answers to these questions.

In the passions of last week, I understand why some people cheered the appearance that the criminal justice system was standing up for Mr. Gray. I totally understand that, but let me ask a question. What happens if these accused police officers are found to have not broken the law? What if one of them, several of them or even all of them are found not to have violated the law? What happens then? Will we see Baltimore, and maybe other cities, erupt in flames once more? That is already what appears to be forecast in some quarters.

What about those six individual police officers? Well, we know what happens if they are found guilty. If they are found guilty, they are going to go to jail for a long time, and that will be appropriate.

But what happens if they are found innocent? In the Ferguson, MO, case, a grand jury found there was no reason to believe a crime had been committed by the accused police officer, Darren Wilson.

The U.S. Justice Department also did an investigation, and they decided not to bring civil rights charges against Officer Wilson. So Officer Wilson was found to have committed no wrongdoing, neither by the local grand jury nor by the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Justice Department.

But what happened to Officer Wilson? Did anybody ask that question, What happened to Officer Wilson? Well, he faced multiple death threats. He ended up having to leave his job on the police force, the one job he had always wanted and he loved to do. He ended up having to move out of his home and go live somewhere else. He is only 28 years old.

Now, the accused police officers in Baltimore have life stories too. One of them is police Sergeant Alicia White. She is a 30-year-old African-American woman who joined the Baltimore Police Department 5 years ago. She is engaged to be married. A local Baltimore minister, who knows Sergeant White, described her this way:

> She wanted to be a police officer because she is a Christian and wants to be a good role model for young black women. And she wanted to be that good cop in the community and bridge the gap between the police and the neighborhoods.

Of the six arrested officers, three are African Americans, three are White. None of this means any of these officers necessarily acted appropriately or right in this case. It is quite possible they did not and, if so, the court system, our legal judicial system, will determine that.

What I am simply trying to point out is that these police officers have human faces. They are human beings, and these officers are going to go through hell whether they deserve to or not. Their lives will never be the same whether they are guilty or innocent. There will be many people in the community who shun them, even if they are found to have done nothing wrong.

What message does that send to all the tens of thousands of police officers all across America who risk their lives every day to protect their communities from criminals? Unfortunately, it says there are a lot of people out there who are looking to misplace a lot of social problems we face in our country on the backs of the police. It says they might not be allowed to do their jobs when their communities most need them to do their jobs, and it says that one day, should they find themselves accused of wrongdoing, there might be a public mob that clamors for their conviction and threatens to burn down the city if the legal system finds them independent. That is a sad state of affairs.

I am not defending the officers in the Gray case. I don't know whether they are guilty or innocent. I expect the legal system to determine that, but that is not my point. My point is that while there are some police officers who act terribly and who must be stopped, there is no epidemic of police criminality in this country.

We should absolutely discuss and act upon the issues that surround police and community relations, by all means, and we also need to acknowledge the critical role the police play in keeping our community safe, the overwhelming majority of police who conduct themselves honorably day in and day out.

The next time there is a demonstration about police conduct, I hope it is a demonstration to thank the police for their dedication, their hard work, and their courage. That is a demonstration I will be honored to join.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, we are here debating choices. They happen to be choices about our budget, about the future of our Nation that will be determined by choices we make about how to invest.

That is the key concept at stake in this very momentous moment as we consider choices for how to invest in middle-class financial security, and all that goes along with it, job creation, infrastructure, education funding, clean energy research. All of those choices are critical to the future of our Nation, and we will make disastrous choices if we adopt the budget that has come to us in the conference report for fiscal year 2016 because it fails to understand the need for investment in our future.

We are in danger of leaving a lesser America—an America that for the first time in our history will reflect a lesser Nation left to our children and their grandchildren. All generations before us determined that they would sacrifice, that they would give back and pay forward. Yet now, sadly, in fact tragically, we endanger their future by failing in those investment decisions.

The conference agreement would cut trillions of dollars to domestic programs without seeking revenue. In fact, it relies on gimmicks that undermine its integrity—a significant gimmick, for example, accounting, $2 trillion in tax revenue from the Affordable Care Act while at the same time repealing that law. It relies on trillions of dollars in supposed savings without detailing how those savings will be accomplished.

At the very least, we owe a measure of integrity to the American people. We can disagree about choices, but at least we should be honest about how revenue is supposed to match the

spending we allocate. The proposal before us would, in fact, repeal the Affordable Care Act, which has already allowed more than 16 million Americans to obtain health insurance, access preventive services, and save money on their premiums. It would cut more than $1 trillion from Medicaid, reversing the expansion that has provided health insurance to millions of Americans.

Too many Americans are still struggling, and yet this budget would cut funding for job training and employment services. It would eliminate the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which provides vital support for small manufacturers in Connecticut and across the country. Time and again, we have learned that education is the key to a brighter future for our children. Yet, tragically, this budget would cut the funding across the spectrum of American education, from universal prekindergarten, which would be slashed, to college affordability, where loan programs would be decimated. In fact, instead of making college more affordable, this budget decimates two critical programs that would help future students pay back loans. Remember, the average student debt in this country is in the tens of thousands of dollars. In Connecticut, it is about $30,000, conservatively estimated.

This budget would increase student loan payments for millions of borrowers, and it would slash Pell grants—increase the cost of loans, cut the amount of grants available that enable students to avoid borrowing. In fact, it would cut the Pell Grant Program by nearly 30 percent and eliminate other important Federal subsidies.

These moneys are not spending, they are investments in our future, the futures of those students whose hopes and dreams will be constrained, undercut, and killed but also the future of our capacity to manufacture and compete around the globe because what we have—more than any other nation—is very smart, skilled people. That is why companies are coming back to this Nation after outsourcing.

One of these programs, the Pay as You Earn Program, caps monthly student loan payments at a level that is proportionate to their earnings and forgives debt after 20 years of repayment.

But the Republican budget would require cuts to this program in a way that could increase required monthly payment increases of more than 50 percent to some borrowers, and it paves the way for eliminating the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program, which assists students with debt payments for those who go into public service professions, such as teaching, firefighting, and policing. This program ought to be especially close to our hearts because we purport to be engaged in public service and to provide a role model for young people who engage in public service.

I am particularly concerned about this program's impact on our railroads, roads, bridges, and airports. We know those facilities as infrastructure—the magic word in the Senate, ''infrastructure.'' In fact, we had a hearing just this morning in the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee on the importance of fully funded, long-term investments in our Nation's highway transit and rail system.

We heard testimony from the public and private sectors about how important a revitalized and reinvigorated transportation network is for American competitiveness, American businesses, and American professionals to compete in the world. Yet, through this budget, we will not only sanction, but we will encourage and enable an inadequate investment in infrastructure. The budget conference report before us would cut funding for highways and mass transit by 40 percent over the next decade. There may be no more important fact to know about this budget.

So I regret that I will vote against this budget because I wish, as do many of my colleagues, that we could reach a bipartisan measure that will embody the best in America, not encourage a retreat from our public obligation.

In fact, I think America is ready to invest, ready to give back and to pay forward. In fact, I believe our wealthiest Americans are ready to do more and approve closing loopholes and ending subsidies, not making blanket cuts to vital programs, not cutting taxes for millionaires, as this budget would create a pathway to do, not forcing another 12 million middle-class families and students to pay for college by ending the American opportunity tax credit or adding $1,100 more in burdens on them, and not forcing 16 million middle-class families to pay a $900 tax hike by ending the expansions of the earned-income tax credit and child tax credit. I think our most fortunate Americans are ready to pay forward and do more and invest and, in fact, make more sacrifices, which is the way this budget ought to be arranged. And it isn't even a matter of sacrifices on the part of anyone; it is ending the subsidies for outsourcing to ensure that everyone pays their fair share without those hidden tax breaks and subsidies that can be closed.

I hope we can do better than this. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the budget conference report.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, a budget is a vision of the future, and it clearly appears the two sides have very different visions as to what our country should be and the direction in which we move.

At a time of unprecedented and grotesque income and wealth inequality, where 99 percent of all new income is going to the top 1 percent, my Republican colleagues say we need to give a massive tax break to the 5,000 wealthiest families in America—the top two-tenths of 1 percent—a $269 billion tax break over a 10-year period. That is not what the American people believe. What they believe is that at a time when the rich and large corporations are doing phenomenally well, when we have a large deficit, when we have massive unmet needs in this country, that maybe, just maybe it is time to ask the wealthy and large corporations to start paying their fair share of taxes, not give them more tax breaks. That is exactly what this Republican budget does.

At a time when the United States is the only major country on Earth that doesn't guarantee health care to all people and when 35 million Americans today have no health insurance and even more are underinsured, with large copayments and high premiums, the Republican budget unbelievably—unbelievably—simply throws 27 million Americans off of health insurance. What happens to them? What happens when the Affordable Care Act is ended—which is what their budget does—and 16 million people lose their health insurance? What happens when another 11 million people lose their health insurance because of the $440 billion cuts in Medicaid? What happens to 27 million Americans? How many of them will die? Clearly, many thousands will die. People who are sick will not be able to go to the doctor. People who are sick will get sicker and suffer. Twenty-seven million people thrown off of health insurance is beyond being unconscionable. Yet, that is what is in the Republican budget.

The Presiding Officer is a neighbor of mine in New Hampshire. I know that in New Hampshire—I have been there recently—and in Vermont, young people are wondering about how they are going to be able to afford to go to college and what kind of student debts they will incur when they leave college. Our charge is to work together to make sure that every young person in this country who has the ability and the desire and the willingness to go to college is able to go to college regardless of his or her income. That is what we need to do in a competitive global economy.

We used to have the highest percentage of college graduates in the world. Today, we are in 12th place. That is not where we should be if we want to compete globally in this difficult world economy.

What is the Republican solution? The Republican solution is to make a bad situation much worse, with a $90 billion cut over a 10-year period in mandatory Pell Grant funding—Pell grants being the major source of funding for low- and moderate-income young people in order to get help to go to college.

This budget does exactly the opposite of what we should be doing.

We are the wealthiest country in the history of the world. The problem we are having is that almost all of that wealth is going to a handful of people at the top. Yet, today we have more people living in poverty than at almost any time in the modern history of America. We have seen some descriptions of that in the tragedy we recently observed in Baltimore in communities where 50 percent of the people are unemployed, where kids don't have enough to eat. Honestly, without being too rhetorical, I just don't understand how, when families are struggling to feed their kids, when everybody understands that hunger is a real problem in this country, anybody could vote for a budget that makes huge cuts in food stamps, in the WIC Program, and in other nutrition programs for families who are struggling to feed their families. That is not what this country is supposed to be about.

On top of all of that—on top of cutting health care, with 27 million people thrown off of health insurance; cutting education, making it harder for kids to go to college, harder for families to put their kids into Head Start; harder for poor families to feed their kids—my Republican colleagues say a major priority in this country is to give $269 billion in tax breaks to the top two-tenths of 1 percent. Does anybody—anybody outside of this Chamber think that makes any sense at all? Does anybody outside of here think those are American priorities? Billionaires do not need another tax break. They are doing just great. They are doing fine.

Then, to add insult to injury, the Republican budget allows to expire the additional benefits we put into the earned-income tax credit and the child tax credit. That, in effect, would mean a tax increase for over 10 million working families. We would be raising taxes on low-income workers while lowering taxes on billionaires. Those are not the priorities of the American people.

Madam President, I hope very much we will reject this budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, the Senate will soon vote to adopt the conference report to S. Con. Res. 11, the budget resolution. I supported the budget resolution when we considered it in March, and I plan to support the conference report, but I was disappointed to see one difference between the budget resolution that was passed by the Senate this year and the conference report we will be voting on later today. The Senate's budget resolution contained language that would have created a point of order against any legislation that designated more in the so-called OCO or overseas contingency operations funding than what the President requested in fiscal year 2016. The conference report we will soon consider does not contain that provision.

This point of order would have allowed those of us who have objected to off-budget funds being used in order to avoid spending caps—particularly in the international affairs budget—to at least raise the issue on various appropriations bills and other measures we consider in this body. This is an issue which needs to be raised, especially in light of the State Department's use of such funding.

It is bad enough that the administration has been requesting OCO funding to avoid making tough choices for its underlying budget since 2012, but Members of Congress have become enablers, consistently appropriating more OCO funds than the administration has asked for. In fiscal year 2014, the administration requested $3.8 billion in OCO funding for international affairs; Congress appropriated $6.5 billion. For fiscal year 2015, the administration requested $7.8 billion in OCO funding for international affairs; Congress appropriated $9.26 billion. That figure does not include the $2.5 billion appropriated to address the Ebola crisis; we appropriated that separately as emergency funding.

While emergency funding and OCO are different designations, the practical effect is the same. This is funding which is not subject to budget spending caps created by the Budget Control Act.

This year, the administration has requested $7 billion in OCO funding for international affairs.

Secretary Kerry said in early 2013 that ''OCO funding supports the efforts of the department in meeting the extraordinary demands of operating in the frontline states of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, and to a limited extent in other fragile regions.'' This year's OCO request includes funding for those countries, plus Syria, Jordan, and the Ukraine.

Some of my colleagues have concerns that the Defense Department will be shortchanged under the spending caps, and we have worked to increase OCO funding spending in 2016 beyond the $57 billion requested by the President to $96 billion in total. But that $96 billion can be used for anything the administration and Congress both designate as being in support of ''overseas contingency operations.'' It also enables departments that receive OCO-designated appropriations to avoid having to make the tough funding decisions in their underlying budgets.

I am disappointed the conference report we will consider today does not contain a point of order that would have at least enabled those of us who share these concerns I have raised today to raise this issue and to take some votes on it.

With that being said, I also understand that passing a budget is an important step in getting back to regular order and allowing Congress to carry out one of its primary responsibilities—establishing a budget for the Federal Government. By passing this budget, Congress will be able to start considering appropriations bills and other budget-related legislation. After all, it is Congress's job to exercise oversight and prioritize where and how Federal dollars are to be spent. In addition, passing a budget also initiates the reconciliation process for the committees in the House and the Senate that oversee the Affordable Care Act.

As I said earlier, I will support this conference report, but I would be remiss not to voice my concerns over the removal of the OCO-related point of order and the systemic use of off-budget funds to avoid busting the spending caps.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time remaining on the conference report be yielded back at 5:30 p.m. today and that the Senate vote on the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, the American people have consistently and overwhelmingly voiced their concern that our country is moving in the wrong direction, whether that be with regard to wage stagnation, unemployment or simply realizing the American dream.

Unfortunately, the budget resolution before us sends a strong message to the American people that Washington isn't listening. Instead of taking the opportunity to work together across party lines and move our country in the right direction, the Republican budget resolution continues to take our Nation down a road where Washington again stacks the deck against the middle class and rewards the wealthiest families and largest corporations in America.

There isn't a single tax expenditure or loophole that is closed in the Republican budget. This budget refuses to ask the wealthy to contribute a single dollar more to deficit reduction. It does nothing to eliminate the carried interest loophole at a time when Wall Street billionaires pay a lower effective tax rate than some truckdrivers, teachers, and nurses. In fact, this budget would eliminate the estate tax for wealthy families who inherit over $10 million.

This budget doesn't just give a tax cut for the wealthiest 1 percent, it also calls for lowering the top individual tax rate at a time when the top 1 percent already earns more income than the bottom 50 percent.

What is more, the Republican budget resolution actually delivers a tax break for the wealthiest 0.2 percent of Americans over the next decade, providing an average tax break of $3 million to multimillionaires and billionaires. In fact, there are more Senators who will be voting later this afternoon on this budget proposal than the number of Wisconsin families who would benefit from the tax provision of this tax break I just cited.

Who picks up the tab for these giveaways? In my home State of Wisconsin, an estimated 158,000 hard-working families would pay $1,000 or more in taxes under the Republican budget resolution. I wonder, do my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really believe this budget gives Americans ''the right to rise''? Is this their idea of an ''American revival'' for our middle class?

Not only does the Republican budget resolution fall short when it comes to making strong investments in education to create a strong path to the middle class, it actually falls flat by actually cutting these investments, failing to make college education affordable, and ignoring the huge student debt crisis across America. For Wisconsin families, the cost of college education will increase for up to 117,000 students because of the Republican budget's substantial cuts to the Pell Grant Program. At a time when our national economy moves forward with a slow and steady recovery, my State's economy has continued to lag behind.

So I can't support this Republican budget resolution when it doesn't make the strong investments America desperately needs in our roads, in our bridges, and in our ports that will create jobs, boost our local economies, and provide businesses with the quality transportation system they need to move their goods to market. I can't support this Republican budget resolution when about 46,000 Wisconsin jobs would be eliminated because of cuts to investment in transportation, education, and other programs.

At a time when both parties should be working together to pass a budget that grows our economy for the middle class and gives everyone a fair shot at getting ahead, this Republican budget resolution cuts investments in workforce readiness, leaving 40,000 Wisconsinites without the training that prepares them to put their hard work ethic to work moving our economy forward.

Many of the Wisconsin workers I hear from every day are really struggling to make ends meet. They are working more, taking home less, and worried—worried that for the first time in American history, their kids will have fewer opportunities than they did.

The Republican budget doesn't address those worries, it doesn't address those anxieties or those fears. It doesn't respond to this insecurity. Rather, the Republican budget continues the same failed, top-down economics, where Washington rigs the rules in favor of special interests, in favor of millionaires and billionaires.

Unfortunately, the Republican proposal seeks to balance the budget on the backs of the middle class and those struggling to one day become a part of America's middle class. This budget proposal marks another missed opportunity for the majority. The American people are right to believe this budget takes our country another step in the wrong direction because it turns its backs on building a stronger future. We can do better.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, section 3112 of the conference agreement directs the Joint Committee on Taxation and CBO to produce, alongside CBO's conventional estimates, cost estimates that incorporate the macroeconomic effects of major policy changes. With respect to the designation of the major legislation that would fall within this definition, the chair of the Committee on the Budget in the Senate shall exercise the authority granted under subsection (c)(1)(B)(ii), in consultation with the appropriate chair or vice chair of the Joint Committee on Taxation, to designate a revenue measure as major legislation.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I have been here most of the day listening to comments about the budget. I am fascinated by the budget speculation that has gone on here. Of course, I do know I only had 6 weeks to make up a budget for us to debate, and add to, subtract from, and then to conference. But a lot of what has been said is not actually in the budget. Of course, one of the comments was that it should be a bipartisan budget. In the whole time I have been here, there has not been a bipartisan budget. The majority party has always gotten to take the lead and outline what they see as a vision. But in the past, I remember we used to do our opening statements on the budget in the Budget Committee and then get a copy of the budget we had just commented on. I thought that was wrong. I provided them with it the day before the statements were made so they could make better comments on the budget and have better amendments.

What I really would have liked to have done is to have released it even a little earlier. I proposed this to them in exchange for them doing their amendments in advance so we could see their amendments and they could see our amendments. That would lead to a much more bipartisan budget event. That was not agreed to.

Now we are down to the point where we are talking about this final conference report, where we have gotten the House and the Senate to agree on a position. I noticed a lot of people today said we were cutting highways. We are not cutting highways. There is a provision in there to take care of highways. I think everybody—both sides of the aisle—wants to make sure we have adequate highways in America. How we get there might be a little different. The President suggested we put a mandatory tax on money that is held overseas by companies to force them to bring it back. If that is done in too short of a period, that would bankrupt a lot of companies because they do have those invested in things overseas. But it is something everybody looking at international tax reform has been talking about. One of the difficulties is, if you do give a reduction in the amount of tax in order to encourage them to bring it back without making it mandatory, it shows up as a huge cost to the Federal Government. Right now they are taxed at 35 percent. If we were to say they could bring it back at the 14 percent the President suggested, that would be a 21-percent cost to our budget. But if we leave it at 35 percent, nobody is bringing that money back here. If we put it at 14 percent and make it mandatory, I guess they would bring the money back here, if we didn't bankrupt them. That will be considered in the Finance Committee in the tax reform package.

I am certain something will be done on that to make us more competitive overseas, to bring the money back. I know they are talking about taking, as the President suggested, a portion of those funds to take care of the highways in the beginning, but we still have to have a long-term way to take care of highways, and that is going to require some bipartisan action.

Virtually everything that was talked about today in the way of criticism is something that still has to be done. It has to be done with a majority vote, and it has to make it through the whole Senate process, which probably requires 60 votes, which means it is going to be bipartisan, and then every one of those things we were accused of doing has to be signed by the President.

They have to be reasonable. They cannot be unreasonable, as we are seeing in there. Some do not even exist. For instance, we were accused of cutting Head Start money. That is not in the budget. There were some cuts to Head Start. That was part of the sequester a couple of years ago. I was astounded when some of the Head Start people came to my office and said: We got cut 7½ percent.

I said: No, no. It is 2.3 percent.

They said: No. We got cut 7½ percent.

What I found out was that the bureaucracy in DC kept their money and took it out on the kids out there. Kids were taken out of Head Start. They realized their error and they made some different changes and they restored the money out there.

I asked my people: Ok. You got your money back?

They said: Yes, but we still couldn't put our kids back because our costs went up so high under ObamaCare on health care for our employees that we had to put all of that into health care. That was not how it was supposed to work either, but that is how ObamaCare works.

They also talk about us cutting Pell grants. We moved Pell from mandatory to discretionary. It was not cut. It was moved so it could be reviewed on a regular basis, just like everything else. The estate tax was mentioned. Again, that is a Committee on Finance issue that would have to be dealt with. It has not been given approval for all the years that have been asked for, but that does not mean somebody cannot request it. We will see if the Finance Committee can find some way to do it.

I think we can tell from the discussion that probably was not going to happen. The numbers speak, and the speculation does not. But here are some of the things this budget does: It balances the budget within 10 years without raising taxes. It achieves more than $5 trillion in savings, so it puts us on a slope to get to a balanced budget in 9 years. It produces a $32 billion surplus in 2024 and a $24 billion surplus in 2025 and it stays in balance. It boosts the Nation's economy by more than $400 billion in additional economic growth over the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. It is expected to grow 1.2 million additional jobs over the next 10 years—again, according to the Congressional Budget Office statement.

The balanced budget ensures a strong national defense. Yes, that is in there. The balanced budget provides for repeal and replacement of ObamaCare. The balanced budget preserves Medicare. We heard about these cuts to Medicare. There are some savings in Medicare. Under our plan, instead of those being spent on other programs outside of Medicare, those are to be used for Medicare.

We already saw that we did the doc fix. That is so the doctors would be adequately paid so they would continue to take Medicare patients—very important. That is taken care of in this budget. The balanced budget supports stronger economic growth. Note that the boost in economic growth will all come from the private sector. Government spending does not contribute to this growth.

As my fellow Budget Committee member and businessman Senator PERDUE notes, expanding government does not help grow the economy.

The budget agreement improves transparency, efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of the Federal Government by cutting waste and eliminating redundancies and enacting regulatory reform. It calls for modernizing Medicaid by increasing State flexibility and protecting those most in need of assistance. It improves honest and responsible accounting practices as part of the Federal budget process by ensuring that fair value accounting is used, which provides a more honest accounting method.

I am the first accountant to chair the Budget Committee. It is very important for me to have it so we can tell exactly where things are going, not just in the first 10 years, which is what we have been typically doing, but looking at the outlying numbers too.

We are going through a baby boom retirement right now, and the number of people under Social Security is going just like that.

We did not change Social Security. Under the Budget Act, we are not allowed to change Social Security, but we are going to have to take a look at it. Looking at those numbers in the long term is going to force both sides of the aisle to take a look at what we need to do to save what we are used to.

This new honest accounting will tell us more accurately what the legislation will cost the hard-working taxpayers. It improves the administration and coordination of benefits, and it increases employment opportunities for disabled workers. It calls on Congress to pass a balanced budget amendment for the Constitution. There are a bunch of States that are working on it and 27 States passed the requirement for us to do that. Nine other States are close behind. If seven of the nine agree to that, we will have to actually balance the budget.

How difficult is that? Last year, we overspent $468 billion. The dollars that we get to actually make decisions on are about $1,100 billion. Some people call that $1.1 trillion. I do not think that really tells the story; 1,100 billion sounds like a lot more than $1.1 trillion. So $468 billion overspent on an $1,100 billion decision process, that is 50 percent. If we were to balance the budget, we would have to cut that by 50 percent, and people really would be concerned.

Why do we have to do that? Interest rates alone will cause us to do that. If the interest rates go up to what they normally would be—right now we are spending $230 billion, and that is at an interest rate of 1.7 percent. With interest rates rising, we would have to spend $1,745 billion over the next 10 years just on interest.

Another reason we need to get this budget done is so appropriators can get started. They are the ones that do the spending bills. There are 12 spending bills out there that get into the specifics of the things we are spending. All we did was give a blueprint for the overall picture for each of those 12 spending committees. But they need to take a look at what they have jurisdiction over and see where there is duplication, fraud, waste, and programs that are not even working.

We have a bunch of programs out there that we have not reauthorized. That means they have expired, but we are still spending money on them—$293 billion a year on them. We have to do better.

There are two ways we can make a difference. We can look at those 260 programs and see if—if they have not been looked at for a long time, see if there couldn't be some savings there. Secondly, we can try to grow the private sector economy. Private sector growth by 1 percent would provide more than $300 billion in additional tax revenue every year. That almost balances the budget by itself.

There are some things we can do if we start looking at how we can keep from impeding business, get business going and make it more competitive in the United States, and we can do better.

I hope the people will all support the budget we have. It isn't perfect. We had a short time to work on it compared to the time the other side had to work on it in previous years, but we did it, and now we need to finish it.

I ask for my colleagues' support on the budget.

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

Under the previous order, all time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11.

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Collins	Gardner
Ayotte	Corker	Graham
Barrasso	Cornyn	Grassley
Blunt	Cotton	Hatch
Boozman	Crapo	Heller
Burr	Daines	Hoeven
Capito	Enzi	Inhofe
Cassidy	Ernst	Isakson
Coats	Fischer	Johnson
Cochran	Flake	Kirk

Lankford	Portman	Sessions
Lee	Risch	Shelby
McCain	Roberts	Sullivan
McConnell	Rounds	Thune
Moran	Rubio	Tillis
Murkowski	Sasse	Toomey
Perdue	Scott	Wicker

NAYS—48

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

NOT VOTING—1

Vitter

The conference report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the veto message.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Bennet	Boozman
Ayotte	Blumenthal	Boxer
Baldwin	Blunt	Brown
Barrasso	Booker	Burr
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Peters
Capito	Heller	Portman
Cardin	Hirono	Reed
Carper	Hoeven	Reid
Casey	Inhofe	Risch
Cassidy	Isakson	Roberts
Coats	Johnson	Rounds
Cochran	Kaine	Rubio
Collins	King	Sanders
Coons	Kirk	Sasse
Corker	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cornyn	Lankford	Schumer
Cotton	Leahy	Scott
Crapo	Lee	Sessions
Daines	Manchin	Shaheen
Donnelly	Markey	Shelby
Durbin	McCain	Stabenow
Enzi	McCaskill	Sullivan
Ernst	McConnell	Tester
Feinstein	Menendez	Thune
Fischer	Merkley	Tillis
Flake	Mikulski	Toomey
Franken	Murkowski	Udall
Gardner	Murphy	Warner
Gillibrand	Murray	Warren
Graham	Nelson	Whitehouse
Hatch	Paul	Wicker
Heinrich	Perdue	Wyden

NAYS—3

Cruz	Grassley	Moran

NOT VOTING—1

Vitter

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT—Resumed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 1191, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1140, in the nature of a substitute.

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1179 (to amendment No. 1140), to require submission of all Persian text included in the agreement.

Blunt amendment No. 1155 (to amendment No. 1140), to extend the requirement for annual Department of Defense reports on the military power of Iran.

Vitter modified amendment No. 1186 (to amendment No. 1179), to require an assessment of inadequacies in the international monitoring and verification system as they relate to a nuclear agreement with Iran.

Cotton amendment No. 1197 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140), of a perfecting nature.

Cotton (for Rubio) amendment No. 1198 (to amendment No. 1197), to require a certification that Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the Corker amendment No. 1140 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Corker amendment No. 1140 to H.R. 1191, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Joni Ernst, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, Shelley Moore Capito, Thad Cochran, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Kelly Ayotte, Cory Gardner, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, John Cornyn.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to H.R. 1191 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 1191, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Joni Ernst, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, Shelley Moore Capito, Thad Cochran, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Kelly Ayotte, Cory Gardner, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, John Cornyn.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorums required under rule XXII be waived.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

The Senator from Iowa.

U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the U.S. Marshals Service performs many important functions. Marshals protect Federal judges, they transport Federal

prisoners, and they apprehend fugitives. The marshals operate the Witness Security Program, and they manage the Asset Forfeiture Program. The work is vital and sometimes even dangerous.

Given the important nature of the work, it is all the more essential that its leaders carry out their mission with integrity and openness. Unfortunately, the evidence suggests that there are serious questions about the leadership of the Marshals Service. The growing number of allegations brought to my office by whistleblowers is very alarming. It suggests there may be a pattern of mismanagement.

In several letters to the Justice Department, I have asked about multiple personnel actions allegedly driven by favoritism rather than merit.

The first example involves the Director of the U.S. Marshals Service, Stacia Hylton. In September 2011, Director Hylton sent an email from her personal email address to Kimberly Beal. At the time, Beal was the Deputy Assistant Director of the Asset Forfeiture Division. The email included the resume of an applicant for a highly paid contractor position.

Beal apparently went to unusual lengths to ensure that the applicant, who knew Director Hylton in college, was hired. Emails indicate that Ms. Beal inserted herself into the hiring process even though a contractor representative told her the applicant was unqualified. She directed subordinates to remain silent about the applicant's lack of qualifications. Ms. Beal traveled to Boston to interview the applicant in person. According to the whistleblower, she did not travel to interview other candidates for similar positions.

After the contractor hired the applicant, Director Hylton placed Ms. Beal in the position of Acting Assistant Director of the Asset Forfeiture Division—a position she now holds permanently.

In yet another example, an Assistant Director reportedly directed subordinates to offer a lucrative contract position to a person with whom she allegedly had a personal relationship. Gamesmanship of this sort undermines the confidence of dedicated Marshals Service employees in their leaders.

I could go on and on with examples such as these that have been pouring into my office.

Another problem area is the alleged mismanagement of the Assets Forfeiture Fund. The law requires that proceeds generated from asset sales be used to operate the Asset Forfeiture Program, compensate victims, and support law enforcement. Yet, it appears that some in leadership use the funds to feather their own nests. Money is spent on the ''best of the best'' in office furnishings and decorations instead of what is really needed to enhance law enforcement. In one example, the fund was used to purchase a $22,000 conference table. In another example, the fund was used to buy 57 square feet of top-of-the-line granite for the Asset Forfeiture Training Academy in Houston. The Marshals Service claims it cannot even figure out how much the granite cost. Whistleblowers say the official who approved it told the supplier that ''cost was not a factor.'' And that official has dismissed concerns about wasteful spending of asset forfeiture money on the grounds that it does not come from appropriated funds.

That is not responsible leadership. All money collected through the power of government needs to be spent carefully. Every dollar wasted on unnecessary luxuries in Marshals Services offices is a dollar that cannot be used to support real law enforcement priorities as the law requires. The proceeds of asset forfeitures should not be a slush fund for the personal whims of unaccountable bureaucrats.

How has the Justice Department responded to these allegations? When I asked the Department to explain the efforts to have Director Hylton's favorite candidate hired by a contractor, the Department told me that Director Hylton ''did not recommend'' the applicant ''for any position.'' And the words ''did not recommend for any position'' is a quote.

The Marshals Service says it consulted with its Office of General Counsel before the Department sent its letter denying any improper hiring practices. That is disturbing because the Office of General Counsel has known about these allegations since December 2013. Still, the Justice Department told me that no one did anything wrong. Someone in the Marshals Service General Counsel's Office had an obligation to speak up before the Justice Department issued a false denial. They should have known better.

About 3 weeks later, the Department retracted its earlier denial. In a second response, the Department attached additional evidence that, in its words, ''appears to be inconsistent with representations'' that it had previously made. That evidence was an email chain showing that then-Deputy Assistant Beal had, in fact, received the applicant's resume from Director Hylton's personal email address. She then forwarded it to other senior leadership, stating that the ''Director . . . highly recommends'' the applicant. That evidence directly contradicts the denial that the Department initially sent to the Judiciary Committee.

You would think the Department would insist on an independent inquiry after being misled like that. Unfortunately, the Department is still allowing the Marshals Service to investigate itself. Justice Department headquarters is not doing its job when it fails to supervise components within DOJ. There needs to be better supervision and a truly independent inquiry to get to the bottom of these allegations.

Finally, I recognize the courageous whistleblowers who are bringing these shortcomings to Congress's attention. As often happens, many of these whistleblowers have faced retaliation for just speaking up, just telling the truth, just helping Congress do its constitutional responsibilities. But they have been retaliated against, and even today they fear more retaliation will come. Multiple whistleblowers allege that senior leaders submit FOIA requests to seek information on employees who may have made protected disclosures. How sneaky. This is not the purpose of the Freedom of Information Act. Multiple whistleblowers also allege that since receiving my letters, managers within the U.S. Marshals Service have been on the hunt for the identities of those who have made protected disclosures to my office. This behavior is absolutely unacceptable and contrary to the intent of whistleblower protection legislation. Maybe instead of spending time targeting the people who are trying to bring wrongdoing to light, the marshals should focus on providing full and accurate answers to my questions.

The work of the Marshals Service is vital. The men and women doing that work deserve not just our gratitude but our support as well. That support includes demanding responsible and accountable leadership from the Marshals Service.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

MEDICAID

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about one aspect of the budget debate that has been before us, and it involves a major program that affects the lives of not just millions of Americans but literally tens of millions.

We have debates and discussions in this body all the time about our commitment to children, our commitment to older citizens, and a whole range of folks we are concerned about. All of us at one time or another have made pronouncements about how important it is to support children, especially vulnerable children. We also are very concerned that as our parents or older relatives reach a certain age, they get the quality care in the twilight of their lives that we would expect. They are helped through a range of programs and services, actually starting with Medicare.

So we are concerned about our children, we are concerned about our older citizens, and we are also concerned about the middle class. We hear a lot of us speaking about strategies or efforts to help boost the middle class and all of the challenges of the middle class. It

is interesting, though, that some issues affect all three of those broad groups of Americans. The issue I am going to talk about is Medicaid. It affects, obviously, children. It affects individuals with disabilities. It certainly affects older citizens across the country. And, indeed, it affects the middle class.

The Senate Republican budget cuts Medicaid funding by more than $1.3 trillion, and in my judgment—and this is an assertion of an opinion—it would end the program as we know it because of the dimensions of those cuts. The budget would repeal the Medicaid expansion, threatening health insurance for some 14 million Americans, and convert much of the program's funding into block grants.

Let me talk about seniors for a moment. We have had lots of debates about the best policy going forward in the budget as it relates to a whole range of issues, especially programs such as Medicaid. But at the end of the day, it is not the rhetoric or the speeches; it is the votes that tell where one stands and what we prioritize.

We all have our own personal stories about those who have gone before us, and we, of course, always remember our own parents. But when we are talking about our seniors, we are talking about Americans who fought our wars, worked in our factories, taught our children, built the middle class, and did so much for us, including giving us life and love. We want to make sure we are doing everything possible to provide them with the quality care they deserve when they reach the age of 65 or older.

We know Medicaid provides older beneficiaries the dignity in their later years that they should have a right to expect, as well as the flexibility to design where they receive care.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, over 40 percent of Medicaid spending on long-term services and supports goes towards home and community-based care. Many assume the Medicare Program—Medicare, not Medicaid—will cover long-term care. In fact, it is Medicaid that is the largest single provider of long-term care in America—not Medicare, but Medicaid.

Medicaid covers approximately 40 percent of all long-term care services provided in the United States, and 4 out of 10 people is a big number, obviously. It is lots of folks we care about and interact with in the course of a day, whether they are neighbors or family members or coworkers across the board.

As enrollment continues to grow, more Americans are relying upon Medicaid than ever before. Medicaid is the major long-term care program for the middle class. So I would ask we all keep that in mind as we consider the determinations made through the budget process.

Let me give one example of a man living in Philadelphia—his example and his mother's. After her husband's passing, this individual's mom had health problems and her health deteriorated quickly. Kidney problems forced her in and out of the hospital. She was living on a fixed income, with medical bills piling up. She sold her apartment and used that money to pay for a few more years of care. This woman and her son were using every penny they could to help with her care, but it wasn't enough. She needed constant assistance. Her son, as the only child in the family, couldn't do it himself while raising his own two children.

Eventually, this man's mother received Medicaid benefits and moved into a nursing home in Philadelphia. Her son says he doesn't know what his family would have done without Medicaid. Paying for nursing home care would have quickly eaten his salary, and he would have had to sell his family home. Again, he was raising two children. Medicaid allowed him to avoid that vicious cycle.

Like millions of Americans, this man went to school and worked hard to get a good job so he could make a decent living. But despite being employed as a professional, without Medicaid to help his mom, he would have had to impoverish his own family—his two children—to care for his aging mom. This would have put his children's future at risk.

Medicaid offered this individual some help—obviously, his mother some help—in providing for his family and offering a way to have his mother get the care she needed.

This is not atypical. This is reality for so many families. Here is one quick statistic. Then I will move to children, and then I will wrap up.

In Pennsylvania, seniors accounted for just 10 percent of Medicaid enrollees but over 22 percent of spending in 2011. The national numbers aren't much different than that. The number of enrollees might be around 10 percent or in that lower range, but the spending, because of the kind of care they received, is of a higher cost.

Let me talk for a couple of minutes about children. Together, Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, which we know as CHIP, served more than 45 million children in Federal fiscal year 2013, representing one in three children in the United States. So Medicaid plus CHIP is the health care for more than one in three children.

We know CHIP is the health insurance program that impacts a lot of middle-income or at least lower-income families with children. In Pennsylvania, for example, just the Medicaid Program covered 34 percent of children ages 0 to 18. So just a little more than a third of Pennsylvania children rely upon Medicaid—a critically important program for those children.

One of the groups here in Washington that tracks programs and policies for children is First Focus. They had a report in September of 2014 where they reported that in calendar year 2012, 47 percent of rural children were covered by public insurance, meaning Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program or maybe a third option. So 47 percent of rural children were covered by public health insurance and only 38 percent of urban children.

I know that sounds counterintuitive for some here, but rural children in America rely substantially upon Medicaid and the CHIP program. So improving access to health insurance for low-income children not only leads to better health outcomes in the short run and in the long run, but it also improves educational outcomes and government savings in the long term.

Compared to their uninsured counterparts, children covered by Medicaid or CHIP are more likely to complete high school and college. These important programs help children literally succeed in life because they stay in school, whereas they would not at that rate if they were uninsured.

Some claim Medicaid is a highly inefficient program—that is one of the charges against it—whose costs are growing out of control. In fact, Medicaid's cost per child is 27 percent lower than the per-child cost for private insurance. And Medicaid's costs per beneficiary have been growing more slowly—per beneficiary costs—than under private coverage. I would argue it is not only efficient but effective in delivering quality health care to our children.

We know there is more to be done. We know there are improvements that Medicaid could incorporate. We need to improve dental and behavioral health care for children and increase access to screenings and vaccinations to make sure our children are protected.

Let me just close with a couple of observations about children and pregnant women. We know that Medicaid is also an important addition for children, but it is very important for pregnant women, with prenatal, labor, delivery, and postpartum care.

Nationwide, Medicaid finances 45 percent of all births—45 percent. We have a lot of folks in both parties who say how much they care about pregnant women and children. Well, if 45 percent of all births are in Medicaid, we better protect Medicaid. It is vitally important.

Children who have health insurance, such as Medicaid and CHIP, are more likely to receive vaccinations, have regular medical checkups, and avoid preventable childhood illnesses.

So let me conclude with this thought. We know we have to find savings. We know we have to work towards a fiscally responsible budget. But I don't think anyone here believes the way to do that is to do it on the

backs of children who are poor but receive good health care through Medicaid or to do it by way of short-circuiting or limiting substantially the opportunities that older citizens have to go to a nursing home. Everyone in this building knows someone who is in a nursing home solely because of Medicaid—not everyone, but plenty of people either we know and love or people we know and encounter during the course of the year.

So if we care about pregnant women, if we care about kids, if we care about older citizens and individuals with disabilities, we should think long and hard before we substantially cut, as this budget does, Medicaid.

With that, I yield the floor.

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this week, the Senate is poised to pass the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2015. The law enforcement community is unified in its support of this program because it quite simply saves lives. To date, this program has provided more than 13,000 State and local law enforcement agencies with nearly 1.2 million bulletproof vests, including nearly 4,400 to officers in Vermont.

Senator GRAHAM and I have been working to address any and all concerns that certain Republican Senators have raised about the bill. We are prepared, for example, to accept an amendment from Senator LEE that would reduce the authorization level from $30 million annually to $25 million. Unfortunately, I learned yesterday that a single Republican Senator continues to maintain a hold on this bill, continuing a pattern from the last Congress of unwarranted obstructionism. I have been in contact with a number of law enforcement groups representing officers around the country, and I know that they are all incredibly disappointed that this bill continues to be blocked.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership has helped to establish protective vests as standard equipment for law enforcement agencies across the country. Yet, for far too many jurisdictions—especially rural and smaller agencies—vests still cost too much and wear out too soon. We know that bulletproof vests will not save every officer, but they have already saved the lives of more than 3,000 law enforcement officers since 1987. I have met with police officers who are alive today because of vests purchased through this program, and they will attest to the fact that this program saves lives. These vests also are a comfort for families, to know that their loved ones have them.

While I will keep fighting for passage of this bulletproof vest legislation, we must also make sure that our work to make our communities safer for all continues. Over the past few years, the Senate has come together to protect victims of sexual assault and domestic violence by reauthorizing and reinvigorating the Violence Against Women Act. We have worked to protect racial and religious minorities and the LGBT community when we passed the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act. We came together to pass the Innocence Protection Act and the Drug Free Communities Act. And just a few months ago, we came together to enact the Death in Custody Act to bring needed transparency to every death that occurs in police custody, and we need to do more to prevent such tragedies.

In the coming weeks, I hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will turn its attention to the bipartisan effort to end mass incarceration. I am working with Chairman GRASSLEY on the importance of legal representation for those accused of misdemeanor offenses. Chairman GRASSLEY is working with Senator WHITEHOUSE and others to improve our juvenile justice system. Senator RAND PAUL and I are working to eliminate mandatory minimum sentences. I also support the work of Senators DURBIN and LEE, who are seeking to reduce mandatory minimum sentences for certain drug crimes. We have historic opportunity to restore the faith that Americans should have in the justice system. If we work together, I know we can make meaningful improvements so that our entire justice system lives up to its name.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 169 on the nomination of Willie E. May to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

RECOGNIZING FUTURE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to honor 52 high school seniors in Southern New Jersey for their commendable decision to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces. Of these 52, 13 have elected to join the U.S. Army: Mark Beverley, Thomas Connor, Jose Espinal, Luis Mansilla, Tyler Trappanese, Luis Rodriguez, Alexander Wallingford, Jacob Hoey, Karl Steinbach, Jason Jastillana, Marlett Eilenberger, Cordell Huesser, and Lorenzo Morales. Six have joined the U.S. Navy: Imani Glover, Jasmine Wilson, Kevin Pawlowski, Michael Livesey, Rebecca Herrera, Darrian Shufford. Four have elected to join the U.S. Air Force: Angel Gomez, Roselynn McPherson, Cachina Stevenson-Bisom, Christopher Pugliese. Thirteen have elected to join the U.S. Marine Corps: Ramon Paige, Jonathan Balonaguilan, Garrett Gudauskas, Nakee King, Howard Morgan, Christian Lidel, Aliyah Ortiz, Christian Godshall, Nhiem Bien, Cheavin Kim, Danvil Coombs, James Boyd, Policarpo Tovar. Sixteen have elected to join the New Jersey National Guard: Andrea Perez, Nini Tran, Thang Ngo, Edward Hutchinson, Muquim Shah, Troy Logan, Michael Wallace, Jr., Richard Scott, Ethan West, Jabari Ashanti, James Bartleson, Paul Mueller, Jr., Kristoffer Flores, Kelsey Hohenberger, Michelle Rivera, Dominic White. These 52 will also be honored on May 19, 2015 at an ''Our Community Salutes of South Jersey'' recognition ceremony in Voorhees Township, NJ.

The future of our Nation remains strong because of young men and women, like these 52 individuals, who have decided to step forward and commit themselves to the defense of our Nation and to upholding the ideals upon which it was founded. Indeed, these New Jerseyans represent the very best of America, and they should rest assured that the full support of the Senate as well as the American people, are with them in whatever challenges may lie ahead.

It is thanks to the dedication of untold numbers of patriots like these 52 that we are able to meet here today, in the Senate, and openly debate the best solutions to the many and diverse problems that confront our country. It is thanks to their sacrifices that the United States of America remains a beacon of hope and freedom throughout the world. We owe them, along with all those who serve our country, a deep debt of gratitude.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO'S INTEGRATIVE COMMUNITY STUDIES PROGRAM

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate 11 students who will be graduating tomorrow at the University of North Carolina-Greensboro. While celebrations will abound across our country for the class of 2015, I want to highlight this very special group who, I must say, stands above the rest for their achievement.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro works with its nonprofit partner Beyond Academics to provide students who have intellectual and developmental disabilities a 4-year course of study that promotes self-determination, life planning, and career development. They call it the Integrative Community Studies program. These students learn how to build their own lives through employment and self-sufficient living. I have long supported these efforts and believe that anyone who cares about outcomes for individuals with disabilities should

look no further than UNC-G and Beyond Academics as an example for promoting success.

This is a particularly special graduation day as it is the fifth graduating class since this course of study was created, and is the largest class to date. In sum, a total of 34 graduates are now better prepared to live self-sufficient lives that will not only make themselves better, but the community around them better as well. I couldn't be prouder of all of them.

What started only about a decade ago as a community-wide effort in my homestate, has grown to, in my opinion, one of the most exciting things being done in the country for this community.

It is with great enthusiasm and awe that I share with my colleagues this truly important day for these graduates and this wonderful program.

RECOGNIZING DR. WALTER NOLTE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to recognize Dr. Walt Nolte, who will retire on June 30, 2015, after 11 years as president of Casper College.

Dr. Nolte and his wife Becky joined Casper College on July 1, 2004, becoming the seventh chief executive officer in the college's 63-year history. He served as an administrator in several States, but Casper College was the institution he chose to call home longer than any other.

Dr. Nolte has been Casper College's ''Great Communicator.'' He is a leader guided by the principle of doing what is best for the team. He has actively encouraged and developed open dialog between the college's governing bodies. He has provided constant encouragement and participation within the college community to uphold Casper College's mission: education for a lifetime. His understanding of the value of community partnership has enabled the college to build one of the highest rates of civic engagement of any Wyoming college.

In addition to guiding an excellent curriculum, Dr. Nolte has always maintained that the campus facilities must be a priority. He is a leader who looks to the future and meets challenges head-on. In just 11 years, he was able to secure voter and community support for critical improvements to Casper College during a national economic downturn.

Dr. Nolte has been recognized at the regional and national level for his leadership. The National Council for Marketing and Public Relations District No. 4 named him their 2011 Pacesetter of the Year. He was also named a distinguished graduate of the University of Texas at Austin College of Education, and in 2011, Walt was named the first recipients of the Tacoma County Community College Distinguished Alumnus Award.

John E. Roueche, Ph.D., arguably the foremost scholar on community college leadership, recently wrote

Dr. Nolte is one of those rare leaders who practices well what he preaches, leading by his own excellent example. He is also a leader who is quite comfortable in his own skin and delights in the success of all on his team. He truly understands that the community college is of, by and for the community.

Dr. Walt Nolte's legacy will benefit the college, the community of Casper, and the great State of Wyoming for years to come. My wife Bobbi and I wish him the very best as he embarks on the next chapter of his life.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, IPFW, on its 50th anniversary. I also want to recognize the outstanding faculty and staff for the extraordinary impact they have had on the education and lives of countless students.

IPFW now is the largest university in northeast Indiana, providing a critical foundation for thousands of Hoosiers who then use their skills and education to contribute to the surrounding community. In fact, 75 percent of IPFW alumni live and work in northeast Indiana.

In 1964, Indiana University and Purdue University merged their Fort Wayne campuses to form IPFW, and the campus administration formally combined in 1975. In the 1990s, IPFW opened the doors of some of its major, state-of-the-art facilities, which paved the way for larger student enrollment. By 2000, more than 10,500 students were enrolled, and in 2004, campus housing opened, allowing students to live and learn at IPFW for the first time. The campus went on to set a new enrollment record in the 2010–2011 school year with 14,192 students.

IPFW prides itself on keeping class sizes small in order to maintain high-quality, individualized instruction. This gives IPFW students the chance to be on a first-name basis with experts in their field of study and affords them the opportunity to develop a network of professional contacts. The IPFW curriculum offers a wide variety of classes with more than 200 academic programs, including undergraduate, graduate, and online; more than 230 partnerships with businesses and educational organizations; and a growing number of scholarships that afford Hoosiers from all backgrounds the opportunity to learn and thrive in an academic setting. For the past 50 years, IPFW has worked to fulfill its mission to be an exceptional environment for teaching, learning, and student achievement.

Outside of the classroom, IPFW excels, too. The Mastodons now compete as a member of the NCAA Division I Athletics and fields 14 varsity teams. IPFW previously competed in Division II of the NCAA, where in 1993, the men's basketball team won a school-record 23 games and achieved the No. 4 ranking among Division II teams. IPFW's men's volleyball team, commonly known on campus as the Volleydons, has gained national recognition with strong postseason showings, making six NCAA Tournament Final Four appearances and reaching the 2007 NCAA National Tournament Final. Former Mastodon setter Lloy Ball won an Olympic Gold Medal in the 2008 Beijing Games. IPFW athletics has many achievements to recognize, all the while meeting high academic standards in the classroom.

For five decades, IPFW has provided northeastern Indiana and students across the State and country with the opportunity to achieve their dreams through higher education. IPFW remains representative of the hard work, dedication, and innovation that are fundamental parts of the Hoosier spirit. I want to congratulate Chancellor Vicky L. Carwein, the entire faculty and staff, and students both past and present, on this important anniversary. I am confident IPFW will continue to be a fixture in northeast Indiana and know the faculty and staff will continue to provide an outstanding education to our students in the years to come. On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate each and every member of the IPFW community on this 50th anniversary. I wish IPFW continued success and growth for many more years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING GRETCHEN KAFOURY

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, long ago, I decided the most complimentary statement one could make about an elected official boils down to four simple words: ''That person really cares.'' Those four words perfectly sum up Gretchen Kafoury's long record of public service in Portland and in Oregon.

From serving in the Peace Corps during the 1960s to teaching at Portland State University four decades later, Gretchen just cared—and then cared some more—about helping everyone have a better life.

Gretchen was the go-to leader in Portland and statewide in the fight to help women escape domestic violence. She was our conscience in the battle to help people of modest means have more affordable housing. And she was a pioneer for equal rights when she organized the campaign to force open the doors at the City Club of Portland for women.

Small in stature, Gretchen Kafoury had the biggest heart in Oregon. If you

didn't have power or clout or a political action committee—and you were talking about justice, Gretchen brought her smarts, her energy, and her persistence to your cause.

I met Gretchen shortly after I graduated from law school at the University of Oregon and was starting the Oregon Gray Panthers with another admirer of Gretchen's—Ruth Haefner.

When you visited Ruth's house in Northeast Portland, you would see it filled with literature from progressive seniors for good causes. And I clearly remember how those progressive seniors thought Gretchen was spot on, for example, in developing the first health clinic for teenagers at Roosevelt High School.

Gretchen was incredibly helpful to the Gray Panthers in those days when she served in the Oregon Legislature as our State passed a generic drug law, home care for seniors, and new rules to stop rip-off artists scamming health insurance to seniors.

Before Gretchen worked to crack down on those scamsters, it was common to see seniors with as many as 8 to 10 worthless health insurance policies that fast-talking salesmen had sold them. Those phony salesmen never stood a chance when Gretchen fought to stop business practices that fleeced the elderly.

When I ran for Congress in 1980, virtually no established elected officials were in my corner. Gretchen was one of those folks in a group so tiny it could have fit in a couple of phone booths. I had never run for public office but—with help and encouragement from Gretchen and seniors—I wanted to go to Washington to work on the very issues Gretchen championed. I was proud she was in my corner every step of the way.

Over the years when I would see Gretchen at a housing rally, a domestic violence conference, or an event to help nurses and other health care providers get better care for Oregonians at lower cost, I would always see Gretchen and start to smile. That is because her caring was so infectious and her passion to help people who needed help was so powerful.

She prompted so many others to become involved in public life, not the least of whom are her two daughters, one of whom is Multnomah County Chair Deborah Kafoury.

How lucky all Oregonians were to have Gretchen, and how lucky I was that she was my friend.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2028. An act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2028. An act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–1510. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Addition to Certain Persons to the Entity List'' (RIN0694–AG58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1511. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Minority and Women Inclusion Amendments'' (RIN2590–AA67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1512. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Travelers' Information Stations; American Association of Information Radio Operators Petition for Ruling on Travelers' Information Station Rules; Highway Information Systems, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking; American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Petition for Rulemaking'' ((FCC 15–37) (PS Docket No. 09–19)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1513. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–029); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1514. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–011); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1515. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–008); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1516. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of the Government of Cuba's compliance with the United States-Cuba September 1994 ''Joint Communique'' and on the treatment of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 ''Joint Statement''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1517. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fenazaquin; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9925–97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1518. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defensin Proteins (SoD2 and SoD7) derived from spinach (Spinacia oleracea L.) in Citrus Plants; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9926–99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1519. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Bacillus thuringiensis Cry2Ab2 Protein in Soybean; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9925–85) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1520. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''1-Octanol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9924–81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1521. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conservation Compliance'' (RIN0560–AI26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1522. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Authority of DOE Protective Force Officers That Are Federal Employees To Make Arrests Without a Warrant for Certain Crimes'' (RIN1994–AA03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1523. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1524. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Construction and Development Point Source Category; Correcting Amendment'' (FRL No. 9926–32–OW) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1,

2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1525. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; South Coast Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits'' (FRL No. 9926–77–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1526. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Revisions to Emissions Inventory Requirements, and General Provisions'' (FRL No. 9927–24–Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1527. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Partial Withdrawal of Technical Amendments Related to: Tier 3 Motor Vehicle Fuel and Quality Assurance Plan Provisions'' (FRL No. 9927–17–OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1528. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the six-month period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1529. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1530. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report relative to the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1531. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on National HIV Testing Goals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1532. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a performance report relative to the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1533. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Wage Methodology for the Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment H–2B Program'' (RIN1615–AC02 and RIN1205–AB69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1534. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1535. A communication from the Chair, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines that were proposed by the Commission during the 2014–2015 amendment cycle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1536. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an audit of the Garden for the period from January 1, 2013, through December 31, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1537. A communication from the Director of the Office of Information Policy, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Department's Freedom of Information Act Regulations'' ((RIN1105–AB43) (OAG 140)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1538. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment of H–2B Aliens in the United States'' (RIN1205–AB76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1539. A communication from the Chief Impact Analyst, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Health Care for Homeless Veterans Program'' (RIN2900–AO71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1540. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting proposed legislation entitled ''Department of Veterans Affairs Purchased Health Care Streamlining and Modernization Act''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1541. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Review of Medicare Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2013''; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 136. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service (Rept. No. 114–35).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 579. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–36).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1188. A bill to provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1189. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1190. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1191. A bill to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to convey certain property from the United States to the County of Marin, California; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1192. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to raise awareness of, and to educate breast cancer patients anticipating surgery, especially patients who are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, regarding the availability and coverage of breast reconstruction, prostheses, and other options; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent and expand the temporary minimum credit rate for the low-income housing tax credit program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1194. A bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to update the medical-vocational guidelines used in disability determinations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1195. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of postsecondary enrollment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1196. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way on Federal land; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1197. A bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to make publicly available on-line tools to allow individuals eligible for disability benefits to assess the impact of earnings on the individual's eligibility for, and amount of, benefits received through Federal and State benefit programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1198. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude certain medical sources of evidence in making disability determinations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1199. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to provide alternative fuel to Federal employees on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 167. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the courageous work and life of Argentinian prosecutor Alberto Nisman, and calling for a swift and transparent investigation into his tragic death in Buenos Aires on January 18, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 168. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. Res. 169. A resolution expressing condolences to the family of Dr. Warren Weinstein, and commemorating the life and work of Dr. Warren Weinstein; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 320

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 320, a bill to authorize the collection of supplemental payments to increase congressional investments in medical research, and for other purposes.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 523

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 523, a bill to coordinate the provision of energy retrofitting assistance to schools.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 608

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 608, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 611, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes.

S. 619

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to include among the principal trade negotiating objectives of the United States regarding commercial partnerships trade negotiating objectives with respect to discouraging activity that discourages, penalizes, or otherwise limits commercial relations with Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 621

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 621, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety and effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials approved for use in the prevention and control of animal diseases, in order to minimize the development of antibiotic-resistant bacteria.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 812, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 860, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 884

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 884, a bill to improve access to emergency medical services, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land

and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 911

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 911, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 968

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 968, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 970

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 970, a bill to allow more small insured depository institutions to qualify for the 18-month on-site examination cycle, and for other purposes.

S. 979

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 1049

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to allow the financing by United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1062

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1062, a bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1135

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1135, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1195. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of postsecondary enrollment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, when my colleagues and I went to college, things were a lot different. Our colleagues took out loans, but those loans were manageable, and there were jobs waiting after graduation. Today, too often, that is simply not the case. In fact, the majority of students today will leave school weighed down with an average of more than $31,000 in debt.

Investment in higher education is an economic imperative. Education is the great equalizer. It enables upward economic mobility and breaks down class structures. A highly skilled and educated workforce is the basis for any healthy economy. It is the foundation of our country's future.

In nearly every financial decision Americans make, individuals and families try to evaluate the economic value of that decision. Like prospective homebuyers who inspect and assess the potential value of their future home, students should be able to compare colleges and programs based on what the likely return on their investment will be.

Our capital markets work best when there is transparency so we can accurately measure the value of what we choose to invest in. We saw what happens when this is not the case with the burst of the housing bubble. Parts of our economy have yet to recover from the mortgage crisis. Misinformed consumers bought a product based on misleading information and, often times, fell victim to bad loans offered by predatory lenders.

Consumers must know what they can expect from their investments. Similarly, students are entitled to know the value of their education before they borrow tens of thousands of dollars from banks and the government to finance their future.

Right now, consumers don't have this information. It is unavailable to students and families who are making critical decisions that will impact not only their future—both their financial future and career path—but also the collective future of our country. That is why today, Senator RUBIO, Senator WARNER and I are introducing an updated version of the Student Right to Know Before You Go Act which will help inform consumers and prevent market failures.

This proposal would ensure future students and their families can make well-informed decisions by creating a market in which specific schools and specific programs can be evaluated based on the average annual earnings and employment outcomes of graduates; rates of remedial enrollment and success of students that participate in remedial education; the percent of students that receive Federal, State, and institutional grant aid or loans by source; the average amount of total Federal loan debt of students upon graduation; the average amount of total Federal loan debt for students that do not complete a program; transfer success rates; and rates at which students continue on to higher levels of education.

The Department of Education has created a College Scorecard which is a step in the right direction. The Scorecard, however, does not fully capture any of the metrics outlined above. The Wyden-Rubio-Warner bill generates this critical information.

Markets fail when there is too little information and until now, it has been impossible to collect this data in a cost-effective way while ensuring student privacy.

This proposal makes it possible to secure a return on investment—for students, parents, policymakers, and taxpayers—while creating a workforce that meets the demands of today's

businesses and ensures that American workers can successfully compete in the global economy.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 167—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE COURAGEOUS WORK AND LIFE OF ARGENTINIAN PROSECUTOR ALBERTO NISMAN, AND CALLING FOR A SWIFT AND TRANSPARENT INVESTIGATION INTO HIS TRAGIC DEATH IN BUENOS AIRES ON JANUARY 18, 2015

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 167

Whereas the bombing of the Argentine Israelite Mutual Association (AMIA) in Buenos Aires, Argentina, on July 18, 1994, killed 85 people and wounded more than 300;

Whereas the AMIA bombing case has been marked by judicial misconduct, and the investigation had reached an impasse in 2004;

Whereas, in September 2004, Alberto Nisman was appointed as the Special Prosecutor in charge of the 1994 AMIA bombing investigation;

Whereas, on October 25, 2006, Argentine prosecutors Alberto Nisman and Marcelo Martínez Burgos formally accused the Government of Iran of directing the bombing, and the Hezbollah militia of carrying it out;

Whereas Ibrahim Hussain Berro, a member of the terrorist group Hezbollah, was identified as the AMIA bomber;

Whereas Iranians Ali Fallahijan (former Iranian Intelligence Minster), Mohsen Rabbani (former Iranian cultural attaché), Ahmad Reza Asghari (former Iranian Diplomat), Ahmad Vahidi (former Iranian Minister of Defense), Ali Akbar Velayati (former Iranian Foreign Minister), Mohsen Rezaee (former Chief Commander of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps), and Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani (former President of Iran) were named as the Iranian suspects in the bombing;

Whereas Imad Fayez Moughnieh (former head of Hezbollah's external security) was named as a suspect in the bombing;

Whereas, in November 2007, Interpol voted to put 5 Iranian and 1 Lebanese suspect in the 1994 AMIA attack on its most wanted list;

Whereas, in 2007, a Guyanese man, Abdul Kadir, plotted to blow up JFK airport in New York and was, according to Mr. Nisman, ''the most important Iranian agent'' in Guyana and influenced by Mohsen Rabbani;

Whereas there are countries in Latin America, especially the group known as the Bolivarian Alliance (ALBA), that actively cooperate with the Government of Iran and maintain special relations with the Islamic Republic at various levels;

Whereas Iranians and other citizens from the Middle East have received passports from Venezuela or purchased them in other countries of the region associated with ALBA countries;

Whereas the Government of Iran has allegedly purchased uranium from Venezuela and Bolivia;

Whereas Hezbollah, Iran's proxy, cooperates with drug cartels in Latin America;

Whereas, in January of 2013, the Argentinian agreement with Iran set up a ''truth commission'' to investigate who was ''really'' responsible for the bombing, despite the fact that Iran remains the main suspect in such attack;

Whereas Alberto Nisman was invited to testify before Congress in February 2013, but was prevented by the Government of Argentina, who denied him permission to travel to Washington, DC, to testify;

Whereas, in May 2013, Prosecutor Alberto Nisman published a 500-page indictment accusing Iran of establishing terrorist networks throughout Latin America, including in Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Chile, Colombia, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, and Suriname, dating back to the 1980s;

Whereas, on January 13, 2015, Alberto Nisman alleged in a complaint that Argentinian President Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner and Minister of Foreign Relations Héctor Timerman conspired to cover up Iranian involvement in the 1994 terrorist bombing, and reportedly agreed to negotiate immunity for Iranian suspects and help get their names removed from the Interpol list;

Whereas Alberto Nisman alleged that Iranian oil was to flow to Argentina in exchange for Iran to purchase large quantities of Argentine grain and had evidence that reportedly included wire-taps of phone calls ''between people close to Mrs. Kirchner'' and a number of Iranians, including Mr. Rabbani, the Iranian diplomat;

Whereas Alberto Nisman was scheduled to present his new findings to the Argentinian Congress on January 19, 2015;

Whereas Alberto Nisman was found shot in the head in his apartment located in Buenos Aires on January 18, 2015;

Whereas, Diego Lagomarsino, the prosecutor's office employee who last saw Alberto Nisman alive and had provided Mr. Nisman with the revolver that was found at Mr. Nisman's residence, stated that Mr. Nisman had told him that ''it [the revolver] was for security'' and that the previous day Antonio Jaimie Stiusso (former head of Argentina's Intelligence service) had called, warning him to ''take care of his [Nisman's] security detail and his daughters' safety'';

Whereas officials of the Government of Argentina continue to discredit Mr. Nisman, attempting to ruin his reputation;

Whereas the President of Argentina continues to raise unfounded hypotheses with regard to Mr. Nisman's findings, including imaginary conspiracies she has suggested were orchestrated by United States hedge funds and other entities she considers ''hostile'' to the President of Argentina;

Whereas an Argentinean Federal court dismissed Nisman's findings against the president and other officials and later the accusations were dropped by Javier De Luca, another Federal prosecutor;

Whereas that move has raised questions in Argentina about the objectivity of Mr. De Luca, given his closeness to a group of Ms. Kirchner's supporters;

Whereas the ongoing official investigation into Alberto Nisman's death has yet to determine 2 months later whether his death is a suicide or a homicide;

Whereas an independent investigation launched by Alberto Nisman's family has released its own report by forensic experts and forensic pathologists showing that Mr. Nisman's death was not an accident or suicide, including claims that ''the prosecutor had been shot in the back of the head'', that ''no gun powder residue was found on his hands'', and that ''Mr. Nisman's body had been moved to the bathroom once he was shot''; and

Whereas no one has been brought to justice for the death of Alberto Nisman, nor have any of the named Iranian suspects for the AMIA bombing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) offers its sincerest condolences to the family of Argentinian prosecutor Alberto Nisman;

(2) recognizes Alberto Nisman's courageous work in dedicating his life to the investigation of the bombing of the Argentine Israelite Mutual Association (AMIA) in Buenos Aires, Argentina, which killed 85 people and wounded more than 300;

(3) calls for a swift, transparent, and internationally backed investigation into Alberto Nisman's tragic death;

(4) encourages the public release of the results of the investigation, including the forensic and pathological reports by the government, which would show whether Alberto Nisman took his own life, or if his death is a homicide;

(5) urges the President to directly offer United States technical assistance to the Government of Argentina in solving the death of Alberto Nisman, as well as the ongoing investigation of the AMIA bombing;

(6) expresses serious concern about Iran's terrorist network in Argentina, the United States, and all of the Western Hemisphere, mindful of the findings of Mr. Nisman's investigation and reports on this matter, and encourages continued investigations of Iranian terrorist networks based on his work;

(7) urges an independent investigation into the findings of Mr. Nisman regarding the events that led to the memorandum signed between Argentina and Iran;

(8) likewise expresses serious concerns about attempts by President Cristina Kirchner and her government to discredit Mr. Nisman and raise unfounded hypotheses on Mr. Nisman's findings and death findings while the work of the courts on this matter still continues; and

(9) urges the President of the United States to continue to monitor Iran's activities in Latin America and the Caribbean as it is mandated by the Countering Iran in the Western Hemisphere Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–220).

SENATE RESOLUTION 168—RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT THE CHALLENGES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM, AND ENCOURAGING CONGRESS TO IMPLEMENT POLICY TO IMPROVE THE LIVES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 168

Whereas National Foster Care Month was established more than 20 years ago—

(1) to bring foster care issues to the forefront of public consciousness;

(2) to highlight the importance of permanency for every child; and

(3) to recognize the essential role that foster parents, social workers, and advocates have in the lives of children in foster care throughout the United States;

Whereas all children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent home;

Whereas the primary goal of the foster care system is to ensure the safety and well-being of children while working to provide a safe, loving, and permanent home for each child;

Whereas approximately 400,000 children are living in foster care;

Whereas nearly 255,000 youth entered the foster care system in 2013, while more than 101,000 youth were eligible for and awaiting adoption at the end of 2013;

Whereas children of minority races and ethnicities are more likely to stay in the foster care system for longer periods of time and are less likely to be reunited with their biological families;

Whereas foster parents—

(1) are the front-line caregivers for children who cannot safely remain with their biological parents;

(2) provide physical care, emotional support, and education advocacy to the children in their care; and

(3) are the largest single source of families providing permanent homes for children transitioning from foster care to adoption;

Whereas children in foster care who are placed with relatives, compared to children placed with nonrelatives, have more stability, including fewer changes in placements, have more positive perceptions of their placements, are more likely to be placed with their siblings, and demonstrate fewer behavioral problems;

Whereas some relative caregivers receive less financial assistance and support services than foster caregivers;

Whereas children in foster care are 4 times more likely to receive psychotropic medications than children enrolled in Medicaid overall;

Whereas youth in foster care are much more likely to face educational instability, with 65 percent of former foster children experiencing at least 7 school changes while in foster care;

Whereas an increased emphasis on prevention and reunification services is necessary to reduce the number of children who are forced to remain in the foster care system;

Whereas more than 23,000 youth ''age out'' of foster care annually without a legal permanent connection to an adult or family;

Whereas the number of youth who age out of foster care has increased during the past decade;

Whereas foster care is intended to be a temporary placement, but children remain in the foster care system for an average of 2 years;

Whereas children in foster care experience an average of 3 different placements, which often leads to disruption of routines and the need to change schools and move away from siblings, extended families, and familiar surroundings;

Whereas children entering foster care often confront the widespread misperception that children in foster care are disruptive, unruly, and dangerous, even though placement in foster care is based on the actions of a parent or guardian, not the child;

Whereas children who age out of foster care lack the security and support of a biological or adoptive family and frequently struggle to secure affordable housing, obtain health insurance, pursue higher education, and acquire adequate employment;

Whereas States, localities, and communities should be encouraged to invest resources in preventative and reunification services and postpermanency programs to ensure that more children in foster care are provided with safe, loving, and permanent placements;

Whereas Federal legislation during the past 3 decades, including the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–272), the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89), the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–351), the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (Public Law 112–34), and the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (Public Law 113–183) provided new investments and services to improve the outcomes of children in the foster care system;

Whereas May 2015 is an appropriate month to designate as ''National Foster Care Month'' to provide an opportunity to acknowledge the accomplishments of the child-welfare workforce, foster parents, the advocacy community, and mentors for their dedication, accomplishments, and positive impact on the lives of children; and

Whereas much remains to be done to ensure that all children have a safe, loving, nurturing, and permanent family, regardless of age or special needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2015 as ''National Foster Care Month'';

(2) recognizes National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges that children face in the foster care system;

(3) encourages Congress to implement policies to improve the lives of children in the foster care system;

(4) acknowledges the special needs of children in the foster care system;

(5) recognizes youth in foster care throughout the United States for their ongoing tenacity, courage, and resilience while facing life challenges;

(6) acknowledges the exceptional alumni of the foster care system who serve as advocates and role models for youth who remain in care;

(7) honors the commitment and dedication of the individuals who work tirelessly to provide assistance and services to children in the foster care system; and

(8) reaffirms the need to continue working to improve the outcomes of all children in the foster care system through parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and other programs designed—

(A) to support vulnerable families;

(B) to invest in prevention and reunification services;

(C) to promote adoption in cases where reunification is not in the best interests of the child;

(D) to adequately serve children brought into the foster care system; and

(E) to facilitate the successful transition into adulthood for children who ''age out'' of the foster care system.

SENATE RESOLUTION 169—EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY OF DR. WARREN WEINSTEIN, AND COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND WORK OF DR. WARREN WEINSTEIN

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 169

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein was abducted in Lahore, Pakistan on August 13, 2011, and was held captive by al-Qaeda for nearly 4 years;

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein is widely recognized as a scholar and humanitarian who devoted his life to improving the lives of men, women, and children around the world;

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein selflessly suffered financial hardships and separation from his family, as many foreign service, military, development, and journalism personnel do, in order to serve the greater good and those in need;

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein was a Fulbright scholar who earned a master's degree and a Ph.D. in international law and economics from Columbia University;

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein served as a tenured professor with the political science department at SUNY Oswego;

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein served for 9 years at the Africa Bureau of the United States Agency for International Development and for 7 years at the International Finance Corporation, a division of the World Bank Group;

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein served as a Peace Corps Director in Togo and Ivory Coast;

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein served for 7 years as a development advisor in Pakistan for J.E. & Austin Associates, a contractor to the United States Agency for International Development;

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein was proficient in at least 7 languages;

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein had a home in Rockville, Maryland, where he lived with his family; and

Whereas Dr. Warren Weinstein is survived by his wife, 2 daughters, a son-in-law, a granddaughter, and a grandson: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) mourns the death of Dr. Warren Weinstein and expresses condolences to his family;

(2) salutes Dr. Warren Weinstein for his lifelong commitment to humanitarian development work in challenging and dangerous circumstances;

(3) calls on the United States to make the return of all citizens of the United States held captive abroad, regardless of the different circumstances, a top priority and to provide a coordinated and consistent approach to supporting hostages and the families of the hostages; and

(4) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Dr. Warren Weinstein.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1199. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 97, supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

SA 1200. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 97, supra.

SA 1201. Mr. CORKER (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1200 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) to the resolution S. Res. 97, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1199. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 97, supporting the goals of International Women's Day; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: ''That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of International Women's Day;

(2) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of countries to generate economic growth, sustainable democracy, and inclusive security;

(3) recognizes and honors individuals in the United States and around the world, including women who are human rights defenders, who have worked throughout history to ensure that women are guaranteed equality and basic human rights;

(4) reaffirms the commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women and girls worldwide, and to promoting meaningful and significant participation of women in all aspects of their societies and communities;

(5) supports efforts to establish a sustainable, measurable and global development framework that seeks to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment; and

(6) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women's Day with appropriate programs and activities.

SA 1200. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 97, supporting the goals of International Women's Day; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas there are more than 3,500,000,000 women in the world as of March 2015;

Whereas women around the world have fundamental rights, participate in the political, social, and economic life of their communities, play a critical role in providing and caring for their families, contribute substantially to the growth of economies and the prevention of conflict, and, as farmers and caregivers, play an important role in advancing food security for their communities;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas on September 24, 2014, the President highlighted the United States' support for the advancement of women, noting: ''Where women are full participants in a country's politics or economy, societies are more likely to succeed. And that's why we support the participation of women in parliaments and peace processes, schools, and the economy.'';

Whereas women remain underrepresented in conflict prevention and conflict resolution efforts, despite proven success by women in conflict-affected regions in moderating violent extremism, countering terrorism, resolving disputes through nonviolent mediation and negotiation, and stabilizing societies by improving access to peace and security services, institutions, and decisionmaking venues;

Whereas on December 19, 2011, the Obama Administration launched the first United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (referred to in this preamble as the ''National Action Plan'') that includes a comprehensive set of national commitments to advance the active participation of women in decisionmaking relating to matters of war and peace;

Whereas the National Action Plan states the following: ''Deadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be best forged and sustained, when women become equal partners in all aspects of peace-building and conflict prevention, when their lives are protected, their experiences considered, and their voices heard.'';

Whereas the National Action Plan requires the National Security Council staff to coordinate a comprehensive review of, and update to, the National Action Plan in 2015 with consultation from international partners and civil society organizations;

Whereas according to the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State, the full and meaningful participation of women in security forces vastly enhances the forces' effectiveness;

Whereas the ability of women and girls to realize their full potential is critical to the ability of a country to achieve strong and lasting economic growth and political and social stability;

Whereas according to the International Monetary Fund, ''focusing on the needs and empowerment of women is one of the keys to human development'';

Whereas according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, ⅔ of the 781,000,000 illiterate people in the world are female;

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development, compared to uneducated women, ''educated women are less likely to marry early and more likely to have smaller and healthier families. They are also more likely to get a job and earn a higher wage.'';

Whereas according to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the majority of women living in rural areas of the developing world are heavily engaged in agricultural labor, yet they receive less credit, land, agricultural inputs, and training than their male counterparts;

Whereas according to the United Nations, women have access to fewer income-earning opportunities and are more likely to manage the household and engage in agricultural work, making women more vulnerable to economic insecurity caused by natural disasters and long-term changes in weather patterns;

Whereas according to the World Bank, women own or partly own more than ⅓ of small and medium-sized enterprises in developing countries, and 40 percent of the global workforce is female, yet women entrepreneurs and employers have disproportionately less access to capital and other financial services compared to men;

Whereas despite strides in recent decades, women around the world continue to face significant obstacles in all aspects of their lives, including underrepresentation in all aspects of public life, denial of basic human rights, and discrimination;

Whereas despite achievements by individual female leaders, women around the world are still vastly underrepresented in high-level positions and in national and local legislatures and governments and, according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women account for only 21.9 percent of national parliamentarians;

Whereas it is estimated that 1 in 3 women around the world has experienced some form of physical or sexual violence;

Whereas according to the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime's 2012 Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, women account for between 55 and 60 percent of all trafficking victims detected worldwide, and women and girls together make up approximately 75 percent of all known trafficking victims;

Whereas 603,000,000 women live in countries where domestic violence has not been criminalized;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, approximately 800 women die from preventable causes related to pregnancy and childbirth every day, with 99 percent of all maternal deaths occurring in developing countries;

Whereas on August 10, 2012, the President announced the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, the first interagency strategy to address gender-based violence around the world;

Whereas violence against women and girls impedes progress in meeting many international global development goals, including efforts to stem maternal mortality and the spread of HIV/AIDS;

Whereas on October 11, 2013, the President strongly condemned the practice of child marriage;

Whereas according to the International Center for Research on Women, ⅓ of girls in the developing world are married before the age of 18, and 1 in 9 girls is married before the age of 15;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, suicide is the leading cause of death for girls ages 15 to 19, followed by complications from pregnancy and childbirth;

Whereas it is imperative to alleviate violence and discrimination against women and afford women every opportunity to be full and productive members of their communities;

Whereas 2015 marks the 20th anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women, where 189 countries committed to integrating gender equality into all dimensions of society;

Whereas 2015 marks the deadline for meeting the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, and progress towards meeting the targets for gender equality and women's empowerment remains uneven; and

Whereas March 8 is recognized each year as International Women's Day, a global day to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women past, present, and future, and to recognize the obstacles that women still face in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

---

SA 1201. Mr. CORKER (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1200 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) to the resolution S. Res. 97, supporting the goals of International Women's Day; as follows:

Strike the 13th whereas clause of the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development, compared to uneducated women, educated women are less likely to marry as children and more likely to have healthier families;

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room 328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Review of the U.S. Grain Standards Act.''

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled ''Surface Transportation Reauthorization: The Importance of a Long Term Reauthorization.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 5, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Continuing America's Leadership: Realizing the Promise of Precision Medicine for Patients.''

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Legal Implications of the Clean Power Plan.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE, TRANSNATIONAL CRIME, CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2015, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Review of Resources, Priorities and Programs in the FY 2016 State Department Budget Request.''

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 97 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 97) supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

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

Mr. CORKER. I further ask unanimous consent that the Corker substitute to the resolution be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the Corker substitute to the preamble be considered; the Lee amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the Corker substitute, as amended, be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 1199) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a complete substitute)

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: ''That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of International Women's Day;

(2) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of countries to generate economic growth, sustainable democracy, and inclusive security;

(3) recognizes and honors individuals in the United States and around the world, including women who are human rights defenders, who have worked throughout history to ensure that women are guaranteed equality and basic human rights;

(4) reaffirms the commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women and girls worldwide, and to promoting meaningful and significant participation of women in all aspects of their societies and communities;

(5) supports efforts to establish a sustainable, measurable and global development framework that seeks to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment; and

(6) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women's Day with appropriate programs and activities.

The resolution (S. Res. 97), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1200) was considered, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas there are more than 3,500,000,000 women in the world as of March 2015;

Whereas women around the world have fundamental rights, participate in the political, social, and economic life of their communities, play a critical role in providing and caring for their families, contribute substantially to the growth of economies and the prevention of conflict, and, as farmers and caregivers, play an important role in advancing food security for their communities;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas on September 24, 2014, the President highlighted the United States' support for the advancement of women, noting: ''Where women are full participants in a country's politics or economy, societies are more likely to succeed. And that's why we support the participation of women in parliaments and peace processes, schools, and the economy.'';

Whereas women remain underrepresented in conflict prevention and conflict resolution efforts, despite proven success by women in conflict-affected regions in moderating violent extremism, countering terrorism, resolving disputes through nonviolent mediation and negotiation, and stabilizing societies by improving access to peace and security services, institutions, and decisionmaking venues;

Whereas on December 19, 2011, the Obama Administration launched the first United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (referred to in this preamble as the ''National Action Plan'') that includes a comprehensive set of national commitments to advance the active participation of women in decisionmaking relating to matters of war and peace;

Whereas the National Action Plan states the following: ''Deadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be best forged and sustained, when women become

equal partners in all aspects of peace-building and conflict prevention, when their lives are protected, their experiences considered, and their voices heard.'';

Whereas the National Action Plan requires the National Security Council staff to coordinate a comprehensive review of, and update to, the National Action Plan in 2015 with consultation from international partners and civil society organizations;

Whereas according to the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State, the full and meaningful participation of women in security forces vastly enhances the forces' effectiveness;

Whereas the ability of women and girls to realize their full potential is critical to the ability of a country to achieve strong and lasting economic growth and political and social stability;

Whereas according to the International Monetary Fund, ''focusing on the needs and empowerment of women is one of the keys to human development'';

Whereas according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, ⅔ of the 781,000,000 illiterate people in the world are female;

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development, compared to uneducated women, ''educated women are less likely to marry early and more likely to have smaller and healthier families. They are also more likely to get a job and earn a higher wage.'';

Whereas according to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the majority of women living in rural areas of the developing world are heavily engaged in agricultural labor, yet they receive less credit, land, agricultural inputs, and training than their male counterparts;

Whereas according to the United Nations, women have access to fewer income-earning opportunities and are more likely to manage the household and engage in agricultural work, making women more vulnerable to economic insecurity caused by natural disasters and long-term changes in weather patterns;

Whereas according to the World Bank, women own or partly own more than ⅓ of small and medium-sized enterprises in developing countries, and 40 percent of the global workforce is female, yet women entrepreneurs and employers have disproportionately less access to capital and other financial services compared to men;

Whereas despite strides in recent decades, women around the world continue to face significant obstacles in all aspects of their lives, including underrepresentation in all aspects of public life, denial of basic human rights, and discrimination;

Whereas despite achievements by individual female leaders, women around the world are still vastly underrepresented in high-level positions and in national and local legislatures and governments and, according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women account for only 21.9 percent of national parliamentarians;

Whereas it is estimated that 1 in 3 women around the world has experienced some form of physical or sexual violence;

Whereas according to the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime's 2012 Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, women account for between 55 and 60 percent of all trafficking victims detected worldwide, and women and girls together make up approximately 75 percent of all known trafficking victims;

Whereas 603,000,000 women live in countries where domestic violence has not been criminalized;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, approximately 800 women die from preventable causes related to pregnancy and childbirth every day, with 99 percent of all maternal deaths occurring in developing countries;

Whereas on August 10, 2012, the President announced the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, the first interagency strategy to address gender-based violence around the world;

Whereas violence against women and girls impedes progress in meeting many international global development goals, including efforts to stem maternal mortality and the spread of HIV/AIDS;

Whereas on October 11, 2013, the President strongly condemned the practice of child marriage;

Whereas according to the International Center for Research on Women, ⅓ of girls in the developing world are married before the age of 18, and 1 in 9 girls is married before the age of 15;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, suicide is the leading cause of death for girls ages 15 to 19, followed by complications from pregnancy and childbirth;

Whereas it is imperative to alleviate violence and discrimination against women and afford women every opportunity to be full and productive members of their communities;

Whereas 2015 marks the 20th anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women, where 189 countries committed to integrating gender equality into all dimensions of society;

Whereas 2015 marks the deadline for meeting the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, and progress towards meeting the targets for gender equality and women's empowerment remains uneven; and

Whereas March 8 is recognized each year as International Women's Day, a global day to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women past, present, and future, and to recognize the obstacles that women still face in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

The amendment (No. 1201) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Strike the 13th whereas clause of the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development, compared to uneducated women, educated women are less likely to marry as children and more likely to have healthier families;

The amendment (No. 1200), as amended, in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 97

Whereas there are more than 3,500,000,000 women in the world as of March 2015;

Whereas women around the world have fundamental rights, participate in the political, social, and economic life of their communities, play a critical role in providing and caring for their families, contribute substantially to the growth of economies and the prevention of conflict, and, as farmers and caregivers, play an important role in advancing food security for their communities;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas on September 24, 2014, the President highlighted the United States' support for the advancement of women, noting: ''Where women are full participants in a country's politics or economy, societies are more likely to succeed. And that's why we support the participation of women in parliaments and peace processes, schools, and the economy.'';

Whereas women remain underrepresented in conflict prevention and conflict resolution efforts, despite proven success by women in conflict-affected regions in moderating violent extremism, countering terrorism, resolving disputes through nonviolent mediation and negotiation, and stabilizing societies by improving access to peace and security services, institutions, and decision-making venues;

Whereas on December 19, 2011, the Obama Administration launched the first United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (referred to in this preamble as the ''National Action Plan'') that includes a comprehensive set of national commitments to advance the active participation of women in decisionmaking relating to matters of war and peace;

Whereas the National Action Plan states the following: ''Deadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be best forged and sustained, when women become equal partners in all aspects of peace-building and conflict prevention, when their lives are protected, their experiences considered, and their voices heard.'';

Whereas the National Action Plan requires the National Security Council staff to coordinate a comprehensive review of, and update to, the National Action Plan in 2015 with consultation from international partners and civil society organizations;

Whereas according to the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State, the full and meaningful participation of women in security forces vastly enhances the forces' effectiveness;

Whereas the ability of women and girls to realize their full potential is critical to the ability of a country to achieve strong and lasting economic growth and political and social stability;

Whereas according to the International Monetary Fund, ''focusing on the needs and empowerment of women is one of the keys to human development'';

Whereas according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, ⅔ of the 781,000,000 illiterate people in the world are female;

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development, compared to uneducated women, educated women are less likely to marry as children and more likely to have healthier families;

Whereas according to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the majority of women living in rural areas of the developing world are heavily engaged in agricultural labor, yet they receive less credit, land, agricultural inputs, and training than their male counterparts;

Whereas according to the United Nations, women have access to fewer income-earning opportunities and are more likely to manage the household and engage in agricultural work, making women more vulnerable to

economic insecurity caused by natural disasters and long-term changes in weather patterns;

Whereas according to the World Bank, women own or partly own more than ⅓ of small and medium-sized enterprises in developing countries, and 40 percent of the global workforce is female, yet women entrepreneurs and employers have disproportionately less access to capital and other financial services compared to men;

Whereas despite strides in recent decades, women around the world continue to face significant obstacles in all aspects of their lives, including underrepresentation in all aspects of public life, denial of basic human rights, and discrimination;

Whereas despite achievements by individual female leaders, women around the world are still vastly underrepresented in high-level positions and in national and local legislatures and governments and, according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women account for only 21.9 percent of national parliamentarians;

Whereas it is estimated that 1 in 3 women around the world has experienced some form of physical or sexual violence;

Whereas according to the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime's 2012 Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, women account for between 55 and 60 percent of all trafficking victims detected worldwide, and women and girls together make up approximately 75 percent of all known trafficking victims;

Whereas 603,000,000 women live in countries where domestic violence has not been criminalized;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, approximately 800 women die from preventable causes related to pregnancy and childbirth every day, with 99 percent of all maternal deaths occurring in developing countries;

Whereas on August 10, 2012, the President announced the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, the first interagency strategy to address gender-based violence around the world;

Whereas violence against women and girls impedes progress in meeting many international global development goals, including efforts to stem maternal mortality and the spread of HIV/AIDS;

Whereas on October 11, 2013, the President strongly condemned the practice of child marriage;

Whereas according to the International Center for Research on Women, ⅓ of girls in the developing world are married before the age of 18, and 1 in 9 girls is married before the age of 15;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, suicide is the leading cause of death for girls ages 15 to 19, followed by complications from pregnancy and childbirth;

Whereas it is imperative to alleviate violence and discrimination against women and afford women every opportunity to be full and productive members of their communities;

Whereas 2015 marks the 20th anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women, where 189 countries committed to integrating gender equality into all dimensions of society;

Whereas 2015 marks the deadline for meeting the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, and progress towards meeting the targets for gender equality and women's empowerment remains uneven; and

Whereas March 8 is recognized each year as International Women's Day, a global day to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women past, present, and future, and to recognize the obstacles that women still face in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of International Women's Day;

(2) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of countries to generate economic growth, sustainable democracy, and inclusive security;

(3) recognizes and honors individuals in the United States and around the world, including women who are human rights defenders, who have worked throughout history to ensure that women are guaranteed equality and basic human rights;

(4) reaffirms the commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women and girls worldwide, and to promoting meaningful and significant participation of women in all aspects of their societies and communities;

(5) supports efforts to establish a sustainable, measurable and global development framework that seeks to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment; and

(6) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women's Day with appropriate programs and activities.

DAY OF RECOGNITION FOR EBOLA ORPHANS

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 155.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 155) establishing May 2, 2015, as a Day of Recognition for Ebola Orphans to express support for the children and families affected by the 2014 Ebola outbreak in West Africa by promoting awareness of the children of West Africa who have been orphaned by the 2014 Ebola epidemic, celebrating those who have recognized and are working to fulfill the needs of those children, and encouraging the people of the United States to continue to support the people of West Africa.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 155) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD on April 29, 2015, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY OF DR. WARREN WEINSTEIN

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 169.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 169) expressing condolences to the family of Dr. Warren Weinstein, and commemorating the life and work of Dr. Warren Weinstein.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 169) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 2015

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 6; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the time be equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the second half; finally, that following morning business the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1191.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:01 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 6, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING BRIAN KADING ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM IOWA ASSOCIATION OF ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Brian Kading on his retirement from the Iowa Association of Electric Cooperatives. He has spent the last 19 years as the Executive Vice President leading the organization during times of unprecedented change in the electric utility industry. Brian successfully guided the membership of the IAEC through deregulation in the mid-90s and has been the steady hand ever since.

When winter storms struck the co-ops, Brian's leadership ensured that the IAEC was prepared to provide the high level coordination necessary to get the trucks and the crews from in and out of state to the areas that were most needed.

Brian has been a tireless defender of the cooperative business model always keeping the organization focused on the cooperative principles. In recognition of his achievements, he received the William F. Matson Democracy Award, but in typical Brian Kading fashion, refused to accept the award and instead had the award given the IAEC grassroots advocates. Under his leadership the organization also received the Paul Revere Award which is a very proud accomplishment that recognizes a well-organized, highly motivated, broad based grassroots advocacy program.

Brian Kading has exemplified the cooperative principles and has truly lived the phrase he coined: ''Truth, Justice and the Cooperative Way.''

IN HONOR OF THE LAUNCHING OF DIRECT FLIGHTS BETWEEN DALLAS/FT. WORTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (DFW) AND BEIJING CAPITAL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (PEK)

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the May 7th launch of American Airlines Flight #89, a Boeing 777–200ER which is scheduled to depart DFW at 11:20 a.m. for the first direct flight to Beijing. This will be a significant milestone achievement, as obtaining direct service for North Texas to Beijing has been years in the making. I congratulate DFW Airport, the scores of state and local officials involved, and business and community leaders for their years of effort to land this new direct service from the 24th Congressional District to the capital of China.

American Airlines Flight #89 will add to the growing list of direct flights from DFW to Asia. North Texas passengers, as well as countless connecting passengers from across the United States and other countries, can now take advantage of American's direct service from DFW to Beijing, Hong Kong, Seoul, Shanghai, and Tokyo-Narita. Many businesses have operations in my district because of the easy and frequent access to direct flights from DFW. The Beijing service will make it easier for my constituents to travel to China and destinations throughout Asia for both business and leisure.

The new flight to Beijing continues the largest expansion in new international destinations from DFW in the airport's rich history. The Beijing flight will complement other recently added international service from DFW that spans the globe from Bogota to Sydney. This global route expansion will not stop with Beijing, as in June new service from DFW will begin to both Grand Cayman and Managua. Each of these new international routes results in new jobs and economic benefits for my constituents and all of North Texas.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize and congratulate Dallas/Ft. Worth International Airport and American Airlines on their starting direct service to Beijing.

HONORING THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART, CHAPTER 393

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to recognize the Military Order of the Purple Heart Chapter 393, a distinguished Veteran Service Organization in El Paso, Texas.

Since 1932, Chapter 393 has served our veteran population not just in El Paso County but also southern New Mexico. It has also been there for our Service Members stationed at Fort Bliss. Chapter 393 upholds the tenants of the Order of the Purple Heart by assisting veterans' families, providing memorial services, and engaging the community to help better serve veterans.

Chartered by Congress in 1958, The Military Order of the Purple Heart is composed of military men and women who received the Purple Heart Medal for wounds suffered in combat. Although its membership is restricted to the combat wounded, the organization supports all veterans and their families with a number of programs led by dedicated members like Robert Macias in El Paso. Mr. Macias is a national certified service officer and works tirelessly at the El Paso VA Outpatient Facility to ensure our community's veterans receive the care they deserve. I thank him for his leadership.

The Military Order of the Purple Heart Chapter 393 is an asset to our veteran community and the El Paso area. I thank the Military Order of the Purple Heart Chapter 393 for their commitment to honoring our veterans in the El Paso community.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORANGE MOUND IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125th anniversary of Orange Mound, an historic and cultural hub in Memphis, Tennessee. Founded in 1890, Orange Mound was the first American community developed specifically for African-Americans to buy land and purchase homes. From the early twentieth century into the 1970s, the community was said to be home to the largest concentration of African-Americans outside of Harlem, New York, and like Harlem, Orange Mound has a rich history of talent and economic independence.

Orange Mound is home to some of the most well-known leaders and entrepreneurs in Memphis. Its residents have included the late Judge Otis Higgs, Jr., the first African-American sheriff in Shelby County, Tennessee and an instrumental figure in overturning the runoff provision in Memphis' citywide races, which led to the election of the city's first African-American mayor. Fred Davis, the first African-American insurance policy writing agent in Tennessee, the first African-American to own an insurance agency in the South, the first African-American member of the Independent Insurance Agents of America and the first African-American Chairman of the Memphis City Council was also a noteworthy Memphian who claimed Orange Mound as his home.

Orange Mound is also well-known for Melrose High School, an all-black school that was also founded in 1890 and remains revered in the community today. Many great athletes lived in Orange Mound and attended Melrose, including NFL cornerback Barry Wilburn who played for eight seasons from 1985 to 1996 and won a Super Bowl ring with the Washington Redskins in their 42–10 victory at Super Bowl XXII. His father, Jesse, coached football at Melrose from 1959 to 1968 and his mother, Margaret, was a track and field bronze medalist in the 1956 Summer Olympics. Bobby ''Bingo'' Smith was a college All-

American basketball player at the University of Tulsa, a top ten pick in the 1969 NBA Draft and played for the San Diego Rockets, the Cleveland Cavaliers and the San Diego Clippers. Track star and Olympic gold (1996) and silver (1992) medalist Rochelle Stevens also attended Melrose and in 2007, the Memphis City Council renamed a street in her honor. Memphis State University (MSU) men's basketball coach Larry Finch, who helped ease race relations during a sharply divided era, led the Memphis State Tigers to the NCAA Tournament finals as a teammate, and then coached the team to its greatest number of wins, was also from Orange Mound and attended Melrose High School.

Other notable Melrose alumni athletes include 1968 to 1971 NFL player Sam Walton, who played for the New York Jets when they won Super Bowl III; Ronnie Robinson, who played at MSU with Larry Finch and helped lead the team to the 1973 Final Four; Melrose 1974 state champion and MSU point guard Alvin Wright, who also helped MSU to a four year record of 80–34; John ''Big John'' Gunn played for MSU from 1974 to 1976; power forward for MSU and 1979 NBA Round 2 draft pick James Bradley; All-American William Bedford who also played in the NBA from 1986 to 1993; and NFL player Jerome Woods from 1996 to 2005.

Melrose High School has also graduated top scholars, including Dellarontay Readus. Dellarontay scored a 31 on the ACT, is Melrose's class of 2015 valedictorian and was awarded a full academic scholarship by Stanford University. Melrose has also graduated three ''all college expenses paid'' Bill Gates Scholars.

In addition to being home to many Memphis greats, Orange Mound has served as a hub for live music and entertainment. The W.C. Handy Theater located on Park Avenue was built by a group of Memphis businessmen and was a popular entertainment attraction for several years. Such premier acts of the day included Count Basie, Sarah Vaughan, Lionel Hampton, and Memphis legends B.B. King, Bukka White and Willie Mitchell. Internationally famed jazz saxophonist and CEO of the Soulsville Foundation, Kirk Whalum, got his start in music playing for the Melrose High School band.

Religion has also been central to the Orange Mound community. It is the only community in America with six churches over 100 years old and many more that are over 75 years old. Particularly well-known churches include Mt. Pisgah CME Church at the corner of Park Avenue and Marchaneil, which was founded in the late 1870s and played a role in assisting activists during the Civil Rights Movement, and Mount Moriah Baptist Church, which was founded in 1879 before moving to its present-day location at the corner of David and Carnes Streets in 1883. Today, descendants of the founders of many churches in Orange Mound still attend these historic houses of worship and serve in the community.

Since 1990, Memphis has played host to the Southern Heritage Classic football game between Tennessee State University and Jackson State University at the Liberty Bowl Stadium, which helps form the northern border of Orange Mound. In that same year, the Orange Mound Parade Committee was formed to honor Memphian Fred Jones for his dedicated work in establishing the Southern Heritage Classic. As the Congressman for Tennessee's Ninth District, which includes Orange Mound, I have been honored to participate in this parade as it travels down Park Avenue and passes Melrose High School, homes, local businesses and Orange Mound's historic churches. I have met with the residents of Orange Mound and am always inspired by their commitment to the revitalization and renaissance of this historic community in America.

In commemoration of the anniversary, the United States Postal Office has issued a special postmark cancellation honoring Orange Mound. It was designed by the residents of Orange Mound and I was happy to work with the new Memphis Postmaster, Jennifer Vo, to make this a reality. As the first all African-American community in America that has been home to many internationally known African-Americans who have contributed to American culture, the Orange Mound community is truly part of American history and is deserving of this special recognition. As such, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 125th anniversary of Orange Mound in Memphis, Tennessee.

RECOGNIZING MARY AGEE ON HER RETIREMENT AS PRESIDENT AND CEO OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA FAMILY SERVICE

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mary Agee and her service as president and CEO of Northern Virginia Family Service (NVFS). She will step down in June after leading the agency, with distinction, for 27 years.

The organization we know today as the NVFS originated in 1924 in Alexandria, Virginia, as an organization with one volunteer and no operating budget. Mary Agee joined the staff of this organization as a family counselor in 1972 and rose to the position of deputy director in 1978. When she received this promotion NVFS had 11 staff and an annual operating budget of $178,000. Under her leadership the organization grew to its current size of 350 employees, 3,600 volunteers and operating budget of $32 million. NVFS is now the largest private, nonprofit human service organization in Northern Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, every year, almost 34,000 families and individuals utilize the human service programs offered by NVFS which include: housing and emergency services, early childhood programs, health & mental health services, workforce development programs, legal assistance, anti-hunger programs, and intervention & prevention programs. The NVFS has taken an aggressive role supporting community partnerships under the leadership of Mary Agee and has been able to collaborate with other human services agencies to provide comprehensive multi-agency service provisions for their clients. NVFS's dedicated approach to serving others has earned them an impeccable reputation for their ability to stabilize and assist families in crisis. They are truly angels in our community.

Following the devastating September 11th Terrorist Attacks at the Pentagon, NVFS was selected by the Community Foundation of the National Capital Area to manage the 9/11 Survivors' Fund. Mary Agee has said that the ability of the NVFS to directly provide the families of the victims of the attack with vital human services is the proudest moment in her nearly four decades of service to her community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mrs. Mary Agee upon her retirement from the Northern Virginia Family Service. Her dedicated hard work and service in the Northern Virginia Community has touched and improved the lives of countless families and individuals. We know she will continue to provide years of service to her community in whatever she chooses to do and we sincerely thank her for her service, and wish her the best on all future endeavors.

HONORING DR. ALAN RAY

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Dr. S. Alan Ray. After seven years of exemplary service as President of Elmhurst College he will be retiring in June of this year.

Since beginning his tenure at Elmhurst College in July of 2008, he has been vital to the development and execution of many transformative projects. On his first day he announced the first strategic planning process in the school's history. This plan set the ground work for the many improvements that would follow.

Under Dr. Ray's leadership, Elmhurst College has improved its standing in the Chicago Metropolitan area by forming partnerships with John Marshall Law School, Elmhurst Memorial Healthcare, Roosevelt University, and a variety of other institutions. Elmhurst College has also seen an increase in diversity, with a 20% increase in students of color during his 7 years.

In 2012, the School for Professional Studies was launched under the supervision of Dr. Ray. This new school is a source of graduate education as well as adult learning. These opportunities help those already in the workforce to remain competitive in our ever-changing economy.

I invite my colleagues to join me honoring Dr. S. Alan Ray for the work he has done for Elmhurst College, his community, and this great nation by helping to improve the lives of thousands of students. We thank him for his invaluable service, and wish him well in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING ASIAN-PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observance of Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month. I extend my warm wishes to all Asian-Pacific Americans (APA), whose contributions to our society cannot be understated. From our unique culture, culinary practices and art, to the construction of vital infrastructure and contributions to science and technology, APA's have always been at the forefront of American innovation.

In 1977, Congress declared the first week of May as Asian-Pacific American Heritage week; and in 1992 passed a resolution that set aside the entire month to recognize APA's and the many contributions that they have made to American culture, science and industry.

As the Senior, APA Republican in Congress, I want to take this opportunity to celebrate the beginning of Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month. I could not be more proud of the influence and contributions of those who came before me. It is their memory and sacrifices that drive me while performing my duties as the Member of Congress who represents American Samoa and I look forward to continuing the important work that they began.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the many contributions that APA's have made to this great nation and I ask that we carry this spirit throughout the entire year.

HONORING CAPTAIN GEORGE KLEIN

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Captain George Klein of the United States Army. Captain Klein served during World War II and fought valiantly during the invasion of Normandy. As a member of the 2nd Ranger Battalion, Captain Klein took part in the dangerous mission of scaling the cliffs at Pointe Du Hoc.

On June 6, 1944, Captain Klein led Fox Company as they began the invasion of Normandy. Upon landing, the Company charged the cliffs of Pointe Du Hoc and began to climb the 100 feet to the top. After scaling the cliffs Captain Klein was injured by a German soldier. Thankfully, Captain Klein was given medical treatment and recovered from his wounds in England.

Captain Klein will be returning to the cliffs at Pointe Du Hoc this year in recognition of the 71st anniversary of D-Day. Captain Klein's unwavering courage and gallantry displayed during the landing at Normandy deserves our utmost respect and gratitude. He is truly an American hero, and Illinois' 10th Congressional District is lucky to have him as a resident.

RECOGNIZING CINCO DE MAYO

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the holiday of Cinco de Mayo commemorating the victory of the Mexican Army 1862 over France at the Battle of Puebla during the Franco-Mexican War.

Certain of Victory, 6,000 French troops led by General Charles Latrille de Lorencez attacked the city of Puebla de Los Angeles, but the 2,000 Mexican soldiers led by the Texas-born General Zaragoza defeated the French with 100 casualties as opposed to the 500 soldiers lost by the French.

Cinco de Mayo has evolved in the United States into a celebration of Mexican culture and heritage.

Different traditions surrounding Cinco de Mayo include parades, mariachi music performances, and street festivals and the serving of foods such as tacos and mole poblano; specifically in areas with a large Mexican-American population.

Houston, Texas, along with Los Angeles, and Chicago are home to the largest Cinco de Mayo celebrations in the nation.

As of March 2014, Latinos made up 38.2% of the Texas population, so it is very important to recognize and celebrate their culture.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in the recognition of Cinco de Mayo and celebrate Mexican culture as well as the victory at the Battle of Pueblo.

HONORING THE AMERICAN LEGION, PASO DEL NORTE POST 58

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to recognize the American Legion Post 58 located in Northeast El Paso on Vulcan Avenue, also known as the El Paso Del Norte Post. I am pleased to recognize them as a distinguished Veteran Services Organization in my district.

As one of the largest VSOs in Texas, the Paso Del Norte Post's engagement with our veteran community is exemplary. Several of the officers at this post serve or have served on national committees and commissions of the American Legion. In the fall of 2014, a team from the American Legion national organization visited El Paso and worked with the El Paso VA to provide medical care to veterans in need. The visiting group of the American Legion, led by Verna Jones, Director of the Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation Division in Washington, D.C., also hosted a town hall at the El Paso Del Norte headquarters where over 400 veterans attended.

Post 58 further provided accommodations to their national counterparts for four additional days to assist veterans through their ''Veteran Crisis Command Center'' where a team known as a ''triage team'' was available to help veterans get access to the medical care they deserve. The American Legion Post 58's commitment to our community's veterans is remarkable and their team is comprised of dedicated veterans who volunteer their time to serve fellow veterans. The American Legion in my district is currently led by Richard Britton. I thank him for his leadership.

The American Legion Paso Del Norte Post 58 is an asset to our veteran community and El Paso. I thank Post 58 for their commitment to honoring our veterans and for helping strengthen the bonds in the El Paso community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF HAVEN

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize HAVEN and its staff and volunteers for their 40 years of service to domestic and sexual violence victims and their families. HAVEN is a nationally recognized non-profit leader whose survivor-centered services honor survivors as experts of their own experiences. HAVEN empowers nearly 30,000 people each year by providing shelter, counseling, advocacy and education programming.

HAVEN's vision of promoting a world of safe, equal and accountable communities is inspiring and moves us ever closer to eradicating sexual assault and domestic violence, especially against women and girls, who are disproportionately victimized by their partners and others. Their programs educate our community about recognizing abusive behaviors, understanding the problem and our role in prevention, and how we can refuse to contribute to a culture of domestic abuse. I join them in asserting their guiding principle, that we all have a right to live without fear.

HAVEN should also be commended on their recent groundbreaking for a new facility. The new campus will only expand their ability to provide medical, legal, educational, and economic support to survivors and their families. When they opened in 1975, there were no laws to protect victims from stalking or assault. This new facility will serve as a beacon of hope and a statement that their community will support and protect them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor HAVEN for their 40 years of leadership in combating domestic violence and sexual assault. I thank them for their commitment to our community and wish them many more years of success.

HONORING JAN ALDERTON OF THE CUMBERLAND TIMES-NEWS

HON. JOHN K. DELANEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and honor Mr. Jan Alderton, Managing Editor at the Cumberland Times-News,

for his incredible career and his retirement after nearly 48 years of journalism.

Jan started at the Cumberland News in 1967 as a proofreader. Eventually, he worked his way through almost every newsroom position. From his coverage of the Maryland General Assembly in the 1970s, to his work as a sports reporter, Jan showed true commitment to his craft, and worked hard to publish the best stories each day.

In 1987, Jan was named Managing Editor of the Times-News for the first time. There, Jan strived to make sure readers of the Times-News had access to breaking stories and the best reporting. His service to the people of Allegany County will be dearly missed.

Local journalism, like that at the Cumberland Times-News, provides a critical service for communities nationwide, highlighting events that aren't covered elsewhere. When it comes to reading hometown news, there's only one place to find it, and that's your hometown paper.

I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues help me in honoring Mr. Jan Alderton, for his dedication to honest reporting and his commitment to the people of Cumberland. Let's wish Jan a happy and healthy retirement.

IN HONOR OF BOB ROBERTS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the House's attention that Bob Roberts, the President of the renowned California Ski Industry Association is retiring. Perhaps we ought to alert the federal agencies to be on the lookout for the impending consequences. Ski lifts will stop running, avalanches will start falling, snow accumulation will dramatically decrease. My God, Mr. Speaker, how can this country even exist without Bob Roberts at the helm? And it's not even just the U.S. who will be affected, for he is known as the Peace Corps volunteer who put Peru on the map. Will the Andes now disappear without him? Take a look at his distinguished career.

Mr. Roberts began his career in the ski industry in 1969 as operator of Mt. Shasta Ski Area. He held this post until 1975, after which, he founded the California Ski Industry Association. He has stood at the helm of the CSIA for 40 years, working from the ground up to create an organization which has effectively continued to improve and enhance the thriving ski industry in my home state of California. Through successful campaigns such as the ''Ski California USA'' and an award winning cooperative promotion with Virgin Atlantic Airways, Bob and the CSIA have been able to attract unprecedented levels of domestic and international visitors to California's alpine and cross-country resorts.

Bob Roberts received his undergraduate BA in political science from Stanford University and an MBA in international business from Columbia University. After graduation, he was one of the very first Peace Corps volunteers sent to Peru. During his time in Peru he served in the Andes as a supervisor on the development and construction of a hotel and thermal baths. He then continued his work with the Peace Corps, serving as regional director in Bolivia and then director for the Latin American training center in Escondido, California. Bob's selfless work with the Peace Corps would equip him with a political aptitude, a disposition towards public service and a keen interest in the resort business.

A true icon in the tourism industry, Mr. Roberts was also instrumental in the creation of the California Travel and Tourism Commission. He was elected Vice Chair of the first commission and also served for six years as chair of the marketing committee, directing California's tourism programs.

As well as a tireless advocate for the tourism industry, Bob is also a devoted husband to his wife, Betty, and a father of two, Kirsten and Christopher, and grandfather to five.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak on behalf of the entire House in thanking my friend from the Peace Corps for his exceptional service and I wish him the very best in the next chapter of his life.

HONORING THE DAILY BREEZE NEWSPAPER FOR WINNING THE PULITZER PRIZE

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Daily Breeze newspaper, which won a Pulitzer Prize for local reporting for their investigation into the corruption at Centinela Valley Union High School District.

I want to commend the Daily Breeze for their exceptional journalism and congratulate them on this honor. I was overjoyed to hear that they had received the award. All of the Daily Breeze's editors, journalists, and staff should be enormously proud, and they do great credit to the 33rd Congressional District.

The Daily Breeze excels in many areas, including political journalism, acting as a vital watchdog to address problems in government. Their investigation into the Centinela School District exposed the culture of corruption within the district's administration. Despite the excessive salaries given to the administration's leadership, the district was cutting important academic programs, scoring poorly on student performance evaluations, and hurting the educations of students whose job it was for them to help.

The Daily Breeze's investigation resulted in the removal of the school superintendent and led the FBI and Los Angeles District Attorney to open investigations into the district's shady dealings. Without the Daily Breeze's fine reporting, this waste of taxpayer money and abuse of the public's trust might never have been brought to light.

The paper has served as the voice of Torrance and the entire South Bay area since 1894. For more than a hundred years, the Daily Breeze combines comprehensive national reporting with innovative and hard-hitting local coverage. As a Torrance resident, I have been reading the Daily Breeze for nearly two decades. Whether reporting on government, local entertainment or criminal investigations, the Daily Breeze exemplifies the best ideals of journalism: creativity, civic service, and integrity. I am proud to honor the Daily Breeze leadership, reporters, and employees as they celebrate their first Pulitzer Prize.

SENATE—*Wednesday, May 6, 2015*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Holy God, thank You for daily blessings and mercies, for You fill the void of our spirits with Your abiding presence. Lord, You provide us with strength for each day and hope for each tomorrow. Your ways are just and true.

Supply all the needs of our Senators. Give them wisdom to solve the complex problems of our time. Help them to express their gratitude to You with deeds of faith and compassion. Lord, use them to call us out of the night of selfish living to the sunrise of sacrifice and service. Continue to be their refuge and strength, a very present help for every trial.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The Democratic leader is recognized.

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have all heard the legal maxim ''Justice delayed is justice denied,'' and it is really applicable to what is going on in the Senate today. Here in this body, justice is being delayed by the Republican majority. The refusal of the Senate Republicans to heed their constitutional duty to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations is an injustice to the American people.

So far this year, the Senate has confirmed two judicial nominations—just two—in more than 4 months. By contrast, in 2007, my first year as majority leader during the Bush administration, we had already confirmed 16 nominations. If the Republican majority keeps up their current trend of ignoring judicial nominees, by the end of this year we will have confirmed five for an entire year. The last time the Senate confirmed so few Presidential nominations was, unsurprisingly, when we had a Republican majority here in the Senate under the Clinton administration. It is funny how history repeats itself.

The Federal courts depend on the Senate to do its job so justice can be dispensed in courtrooms all across the country. As of today, there are 55 Federal court vacancies, 24 of which are classified as emergencies. At the beginning of the year, there were only 12 judicial emergencies, but now it is double that—24. These vacancies create a backlog of cases, effectively delaying justice for plaintiffs and defendants, for prosecutors and the accused, and for the sitting judges who are trying their best to administer justice, but they can't do their work because they are so overwhelmed with work.

This is about more than judges and lawyers. This is about the people who come before the courts, people who have cases that have been waiting and waiting. This is about a prosecutor who is going after somebody who, in their opinion, has done something really bad. We have all heard the expression ''They are trying to make a Federal case out of it.'' The reason they say that is because Federal prosecutors do such a great job. But if they have to wait and wait until there is availability in the courtroom, witnesses disappear and it makes it much more difficult.

What has happened to our judicial system is, because of the Republicans, we are having justice delayed. This is unconscionable.

It is no wonder Republicans are scrambling for cover on judicial nominations. They are scrambling because they have been ignoring their constitutional duty.

This afternoon, the courts are going to be looked at by the Judiciary Committee. In fact, the committee is going to hold a hearing on several delayed judicial nominations. But everyone should look at Felipe Restrepo, the President's nominee to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. That is in Pennsylvania and other places—a very important circuit. Despite being nominated by the President 6 months ago, this man is not even going to be on the calendar. And this is what was done previously. The man, my friend, who is chair of the Committee on Finance, was chair of the Judiciary Committee back in those days, and he did the same thing—just ignored them, didn't even schedule them for a hearing. Senator LEAHY has been to the floor many times—our past chair of the Judiciary Committee, now ranking member of the Judiciary Committee—talking about how bad that used to be, and now he is talking about how bad it is even today.

So Restrepo and others will not be on the agenda. Despite the fact that this Philadelphia-based seat is a judicial emergency, they just ignore people like Restrepo. They say: We only have a few people on the calendar. Why aren't there more on the calendar?

Because they won't schedule hearings. It is so unfair.

Now Restrepo won't be on the agenda in spite of the fact that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania said Restrepo would be a ''superb addition to the third circuit.'' Why doesn't the junior Senator from Pennsylvania talk about this man being held up by his own party? There is no reason he has been held up for 6 months other than the Republicans simply want to do everything they can to create problems for President Obama. But it is not a problem for President Obama. President Obama is doing just fine. It is a problem for the people I have talked about—the prosecutors, those who are accused of crimes, plaintiffs and defendants in civil cases, and, of course, the judges.

After having heard the statement from the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, I wonder what Pennsylvanians are thinking. Are they left wondering why this qualified judicial candidate is not moving forward and not a word from the junior Senator from Pennsylvania? Not a word.

It appears Republicans are heeding calls from the far right to retaliate against President Obama by blocking judges. Republicans couldn't defend their trying to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. They tried. They tried to block Loretta Lynch's nomination, and they couldn't get that done. So now they want to block President Obama's judges.

Our courts should be above political gamesmanship. Qualified judicial nominees such as Mr. Restrepo deserve a vote in the Senate.

President Bush's judges were considered fairly when I was the majority leader, and there is no one who can say that nominees are now being handled fairly. It is certainly not unreasonable for Democrats to expect the same measure of cooperation and fairness from Republicans that I gave them. The American judicial system should not be taking a backseat to Republican politics here in the Senate, in our Nation's Capitol. If it were only the judges they are holding up, that would be one thing, but Republican Senators

are holding up basically all his nominations, with rare exception. For example, the chief law enforcement officer of this country, Loretta Lynch, who is well qualified in every way—experience, education, and character—was held up for 6 months. If what they did in her case wasn't bad enough, they now are not allowing her to have the people she needs around her. They are not allowing a vote on her No. 1 assistant. It is unfair and just too bad that justice delayed is justice denied. I am sorry to say that is where we find ourselves today.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT AND BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL TRADE PRIORITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate is now nearing completion of the bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. This is a bipartisan bill which is based on an important principle: that the American people, through the Congress they elect, deserve a say on one of the most important issues of our time.

This act would require that any agreement reached with Iran be submitted to Congress for a review. It would require that Congress be given time to hold hearings and to take a vote to approve or disapprove of the agreement before congressional sanctions could be lifted. It would give Congress more power to rapidly impose sanctions if Iran does cheat.

Many wish the bill were stronger. I don't disagree with them. But this is a piece of legislation worthy of our support. It offers the best chance we have to provide the American people and the Congress they elect with the power to weigh in on a vital issue. We will pursue other opportunities to address Iran's full-spectrum campaign to increase its sphere of influence in the broader Middle East as well.

I look forward to Senators of both parties coming together to pass this bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act soon. Once we do, the Senate will take up another measure designed to hold the administration accountable: the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act. This bipartisan bill is about a lot more than just expanding Congress's oversight authority. It is about delivering prosperity for the middle class and supporting jobs. It is about helping American workers sell more of what they make and farmers sell more of what they grow. It is about eliminating unfair rules in other countries that discriminate against American workers and American jobs. Remember, the United States already has one of the most open markets in the world, but other countries maintain unfair barriers against American goods and services—barriers that trade agreements can reduce or even eliminate to make things fairer for America.

That is why the United States is currently involved in negotiations with Europe and several nations in the Pacific such as Japan—in order to break down barriers to goods stamped ''Made in America.'' That is the main point here. We want to knock down barriers to our goods stamped with ''Made in America'' to be sold in other countries.

One estimate shows that trade agreements with Europe and the Pacific could support as many as 1.4 million additional jobs in our country, including over 18,000 in Kentucky alone. But in order to get there, we will first need to lay down some clear and fair rules of the road for our trade negotiators. That is what the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act would do.

First, it would make Congress's priorities clear, issuing specific objectives for the administration's trade negotiators.

Second, it would mandate transparency, forcing the administration to consult regularly with Congress and stakeholders.

And it would reaffirm the supremacy of this body and require our exclusive approval before trade agreements are enacted.

The Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act is good bipartisan legislation that was endorsed overwhelmingly in the Finance Committee 20 to 6. It is good for the middle class, it is good for manufacturers, and, yes, it is very good for farmers.

Here is what one Kentucky constituent—a corn, wheat, and soybean farmer from Spencer County—recently wrote to say on the issue:

> We need free trade to compete with grain farms in South America. Dozens of people have jobs as a direct result of our small business: Input suppliers, truckers, mechanics and traders, just to name a few.

He went on.

> Help me and all these people by expanding trade and consumption globally. Our future depends on it.

Well, I couldn't agree more with that farmer from Spencer County. Our future does depend on cultivating better opportunities for American goods, American crops, and American workers in the 21st century.

I look forward to the Senate turning to the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act very soon.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from Iowa.

FIGHT AGAINST ISIS

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, as we continue to fight against ISIS and those radicalized by them, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join efforts to provide direct assistance to a critical partner in that fight—the Kurdistan Regional Government.

Yesterday, I joined Senator BARBARA BOXER of California to do just that. We introduced bipartisan legislation to provide temporary authority for the President to provide weapons directly to Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga forces in the fight against ISIS. This legislation builds upon a similar bipartisan House effort led by House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL. The bill's 3-year authorization seeks to reduce delays in arming Peshmerga forces to fight ISIS, while still maintaining consultation with the Iraqi Government.

Beginning in the first gulf war, the Iraqi Kurds and their Peshmerga forces have played a vital role in supporting U.S. interests and a free Iraq, despite limited means of doing so.

Since August 2014, the Kurds have provided sanctuary to nearly 2 million ethnic and religious minorities in Iraqi Kurdistan, and they have been the only force to hold its ground against ISIS in northern Iraq.

Currently, by law, the United States must provide support to the Iraqi Kurds through the Iraqi central government in Baghdad, which has often not been timely or adequate in the past. This has had a negative impact on the Kurds' ability to defend Iraqi territory and provide security for those Iraqis and Syrians who have sought refuge in Iraqi Kurdistan.

Last November, Secretary of State John Kerry said that if Chairman ROYCE wanted to change current law—to ''fix it''—that he invited him to do so. Well, that is exactly what this legislation does.

It makes it the policy of the United States to provide direct assistance to the Kurdistan Regional Government to combat ISIS. We do that because we believe that defeating ISIS is critical to maintaining an inclusive and unified Iraq and that the Iraqi Kurds are key in that goal, as well as to help to end the humanitarian crisis in Iraq through their support of over 1.6 million displaced persons from Iraq and Syria.

The legislation preserves the President's ability to notify the Iraqi Government before weapons, equipment, defense services or related training is provided to Iraqi Kurdish forces.

It ensures this emergency authorization does not construct a precedent of providing direct support to organizations other than a country or an international organization. Finally, it works toward accountability by requiring a report to Congress on U.S. weapons provided to the Iraqi Government which have ended up in the hands of Iranian controlled and supported Shia militias or foreign terrorist groups.

ISIS is deadly and determined, and Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga forces—our critical partner in the fight against ISIS—need U.S. weapons as quickly as possible.

This 3-year authorization would bolster efforts against ISIS, which are critical to maintaining a unified and stable Iraq and imperative to our national security interests. We simply cannot afford to have future delays at this critical moment in the battle.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this much-needed legislation to arm the Iraqi Kurds in the fight against ISIS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, Thursday a week ago I had the privilege, as a member of the Finance Committee, to serve on the markup of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, trade promotion authority, and trade adjustment and assistance.

This past Saturday, I was given the opportunity to give the Republican response on the radio, and I talked about trade promotion authority. I have been privileged to be ranking member and chairman at one time of the African Affairs Subcommittee. I have traveled back and forth to the continent of Africa, seen the opportunities for trade, business, and exchange with the African people.

I came to the Congress in 1999. In that year, I voted for trade promotion authority for President Bill Clinton, a Democrat. Later, I voted for trade promotion authority for President Bush, a Republican. And I proudly will vote for trade promotion authority for President Obama, a Democrat, because trade is not a partisan issue. It should not be nor should it ever be a partisan issue. It should be an issue of the American people's employment opportunities and jobs in the future. Trade is the cement that holds together the diplomacy and the agreements between countries to work together, play together, and not fight together and not have armed conflict. Trade is important to the security of the United States of America and, in fact, the rest of the world.

But I don't want to talk about trade promotion authority today. I want to talk about the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Africa is the continent of the 21st century for the United States of America, with 1.5 billion mouths to feed, a number of votes at the United Nations, in terms of the African countries, but most importantly, it has the rarest earth minerals and the natural resources so important to us and the rest of the world. Africa is a gold mine waiting to be mined. But it is not one that we abuse, like the Chinese are abusing it. It is one where we share in prosperity.

When China goes into Africa, they bring their own workers, pay their own workers with Chinese currency, extract the rarest minerals—oil and petroleum and natural resources—and then leave.

When America goes, we invest in the human capital with PEPFAR to reduce the rate of AIDS, and we invest in the Millennium Challenge Corporation to bring jobs, opportunities, and a lack of corruption to the African people.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is a godsend for the continent of Africa, but it is a godsend to the country of the United States of America. In the future, Africa will become our greatest trading partner if we handle it right.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act that will be before us, along with TPA, is a 10-year extension of our goal. That is important, because it gives predictability to the African countries and the United States. But, more importantly, it gives us the opportunity to file cases with the Trade Representative against those countries that are not playing by the rules.

South Africa is a perfect example. They have blocked access to their market to poultry from the United States of America, with arbitrary and capricious blockades to keep our poultry from going in.

Senator COONS from Delaware and I from Georgia, two big poultry States, have confronted the South Africans. We know that under the new AGOA, when it is passed and ratified by this Congress and by the African countries as well, it will give us the opportunity to file a petition to ask the Trade Representative to file a case to open up the South African practices. And if they are found to be not right—or wrong or corrupt—then we can block South Africa's participation in parts of the AGOA or all of the AGOA. In other words, the AGOA is going to have consequences, much as the Millennium Challenge account does.

Today, when America makes an investment in a foreign country in Africa for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, there are consequences if they don't end corruption, if they don't have private sector participation, if they don't have the rule of law governing their project. We pull the Millennium Challenge Corporation out, and they don't get another grant.

Look at the nation of Ghana, which is now working on its third grant, or the nation of Benin, which is working on its second. Both are improving their infrastructure and their ability to trade and produce with America because of a joint venture between our country and those countries.

I urge all my colleagues in the House and the Senate to adopt the African Growth and Opportunity Act for three reasons.

No. 1, it is a 10-year predictable extension of a relationship we need to grow and prosper.

No. 2, it gives us the tools not to be abused, and it makes sure that if one of the African countries is abusing American access to their market, we can stop it and file a case with the Trade Representative.

But No. 3, it offers hope and prosperity for America in the 21st century—with 1.5 billion mouths to feed, rare earth minerals, natural resources, the power of the people and the power of the purse of the people. Africa is the continent of the 21st century for our country. Having a trade agreement with Africa is essential to seeing to it that we have a prosperous and free future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REBUILDING OUR COMMUNITIES

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, yesterday, along with Senator MIKULSKI and Congressmen CUMMINGS and RUPPERSBERGER and SARBANES, I was in Baltimore with Attorney General Lynch meeting with our faith-based leaders. Attorney General Lynch also met with the mayor of Baltimore as well as the family of Freddie Gray. She also met with our Baltimore City Police Department. I wish to thank the Attorney General for her personal presence in Baltimore.

For those of us who live in Baltimore, the events over these last couple of weeks have been heartbreaking. The city we love has gone through a very difficult time. I wish to thank my colleagues who have contacted Senator MIKULSKI and me for offering their help, for offering their understanding, and for their willingness to work together so we can deal with the issues

that have been raised in Baltimore—and other cities, quite frankly—in other places around the country. It is our responsibility to move forward, and the people of Baltimore understand that. We understand the national spotlight will be leaving and we are going to need to deal with the issues that are left behind.

To me, there are two pillars for the rebuilding of Baltimore and restoring confidence; one deals with public safety and justice and the other deals with rebuilding as a result of the damages that were caused and dealing with the core problems that led up to the violence in Baltimore. I believe that we in Baltimore can serve as a model for the country as to how we can make our community and our Nation stronger.

On the public safety and justice pillar, let me make some suggestions to my colleagues. I have spoken to several of my colleagues about areas where I hope we can work together in order to restore public safety and justice in our community. One of those issues is a bill I filed that would end racial profiling in America. We should have passed this bill a long time ago.

Racial profiling—profiling because of the race of a community or the ethnic background or a religion—is just wrong. It is against the values we believe in in this country. It turns communities against law enforcement. We saw that in Baltimore and we have seen it in other communities around the country where the local community just does not have confidence that the police department is working on their behalf. We heard examples of that yesterday in the roundtable discussion we had with the faith-based leaders. We have to restore that confidence. One way to do it is to make it clear that our national policy is against profiling by police.

Now, let me make it clear that if a person has some specific information about a particular crime and identifies who is responsible, that is not profiling. That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about communities in Baltimore and around the country where a person is African American and they have a much better chance of being stopped by police just because of the color of their skin. That is wrong, and it has to end in America. We need to take action in this body, the U.S. Senate, to make it clear that we will not permit racial profiling. It is not only wrong and counterproductive to neighborhoods working with police; it is costly. We have limited resources to spend in law enforcement. It is not productive in keeping communities safe, and as we have seen around the country, it can be deadly. We need to do more in this area.

I have spoken to some of my colleagues about some of the sentencing guidelines we have in this country. They are certainly discriminatory against certain communities in America. We need to take a look at our criminal justice system and at the sentencing guidelines to recognize that if a person is of a certain race or a certain religion or ethnic background, that person is much more likely to end up in prison today, even though the incidents of the violations of the law are no different in their community than in other communities in this country. We have to deal with it. This country has to deal with that.

Lastly, I have introduced legislation that would restore voting privileges for those who have completed their prison sentences, and we need to pass it. I know I have support on both sides of the aisle. We had a vote on that not too long ago, where we had almost a majority willing to move forward. I hope we can come to an agreement. I remember the opposition said it is the wrong bill. Well, let's get a bill that is the right bill to restore voting privileges to those who complete their sentences.

They can then again become a part of the community. They know we believe they have a future. They should be able to serve on our juries. There is not a person who is serving in the U.S. Senate who didn't have a second chance sometime in their life. All of us need a second chance. We can't give up on people. I think the experiences we have seen in Baltimore and around the rest of the country indicate that we all have a stake in rebuilding and giving opportunities to every person in our community.

I talked about rebuilding and dealing with the core issues that led up to the violence in Baltimore. There was a letter written to the Baltimore Sun this week that said we need a Marshall Plan for America's cities. That sort of struck me because I thought back to World War II, when Europe was burning and the United States came to the rescue of Europe and put out the fire. But we didn't stop there. We then planted the seeds for the rebuilding of Europe. We were not alone. Other countries helped us, the private community helped us, businesses helped us, and Europe was rebuilt.

So it is not enough just to restore public order on the streets of Baltimore. We have to rebuild in a way that we give opportunities for jobs for all the people in the community. We talked about what is going to happen this summer. Will there be summer jobs for our young people? Will we have permanent jobs for them? We have to work on that.

We have to work on rebuilding. We can do this. We have come together in the past. We are the strongest country in the world. The United States has been there to help people around the world. We said we would pursue efforts about ending HIV/AIDS under President Reagan, and the PEPFAR Program has changed the dynamics around the world on the spread of HIV/AIDS. It is time we used that energy here in America to help the people of this country.

So I hope we will all come together and look at the core problems and help rebuild America. It is appropriate that we talk about it the day after we passed our budget. I hope, as we get to the individual appropriations bills, that we understand the Federal Government, in partnership with the private sector, in partnership with State and local governments, can do a better job.

Today, Secretary Perez, the Secretary of Labor, is going to be in Baltimore meeting with local officials to figure out how the Federal Government can partner with us to provide resources to energize the private sector, to energize the rebirth of Baltimore. I heard a request from groups I met with about the new markets tax credit. We need to extend those types of credits that can make a difference in our urban centers. I visited with Pastor Hickman whose church was torched—the senior housing project next door to his church was on fire last Monday night. He is rebuilding that senior housing project, but he clearly knows he needs partners from the Federal Government.

We can do a better job. I urge my colleagues to understand we can do this. We must do this. We must rebuild our cities and our communities for a better Baltimore and for the betterment of America's future.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1191, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1140, in the nature of a substitute.

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1179 (to amendment No. 1140), to require submission of all Persian text included in the agreement.

Blunt amendment No. 1155 (to amendment No. 1140), to extend the requirement for annual Department of Defense reports on the military power of Iran.

Vitter modified amendment No. 1186 (to amendment No. 1179), to require an assessment of inadequacies in the international monitoring and verification system as they relate to a nuclear agreement with Iran.

Cotton amendment No. 1197 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140), of a perfecting nature.

Cotton (for Rubio) amendment No. 1198 (to amendment No. 1197), to require a certification that Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 58, H.R. 1314, the bill we will use for trade promotion authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. SULLIVAN assumed the Chair.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as were most Americans, I was very disturbed by the scenes from Baltimore that unfolded on our TV sets across America—a place not too far away from here—during the last couple of weeks. The whole idea of a young man dying in police custody, followed by the confrontations with police and the looting and burning of innocent minority-owned businesses in their own neighborhoods—these are all scenes we would expect perhaps in other countries, somewhere else around the world, but certainly not here at home. But that is what we saw and not just last week but also last summer in Ferguson, MO.

So the question arises: What can we do? What can we do about it? What can we do as individual citizens? What can we do as parents? What can we do as neighbors? And then: What can we do as Members of the U.S. Congress? Perhaps more fundamentally, how can we as a nation unite to address injustice when it occurs? What steps can we take today to help the diverse fabric of this great Nation mend for future generations?

As I indicated, I am somewhat skeptical that Washington, DC, and particularly the U.S. Congress, can wave a magic wand and solve these problems. A lot of this is going to have to be worked out at the local level by communities, by families, by houses of faith, and by civic organizations as well. Obviously, they are closest to the situation. But the Federal Government does, I believe, have a role to play that I will speak about in just a moment. I will just conclude in speaking about Baltimore by saying that our prayers, I know, are with those involved, and I know they are carefully considering how best to move forward and heal as well. But we are doing a great disservice to ourselves and to everyone else so clearly frustrated by the status quo if we isolate Baltimore or Ferguson as just individual instances of civil unrest and if we don't step back and see how they fit into the broader issue of our entire criminal justice system.

I sometimes call myself a recovering judge. I was a district judge for 6 years, which is our main trial court in Texas, and I was on the Texas Supreme Court for 7 years after that. I also served as attorney general. I mention all of that just to say that I have had some exposure in my professional life and in my adult life with our criminal justice system. I have seen how it should work, and I have seen areas where we need to get to work to reform what is broken.

I believe Congress can and must play a role—even a small role; I say small but in a significant way—by correcting injustice where we can and making it less likely that situations such as those we have seen in Ferguson or Baltimore are repeated. While we cannot singlehandedly fix broken families or broken communities or deal with situations at the local level around the country, we can contribute to efforts to remedy the basic instability of those communities and particularly we can start to make real progress in our criminal justice system to lessen the burden on those communities that are struggling with these issues.

I know the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senator GRASSLEY, is committed to doing what he can, through the Committee on the Judiciary, to pursue criminal justice reform. I am happy to say that under the leadership of Senator GRASSLEY, many efforts are already underway to consider how we can do a better job of rehabilitating offenders, increase public safety, save taxpayers some money, and help rebuild that all-important relationship between law enforcement and local communities.

One example of how we are doing that is a piece of legislation I introduced in February with the junior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, called the CORRECTIONS Act, which stands for the Corrections Oversight, Recidivism Reduction, and Eliminating Costs for Taxpayers In Our National System Act. That is why we call it CORRECTIONS, because that is such a long title, but I think it says a lot about what we are trying to achieve.

With about 30 percent of the Department of Justice budget spent on detaining Federal inmates and the costs of Federal prisons skyrocketing, this bill would actually take a number of constructive steps to reform our Federal prison system and would also make better use of taxpayers' money.

For example, the CORRECTIONS Act would allow eligible offenders—mainly low-risk or medium-risk offenders; certainly not high-risk offenders—to earn additional days of good time credit by participating in programs that will help equip them for life outside of prison. Texas is sometimes considered a tough-on-crime State, and that is true. After awhile, though, we realized we also need to be smart on crime because virtually all of the people incarcerated in our prisons will eventually someday be released. We need to begin to focus on what we can do to help them—those who want help and who will accept that help—and how we can do a better job of equipping them so they don't end up recommitting, reoffending, and ending up back in prison again. That is what this piece of legislation tries to do.

So the CORRECTIONS Act allows offenders to earn additional days of earned time credit by participating in programs that will prepare them for life outside of prison. Low-risk offenders, for example, could earn up to 10 days of earned time credit for every month in which they are successfully completing programs such as drug rehab, education, work programs, faith-based training, and life skills courses. It is astonishing. I was in East Texas at one part of the Texas prison system where I got to observe some of the prisoners, some of the inmates there attending some of these types of courses. It is shocking how poorly equipped so many of these inmates are for life outside of prison and why it is so important that we try to help those who will accept the help and who want the help to prepare for life outside so they don't end up back inside.

This legislation would allow these eligible prisoners to use this good time credit to spend the final portion of their sentences in home confinement or a halfway house. Halfway houses have

worked over time as a transition from prison to life in communities, and they work very well. Also, technology can even allow home confinement for nonviolent, low-risk prisoners who have earned the right to a less confining circumstance on the backhand of their sentence. This may sound like a little thing, but it is important for several reasons.

First of all, inmates need to learn valuable skills that can transfer to a lifetime of community engagement, instead of returning to a lifetime of crime. Second, it allows them to reconnect sooner with their families and the communities that need them most. Finally, this makes financial sense. It costs about $5,000 a year to keep a low-risk prisoner in home confinement, and it cost $30,000 a year to keep them in prison.

I am not one of those who say, well, we just need to save money, so let's throw public safety to the wind. That is not what this does. We focus first on public safety as we must, but we also try to be smart about it—not just tough on crime. We try to be smart on crime. The great thing is that we actually have States such as my State that have experimented with this sort of approach with great success. Texas has actually, over recent years, closed three prison systems. Crime has not spiked, and, in fact, many inmates who have taken advantage of this program have become resocialized and integrated back into society. So we actually know. Rather than the Federal Government trying to mandate for the entire Nation and adhering to some new experiment, we actually have the laboratories of democracy—otherwise known as the States—under our Federal system, trying things out to see if they will work, and we learn from that if we can. This is an area where we can learn, and we should.

So I look forward to working with Chairman GRASSLEY and our members of the Judiciary Committee to get the CORRECTIONS Act passed. The last time it was considered, last year, it passed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis through the Judiciary Committee.

As I said, fortunately, Chairman GRASSLEY has made this a priority, and he has put together a bipartisan effort to look at some other consensus ideas that we might add to this prison reform bill, such as sentencing reform. Honestly, that is a little bit more controversial, because I am not one for just cutting sentences on the front-end indiscriminately or arbitrarily. We need to make sure we are smart about sentencing reform. I think this consensus-building effort that Chairman GRASSLEY has undertaken will help us get in the right place. There are a number of targeted sentencing reforms I think we could all support to help address failures in our criminal justice system.

So we should not let the divisive, controversial proposals stand in the way of making real bipartisan progress on the issue of criminal justice reform. But this is sort of a chronic problem we have had around here when we try to do comprehensive everything. When we try to do comprehensive everything, we make mistakes. We also make it almost impossible to do, because there are so many different moving parts. It is complicated, and many people remain skeptical about its chances of succeeding. But when you have something such as the CORRECTIONS Act, which brings to the Federal level the successful pilot programs that have been undertaken in the States, it just makes sense that this should be the place we should start. Indeed, that is why it has such broad bipartisan support.

In order to make sure that the conversation about criminal justice reform extends to issues beyond prison reform and sentencing, there is another step the junior Senator from Michigan, the senior Senator from South Carolina, and I introduced just last week. This is another idea, because we realize the time that Congress has in our capacity, both on the floor and in committee, to deal with this complex topic in a thoughtful and deliberate way. So we need some help, and what we have introduced is something we call the National Criminal Justice Commission Act, which would create a commission to provide a top-down review of our entire criminal justice system.

After completing a review of the system, this bipartisan commission would work for a unanimous recommendation on how to strengthen it. Congress could—much as it did with the 9/11 Commission—take bits and pieces of it. We wouldn't need to embrace all of it—or any of it, for that matter. But at least we would have the good and thoughtful work product of some experts who would be able to make recommendations to us in a number of areas.

I was just at a meeting where somebody asked about the overcriminalization of a regulatory state, and that is a real problem. The fact that you can commit a crime without even intending to commit a crime if you happen to violate some regulation is a real problem. There are a number of areas I think we need to look at. As our attention was riveted by what happened in Baltimore and Ferguson, I think those incidents are symptoms of a much bigger challenge, and I think this commission would help us focus on building consensus and producing actionable results.

Importantly, the continuing dialogue and commission process will help us strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and communities and help us to build on consensus items such as the CORRECTIONS Act. I think the CORRECTIONS Act is a good place to start, and the National Criminal Justice Act, the consensus-based sentencing reform—all of these measures will help us improve our criminal justice system. It will help bring down some of the tension we witnessed across the Nation, and help us, again, be smart when it comes to dealing with our criminal justice system.

I hope my colleagues will join me in this important effort. I think this is the kind of big idea of a big challenge which will resonate with the people we represent in our States and across the country. When they see us coming together on a bipartisan basis and actually trying to solve problems, I think they feel that we are finally listening to them and doing what we should be doing here in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, for the past couple of weeks, we have been talking about very important things on the floor of the Senate. One of the most important has been the possible deal with Iran over the country's nuclear program. I believe an agreement that could stop Iran's efforts to get nuclear weapons would be enormously significant. Making sure the American people are involved in this process is also extremely important. There is bipartisan agreement on both of those things. We are still debating the Iran sanctions review act simply because it is so important. The debate has been going on.

This bill goes a long way toward protecting the right of the American people to have a say on any deal and the right of Congress to review the specifics of that deal. I know there are Senators who have ideas for how to make this bill even better. I had an amendment last week, and I appreciated the chance to debate the amendment and to have a vote on it. That is the important part of this process. It is a big reason why the Senate has been so much more productive, I believe, this year than it was under the previous majority leader.

Under Republican leadership, Senators of both parties have gotten back the right to really represent our constituents—something we were elected to do. We have gotten back the right to

work through committees, the right to offer amendments and to make our case on the floor.

Republicans and Democrats agree that the bill before us right now is important. Congressional review of any Iranian deal is absolutely essential. We also agree that a nuclear-armed Iran would be a global threat to everyone everywhere. Republicans and Democrats in the Senate know it would be better to have no deal at all than to have a bad deal. Even President Obama has said that.

The concern many Americans have right now is that the deal the President seems prepared to sign is nowhere near strong enough. When I go home to Wyoming every weekend, as I did this past weekend, the people I talk with don't believe Iran has earned the right to be trusted. They are very concerned that the President is ready to sign a very bad deal. I think those concerns are absolutely justified. Iran has avoided scrutiny of its nuclear program for years. What has happened to make the President think all of a sudden that Iran will come clean? I have not seen anything happen out there.

President Obama and his team have been too willing to negotiate without conditions and too hesitant to take the strong stand that I believe must be taken. The President never wanted these economic sanctions in the first place. He said the sanctions would ruin his chances of negotiating a deal at all. Remember that? Well, Congress insisted anyway. Those sanctions did not drive Iran away; it is the sanctions themselves that brought Iran to the negotiating table. Now the President admits that the sanctions, which he opposed, were a good idea. He still wanted to get rid of them as quickly as possible.

The President wanted members of his administration to do all of the negotiating in private, and he wanted to decide by himself what is best. Republicans and Democrats both said that Congress needs to review any deal before getting rid of the sanctions—the sanctions imposed by Congress. We said that he does not have the right to make such important decisions about sanctions imposed by Congress. He does not have the right to eliminate them by himself.

It is very important that we keep asking questions about any potential deal, questions such as, what exactly is the Obama administration agreeing to on sanctions relief? I mean, it is interesting. Iran has said that the final deal must remove all of the economic sanctions on day No. 1. The administration has said that the sanctions will be lifted in phases and only if Iran complies with different steps along the way. Well, which is it? There is a big difference between what the President is saying and what Iran is saying.

The administration already gave Iran sanction relief from sanctions under the interim agreement in 2013. We saw how that turned out. It has given Iran access to $12 billion in much needed hard currency since then. The Obama administration has been unclear on exactly how much actual additional currency it plans to release under the final agreement. Tens of billions? I heard a number as high as over $100 billion with sanctions relief. Well, once the rest of the sanctions are lifted, how can we make sure Iran does not use the money to support terrorists who want to attack us, who want to attack America? Iran has a long history of supporting terrorists such as Hamas and Hezbollah. Is that where the money is going to go? I do not believe Iran is going to use the money to build roads or hospitals or schools.

What about Iran's plans for their nuclear program? Now Iran says they want to do nuclear research for peaceful purposes. Have our negotiators made any progress on holding Iran to its word on that specific point?

Back in November of 2013, Iran signed a framework agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency that was supposed to address the possible military aspects of Iran's nuclear program. It named 12 specific areas where Iran was going to address those concerns. The Director General of that organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, now says that Iran has addressed only 1 of the 12 it promised to address—only 1 of 12 things it was supposed to do under the last deal from 2013. What has changed since then to make President Obama and the Obama administration think Iran is going to comply with this deal? Why should we suddenly trust Iran now? What is there in the agreement that will force Iran to do what it says it will do?

Congress needs to keep a very close eye on any final agreement. Whatever happens, a deal with Iran must be enforceable, it must be verifiable, and it must be accountable.

We know President Obama is looking to finish out his time by polishing his legacy. Congress needs to make sure this deal is about protecting America and protecting Americans, not protecting the President's diplomatic legacy. The stakes are too high. So far, there are too many unanswered questions.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise to speak on my amendment to the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, to bolster Congress's role in monitoring Iran's ballistic missile and defensive weapons activity. I hope this amendment is agreed to. It has been written, rewritten, and rewritten again to try to fit the concerns of the majority, the minority, everybody concerned.

My amendment simply requires the President to make an addition in his semiannual report to Congress, including to the Finance Committee, of which I am a senior member, on any weapons sold, leased or lent by any country to Iran, which are currently prohibited under the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1929—and sophisticated air defense systems.

In 2010, the United Nations Security Council, including Russia, a permanent member of the security council, passed a new round of sanctions on Iran's nuclear program. Resolution 1929 prohibits Iran from investing abroad in uranium mining, related nuclear technologies or nuclear-capable ballistic missile technology, and prohibits Iran from launching ballistic missiles, including on its own territory.

That same year, Russia finalized a weapons sale with Iran on the S–300, much publicized today—the S–300 air defense system, which is not currently sanctioned by the United Nations. However, to provide a working partnership and cooperation, then-Russian President Dmitry Medvedev placed a halt on the sale. Unfortunately, the situation and agreement has now changed dramatically. Today, we are contending with President Vladimir Putin.

Sophisticated air defense systems, such as the Russian-produced S–300, have the capability of shielding Iranian missile facilities from oversight and airstrikes. This poses a real threat to global security, not to mention peace in the Middle East and, as a consequence, all throughout the world.

To prevent this threat, we must ensure our intelligence community is doing everything in its power and capability to ensure the greatest threat in an unstable region, Iran, is not getting help from nations looking to boost their economy through weapons sales, regardless of the impact.

News reports now confirm Russia is preparing to sell Iran billions in sophisticated weaponry. News reports are one thing. However, it is imperative our intelligence community keeps the administration and the Congress briefed fully and on a timely basis on this national security threat.

One month ago, reports revealed Russia's intention to sell the S–300 to Iran. I was alarmed when I asked my colleagues what they knew about the immediacy of this sale before it was made public in news reports—more specifically, members of the Select Committee on Intelligence—and it was apparent no one in the Senate had been fully briefed.

I cannot imagine any of my colleagues not wanting to know who is and who may be planning to arm Iran or why the administration would not be willing to share this information with the Congress—and know it themselves. Our intelligence community can and surely must do better.

By requiring President Obama, and future Presidents as well, to provide Congress with timely, actionable intelligence on Iran's weapons systems, my amendment ensures that Congress can make informed decisions with regard to our national security.

For Congress to support an agreement, Congress must be kept informed. If a nuclear agreement with Iran has even the slightest chance of preventing a nuclear Iran, then we must be vigilant, at least to ensure that other nations are not arming Iran and putting our allies in the region—Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf States, and, more especially, Israel—at increased risk.

My amendment strengthens this bill by ensuring Congress obtains oversight and intelligence on every country, especially Russia, regarding weapons sales to Iran.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider this amendment and to join me in supporting increased oversight on all of Iran's weapons activities.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for the 98th time to urge this body to stop sleepwalking through history. Climate change is real, it is already harming the United States, and it is time for the Senate to wake up and address this threat.

The science that links carbon pollution to global warming is nothing new. It dates back to President Lincoln. In the century and a half since, we have measured changes in the climate that scientists virtually unanimously say are caused by our burning of fossil fuels. Atmospheric carbon is now measured at 400 parts per million—higher than ever in our species' history. Our oceans are warming and acidifying. Those are measurements again. We are experiencing the warmest years ever recorded. More measurements. And rising seas are lapping at our shores. In Rhode Island, we measure nearly 10 inches of sea level rise since the 1930s. These are all measurements, not projections. These are facts, not theories.

If we do not act soon to cut carbon pollution, we can reasonably expect the consequences to be dire. Yet, the fossil fuel industry continues its crafty, cynical campaign of denial and delay. Big Coal, Oil and Natural Gas, and related industries, such as the Koch brothers' companies, profit by offloading the costs of their carbon pollution onto the rest of us. They traffic in products that put health and safety at risk, and they don't tell the truth about their products. Sound familiar? Well, it should because the fossil fuel industry is using a familiar playbook, one perfected by the tobacco industry. Following this same playbook, Big Tobacco fought for more than four decades to bury the truth about the health effects of its product.

Well, the government has a playbook, too. It is called RICO, the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act. The elements of a civil racketeering case are simple. The government must allege four things: The defendants No. 1 conducted No. 2 an enterprise No. 3 through a pattern No. 4 of racketeering activity. Conducting means everything from directing to aiding and abetting the activity. An enterprise can be any form of association or a common scheme. Pattern means continuity of the scheme and—for civil RICO particularly—the prospect of ongoing conduct. Racketeering activity simply means a violation of designated Federal laws, including the Federal mail fraud and wire fraud statutes.

In 1999, the U.S. Department of Justice filed a civil RICO lawsuit against the major tobacco companies and their associated industry groups. The government's complaint was clear: The tobacco companies ''have engaged in and executed—and continue to engage in and execute—a massive 50-year scheme to defraud the public, including consumers of cigarettes, in violation of RICO.''

Big Tobacco spent millions of dollars and years of litigation fighting the government, but finally, through discovery, government lawyers were able to peel back the layers of deceit and see what the big tobacco companies really knew all along about cigarettes.

In 2006, Judge Gladys Kessler of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia decided the case. In a nearly 1,700-page opinion, she found the tobacco companies' fraudulent campaign amounted to a racketeering enterprise. According to the court:

> Defendants coordinated significant aspects of their public relations, scientific, legal, and marketing activity in furtherance of the shared objective—to . . . maximize industry profits by preserving and expanding the market for cigarettes through a scheme to deceive the public.

The parallels between what the tobacco industry did and what the fossil fuel industry is doing now are striking. In fact, we can go back and reread those judicial findings about tobacco, substitute the words ''fossil fuel,'' and exactly describe what the fossil fuel industry is up to. That is without the benefit of discovery, where litigants get to demand the production of documents and take the depositions of potential witnesses and require answers under oath. What a treasure trove that would produce.

We know that the prospect of action on climate change is a business risk for fossil fuel companies. Serious action on climate—a transition to clean, low-carbon energy—threatens to cut into polluters' market and profits. The match between the fossil fuel industry and Big Tobacco is pretty good in terms of the business risk presented if the public were to be really aware of the harm. They have a motive to deceive.

We know that in the case of both tobacco and fossil fuels, the industry joined together in a common enterprise and coordinated strategy. Remember the finding in the tobacco case that defendants coordinated significant aspects of their public relations, scientific, legal and marketing activity in furtherance of the shared objective. How about the fossil fuel industry?

In 1998, as the Clinton administration was building support for international climate action under the Kyoto Protocol, another group was up to something else. That group was the fossil fuel industry, its trade associations, and the conservative policy institutes that often do the industry's dirty work with clean faces. They met at the Washington office of the American Petroleum Institute. Their plan? To organize a scheme to create doubt about climate change and to undermine public support for American participation in the Kyoto agreement.

A memo from that meeting was leaked to the New York Times. The memo documented the polluters' plans for a multimillion-dollar public relations campaign to undermine climate science. What was the project's goal? To ensure that—and I will quote the memo here—''a majority of the American Public, including industry leadership, recognizes that significant uncertainties exist in climate science, and therefore raises questions among those (e.g. Congress) who chart the future U.S. course on global climate change.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the memo printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

If anything, the fossil fuel industry's climate denial scheme has grown even

bigger and more complex than Big Tobacco's. The shape of the fossil fuel industry's denial operation has been documented by, among others, Drexel University Professor Robert Brulle. Brulle's follow-the-money analysis shows how the fossil fuel industry perpetuates climate denial through a complex network of organizations and funding that is designed to obscure the fossil fuel industry's fingerprints. It is quite a beast.

This is the climate denial beast. Polluter money and dark money are its lifeblood. PR front groups are its organs, and lies and obfuscation are its work. Look at the complex interconnection of the beast's major players. The green diamonds are the big funders—the Koch-affiliated foundations, the Scaife-affiliated Foundations, the American Petroleum Institute. The blue circles are the who's who of tea party, libertarian, and front groups who have wittingly or not become the flacks for the fossil fuel industry—the Heartland Institute, the Hoover Institution, the Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, and the Mercatus Center, to name just a few. Think how much trouble someone must have gone to to set all this in play. Think how important the purpose would have to be to them to take all that trouble.

What was the purpose of this network? To quote directly from Dr. Brulle's report, it was ''a deliberate and organized effort to misdirect the public discussion and distort the public's understanding of climate.'' That sounds a lot like the judge's findings in the tobacco racketeering case: ''Defendants have intentionally maintained and coordinated their fraudulent position on addiction and nicotine as an important part of their overall efforts to influence public opinion and persuade people that smoking is not dangerous.''

The coordinated tactics of this network, Dr. Brulle's report states, ''span a wide range of activities, including political lobbying, contributions to political candidates, and a large number of communication and media efforts that aim at undermining climate science.'' Compare that to the findings in the tobacco case: ''Defendants coordinated significant aspects of their public relations, scientific, legal, and marketing activity in furtherance of the shared objective.''

So that is the beast, and big money flows through it.

Brulle's report chronicles that from 2003 to 2010, 140 foundations made 5,299 grants totaling $558 million to 91 organizations that actively oppose climate action. For decades, the tobacco industry did the same thing. In the tobacco case, Judge Kessler found that the ''defendants took steps to fund research designed and controlled to generate industry favorable results, and to suppress adverse research results.''

Look at the recent affair with Dr. Willie Soon, a scientist who consistently publishes papers downplaying the role of carbon dioxide emissions in causing climate change. Through the Freedom of Information Act, we know that Dr. Soon has received more than half of his funding from oil and electric utility coal interests. His fossil fuel backers include the American Petroleum Institute, ExxonMobil, the Charles G. Koch Foundation, and the Southern Company. Most recently, he has been getting his funding through Donors Trust, the dark money identity-laundering operation that anonymizes corporate and polluter money. By the way, the biggest mark in the whole beast is right there, and that is Donors Trust.

The manipulation of science is pretty egregious. Some of Dr. Soon's research contracts gave his industry backers a chance to see what he was doing before he published it. Some of these contracts even had clauses that promised Dr. Soon's fossil fuel backers would receive ''an advance written copy of proposed publications . . . for comment and input.'' The New York Times reported that in correspondence with his fossil fuel funders, Dr. Soon referred to the scientific papers he produced as ''deliverables.'' Deliverable, indeed.

The fossil fuel industry has had to work against mounting evidence to cover up the risks for as long as possible; The same with Big Tobacco. Again, to quote Judge Kessler's decision in the tobacco case, ''Despite overwhelming evidence from a wide range of disciplines including statistics and epidemiology, pathology and chemistry, clinical observation and animal experimentation, as well as their own internal research, Defendants continued to claim 'no proof' and continued to attempt to create doubt about the scientific findings.''

The Federal racketeering complaint opened up discovery into the files of the tobacco companies and showed finally and unequivocally that for decades the tobacco industry knew about smoking's harm while it continued public relations campaigns to deny that smoking was harmful. Discovery is a powerful tool. Sanctions for hiding evidence from a court are steep. So time and again, it is discovery that finds the real smoking guns in corporate records. Remember when New York's attorney general discovered internal emails from analysts at Merrill Lynch that showed the company promoting stocks to its customers that they internally described as ''junk''?

The fossil fuel industry is engaged in a massive effort to deny climate science and deceive the American public. They have been at it for years, and the clearer the science becomes, the harder the polluters fight. Gary Wills used to work for William F. Buckley at the National Review and recently described this effort as ''their kept scientists, their rigged conferences, their sycophantic beneficiaries [and] and their bought publicists.'' Imagine what a little discovery into the beast would reveal about the schemes and mischief of the climate denial apparatus, about what they are telling each other in private while they scheme to deceive the public.

The truth will eventually come to light. It always does. But here in the Senate, we should not wait for a court case before taking action. The evidence is clear. We have a legislative responsibility to address climate change and to do that now. The facts are clear as day right before our eyes, despite the fossil fuel industry's efforts to deceive and deny, despite their persistent big political spending and bullying. We just have to wake up to the facts and to our duty.

I yield the floor.

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

The material below contains a memo by the API from April 1998.

MEMO

From: Joe Walker
To: Global Climate Science Team
Cc: Michelle Ross; Susan Moya
Subject: Draft Global Climate Science Communications plan

As promised, attached is the draft Global Climate Science Communications Plan that we developed during our workshop Last Friday. Thanks especially to those of you who participated in the workshop, and In particular to John Adams for his very helpful thoughts following up our meeting, and Alan Caudill for turning around the notes from our workshop so quickly.

Please review the pan and get back to me with your comments as soon as possible.

As those of you who were at the workshop know, we have scheduled a follow-up team meeting to review the plan in person on Friday, April 17, form 1 to 3 p.m. at the API headquarters. After that, we hope to have a ''Plan champion'' help us move it forward to potential funding sources, perhaps starting with the global climate ''Coordinating Council.'' That will be an item for discussion on April 17.

Again, thanks for your hard work on this project. Please e-mail me, call or fax me with your comments. Thanks.

Regards,

JOE WALKER.

GLOBAL CLIMATE SCIENCE COMMUNICATIONS

ACTION PLAN

SITUATION ANALYSIS

In December 1997, the Clinton Administration agreed in Kyoto, Japan, to a treaty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to prevent what it purports to be changes in the global climate caused by the continuing release of such emissions. The so-called green house gases have many sources. For example, water vapor is a greenhouse gas. But the Clinton Administration's action, if eventually approved by the U.S. Senate, will mainly affect emissions from fossil fuel (gasoline, coal, natural gas, etc.) combustion.

As the climate change debate has evolved, those who oppose action have argued mainly

that signing such a treaty will place the U.S. at a competitive disadvantage with most other nations, and will be extremely expensive to implement. Much of the cost will be borne by American consumers who will pay higher prices for most energy and transportation.

The climate change theory being advanced by the treaty supporters is based primarily on forecasting models with a very high degree of uncertainty. In fact, its not known for sure whether (a) climate change actually is occurring, or (b) if it is, whether humans really have any influence on it.

Despite these weaknesses in scientific understanding, those who oppose the treaty have done little to build a case against precipitous action on climate change based on the scientific uncertainty. As a result, The Clinton Administration and environmental groups essentially have had the field to themselves. They have conducted an effective public relations program to convince the American public that the climate is changing, we humans are at fault, and we must do something about it before calamity strikes.

The environmental groups know they have been successful. Commenting after the Kyoto negotiations about recent media coverage of climate change, Tom Wathen, executive vice president of the National Environmental Trust, wrote:

''. . . As important as the extent of the coverage was the tone and tenor of it. In a change from just six months ago, most media stories no longer presented global warming as just a theory over which reasonable scientists could differ. Most stories described predictions of global warming as the position of the overwhelming number of mainstream scientists. That the environmental community had, to a great extent, settled the scientific issue with the U.S. media is the other great success that began perhaps several months earlier but became apparent during Kyoto.''

Because the science underpinning the global climate change theory has not been challenged effectively in the media or through other vehicles reaching the American public, there is widespread ignorance, which works in favor of the Kyoto treaty and against the best interests of the United States. Indeed, the public has been highly receptive to the Clinton Administrations plans. There has been little, if any, public resistance or pressure applied to Congress to reject the treaty, except by those ''inside the Beltway'' with vested interests.

Moreover, from the political viewpoint, it is difficult for the United States to oppose the treaty solely on economic grounds, valid as the economic issues are. It makes it too easy for others to portray the United States as putting preservation of its own lifestyle above the greater concerns of mankind. This argument, in turn, forces our negotiators to make concessions that have not been well thought through, and in the end may do far more harm than good. This is the process that unfolded at Kyoto, and is very likely to be repeated in Buenos Aires in November 1998.

The advocates of global warming have been successful on the basis of skillfully misrepresenting the science and the extent of agreement on the science, while industry and its partners ceded the science and fought on the economic issues. Yet if we can show that science does not support the Kyoto treaty—which most true climate scientists believe to be the case—this puts the United States in a stronger moral position and frees its negotiators from the need to make concessions as a defense against perceived selfish economic concerns.

Upon this tableau, the Global Climate Science Communications Team (GCSCT) developed an action plan to inform the American public that science does not support the precipitous actions Kyoto would dictate, thereby providing a climate for the right policy decisions to be made. The team considered results from a new public opinion survey in developing the plan.

Charlton Research's survey of 1,100 ''informed Americans'' suggests that while Americans currently perceive climate change to be a great threat, public opinion is open enough to change on climate science. When informed that ''some scientists believe there is not enough evidence to suggest that [what is called global climate change] is a long-term change due to human behavior and activities,'' 58 percent of those surveyed said they were more likely to oppose the Kyoto treaty. Moreover, half the respondents harbored doubts about climate science.

GCSCT members who contributed to the development of the plan are A. John Adams, John Adams Associates; Candace Crandall, Science and Environmental Policy Project; David Rothbard, Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow; Jeffrey Salmon, The Marshall Institute; Lee Garrigan, environmental issues Council; Lynn Bouchey and Myron Ebell, Frontiers of Freedom; Peter Cleary, Americans for Tax Reform; Randy Randol, Exxon Corp.; Robert Gehri, The Southern Company; Sharon Kneiss, Chevron Corp; Steve Milloy, The Advancement of Sound Science Coalition; and Joseph Walker, American Petroleum Institute.

The action plan is detailed on the following pages.

PROJECT GOAL

A majority of the American public, including industry leadership, recognizes that significant uncertainties exist in climate science, and therefore raises questions among those (e.g. Congress) who chart the future U.S. course on global climate change.

Progress will be measured toward the goal. A measurement of the public's perspective on climate science will be taken before the plan is launched, and the same measurement will be taken at one or more as-yet-to-be-determined intervals as the plan is implemented.

VICTORY WILL BE ACHIEVED WHEN

Average citizens ''understand'' (recognize) uncertainties in climate science; recognition of uncertainties becomes part of the ''conventional wisdom''

Media ''understands'' (recognizes) uncertainties in climate science

Media coverage reflects balance on climate science and recognition of the validity of viewpoints that challenge the current ''conventional wisdom''

Industry senior leadership understands uncertainties in climate science, making them stronger ambassadors to those who shape climate policy

Those promoting the Kyoto treaty on the basis of extent science appears to be out of touch with reality.

CURRENT REALITY

Unless ''climate change'' becomes a nonissue, meaning that the Kyoto proposal is defeated and there are no further initiatives to thwart the threat of climate change, there may be no moment when we can declare victory for our efforts. It will be necessary to establish measurements for the science effort to track progress toward achieving the goal and strategic success.

STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

I. National Media Relations Program: Develop and implement a national media relations program to inform the media about uncertainties in climate science; to generate national, regional and local media coverage on the scientific uncertainties, and thereby educate and inform the public, stimulating them to raise questions with policy makers.

Tactics: These tactics will be undertaken between now and the next climate meeting in Buenos Aires/Argentina, in November 1998, and will be continued thereafter, as appropriate. Activities will be launched as soon as the plan is approved, funding obtained, and the necessary resources (e.g., public relations counsel) arranged and deployed. In all cases, tactical implementation will be fully integrated with other elements of this action plan, most especially Strategy II (National Climate Science Data Center).

Identify, recruit and train a team of five independent scientists to participate in media outreach. These will be individuals who do not have a long history of visibility and/or participation in the climate change debate. Rather, this team will consist of new faces who will add their voices to those recognized scientists who already are vocal.

Develop a global climate science information kit for media including peer-reviewed papers that undercut the ''conventional wisdom'' on climate science. This kit also will include understandable communications, including simple fact sheets that present scientific uncertainties in language that the media and public can understand.

Conduct briefings by media-trained scientists for science writers in the top 20 media markets, using the information kits. Distribute the information kits to daily newspapers nationwide with offer of scientists to brief reporters at each paper. Develop, disseminate radio news releases featuring scientists nationwide, and offer scientists to appear on radio talk shows across the country.

Produce, distribute a steady stream of climate science information via facsimile and e-mail to science writers around the country.

Produce, distribute via syndicate and directly to newspapers nationwide a steady stream of op-ed columns and letters to the editor authored by scientists.

Convince one of the major news national TV journalists (e.g., John Stossel) to produce a report examining the scientific underpinnings of the Kyoto treaty.

Organize, promote and conduct through grassroots organizations a series of campus/community workshops/debates on climate science in 10 most important states during the period mid-August through October, 1998.

Consider advertising the scientific uncertainties in select markets to support national, regional and local (e.g., workshops/debates), as appropriate.

NATIONAL MEDIA PROGRAM BUDGET—$600,000 PLUS PAID ADVERTISING

II. Global Climate Science Information Source: Develop and implement a program to inject credible science and scientific accountability into the global climate debate, thereby raising questions about and undercutting the ''prevailing scientific wisdom.'' The strategy will have the added benefit of providing a platform for credible, constructive criticism of the opposition's position on the science.

Tactics: As with the National Media Relations Program, these activities will be undertaken between now and the next climate meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in November 1998, and will continue thereafter.

Initiatives will be launched as soon as the plan is approved, funding obtained, and the necessary resources arranged and deployed.

Establish a Global Climate Science Data Center. The GCSDC will be established in Washington as a non-profit educational foundation with an advisory board of respected climate scientists. It will be staffed initially with professionals on loan from various companies and associations with a major interest in the climate issue. These executives will bring with them knowledge and experience in the following areas.

Overall history of climate research and the IPCC process;

Congressional relations and knowledge of where individual Senators stand on the climate issue;

Knowledge of key climate scientists and where they stand;

Ability to identify and recruit as many as 20 respected climate scientists to serve on the science advisory board;

Knowledge and expertise in media relations and with established relationships with science and energy writers, columnists and editorial writers;

Expertise in grassroots organization; and

Campaign organization and administration.

The GCSDC will be led by dynamic senior executive with a major personal commitment to the goals of the campaign and easy access to business leaders at the CEO level. The Center will be run on a day-to-day basis by an executive director with responsibility for ensuring targets are met. The Center will be funded at a level that will permit it to succeed, including funding for research contracts that may be deemed appropriate to fill gaps in climate science (e.g., a complete scientific critique of the IPCC research and its conclusions).

The GCSDC will become a one-stop resource on climate science for members of Congress, the media, industry and all others concerned. It will be in constant contact with the best climate scientists and ensure that their findings and views receive appropriate attention. It will provide them with the logistical and moral support they have been lacking. In short, it will be a sound scientific alternative to the IPCC. Its functions will include:

Providing as an easily accessible database (including a website) of all mainstream climate science information.

Identifying and establishing cooperative relationships with all major scientists whose research in this field supports our position.

Establishing cooperative relationships with other mainstream scientific organizations (e.g., meteorologists, geophysicists) to bring their perspectives to bear on the debate, as appropriate.

Developing opportunities to maximize the impact of scientific views consistent with ours with Congress, the media and other key audiences.

Monitoring and serving as and early warning system for scientific developments with the potential to impact on the climate science debate, pro and con.

Responding to claims from the scientific alarmists and media.

Providing grants for advocacy on climate science, as deemed appropriate.

GLOBAL CLIMATE SCIENCE DATA CENTER BUDGET—$5,000,000 (SPREAD OVER TWO YEARS MINIMUM)

III. National Direct Outreach and Education: Develop and implement a direct outreach program to inform and educate members of Congress, state officials, industry leadership, and school teachers/students about uncertainties in climate science. This strategy will enable Congress, state officials and industry leaders will be able to raise such serious questions about the Kyoto treaty's scientific underpinnings that American policy-makers not only will refuse to endorse it, they will seek to prevent progress toward implementation at the Buenos Aires meeting in November or through other ways. Informing teachers/students about uncertainties in climate science will begin to erect a barrier against further efforts to impose Kyoto-like measures in the future.

Tactics: Informing and educating members of Congress, state officials and industry leaders will be undertaken as soon as the plan is approved, funding is obtained, and the necessary resources are arrayed and will continue through Buenos Aires and for the foreseeable future. The teachers/students outreach program will be developed and launched in early 1999. In all cases, tactical implementation will be fully integrated with other elements of this action plan.

Develop and conduct through the Global Climate Science Data Center science briefings for Congress, governors, state legislators, and industry leaders by August 1998.

Develop information kits on climate science targeted specifically at the needs of government officials and industry leaders, to be used in conjunction with and separately from the in-person briefings to further disseminate information on climate science uncertainties and thereby arm these influentials to raise serious questions on the science issue.

Organize under the GCSDC a ''Science Education Task Group'' that will serve as the point of outreach to the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) and other influential science education organizations. Work with NSTA to develop school materials that present a credible, balanced picture of climate science for use in classrooms nationwide.

Distribute educational materials directly to schools and through grassroots organizations of climate science partners (companies, organizations that participate in this effort).

NATIONAL DIRECT OUTREACH PROGRAM BUDGET—$300,000

IV. Funding/Fund Allocation: Develop and implement program to obtain funding, and to allocate funds to ensure that the program is carried out effectively.

Tactics: This strategy will be implemented as soon as we have the go-ahead to proceed.

Potential funding sources were identified as American Petroleum Institute (API) and its members; Business Round Table (BRT) and its members, Edison Electric Institute (EEI) and its members; Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA) and its members; and the National Mining Association (NMA) and its members.

Potential fund allocators were identified as the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), Competitive Enterprise Institute, Frontiers of Freedom and The Marshall Institute.

TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAM THROUGH NOVEMBER 1998—$2,000,000 (A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF FUNDING FOR THE GCSDC WILL BE DEFERRED UNTIL 1999 AND BEYOND)

MEASUREMENTS

Various metrics will be used to track progress. These measurements will have to be determined in fleshing out the action plan and may include:

Baseline public/government official opinion surveys and periodic follow-up surveys on the percentage of Americans and government officials who recognize significant uncertainties in climate science.

Tracking the percent of media articles that raise questions about climate science.

Number of Members of Congress exposed to our materials on climate science.

Number of communications on climate science received by Members of Congress from their constituents.

Number of radio talk show appearances by scientists questioning the ''prevailing wisdom'' on climate science.

Number of school teachers/students reached with our information on climate science.

Number of science writers briefed and who report upon climate science uncertainties.

Total audience exposed to newspaper, radio, television coverage of science uncertainties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT NO. 1186

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the Iran sanctions bill which is pending. This is amendment No. 1186. I come to the floor to attempt to modify my own amendment simply by taking out section 2 of the amendment. I have given this proposed modification of my own amendment to all of the managers of the bill, majority and minority. They have had it for several hours, and I have discussed it with the managers. All I am seeking is to be able to modify the language of my own amendment, which is already pending. With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 1191, the Iran sanctions bill, that I be allowed to modify my amendment No. 1186 with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARDIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as Senator VITTER has pointed out, right now we are on the motion to proceed to the trade bill. We are not on the Iran sanctions bill. There are continuing discussions taking place on the Iran sanctions bill between Senator CORKER and me in an effort to try to get as many of the amendments that we have been working on cleared as possible. Senator VITTER's request could very well at this point interfere with the maximum number of amendments being considered, and for that reason I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, my request is not going to interfere with anything. That is a bunch of bull. My request is that I be allowed to modify the language of my own amendment

which is pending, and it is not going to interfere with any other amendment.

Let's be upfront about what is going on here. It is not an open amendment process. We have been talking about this bill for 2 weeks. We have had two votes on amendments. They are not even talking about amendment votes. What Senator CARDIN is describing is negotiating the language and changing the language of certain amendments so it is agreeable to everyone, including him. That is not an open amendment process. Those are not votes. That is not voting up or down. That is not giving everyone their say and their ability to have votes. That is blocking the gate, blocking the door, and returning to the practices of the HARRY REID Senate and then holding everybody hostage and demanding the language you want, Senator CARDIN wants, everybody wants, in order for that amendment to even possibly be considered. That is as far from an open amendment process as you can get.

If that is what they are discussing, they might as well stop now because I will object. I want a vote on my amendment. I want votes on other significant amendments. If this is just a game to come to some unanimous consent agreement, some managers' package which they bless, they can stop those discussions right now because I will object.

Again, Mr. President, I think it is reasonable that a Senator get to modify his own amendment. I think that is a pretty minimal request. I will repeat it.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 1191, that I be allowed to modify amendment No. 1186 with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me point out that but for the fact that Senator COTTON filed an amendment—he had every right to do so, and I am not saying he did not—without Senator CORKER or the leadership or my knowing that he was going to go through that process, Senator VITTER could have modified his amendment. He is being blocked and needs consent because of actions taken by a Republican Senator.

Prior to that action being taken, Senator CORKER and I, working with—I think there were somewhere around 60 amendments filed by Republicans and none by Democrats. This is a bill which passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 19 to 0, one which incorporated many amendments of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including the Presiding Officer, who is working with us on this. We worked those out. We are in the process of presenting an additional four amendments for floor action.

When that action was taken by a Senator—who had every right to do it because he was trying to get his amendment considered on the floor—in effect, it blocked other amendments from being considered on the floor. When you have one party filing all of the amendments, it is necessary to have an orderly process for these considerations. We were in the process of doing that, and that was blocked.

Senator CORKER and I regret that we did not have a chance to bring more amendments in an orderly way for consideration on the floor. But the request made by Senator VITTER is to try to get his amendment in a different position than other amendments, and for that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, this is not being blocked by Senator COTTON. Everybody knows that. Senator COTTON made it clear that he would happily agree to get amendments up for a vote. This has been a determined, choreographed effort to close the door during an open amendment process and to demand leverage so that every amendment has to be worked out. Do you know what ''worked out'' means? That means they get a veto and we don't get a vote. That is unreasonable, and that is the exact opposite of an open amendment process.

I am not being blocked by Senator COTTON. I know that. Everybody knows that. We are being blocked by the managers of this bill. I think it is highly regrettable.

As I said, if the end game here is to work out amendments to Senator CARDIN's or anyone else's satisfaction, and they get a veto, they can stop their work on that right now because I am objecting, and I will object. I want a vote.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I will point out in response to Senator VITTER that we had two record votes on the floor on this bill, and both were amendments that were overwhelmingly rejected. They were not amendments I wanted on the bill. I opposed both of those amendments and Senator CORKER opposed both of those amendments.

When the amendment was offered by Senator COTTON, we were in the process of scheduling another vote on the floor of an amendment that I equally opposed. I have indicated that I will oppose several of the other amendments Members have tried to make pending, but I did not object to votes on those amendments.

I just want to respond to Senator VITTER. Senator CORKER and I did not attempt to block votes on amendments that we don't agree with. We were seeking an orderly way to proceed because, quite frankly, this bill is critically important to our country.

Let's not lose sight of what we are trying to achieve, and that is to block Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. The best way for us to do that is for this body and the House and the President to speak with a united voice, to give us the strongest possible position in negotiations, and for Congress to carry out its responsibility to review this agreement because it was Congress that imposed the sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table. We have a responsibility—in an orderly way—to review that agreement.

The legislation we brought forward—and the Presiding Officer was very helpful in bringing it forward—allows us, in an orderly way, to consider that agreement, if one is reached, so that we can have open hearings in a deliberative way to determine how Congress should act, and that is what this bill does.

I regret that my friend from Louisiana—and he is my friend—feels that any amendment he wants to offer—and there are 60-some other amendments to be offered—that he should be able to bring them up at any time he wants. Quite frankly, this bill is too important for us to use anything but an orderly way to consider amendments. That is what this bill does for the consideration of a potential agreement.

I thank Senator CORKER for his leadership, and the two of us will work together to make sure we complete this bill in an orderly way.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am surely going to make a unanimous consent request, and I have notified the Republican leader of this, but before I do, I wish to make a statement on this issue. I am talking about the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2015. That is a lot of words, but it is basically talking about the bulletproof vest bill Republican Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell and I first put together 17 years ago. It is a lifesaving grant program.

Senator Nighthorse Campbell and I both had the privilege of serving in various forms of law enforcement. We knew how things had changed. We

knew a number of police officers, men and women, who died, were shot to death, who would have lived had they had bulletproof vests. We also knew a lot of them—especially small departments such as those in my State and many in Senator Nighthorse Campbell's State—could not afford them. That could be said of virtually every single State.

The partnership we put together has provided 13,000 State and local law enforcement agencies with nearly 1.2 million bulletproof vests for their officers. When we pass it today, the Senate will move a step closer to ensuring that for the next 5 years thousands of agencies can purchase bulletproof vests for officers serving in their communities.

These are not just empty words or an empty gesture. It is probably the most tangible support Congress can provide to law enforcement officers. It will help put vests on the backs of more than 200,000 police officers and it will save lives.

Just ask the chief of the Woodway, TX, police department, Yost Zakhary. Chief Zakhary testified at a Senate judiciary hearing last year. He brought this vest with him to the hearing. The officer wearing it was shot at almost pointblank range during a roadside stop. The officer lost a lot of blood—we can see it on his vest—but he did not lose his life because this vest, purchased through this partnership grant program, caught the bullet aimed at his heart.

Officer Ann Carrizales of the Stafford, TX, police department also testified at the hearing last year. She told us that her vest—because we are now beginning to buy vests that recognize the obvious differences between male and female officers—was uniquely fitted for her body. It saved her life when she was shot twice during a routine traffic stop. Her testimony was some of the most moving testimony I have heard in 40 years in the Senate. She brought with her nearly 200 letters from her daughter's elementary school. They saw how a daughter's mother's life was saved, and they all called for the Senate to act.

This bill is important to law enforcement around the Nation. It is certainly important to my little State of Vermont. Vermont law enforcement agencies have received nearly 4,400 protective vests from this program, and those officers throughout Vermont, as well as around the Nation, are better protected and better able to do their jobs. I am proud to share that recent recipients in Vermont include agencies in Addison County, Barre City, Barre Town, Bennington County, Berlin, Brattleboro, Burlington, Caledonia County, Chester, Dover, Essex County, Essex Junction, Franklin County, Grand Isle County, Hardwick, Hartford, Ludlow, Middlebury, Milton, Montpelier, Morristown, Newport, Northfield, Norwich, Orange County, Orleans County, Richmond, Rutland, Shelburne, South Burlington, Springfield, St. Albans, St. Johnsbury, Stowe, Waterbury Village, Weathersfield, Williston, Windsor County, Windsor, and Winooski.

It has helped to make protective vests standard equipment for law enforcement agencies across the country. Yet, for far too many jurisdictions—especially smaller and rural agencies such as those in Vermont—they know the vests still cost too much and wear out too soon. They actually work.

I remember to this day a young police officer who was in and testified before our Senate Judiciary Committee. He had his mother and his father, his wife and his children lined up behind him. He said to us: I love police work. The only thing I love more than that is my family. He said: There was a day when I thought I would never see my family again. Again, it was a routine traffic stop, but the man stepped out and shot him twice, pointblank. He reached under and pulled up the bulletproof vest, and we could see the two slugs embedded in the vest.

He said: My mother and father and my wife and my children came to the hospital to see me. I had cracked ribs that day, but they knew they could bring me home to be with them the next day.

They are not going to save every officer, of course, but they have saved more than 3,000 law enforcement officers since 1987. I have met with police officers such as the one I just described, who are alive today because of vests purchased through this program. They will tell us the program saves lives. But it is also for the members of their families, seeing them going off to work knowing they have put it on. That makes a difference.

This bill also contains a number of improvements to the grant program. I want to thank Senator FEINSTEIN for helping to improve the bill so that it provides incentives for agencies to provide uniquely fitted vests for female officers. The bill also ensures that agencies have mandatory-wear policies to ensure that the vests are used regularly.

This is not a partisan issue. I remember walking down the street in Denver, CO, where Ben Nighthorse Campbell and I first started this. A police officer walked up to me and said: Are you PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont? And I said: Yes. He tapped his chest and said thank you and moved on.

Senator GRAHAM is a lead cosponsor of this legislation. I wish to thank Senator GRAHAM for his important efforts to help pass this legislation.

I am also thankful to the law enforcement community. They have long spoken with a single voice on this issue. They don't care whether we are Republicans or Democrats; they just care about this issue.

So if we pass this bill today and move it to the House of Representatives, I would urge the Speaker to quickly take up the bill so the President can sign it next week as we approach National Police Week. Now is the time to honor the brave men and women of law enforcement who have lost their lives serving their communities. Let's put real meaning behind our words and tributes. It is time to pass this bill.

I see my friend from Oklahoma on the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 32, S. 125; that a Lee amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 125) to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this is a great bill in many ways. There is a tremendous need. I have family members who are police officers, actually, in small, rural police forces. I have staff members who are former police officers. I understand the situation very well, how much of a difference it makes to so many people. But we have two different programs dealing with bulletproof vests, two different systems of actually distributing bulletproof vests from the Federal Government that in many ways are complementary and in some ways competing. We have two sets of applications with two different sets of personnel to actually approve those applications and two different processes to apply.

My goal is that where we find duplication of effort, even if it is a good effort, that we as the Federal Government find ways to be able to streamline that process. Every dollar we spend on bureaucracy here, on a duplicative program, is a dollar less that we actually spend to buy the bulletproof vests and be able to get them out the door.

I have had multiple conversations that have been very productive with Senator LEAHY and with Senator GRAHAM to talk about this particular issue of how we can combine the application process, how we can combine the administrative process to make sure a good program doesn't lose dollars. We have numerous reports all over the Federal Government on duplication in government.

I look forward to the ongoing conversations. I have some assurances that we will deal with some of these issues as we go through the appropriations process in the days ahead, so I am willing to withdraw my objection. I know that we will resolve some of these issues in the days ahead to allow us to be able to move forward.

So with that, I withdraw my objection.

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

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment(No. 1214) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the authorization of appropriations)

On page 2, line 11, strike ''$30,000,000'' and insert ''$25,000,000''.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 125), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 125

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 1001(a)(23) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(23)) is amended to read as follows:

''(23) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out part Y, $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.''.

SEC. 3. EXPIRATION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.

Section 2501 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 379611) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) EXPIRATION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'appropriated funds' means any amounts that are appropriated for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 to carry out this part.

''(2) EXPIRATION.—All appropriated funds that are not obligated on or before December 31, 2022 shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury not later than January 31, 2023.''.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON 2-YEAR LIMITATION ON FUNDS.

It is the sense of Congress that amounts made available to carry out part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 379611 et seq.) should be made available through the end of the first fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the amounts are appropriated and should not be made available until expended.

SEC. 5. MATCHING FUNDS LIMITATION.

Section 2501(f) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 379611(f)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) LIMITATION ON MATCHING FUNDS.—A State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe may not use funding received under any other Federal grant program to pay or defer the cost, in whole or in part, of the matching requirement under paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 6. APPLICATION OF BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS TO ANY ARMOR VEST OR BODY ARMOR PURCHASED WITH FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS.

Section 521 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3766a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a grantee that uses funds made available under this part to purchase an armor vest or body armor shall—

''(A) comply with any requirements established for the use of grants made under part Y;

''(B) have a written policy requiring uniformed patrol officers to wear an armor vest or body armor; and

''(C) use the funds to purchase armor vests or body armor that meet any performance standards established by the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

''(2) In this subsection, the terms 'armor vest' and 'body armor' have the meanings given such terms in section 2503.''.

SEC. 7. UNIQUELY FITTED ARMOR VESTS.

Section 2501(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 379611(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''; or'' and inserting ''; and'';

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) provides armor vests to law enforcement officers that are uniquely fitted for such officers, including vests uniquely fitted to individual female law enforcement officers; or''.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank all of the Senators who have cosponsored this bill. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for withdrawing his objection. I am hoping the other body will soon take this up so that we can try to have it passed before the police meet here at the Capitol for a memorial to fallen police officers and we can move forward.

This has been underfunded over the years, and we have not been able to fill all of the requests. We have filled a lot of them, and we have saved a lot of lives. Of course, I will be willing to work with the Senator from Oklahoma or with any other Senator on this or any other law enforcement program. But I have always considered my years in law enforcement in many ways the high point of my career. I want to make sure we approve it as soon as we can.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to sound a note of warning about the nation of Iran. Consider the following facts: The Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, has accused America of lying. We learned that the Iranian regime has been actively arming and supporting the anti-American Houthi rebels in Yemen since 2009. The Iranian regime held a parade of military equipment that featured chants of ''Death to America'' and ''Death to Israel.'' The Iranian regime unjustly detained American citizen, Washington Post reporter Jason Rezaian and charged him with espionage and other crimes, including ''propaganda against the establishment.'' The Defense Minister of Iran declared that IAEA inspectors would be barred from all military sites, even those known to have nuclear facilities. The Iranian Navy threatened a cargo ship sailing under the flag of the United States in the Strait of Hormuz. The Iranian Navy seized another cargo ship in the Strait of Hormuz sailing under the flag of our ally, the Marshall Islands. The Foreign Minister of Iran accused the United States and our allies of being the biggest danger to the international community. Great Britain informed a U.N. sanctions panel that Iran has an active nuclear procurement network linked to two blacklisted firms. The Iranian Navy harassed a U.S. warship and military plane off the coast of Yemen.

These are not events from 1979 or 1983 or 1996. These are, in chronological order, the aggressive anti-American actions of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the last month. Every one of those occurred in the last month, at least these are the ones we know of that have been covered in the media.

This relentless drumbeat of hostility has gone on unabated for 36 years, and it makes the legislation before this body, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, all the more critical. The bill's supporters insist it is the only way to ensure that Congress has its due say over President Obama's proposed Iran deal.

I agree that it is of paramount importance to give Congress its proper

role in an international agreement of this magnitude and to make clear that President Obama must persuade Congress and the American people to support his deal if he wants it to be binding, which is why I have been supportive of this process so far. But I am here to tell you that as the legislation stands, this legislation is unlikely to stop a bad Iran deal.

The problem is an all-too-familiar one here in Washington, DC, which is that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act contains a provision inserted at the insistence of Senate Democrats which will allow Congress to appear to vote against the deal while tacitly allowing it to go into effect. The bill allows Congress to adopt a ''resolution of disapproval'' of President Obama's Iran deal. On the surface that sounds reasonable.

From what we know publicly of the deal, I certainly disapprove of it strongly. But a resolution of disapproval under this legislation, even if it passed a 60-vote threshold, with grand claims of bipartisanship, would not be the end of the matter.

The President would certainly veto it. Once he did, it would require 67 votes in the Senate and 290 votes in the House to override that veto. No wonder the White House has lifted its objection to this legislation. All the President would have to do to force a bad Iran deal on America is hold 34 Senators in the Democratic Party or 145 Members of Congress.

If he could do that, a bad deal that undermines the national security of this country, that endangers our friend and ally, the nation of Israel, would go into effect. He could claim he was simply following the process Congress required. That is not an oversight. That is not an accident. This bill, as drafted, will provide some political cover to Senate Democrats to say they have voted to provide strict scrutiny and congressional approval of an Iran deal.

Yet, as currently drafted, it is a virtual certainty that no matter how terrible this deal is, it will go into effect and this legislation is unlikely to stop it. Our first priority should be stopping a bad Iran deal that jeopardizes the lives of millions of Americans and millions of our allies. There is nothing more important this body can consider, not trade, not the budget. There is nothing more important.

The first responsibility of this body is to protect the national security of this country, to protect the lives and safety of men, women, and children across this country. The President's Iran deal deeply jeopardizes the safety of Americans. From what we know publicly—and the details are still shrouded in considerable secrecy—but from what we know publicly, under this deal, Iran will be allowed to keep its enriched uranium. It will be allowed to keep its centrifuges and reactors. It will continue its ICBM Program, the only purpose of which is to deliver a nuclear weapon to the United States of America.

Tehran will receive even more economic relief, reportedly including a $50 billion signing bonus. Who in their right mind would give a $50 billion signing bonus to Iran? It is worth noting that even under one of the strictest regimes of international sanctions, Iran was still able to marshall the resources to become one of the world's leading state sponsors of terrorism. We can only imagine what Iran will do with this new source of funding, which will certainly flow to Hamas, to Hezbollah, and to the Houthis, as well as to their proxies in Latin America.

I would note, if this deal goes into effect, and tens or hundreds of billions of dollars flow into Iran, including a $50 billion signing bonus, and that money is given directly to radical Islamic terrorists, the blood of the men and women and children who will be murdered by those terrorists will be directly on the hands of this administration. If we allow tens and hundreds of billions of dollars to flow into the hands of terrorists, it places complicity for that terrorism on this administration.

There is no topic more serious this body could consider than preventing the murder of Americans. The Iranians' behavior speaks for itself. They are, right now today, unlawfully imprisoning multiple American citizens—Pastor Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, as well as Jason Rezaian—under brutal conditions. They are withholding information on the whereabouts of Robert Levinson.

They have killed Americans across the globe and they have plotted to kill us here at home. They are explicitly threatening to wipe our ally, the nation of Israel, off the map. Indeed, in the midst of this negotiation, the senior Iranian general said: The annihilation of Israel is ''non-negotiable''. Given that, there is no way on Earth we should be allowing billions of dollars to flow into a radical terrorist organization that has declared its object destroying Israel, which they call the ''Little Satan,'' and ultimately destroying America, which they call us the ''Great Satan.'' They are telling us they want to kill us, not 10 years ago or 20 years ago—they are telling us this right now. If history teaches any principle with abundant clarity, it is that if somebody tells you they want to kill you, believe them. They are not being subtle. Those are the people the Obama administration are putting on a path to having nuclear weaponry, the most fearsome weaponry known to man. Make no mistake. That is what this deal would do unless Congress steps in to stop it—not to have a show vote, not to pretend to disapprove but to actually stop a bad deal that jeopardizes our safety.

To see how this scenario is likely to play out, we do not have to speculate. We need to look no further than to the recent history of North Korea. In October 1994, the Clinton administration reached another agreed framework with North Korea over that nation's nuclear program. Then-Secretary of State Madeleine Albright insisted she had gotten a deal that would freeze the military components of the program and, through economic incentives and diplomatic outreach, entice the hermit kingdom to join the international community and reject their pursuit of nuclear weapons.

At first, all seemed to go well as North Korea eagerly accepted the influx of hard currency, as well as the promised civilian nuclear reactors. Secretary Albright, accompanied by then-Policy Coordinator for North Korea Wendy Sherman, even visited North Korea in 2000 to celebrate the progress. Despite all of the diplomatic initiatives, despite all of the champagne toasts, the North Koreans were cheating, we now know, they were cheating on the framework from the get-go.

When the George W. Bush administration figured it out, economic sanctions were reimposed. But they had no effect, neither did yet more additional rounds of negotiations while they continued and continued and continued to enrich.

Kim Jong-il had gotten the resources he needed because the Clinton administration relaxed sanctions and allowed billions of dollars to flow into his hands. In 2006, North Korea tested its first nuclear weapon—two more tests to follow.

In 2012, when Kim Jong Un came to power, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton suggested that Kim Jong Un might be a transformative leader. The State Department reportedly assured the President that he would be more concerned with economic improvements than with his inherited nuclear program. In less than 2 years, this, too, was proven wrong. Kim Jong Un has demonstrated no interest in reform. He has, instead, resolutely pursued his father's policy. Just last week, we learned from the Chinese that North Korea is well on its way to having some 40 nuclear weapons by 2016, as their ability to enrich uranium is significantly more sophisticated than had been believed.

In addition, they are hard at work at their ICBM Program and may soon be able not only to threaten our regional allies but also to strike the west coast of the United States. With so many weapons in their arsenal, it seems only logical that this rogue regime may, in turn, offer some of those weapons for sale to the highest bidder.

All of this proves the fallacy of the Clinton administration's repeated basic assumption; that the North Koreans would act in their best interests

economically, for which, for Albright and Sherman, meant reaching a diplomatic agreement to achieve economic relief. Unfortunately, they were dead wrong. The result is the United States faces an escalating strategic threat in the Pacific.

We are now in grave danger of history repeating itself with Iran. Wendy Sherman, the very same person who negotiated the failed North Korea deal, the Obama administration brought her back from the Clinton administration to be our lead negotiator with Iran. Think about that. The person who led the failed North Korea talks, the talks that led to North Korea getting nuclear weapons, is President Obama's lead negotiator with Iran, and her negotiations will certainly lead to the same outcome.

Indeed, when Secretary Clinton brought Wendy Sherman back, Wendy Sherman promptly followed the exact same playbook for the negotiations that she had followed under the Clinton administration with respect to North Korea. You know, Albert Einstein famously said: ''The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.'' If we negotiate the same failed deal, we will get the same failed outcome.

Iran has already enjoyed significant economic relief and legitimization on the international stage, while America's demands have dwindled from dismantling Iran's nuclear program to now merely curbing it around the edges temporarily and unverifiably. It may only be a matter of time before Secretary John Kerry, no doubt accompanied by Under Secretary Wendy Sherman, pays a courtesy call on Tehran to echo history and to show the world how ''civilized'' the whole arrangement is and only a matter of time until the Iranians cheat—just like the North Koreans—their way to a bomb.

Yet the grim reality is that, as bad as the situation is with North Korea, with Iran it is qualitatively worse. The Kim dynasty are brutal, megalomaniacal dictators, but they do seem to be motivated, at least to some extent, by self-preservation, and so to some form, there is at least a possibility of rational deterrence. And therein lies the fundamental difference with Iran.

The mullahs in Tehran are radical, Islamist zealots, for whom the eradication of the little Satan, Israel, and the great Satan, America, is a solemn religious duty. And with radical religious zealots, ordinary cost-benefit analysis doesn't apply the same way. With zealots who glorify death and suicide, deterrence doesn't work the way it works elsewhere.

''Death to America'' is not just a slogan; it is a religious promise.

The risk that the Ayatolla will use the economic windfall of billions of dollars, courtesy of the United States, to pursue nuclear weapons that he would either use himself or give to terrorist surrogates to use is intolerably high.

The consequences of this deal could very well be an Iranian nuclear weapon used in the skies of Tel Aviv, New York or Los Angeles. The consequence of this deal could very well be millions of Americans murdered. There is no more serious topic we could be addressing.

Now, President Obama and his two Secretaries of State have had their chance to negotiate with Iran, and they have squandered it on the same approach that was so spectacularly unsuccessful with North Korea. They changed very little. They just replayed the same failed plan.

Once again, assuming they can reason with a rogue regime, they are on the verge of sealing a deal that could result in the most significant threat to our Nation in the 21st century.

The administration's claim that Tehran will not use their economic windfall to pursue a nuclear program or to support terrorism and that if they do, ''snapback'' sanctions will fix the problem are hardly reassuring, especially, as we know from the example of North Korea that the opposite result is far more likely. Having gotten what they wanted, the mullahs will string out the economic benefits for as long as they want and then, when they are ready, test a nuclear bomb.

The Iranians know perfectly well what a very good deal this is for them. And they are doing what they can to prevent Congress from disrupting it.

In March, I was proud to join with 46 of my colleagues in signing a letter written by Senator TOM COTTON of Arkansas that explained the constitutional role of the Senate in approving a treaty—or of both Houses of Congress—passing legislation into law, for any deal to be binding on the United States of America.

Judging from their reaction, Tehran does not appreciate our free system of government. Foreign Minister Mohammed Zarif responded that:

> The authors [of the letter] may not fully understand that in international law, governments represent the entirety of their respective states, are responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs, are required to fulfill the obligations they undertake with other states and may not invoke their internal law as justification for failure to perform their international obligations.

Speaking last week to an audience at NYU, Mr. Zarif reiterated his opinion that as a matter of international law, President Obama would have to abide by the dictates of whatever deal is struck and that Congress is powerless to stop it.

He also said that he ''does not deal with Congress.'' As a matter of U.S. law, Mr. Zarif is wrong. It is true that in the nation of Iran, when you have a supreme leader, an ayatolla, with the ability to string you up or shoot you if you disagree, the word of the Supreme Leader is binding. But we have no supreme leader in the United States of America.

We are bound by a Constitution and rule of law that keeps sovereignty in we the people. If Mr. Zarif wants a sanctions agreement, the only way to make that binding is to deal with Congress pursuant to the Constitution of the United States. But if we pass the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act as it stands right now, he won't have to.

It is time to tell the American people the truth—enough games. This legislation is not a victory of Congress. This legislation, at best, will slow down, slightly, a terrible deal from being put into place. That is the very best outcome—a slight delay in the President's putting into effect a terrible deal that jeopardizes American security.

It is not a guarantee that President Obama will have to submit this deal and honor the will of Congress. In fact, it provides a back-door path for a minority in Congress, one-third of Congress, to ensure that the deal goes into effect over the bipartisan will of the majority. And even worse, the President will be able to claim that he satisfied the terms that Congress itself set.

That is hardly the message we want to send on Iran's nuclear program. And this issue is far too important to pass a bad bill simply to send a message. By prioritizing bipartisan compromise over our national security, we are endangering the safety and lives of Americans across this country.

Now, I will note there is a silver lining. In 20 months, Mr. Obama will no longer occupy the Oval Office.

In January of 2017, when a new President enters the White House, he or she will have full authority to rescind any international agreement with Iran that has not been ratified by the Senate or passed into law by both Houses of Congress.

Any man or woman who is fit to be Commander in Chief of the United States of America should be prepared to rescind a bad deal with Iran on day one. No President of the United States should jeopardize the lives of millions of Americans or millions of our allies.

Congress could act right now to stop a bad deal. We could come together and assert our constitutional role, and we can do so through a very simple mechanism. Right now, the current bill provides that if Congress doesn't override President Obama's veto, a terrible Iran deal goes into effect.

I have joined with Senator PAT TOOMEY of Pennsylvania in filing an amendment that simply reverses that default, which simply says: The President cannot lift sanctions on Iran unless the deal is affirmatively approved by Congress. That is the constitutional structure.

That ought to be a provision supported—not by 51 Senators or even 60

Senators or even 67 Senators—by all 100 Senators.

What a strange development in our modern polity that the Congress of the United States is content to effectively neuter itself.

The Presiding Officer and I are both Members of the Republican Party. I feel quite confident that if a Republican President were in office, we would not be content to give up the constitutional authority and responsibility that is given to this body to ratify treaties or to pass law. And yet I am sorry to say, on the Democratic side of the aisle, our friends are perfectly content to forfeit their constitutional authority to the President.

If this deal is a good deal on the substance—it most assuredly is not, but if it is—the President should be able to get congressional approval.

Yet the reason that Senate Democrats are terrified of requiring congressional approval is they know full well you cannot defend a deal that allows Iran to keep tens of thousands of centrifuges, to keep enriched uranium, to keep developing their ICBM program, to keep remaining the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and to keep working to annihilate the nation of Israel. That is not defensible on the merits.

One simple change would turn this legislation into something meaningful. One simple change that would say: The President is free to negotiate any deal he likes, but before it goes into effect, bring it to Congress and get the affirmative agreement of Congress. Don't have a fig-leaf vote and let the President's bad deal go into effect. That undermines our national security. Have a meaningful vote that requires the affirmative approval of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Cruz-Toomey amendment, which is a commonsense fix that will give this bill real teeth by removing the resolution of disapproval and, instead, would allow an Iran deal to go into effect only if Congress approves it. In the spirit of this legislation, it is purely procedural, and so it is germane to this bill.

Yet Senate Democrats have blocked a vote on it. They have refused even to vote on this amendment. All this amendment does is ensure that the burden is on President Obama to persuade Congress and the American people that the deal is a good one or, at a very minimum, is not a terrible threat to the national security of the United States of America.

This should be something on which we come together—not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Senators who have a responsibility to protect our constituents, to protect the American people, and to defend the Constitution. We should come together with one voice and say: We will not allow a bad Iran deal that ensures that Iran will acquire nuclear weapons that could be used to murder millions of Americans or millions of our allies.

This should be unanimous.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT NO. 1152

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 1191, that I be allowed to offer my amendment No. 1152.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first I thank my friend from Texas. He and I share the same goal, and that is to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapon State.

There are three basic problems with my friend's amendment, if it were to be adopted.

One, it would either defeat the bill—which is very possible, because it changes the fundamentals of this bill. We are looking at reviewing an agreement that does not require consent, because Congress may, in fact, decide it does not want to take up this issue. That is one of the options.

Second, if it were adopted, it could very well affect our ability to negotiate with Iran. They may say: Gee, we have to negotiate with the President, and then we have to negotiate with the Congress.

And our negotiating partners, who don't have those circumstances, might very well say: That is the end of negotiations.

Then the United States is blamed, and we are isolated as the country that prevented a diplomatic solution to this very difficult problem.

Or, third, it puts our negotiators in a tough position because they don't have a united position. Therefore, we won't negotiate, and we won't have the strength to negotiate the strongest possible deal.

And for my friend who says it is just simple for Congress to pass a bill in order to implement this, we have been on this bill for 2 weeks. It came out of the committee 19 to 0, and I don't yet see an end in sight. So at the same time, this bill prevents the President from exercising his waiver authority under the sanctions regime while Congress is reviewing it.

So, in effect, delay tactics could be used by a minority to prevent the agreement from being considered on the floor of the Senate.

So for all those reasons the well-intended amendment would have, I think it could have the reverse effect. But, from a procedural point of view, as I have explained earlier, we have been working to try to get amendments up.

For all those reasons, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am a little confused about our scheduling. I know I was supposed to be speaking at 5:05 p.m. We do want to get back to where we are going back and forth.

I know my good friend from Ohio wishes to be recognized next for a short period of time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized now and that he be followed by my good friend from Delaware to be recognized for his time, and then I be recognized at the end of his remarks for such time as I would consume as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas still has the floor.

Is there objection to the request?

Mr. INHOFE. I am sorry about that.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I will wrap up momentarily and then will be happy to yield to my friend from Oklahoma for his very reasonable time allocation suggestion.

I would note that the Senator from Maryland suggested the problem of Congress affirmatively approving this is that it could be subject to delay; that Congress might not take it up. I would note for my friend from Maryland that I would certainly be amenable to a friendly amendment to my amendment that required expedited consideration of an Iran deal without the ability to filibuster but with the requirement that it receive the affirmative approval of both Houses of Congress.

So the specific problems my friend from Maryland suggested could be avoided. We could put in a short but expedited time period, if necessary, but what is critical, I would suggest, is that Congress has to ultimately approve this; that we take responsibility. If the deal is a good one, then the majority of Congress should support it. If it is not a good one, then it will not receive the approval of the majority of Congress.

So I would ask my friend from Maryland if that would be a friendly amendment that he would be open to in reaching a compromise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I appreciate the friendliness of my friend from Texas, but I must tell him we have this bill balanced. There is an expedited process in regard to Congress taking action if there is a violation of the agreement by Iran. We do have an expedited process in the bill currently before us so that we can snap back sanctions quickly, and Congress receives not only certification but notices from the administration as to whether there are material breaches. So we already have that process in the bill to deal with any violation of any agreement.

The balance here is that Congress does not know what process it uses: We impose the sanctions. We might want

to take up modifications to the sanctions. We may want to take up an approval resolution. We may want to take up a disapproval resolution. We might want to take up something totally different with Iran. Those are our options. So it would be difficult now to predict an expedited process when we don't know what the action of the Congress is going to be in regard to the agreement being submitted by the President of the United States.

So even though it is a very friendly suggestion, I can't take the Senator up on it.

Mr. CRUZ. I would note, Mr. President, the result of this amendment not being taken up is that Congress is abrogating our authority and responsibility to approve this deal. Because of the result of this bill as drafted, we can look in a crystal ball and know exactly what is going to happen. In a couple of months, the administration will come forward with the details of its terrible deal with Iran. This summer we are going to have debates in this body. A resolution of disapproval will be introduced, and it will not get 67 votes in this body. There will be enough Members of the President's own party who will stand with him no matter how terrible the deal is for our national security.

Right now, with this legislation, the bad deal will go into effect—a deal that has the potential to result in the murder of millions of Americans. There are very few topics we address that come anywhere close to the gravity of this topic, and it is disappointing to see Democratic Senators putting partisan politics above our national security. We should stand together to protect America.

The next 20 months are going to be very dangerous in this Nation. Yet I am encouraged that in 20 months America is going to embark on a different path. America is going to return to defending our Nation and defending our Constitution and defending the men and women across this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, before I propound my unanimous consent request, let me just applaud my friend from Texas.

I had a hard time believing it when they said they were going to be negotiating with a terrorist, they were going to negotiate with Iran. Have these people forgotten our unclassified intelligence way back in 2007 said that by 2015 Iran was expected to have a weapon and a delivery system that could actually reach the United States of America? Here it is—what year is it, 2015—and they are talking about negotiating.

I happened to be out on the USS *Carl Vinson* during this negotiation just a couple of weeks ago, and at the same time we were out there, Iran was sending to Yemen the different weapons, and our sister ship, the USS *Roosevelt*, had to go down and turn them around. At the same time that they are negotiating with Iran, we had Putin sending down to Iran the S–300 rocket. That S–300 rocket—and it is not even classified—it can go up and kill something 98,000 feet above the ground. Yet here we have Israel and the United States, and if the time would come that we would want to take out some of the nuclear activity in Iran, our proven enemy, we would perhaps be unable to do that.

So I do applaud my friend for bringing this up. Not many people are talking about this. I remember so well, though it has been several years ago now, when President Bush was first elected and he talked about the triad, those dangers, and he put at the top of that Iran. How much do they have to do before we realize that is the greatest threat facing America today.

With that, I ask unanimous consent—to straighten out the confusion in the order of things—that my friend from Ohio be recognized for a short presentation; after that, my friend from Delaware would be recognized; and that I be recognized at the conclusion of the remarks of my friend from Delaware for such time as I shall use.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

IRAN AND FEDERAL PERMITTING REFORM

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on a couple of issues, one with regard to Iran. I would just make one point that I think is pretty obvious to most Members on this floor, which is that these sanctions really matter. In other words, regardless of what we end up doing with regard to the Iranian nuclear agreement—and I am very concerned about what I see in the framework agreement—we have to be very careful about relieving sanctions because Iran is the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world. That is based on our own State Department.

With us providing them sanctions relief, it frees up resources that they can then use for some of their terrorist activity in the Mideast and really around the globe.

I returned from Israel a couple days ago and got some great briefings that were very troubling about what is happening with regard to Iran's support of Hezbollah—additional and more sophisticated missiles with guidance systems—and what is happening even with the other groups in the region, including a Sunni group, Hamas, in providing rockets there, and certainly what they are doing in Syria and what they are doing today in Yemen and even in Libya.

So this is not just about the nuclear arms agreement, if that, in fact, does come to some conclusion. It is about a broader issue, about ensuring that we do not provide this funding for Iran to continue its aggression in the Middle East and around the globe.

I want to speak about something closer to home, and I appreciate my colleague from Oklahoma giving me a chance to talk briefly. This is about a piece of legislation that actually passed a committee today that helps create jobs and helps to encourage more construction projects and would make a huge difference in getting people back to work.

I will say I am glad Senator CARPER is on the floor because I want to talk about him too. He was part of this project. We have worked on this the last few years. Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL of Missouri is my cosponsor, but today in the committee, with the help of chairman RON JOHNSON and Ranking Member CARPER on the floor today, we were able to get people working together to move this permitting reform bill forward.

This is about regulatory reform. It is about ensuring we streamline to make our system work better. But ultimately it is about jobs. That is why both the business community and the labor unions representing the building trades—the AFL–CIO Building Trades Council supported this legislation today. They want to see people get back to work, and so do I.

If we look at what has happened over the past year, our economic growth has been anemic. Even in the first quarter of this year, we find just 0.2 percent growth is now the number out there. Employment numbers from last month were disappointing. We need to give this economy a shot in the arm, and this will help do it.

Unfortunately, what we have now is a permitting process that is full of uncertainty, unpredictability, it is out of date, it hinders investment, it stifles growth, and keeps jobs from being created at a time when too many Americans, particularly in the construction trades, are looking for work.

This is a real problem in getting investment in America too. There is a World Bank study done every year about how countries line up in terms of their ability to get things done, the ease of doing business. With regard to green-lighting a project, permitting, the United States of America now stands No. 41 in the world—41. That is unacceptable. That means that capital is going elsewhere, and one reason is because of the delays; one reason is because of the liability risk; one reason is because people are worried if they put capital here, it is not going to be able to come to fruition quickly enough because of our permitting system. So this is about not just global rankings but helping Americans go back to work.

I learned about this first when constituents came to me; that with regard

to Federal permitting, particularly on energy projects, sometimes there are as many as 35 different Federal permits, we are told. American Municipal Power came to me. They were trying to put together a hydro plant on the Ohio River—something we should all be for—and it was taking too much time. They were losing investors.

Folks came to me from Wellsville, OH. They wanted to put together a $6 billion synthetic fuels plant there. It was a coal-to-liquid plant that would convert coal into clean diesel and jet fuel that would create jobs, employing up to 2,500 workers just to build it. Unfortunately, permitting delays and lawsuits interfered with the project and the plant was never constructed. We need that in Ohio. It would have been a win-win for us.

So this is an urgent issue we should address, and this is just a couple of examples of it. The bottom line is it is not unheard of for some projects to have dozens of different Federal permits. So this will help.

This bill does a few things. One, it does strengthen coordination and deadline setting. It creates an interagency council that identifies best practices, deadlines for reviews and approvals of important infrastructure projects, strengthens cooperation between State and local permitting authorities to avoid the duplication we see too often now in trying to get a permit to build something.

The bill also facilitates greater transparency, more public participation, with the creation of an online dashboard so you know where a project is to see who is holding this thing up and how to get it moving. The bill requires agencies to accept comments from stakeholders early in the approval process, with the goal of identifying public policy concerns early on so it doesn't end up stopping the project.

Finally, the bill institutes some very sensible litigation reforms. Again, I thank my colleague from Delaware because he helped us to work through this. This reduces the statute of limitations on lawsuits, challenging permitting decisions from 6 years, where it is now, down to 2 years.

This is legislation that can unite both our parties. It is something that will help to get the economy going. It is something the President's own jobs council has called for. It is something that also the business groups have called for, including the Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable. Again, it is commonsense reform where we were able to bring together groups that normally don't see eye to eye, including the labor unions.

Here is a quote today from Sean McGarvey, president of North America's Building Trades Unions. He said:

> If there was ever an issue that could be considered a no-brainer for Congress, the Federal Permitting Improvement Act is it. . . . Any way you slice it, this is a jobs bill, and it is critically important to the economic interests of the skilled craft construction professionals I represent.

I agree with Sean. This is a bill that makes sense. It is one all Americans can agree on. We need to be committed to these serious reforms and get them done. This is going to help turn our economy around, help bring back some of these good-paying jobs, and it is an area where we can find common ground.

Again, I thank Senator MCCASKILL for her partnership over the last 3 years on this. I thank the members of our committee for voting for it today. Again, to the chairman and ranking member, including Senator CARPER, who is on the floor today, thank you for moving this through the committee. Now let's get it to the floor.

We had a strong vote today. I think the final vote was 12 to 1. Let's get this to the floor and actually get it done, have a vote on this legislation, get it through the House, get it to the President for his signature, and start to bring back these jobs and start to build these projects right here in the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his kind words, and to him and our colleague, Senator MCCASKILL from Missouri, for their persistence and leadership on an important issue.

I oftentimes describe myself on this floor as a recovering Governor and one who focuses on how to create a more nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation. There are a lot of attributes—access to capital, infrastructure—which Senator INHOFE leads us on every day. Another one is a reasonable tax burden. Another is commonsense regulation.

My dad always used to say: Use some common sense. And I think, with the legislation we moved out of committee, and hopefully through this Senate Chamber, that will show a lot of common sense and provide a more nurturing environment.

So I thank Senator INHOFE.

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH ''BETH'' LESKI AND CAROL RICHEL

Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the efforts of the men and women who serve their neighbors every day as Federal, State, county, and municipal workers.

In 1985, the Public Service Roundtable, with support from Congress, started the very first Public Service Recognition Week to honor the hard work of public employees on our behalf and the sacrifices they often make in doing so. Since then, the first week of May has been officially designated by Congress as Public Service Recognition Week. This week is the 30th anniversary, and I think a perfect opportunity for each of us to show our appreciation to the millions of public servants in our communities and across the country.

Over the past several months, I have been coming to the Senate floor, as my colleagues know, to highlight the important work being done by public employees at the Department of Homeland Security, in particular.

Over 200,000 men and women work at the Department of Homeland Security. While their jobs are diverse, they share one common mission; that is, to keep our country a safe, secure, and resilient place where the American way of life can thrive. Whether they are patrolling our borders, responding to natural disasters or bolstering our defenses in cyber space, these public servants touch the lives of Americans every day.

Today, I rise to recognize two more outstanding public servants at DHS, this time from the Transportation Security Administration, which we call TSA.

As we may recall, TSA was established after the devastating September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks with the mission to better protect our Nation's transportation systems. Today, TSA employs some 47,000 transportation security officers at over 440 airports nationwide. Each year, those officers screen about 660 million travelers and nearly 1.5 billion bags.

TSA is also the lead agency in securing our surface transportation networks, including our roads, bridges, tunnels, railroads, and maritime ports. For anyone who has ever taken a flight, chances are they have seen the men and women of TSA in action. If they haven't seen them, they certainly enjoyed the benefit of the important work they often do behind the scenes to keep us safe.

I would like to take a moment today to recognize one of those TSA employees who is keeping our skies safer. Her name is Elizabeth ''Beth'' Leski.

Beth is one of those TSA employees who are usually out of sight but whose work, nonetheless, is vital. She is a Secure Flight Program analyst in the TSA Office of Intelligence and Analysis. Originally from Michigan, she has lived in Severn, MD, for the last two decades with her husband David. After graduating with a B.S. in aviation management, Beth worked in the airline industry for 21 years before joining the Secure Flight Program.

Over the past 4 years, Beth has worked at TSA as a customer service agent, customer service supervisor, and now as a program analyst at the Secure Flight Operations Center.

Here she is in a picture, between Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson and Deputy Secretary Mayorkas.

As I said, over the past 4 years, Beth has worked in different roles at the Secure Flight Operations Center. Secure Flight is a program that enhances aviation security by running the names of passengers against the government's watch list of known or suspected terrorists. In other words, Beth helps to keep bad people off of planes by ensuring that those who receive boarding passes are not on our government's list of individuals prohibited from flying.

According to her colleagues, Beth works tirelessly to synchronize all the moving parts at her operations center. They say that Beth always goes above and beyond the call of duty. She strives to make life easier for fellow analysts, developing checklists, spreadsheets, and calendar invitations to keep individuals accountable and organized. Her colleague James Billups says that Beth ''inspires everyone around her, and truly brings the best out of people.'' I can see why.

In addition to her positive energy in the workplace, she has been widely recognized at TSA and the Department for always lending a helping hand at employee morale events. She is also known for welcoming new recruits to the national capital region with a unique ''Welcome Aboard'' package. It is actions such as these that show that Beth has truly embodied TSA's core value of team spirit.

In 2014, Beth received the Secretary's Award for her steadfast and outstanding assistance to the entire team in the Secure Flight Operations Center.

When she is not securing our skies, Beth likes to run and travel the world—pursuits she and I actually share in common. We have another very important thing in common—the U.S. Navy. Beth is a retired yeoman chief petty officer with 21 years of service with the U.S. Navy Reserve. I retired as a captain and spent a couple of years in an airplane with the Navy around the world, and my dad was a chief in the Navy, as well. But on behalf of the Senate—and, really, on behalf of all Americans—Beth, I just want to thank you. We thank you for your exemplary service to our country.

I wish to take a couple more minutes to recognize the service and sacrifice of another TSA employee. Her name is Carol Richel.

As we can see, even though TSA is often the target of criticism and frustration, their mission at the end of the day is to save lives—our lives. Carol reminded us of this mission just a couple of months ago when a man wielding a machete attacked her and her colleagues at the Louis Armstrong Airport in New Orleans.

A native of St. Ignace, MI, Carol has worked as a TSA officer at the New Orleans airport since October 2003 and has been a TSA supervisory officer since October 2005. She is known by her colleagues to step up on a moment's notice. This latest incident was no exception. As many of us may remember from the news stories, in March, a deranged man began to attack a number of TSA agents at a security checkpoint at the New Orleans airport. The man sprayed insect repellent in the face of an officer, pulled a machete from the waistband of his pants, and began swinging the weapon in the direction of other TSA officers. Watching from her post, Carol yelled at the passengers in the area to run.

But her warning also attracted the attention of the attacker, and at the moment, he started to run toward Carol. As the man got closer to her, Lieutenant Heather Sylve of the Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office began firing at him. Lieutenant Sylve shot the assailant three times, wounding and incapacitating him on site. He later died as a result of those wounds.

Unfortunately, one of those shots also hit Carol in the arm. Injured but undeterred, she reported to her post the very next day, ready to work—not the next week, not the next month, the next day.

When asked about her work, by the St. Ignace News, she said:

I enjoy my job, and I feel that what we do is a necessary thing. . . . This is an example of why it's necessary.

According to her colleagues, Carol is known for her hard work, her dedication to TSA's mission, and her sincere interest in the well-being of the entire team.

Our colleague from Oklahoma will enjoy this. When she is not at work, Carol enjoys caring for her animals and dedicating herself to Bible studies.

Carol's bravery and commitment to her colleagues and the public she serves truly exemplify TSA's core values of integrity, innovation, and team spirit.

To Beth and Carol, let me say this. Every day you go to work, we want you to know that you help to ensure the safety of your fellow Americans and the security of our transportation system, which serves us all. We are grateful for that. Thank you both for your tireless dedication and your invaluable service to our Nation and its people.

And to all of the public servants across this country and beyond our borders who give us 110 percent every day, let me close by saying that I want you to know that what you do every day is important to me and to all of my colleagues with whom I am privileged to serve here in this body. We hope your work and your service fills your life with meaning and with happiness. On behalf of the people that we serve together, thank you for what you do. May God continue to bless each of you and this country we love.

I yield the floor, and thank my colleague from Oklahoma for his kindness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Delaware, I appreciate his remarks. It is seldom people will thank people for the time and effort they spend and the successes they have.

Even though he is located so close to Washington that he is not exposed as much as I am—twice a week—I actually learn personally to know these people. I feel the commitment they make. Certainly in Tulsa, Dallas, and here are the ones whom I know well. So I appreciate the fact that the Senator is paying attention to them. That means a lot.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, since 2002, I have come to the floor to talk, after we discovered the truth about the whole global warming thing and who is behind it and all this stuff. I don't want to say anything that would be interpreted as not respectful, but I can remember back in 2002, it was a difficult thing to tell the truth about this to the American people because at that time most of the American people felt that—yes, they bought into this idea that the world is coming to an end, and it is all man-made gases that are causing this. So it was difficult.

The Gallup poll of 2002 said at that time that, of all the environmental concerns, No. 1 was global warming. Now, that is not true today. Today, it is almost dead last. Last March, there was a poll that came out from Gallup, and it was next to the last. It was down from some 20 different environmental concerns.

So the people have realized that this largest tax increase in the history of America, if it were to take place, is not going to solve a problem—a problem that really doesn't exist to the extent it has been represented. Today, they are still debating this.

I want to bring people up to date on where we are now—the fact that climate change is not based on hard evidence and observation, but rather on a set of wishful beliefs, a well-scripted dialogue with which President Obama and the environmental alarmists are intending to scare the American people into accepting this thing that would be so devastating economically to America.

The other day a good friend of mine, LAMAR SMITH from the House—I like LAMAR. He and I were elected actually the same day many years ago. LAMAR is the chairman of the committee that has a lot of this jurisdiction, and he published an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal that was entitled, ''The Climate-Change Religion.'' Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I thank LAMAR SMITH for his continued leadership and support on this issue. As LAMAR highlights in the op-ed, the debate about global warming is

predicated more on ''scare tactics than on fact based determinations.''

Global warming alarmism has evolved into a religion where one is either an alarmist or a skeptic. Some people are not aware of those two terms. Someone who has bought into this ''the world is coming to an end''—they are the alarmists. People who do not believe that, as myself, are skeptics. And being a skeptic is akin to heresy of the highest order. Good policy has to be based on good science, not on religion, and that requires science free from bias, whatever its conclusions may be.

The modern-day religion of climate change has been very artful in establishing and controlling carefully scripted talking points intended to scare the American people under the guise of environmental protectionism.

There are three main tenets of climate change alarmism that can be found in any related speech, which we heard the President recite during his recent Earth Day speech. Those three tenets are: No. 1, climate change is human caused. No. 2, climate change is already wreaking havoc across the globe. And No. 3, we must act today—now—before terrible things happen—the world coming to an end.

These three main tenets of climate change can be found on just about every administrative agency page, and they are creeping into every Federal policy determination.

As wise as the Presiding Officer is, something that he is not aware of that is happening in America today is that the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, adjusted its policy for receipt of disaster preparedness resources to require States that are to be accepting these FEMA funds to first accept the undeniable ''challenges posed by climate change'' and then spend State resources figuring how to plan for them before becoming eligible for disaster preparedness funds.

Look, I come from Oklahoma, a State that has tornadoes, called Tornado Alley. When this happens, as it did very recently in the south-central part of Oklahoma, for us to get the funds that we are entitled to from FEMA, the State of Oklahoma has to accept the policy that we as a State accept the undeniable challenges posed by climate change and then spend our State resources figuring out how to plan for them before becoming eligible for disaster relief. That is impossible.

People can't believe that is true when I tell them this is being done through the administration and this is adopted by these agencies. FEMA is supposed to be there to assist States in areas of the country for disaster relief. But they cannot get it. They are held hostage until they say something that they know is a lie and are held to that and spend State money. Again, that is not really believable, what I just stated, because it is so inconceivable that that could happen.

Now, the reality of this debate, however, is that the climate has been changing since the Earth was formed. I said the other day—a good friend of mine had an amendment on the floor. The amendment made comment to the fact that the climate is changing. Yes, it is changing. I think what the proponents of this idea are trying to do is to try to change it over to say that those people who are not blaming human emissions as the cause of all these problems are denying that climate changes.

I said on floor at that time, all evidence, archeological evidence, scriptural evidence, historical evidence is that climate has always, always changed. We all accept that. The big issue is, is it because of human emissions. That is where the science now shows clearly that it is not. You are going keep hearing it, though, but it is not.

Further, the scientific debate around the role of climate change, its causes and projected impacts, is ongoing. There is no consensus, and the Wall Street Journal recently produced a great opinion piece that highlights a multitude of discrepancies in the assertion that 90 percent of the scientists believe this to be true. This is kind of interesting because any time you do not have science behind you, what you say is science is settled, science is settled. And sooner or later, people believe it, and they have not offered any evidence that would support that. That is what has happened.

This item really suggests that the Wall Street Journal opinion piece that highlights the discrepancies in the 97 percent, when they say 97 percent of the scientists believe manmade gas is causing global warming—the article points out that the myth of a scientific consensus is predicated on—and I am quoting now—''a handful of surveys and abstract-counting exercises that have been contradicted by more reliable research.''

Over the years, I have quoted a number of scientists. In fact, my Web site way back in the—probably 10 years ago, I started accumulating the number of scientists and their credibility and their qualifications and statements they have made. One I remember, from my head now, is Richard Lindzen. Richard Lindzen is a professor from MIT. He is recognized as one of the top climatologists in the country. When asked the question, he says, of course it is not true. But the reason people, the bureaucracy, are so concerned about it is that regulating carbon is a bureaucracy's dream. If you regulate carbon, you regulate life. That is what the motivation is around this.

I think that is a good article to read so people will realize that there is no consensus, scientific consensus. Some of them believe it, some of them do not.

As climate research continues to develop, limitations in the overall understanding of our climate and the limitations of scientific research have become increasingly evident. This could not be more evident than by the growing discrepancy between climate model predictions and actual observations. For example, alarmists failed to foresee the ongoing warming hiatus.

What is a warming hiatus? There has not been a change in that temperature in the last 15 years. This is something that is incontrovertible. Everybody understands that. They admit they didn't foresee this happening, but that hiatus is actually going on today. It is still continuing. It further explained that the source of such a discrepancy could be caused by the ''combinations of internal climate variability, missing or incorrect radiative forcing, and model response error.''

In other words, climate modeling cannot accurately project, much less predict, the climate of the future as climatologists and the broader scientific community have yet to fully understand how our climate system actually works today.

There is also a growing body of scientific studies suggesting that variations in solar radiation and natural climate variability have a leading role in climate change. Surprise, everybody, the Sun warms us. That is a shocker to a lot of people. It is not manmade gas. It is not CO_2 emissions. It is the Sun.

A number of independent studies assessing the impact of clouds have even suggested that water vapor feedback is entirely canceled out by cloud processes. Yet when the facts of reality do not appropriately align with the religion of climate change, the alarmists will simply try to explain these things away or conveniently exclude any science that shows they are wrong.

A favorite talking point of the climate change religion that is often used by senior officials within the Obama administration is that hurricanes, tornadoes, droughts, floods—you name it—are proof of harm being caused by global warming. They all say that. I have yet to hear a speech by any of the alarmists where they do not talk about the fact that all the hurricanes and tornadoes—the nature of them, the severity of them, the occurrences—are proof of harm being caused by global warming. But the global data shows no increase in the number or intensity of such events, and even the IPCC itself acknowledges the lack of any evident relationship between extreme weather and climate.

This is interesting because the IPCC—I know most people are aware of this who are into this issue. But the IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change. This is the United

Nations. I even wrote a book about it. The longest chapter is talking about the United Nations, how they put this together. But they are the ones who have supposedly the science behind this whole thing, and they are the ones who are now admitting that there is no increase in intensity or occurrences of hurricanes, tornadoes, droughts or floods.

In fact, Roger Pielke was before our committee in July of 2013. He said the oft-asserted linkage between global warming and recent hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, and drought is ''unsupportable based on evidence and research.''

I am still quoting now.

It is misleading, and just plain incorrect, to claim that disasters associated with hurricanes, tornadoes, floods or droughts have increased on climate timescales either in the United States or globally.

Hurricane landfalls have not increased in the United States ''in frequency, intensity or normalized damage since at least the year 1900.''

That is now an accepted fact. But in spite of that, every speech you hear, they talk about all the hurricanes and all the disasters taking place and the intensity that has come to us because of global warming.

The IPCC—again, this is the U.N. 2013 ''Fifth Assessment Report.'' Now, the assessment report that they come out with is—they will come out with a long, complicated report every so often, but then they will have kind of abbreviated ones for people like us to use to spread their propaganda. Their ''Fifth Assessment Report'' concluded that ''current data sets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the past century. . . . No robust trends in annual numbers of tropical storms, hurricanes and major hurricane counts have been identified over the last 100 years in the North Atlantic Basin.''

But let's just keep in mind everyone is now in agreement on that. Yet you still hear in the speeches that the world is coming to an end, and all the tornadoes—all this intensity is going to be disastrous to America.

Counter to the doomsday predictions of climate alarmists, increasing observations suggest a much reduced and practically harmless climate response to increased amounts of atmospheric carbon dioxide. Also missing from the climate alarmists' doomsday scenarios and well-scripted talking points are the benefits from increased carbon that has led to a greening of the planet and contributed to increased agricultural productivity.

People do not realize that you cannot grow things without CO_2. CO_2 is a fertilizer. It is something you cannot do without. No one ever talks about the benefits. The people are inducing that as a fertilizer on a daily basis.

Despite admitted gaps to the scientific understanding of climate change and a track record of climate modeling failures, President Obama and his environmental allies are holding fast to their bedrock beliefs. They are intent on selling the President's so-called Climate Action Plan to the American people that is less about protecting the environment and more about expanding the role of the government while enriching, I should say, some campaigns of some of our friendly Democrats. There is a guy named Tom Styer. Tom Styer lives in California. He is very, very wealthy. He is all wrapped up in this issue. He claims that he spent in the last election to elect people who go along with global warming $75 million of his money. Originally, he was going to spend $100 million, $50 million of his money and $50 million that he was going to raise. He found out he couldn't raise it, so that did not work.

I would say that his effort was not all that successful, judging from the results of the last election. But he is still out there. He still has a lot of money. He will not even miss the $75 million.

For the President's core domestic plan policy, the Clean Power Plan, let's look at what this is. Starting back in 2002, when it was perceived to be a very popular issue, Members of this Senate started introducing bills that would be cap-and-trade bills that would address this issue. It is very similar to the plan the President is putting out now. At that time, I was the chairman of the committee—I think it was the Subcommittee on Clean Air in the Senate. I was a believer because everybody said that was true, until they came out—and there is a study made by the Charles River Associates and MIT that said if we comply with the cap and trade, the cost to the American people would be in the range of $300 billion to $400 billion every year. That, again, would be the largest tax increase in history. I thought, if the world is coming to an end, maybe we need to do that.

I started questioning the science behind it. I started getting responses from scientists all over America. First of all, 10 of them came in. Then it went up to 400 and then 1,000. I started publishing these on my Web site so people would know that there is another side to what they were calling this determined science by IPCC. They tried from that time—this is 2002—until last year to pass legislation that would legislatively give us a cap-and-trade system, but it got defeated more and more each year because the people have actually caught on. They have caught on that it is not a real thing, the science is not settled. That has led the President to say, all right, if you guys are not going to pass legislation, I am going to do it through regulation.

Where have we heard that before? That is everything the President has been doing that he can't get through in his policy that is through the legislature. Right now, you probably cannot get 20 votes in the whole Senate on this issue. He is trying to do it through regulation. We have a Clean Power Plan.

We had a hearing on this just last week. The President is no longer satisfied with the fact that he can now tell you what doctor you can use under ObamaCare, what type of investments you can use under that regulation or how fast your Internet will be. I understand that is coming up next. He would like to dictate what type and how much energy you can use.

With such high costs on the line, one would think there must be an equal amount if not greater number of benefits. What are the benefits? In reality, according to various impact assessments, the environmental benefits of the Clean Power Plan—again, admittedly, it is going to be $479 billion initially, the cost of this, and the core domestic policy of the President's Climate Action Plan that is supposed to protect this country from the impending impacts we are facing, the climate change—all of these costs will reduce CO_2 concentrations by less than 0.5 percent. The global average temperature rise will be reduced by only 0.01 degree Fahrenheit, and sea level rise will be reduced by 0.3 millimeters. That is the thickness of three sheets of paper.

Further, these minuscule benefits would be rendered pointless by the continued emissions growth in India and China. The chart is up now. It is very significant.

Because we look at this and look at what China and India are contributing to the atmosphere by their emissions. Now, there is the United States. In fact, the figure is that China alone produces more CO_2 in 1 month—that is 800 million tons—than the Clean Power Plan will reduce in 1 year, and that is 500 million tons.

Perhaps what is most telling is that President Obama's EPA didn't even bother to measure what impacts the proposed Clean Power Plan would have on the environment. This is something which has been very well documented.

I guess what we are saying here is that it doesn't really matter what we are doing here in the United States. This is not where the problem is. But that is to be expected under the religion of climate change. When the science doesn't add up and the projections don't pan out and the weather won't cooperate, alarmists will refer to their commitment to a higher moral authority or obligation. As evidenced by the Clean Power Plan, it doesn't matter if these policies provide any benefit in climate change; crusaders certainly will not be dissuaded by the exorbitant costs.

It is ironic, however, that while touting a commitment to a moral obligation, which we have heard time and

again from this administration, the resulting policies will cause real economic hardship to this country and to the most vulnerable populations. This is something people need to pay attention to. The increase in the cost of fuel for Americans would be—and it has already been documented—the electricity cost will go up by double digits in 43 States. And whom does it hurt the most? It hurts the poor people. Those individuals who spend the highest amount of their expendable income on heating their homes will be hit the worst. This hypocrisy is kind of akin to jetting around the country in a 232-foot private plane on Earth Day to warn global citizens of the harm caused by increased CO_2 emissions in the atmosphere.

The President's international discussions around climate change stand to be equally harmful to the American people. The President likes to point to his recent agreement with China as evidence of international cooperation on climate change, but this agreement is nothing more than an exercise in theatrics.

China is sitting back right now licking its chops and hoping America will start reducing its emissions and drive its manufacturing base overseas to places where they don't have these emission restrictions. The farce of an agreement lets China continue business as usual, and that is 800 million tons of CO_2 a month until 2030. Boy, that is until 2030, while hard-working American taxpayers are going to foot the cost of the President's economically disastrous climate agenda.

Despite what the President might say to the international community, without the backing of the U.S. Congress, which the President does not have, he has no authority to reach binding or legally enforceable agreements with other countries. I will remind the President of this again in December.

Some people don't know that the United Nations has a big party every year in December, and it has been going on now for 15 years. Every year, they invite all the countries—this is all through the United Nations—from all around the world, some 192 countries, to this big party. I am talking about caviar and all you can drink and all that. All they have to do is say they will agree to try to lower their emissions of CO_2.

I remember the party in Copenhagen 2 years ago. As I recall, Obama was there, Kerry was there, PELOSI was there, and BOXER was there. All the far-left liberals were there to try to convince the people from these other countries that we were going to pass a cap-and-trade bill, so they better do it too.

Well, I waited until they were all through with their things, and I went over to Copenhagen. I tell the Chair, I was the one-man truth squad. I went over to explain the truth to the other 191 countries. I told them that these people are lying to them by saying we will pass legislation. I said we are not going to pass legislation, and of course we did not pass legislation.

I have to say this. The 191 countries over there all had one thing in common: They all hated me, but they all understood that I was right and that there weren't the votes in this country to pass it.

The American people are starting to catch on, and that is why I am not surprised, as I mentioned, that the Gallup Poll that was released just last March concluded that the current level of worry on environmental issues remains at or near record lows, and among those concerns on the environmental issue, global warming is second to last. What Americans do care about is the economy and Federal spending and the size and power of the Federal Government.

The disintegrating case for climate alarm coupled with an American public that is quickly losing interest does not pan well for the President's climate agenda or his self-acclaimed environmental legacy. Climate alarmists have spent just as much energy, if not more, convincing the world that it is bad to be a skeptic of what was once referred to as global cooling and then became global warming and is now global climate change. The tenet of the modern climate change religion cannot withstand the scrutiny of the merits, primarily because it is a result of political design and not scientific revelation. And that is why anyone who is willing to point out discrepancies within the climate change debate or raise legitimate concerns will be subjected to a barrage of arrogant sarcasm and personal attacks.

Whether the alarmists call it global warming or climate change, the American people understand that the President's climate agenda is not about protecting the public; it is about a power grab.

I will make three final points.

First of all, I think we all know that the climate is always changing. I remember—and I will go from memory on this. We have cycles, and the cycles have been taking place all throughout history. In 1895, we went into a period of cooling, and that was when they first started saying that another ice age was coming, and that lasted 30 years, until about 1918. In 1918, a change came about. It started getting warmer, and we went into a 30-year warming period. It was the first time the phrase ''global warming'' was used. In 1945, that changed, and we went into a cooling spell, and the same thing has happened since then. Right now, of course, we are in kind of a remission era.

This is what is interesting: No one can deny that 1945 was the year when we had the largest surge in the emissions of CO_2 in the history of this country, and that precipitated not a warming period but a cooling period. That is first.

The second thing is, in Australia—I wasn't going to mention this until I talked yesterday to one of the members of Parliament in Australia. Several years ago, Australia bought into this argument and said: We are going to lead the way, and we will start restricting our emissions.

They imposed a carbon tax on their economy a few years ago, and it cost $9 billion in lost economic activity each year and destroyed tens of thousands of jobs. It was so bad that the government recently voted to repeal the carbon tax, and their economy is better for it. In fact, it was announced just following the repeal that Australia experienced a record job growth of 121,000 jobs—far more than the 10,000 to 15,000 jobs economists had expected.

There is a country that tried it, and they found out what it cost, and you would think we could learn from their mistakes.

The third thing is to ask the question. What if I am wrong and they are right? There is an answer to that. I remember when President Obama was first elected. He appointed Lisa Jackson, and she became the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency. During the time she was there, they were building this thing up, and we were holding hearings in the committee I chaired at that time.

I asked her: In the event that one of these bills passes on cap and trade or the President comes up with some kind of proposal or a regulation that does the same thing, will that have the effect of lowering CO_2 emissions worldwide?

Her answer: No, it wouldn't.

And the reason it wouldn't is because this is where the problem is. The problem is in China, Mexico, and India. So the mere fact that we do something just in our country has a reverse effect because as we chase away our manufacturing base and it goes to one of those countries—and China is hoping to be one of those countries—where they have no emission requirements, it would have the effect of not decreasing but increasing emissions.

If you bought into this and you agree that I am wrong and they are right, just keep in mind that by their own emission this would not reduce CO_2, and that is what we are supposed to be concerned with.

The people of America have awakened. The economy and the Obama foreign policy of appeasement have captured their interest, and these are concerns that are real concerns and things we ought to do today.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 23, 2015]

THE CLIMATE-CHANGE RELIGION

(By Lamar Smith)

Earth Day provided a fresh opening for Obama to raise alarms about global warming based on beliefs, not science.

''Today, our planet faces new challenges, but none pose a greater threat to future generations than climate change,'' President Obama wrote in his proclamation for Earth Day on Wednesday. ''As a Nation, we must act before it is too late.''

Secretary of State John Kerry, in an Earth Day op-ed for USA Today, declared that climate change has put America ''on a dangerous path—along with the rest of the world.''

Both the president and Mr. Kerry cited rapidly warming global temperatures and ever-more-severe storms caused by climate change as reasons for urgent action.

Given that for the past decade and a half global-temperature increases have been negligible, and that the worsening-storms scenario has been widely debunked, the pronouncements from the Obama administration sound more like scare tactics than fact-based declarations.

At least the United Nations' then-top climate scientist, Rajendra Pachauri, acknowledged—however inadvertently—the faith-based nature of climate-change rhetoric when he resigned amid scandal in February. In a farewell letter, he said that ''the protection of Planet Earth, the survival of all species and sustainability of our ecosystems is more than a mission. It is my religion and my dharma.''

Instead of letting political ideology or climate ''religion'' guide government policy, we should focus on good science. The facts alone should determine what climate policy options the U.S. considers. That is what the scientific method calls for: inquiry based on measurable evidence. Unfortunately this administration's climate plans ignore good science and seek only to advance a political agenda.

Climate reports from the U.N.—which the Obama administration consistently embraces—are designed to provide scientific cover for a preordained policy. This is not good science. Christiana Figueres, the official leading the U.N.'s effort to forge a new international climate treaty later this year in Paris, told reporters in February that the real goal is ''to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years.'' In other words, a central objective of these negotiations is the redistribution of wealth among nations. It is apparent that President Obama shares this vision.

The Obama administration recently submitted its pledge to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The commitment would lock the U.S. into reducing greenhouse-gas emissions more than 25% by 2025 and ''economy-wide emission reductions of 80% or more by 2050.'' The president's pledge lacks details about how to achieve such goals without burdening the economy, and it doesn't quantify the specific climate benefits tied to his pledge.

America will never meet the president's arbitrary targets without the country being subjected to costly regulations, energy rationing and reduced economic growth. These policies won't make America stronger. And these measures will have no significant impact on global temperatures. In a hearing last week before the House Science, Space and Technology Committee, of which I am chairman, climate scientist Judith Curry testified that the president's U.N. pledge is estimated to prevent only a 0.03 Celsius temperature rise. That is three-hundredths of one degree.

In June 2014 testimony before my committee, former Assistant Secretary for Energy Charles McConnell noted that the president's Clean Power Plan—requiring every state to meet federal carbon-emission-reduction targets—would reduce a sea-level increase by less than half the thickness of a dime. Policies like these will only make the government bigger and Americans poorer, with no environmental benefit.

The White House's Climate Assessment implies that extreme weather is getting worse due to human-caused climate change. The president regularly makes this unsubstantiated claim—most recently in his Earth Day proclamation, citing ''more severe weather disasters.''

Even the U.N. doesn't agree with him on that one: In its 2012 Special Report on Extreme Events, the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says there is ''high agreement'' among leading experts that long-term trends in weather disasters are not attributable to human-caused climate change. Why do the president and others in his administration keep repeating this untrue claim?

Climate alarmists have failed to explain the lack of global warming over the past 15 years. They simply keep adjusting their malfunctioning climate models to push the supposedly looming disaster further into the future. Following the U.N.'s 2008 report, its claims about the melting of Himalayan glaciers, the decline of crop yields and the effects of sea-level rise were found to be invalid. The InterAcademy Council, a multinational scientific organization, reviewed the report in 2010 and identified ''significant shortcomings in each major step of [the U.N.] assessment process.''

The U.N. process is designed to generate alarmist results. Many people don't realize that the most-publicized documents of the U.N. reports are not written by scientists. In fact, the scientists who work on the underlying science are forced to step aside to allow partisan political representatives to develop the ''Summary for Policy Makers.'' It is scrubbed to minimize any suggestion of scientific uncertainty and is publicized before the actual science is released. The Summary for Policy Makers is designed to give newspapers and headline writers around the world only one side of the debate.

Yet those who raise valid questions about the very real uncertainties surrounding the understanding of climate change have their motives attacked, reputations savaged and livelihoods threatened. This happens even though challenging prevailing beliefs through open debate and critical thinking is fundamental to the scientific process.

The intellectual dishonesty of senior administration officials who are unwilling to admit when they are wrong is astounding. When assessing climate change, we should focus on good science, not politically correct science.

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CELEBRATING ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month. In 1979, President Jimmy Carter established Asian Pacific Heritage Week. This week of recognition was expanded to a month-long celebration in 1992. Every May, Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month provides Americans the opportunity to reflect upon the many contributions made by the Asian American and Pacific Islander community in Nevada and across the Nation.

May is a significant month in Asian American and Pacific Islander history. The first 10 days of May coincide with the arrival of the first Japanese immigrants in the United States on May 7, 1843, and the completion of the transcontinental railroad on May 10, 1869, which relied heavily on the work of Chinese immigrants. But Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month does not only recognize the past achievements of this vibrant community; this month is also a chance to honor the civil rights activists, farmers, scientists, entrepreneurs, health professionals, educators, and other members of the Asian American and Pacific Islander community, who continue to help shape our Nation into an even better place culturally, economically, and politically.

In Nevada, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are among the fastest growing populations and have enriched Nevada's history and culture. Hundreds of thousands of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders live in Nevada, and contribute to small business development and boost our economy. I am proud to represent such strong and innovative people, and I continue to work hard to enact legislation that positively impacts the Asian American and Pacific Islander community. For instance, I joined my colleague, Hawaii Senator MAZIE HIRONO, earlier this year in fighting for legislation that would reunite children and families of Filipino World War II veterans, and I will continue my steadfast support of family reunification efforts.

America is a nation of immigrants with diverse backgrounds and united common principles, which is part of what makes us strong, resilient, and unique. This month, we celebrate the wonderful and important contributions of the Asian American and Pacific Islander community in Nevada and

throughout the Nation, and I extend my best wishes for a joyous Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

RECOGNIZING THE DIGITAL INVESTIGATION CENTER AT CHAMPLAIN COLLEGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last month, I had the opportunity to visit the award-winning Leahy Center for Digital Investigation at Champlain College in Burlington, VT. One of the Nation's top law enforcement officers, Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, joined me for a tour of this impressive facility. It was a fitting time to visit the center; earlier in the week, the LCDI was recognized as the Best Cybersecurity Higher Education Program in the country by SC Magazine.

We all know that computers and technology have changed not only the way people commit crimes, but also the way law enforcement investigates and prosecutes criminals. Students here are learning firsthand how to help law enforcement agencies across the country in areas related to computer forensics and other forms of digital investigation. By giving them this hands-on experience, Champlain College and the Leahy Center are training the next generation of analysts who will work to combat cyberthreats and other digital threats.

I was especially pleased that the FBI Director joined me in visiting the LCDI. Both of us left with a deep appreciation for the excellent education the next generation of cybersecurity professionals are receiving at the Leahy center. These students receive intense hands-on experience, dealing with the same issues that practitioners in the field work on every day. With a 90 percent placement rate in relevant fields, the center is a critical part of ensuring that law enforcement has the expertise and resources it needs to face the cyberthreats of the future.

The cyberthreats we face are real, and the training students receive from the Leahy Center for Digital Investigation will help us face those threats head on. I congratulate Champlain College and the center for this achievement, and look forward to years of success to come.

RECOGNIZING RED HEN BAKING COMPANY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Red Hen Baking Company was founded in 1999 by Randy George and Eliza Cain in the Mad River Valley of Vermont. They started as a small operation, baking and delivering fresh bread to nearby stores and restaurants. They used pure ingredients, baked around the clock, and soon, with the support of the surrounding community, and as the word-of-mouth testimonials spread, their small operation grew into the Hen we know today. They moved their operation to the popular Camp Meade location, in my hometown of Middlesex.

Red Hen Baking Company exemplifies the spirit and the vision of Vermont business. Randy often says that Vermont is the only State in which he could imagine starting and running a successful bakery of this kind. They tend to do things the right way, rather than the easy way—from the selection of the essential elements of their bread, to their employee treatment policies and practices. Randy, Eliza and the Hen's ''barnyard animals'' take pride in their product, and it shows.

Randy always reminds his customers that his employees are the most important part of his bakery business, so it was no surprise when he was invited by President Obama and Labor Secretary Tom Perez to join them at the White House as a ''Champion of Change'' for working families. Employers from across the country shared their success stories, and the devastating and impossible choices working families face when paid sick leave is not among their benefits. The panel was a tremendous success, and I was proud to have Vermont represented by such a steadfast supporter of fair treatment for employees.

Randy and Liza's message is clear. Put the people in your business at the core of everything you do, and they will work hard for you for years to come—in the Hen's case, even decades. Randy and Liza offer health coverage, fair, livable wages, and paid sick days. They want their employees to thrive both personally and professionally, and they have encouraged other businesses to adopt similar standards.

Marcelle and I are so happy to live in Middlesex and to have our neighbors setting such high standards for the treatment of a dedicated workforce. I want to congratulate Randy and Liza on their successful business, and to thank them. Happy, healthy employees are productive employees, and it is right to invest in each other's success. It is the right way, and it is the Vermont way. We look forward to our visits every time Marcelle and I come home.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF DIVISION M OF THE CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015, THE EXPATRIATE HEALTH COVERAGE CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement in support of Division M of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATORS CARPER, TOOMEY, COONS, AND RUBIO IN SUPPORT OF DIVISION M OF THE CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015, THE EXPATRIATE HEALTH COVERAGE CLARIFICATION ACT.

At the end of the last Congress, a bipartisan group of Senators and Members of Congress led by Senators Carper, Toomey, Coons and Rubio, worked together to secure passage of the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014. That legislation, which was included as Division M of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, provides important technical clarifications of how the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) applies to health coverage provided by U.S. insurers to globally mobile employees. It puts those U.S. insurers on equal footing with their foreign counterparts and protects jobs in this country.

As the Administration prepares to begin the rulemaking process to implement the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act, we want to ensure Congressional intent is clear so the Act is implemented properly. We are aware the Congressional Record already contains two statements that reflect Congressional intent on certain elements of the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act, but further explanation will aid the Administration in its implementation efforts.

The issues that we seek to clarify today are: relief from the ACA's health insurer fee, the effective date of the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act, treatment of groups of similarly situated individuals (including student and religious missionary groups), who to take into account when determining enrollment in expatriate health insurance plans, locations where expatriate plans must provide coverage for qualified expatriates assigned or transferred to the United States, actuarial value, and reporting requirements.

One important clarification relates to the application of the health insurer fee established in section 9010 of the ACA to expatriate health insurance plans. Under the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act, premiums with respect to persons covered by qualified expatriate health insurance plans are not included in the calculation of the amount of that issuer's share of the health insurance fee. To make certain that the intent of that provision is abundantly clear, we want to iterate that no health insurer fee will be owed with respect to expatriate health insurance plans for 2016 and beyond.

Additionally, in implementing the special rule related to the health insurer fee for 2014 and 2015, it is the intent of Congress that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) assess less than the full ''applicable amount'' otherwise specified in ACA section 9010 for 2014 and 2015, and that it refund or credit any excess funds already paid by expatriate health insurance issuers for 2014.

In addition to those important clarifications, we believe additional clarifications will further ensure appropriate implementation of the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act.

The Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act became law on December 16, 2014. The legislative language provides that the Act takes effect upon enactment and applies to expatriate health plans issued or renewed on or after July 1, 2015, unless otherwise

specified. It is important to clarify that Congressional intent is to provide immediate relief to U.S. issuers of expatriate health insurance plans effective on the date of enactment, and for the additional requirements imposed by the Act to apply only to plans issued or renewed on or after July 1, 2015, to give the Administration time to issue guidance on these new requirements.

Another clarification relates to the treatment of ''groups of similarly situated individuals,'' which includes student and religious missionary groups, under the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act. Congress does not intend every student or religious missionary or other similarly situated group to have to endure a lengthy approval process through which the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor determine that international health care coverage is appropriate for the group. Rather, if a health plan meets the requirements of being an expatriate health plan and a group of similarly situated individuals meets the requirements of eligibility to purchase such a plan, we expect that these groups can purchase plans as expeditiously as possible. We expect the Secretaries will issue guidance on this matter that is consistent with the language of the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act for these groups to access health insurance and other related services and support in multiple countries.

The Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act limits its relief to expatriate health plans that meet the standards established in the law. One of those standards is that ''[s]ubstantially all of the primary enrollees in such plan or coverage are qualified expatriates . . . .'' It is important to clarify that Congress does not intend for individuals who are enrolled in COBRA or other continuation coverage under the plan to be taken into account when determining whether substantially all of the primary enrollees are qualified expatriates.

Another standard is that where an expatriate health plan provides coverage for qualified expatriates who are transferred or assigned to the United States, the plan must provide certain coverages in ''. . . such other country or countries as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, may designate (after taking into account the barriers and prohibitions to providing health care services in the countries as designated).'' It is important to clarify that Congress does not intend that expatriates in foreign countries receive duplicate or unnecessary health insurance coverage. Instead, the Secretaries should promulgate guidance establishing that, by virtue of having U.S.-issued expatriate health coverage, qualified expatriates need the full benefits and protections of the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act in such locations as are necessary for the individual to perform his/her job responsibilities.

The Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act says that plan sponsors must reasonably believe that ''the benefits provided by the expatriate health plan satisfy a standard at least actuarially equivalent to the level provided for in section 36B(c)(2)(C)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code.'' The intent of Congress is to require expatriate health coverage to meet the minimum-value as it is delineated in the Internal Revenue Code 36B(c)(2)(C)(ii). We believe the law allows for employers and issuers to retain the flexibility to design and offer plans with a higher value as they may determine necessary and appropriate to meet the needs and circumstances of their covered population.

Finally, there is the issue of reporting requirements. The ACA added section 6055 to the Internal Revenue Code, which provides that every provider of minimum essential coverage will report coverage information by filing an informational return with the IRS and furnishing a statement to individuals. The information is used by the IRS to administer, and individuals to show compliance with, the ACA's individual shared responsibility provision. It is Congress's intent that any additional reporting that may be required as a result of the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act or related guidance should be kept as minimal as possible, recognize the unique nature of expatriate health plans, and be incorporated into the existing requirements under section 6055. Should future laws or regulations streamline the reporting requirements for domestic health plans, we expect that this relief be provided equally to expatriate health plans.

We believe these are important clarifications that will ensure the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act is implemented consistent with Congressional intent and will permit U.S.-based expatriate health insurance issuers to compete with their foreign counterparts.

RECOGNIZING FLIGHT OFFICER WILLIAM A. COLBERT, JR., OF THE TUSKEGEE AIRMEN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Flight Officer William August Colbert, Jr., for his honorable service to the United States as a member of the famed Tuskegee Airmen. Mr. Colbert is a lifelong Marylander who was born in Annapolis and attended Anne Arundel County public schools, graduating from Wiley H. Bates High School. Upon his graduation, he joined the Civilian Conservation Corps and was stationed in Allegany County, MD where he met and married his wife, the late Vivian Lee Colbert. He ultimately made Cumberland his home.

After spending time working in the Baltimore shipyards, Mr. Colbert enlisted in the Army Air Force in 1943 and achieved the rank of flight officer at the Tuskegee Army Air Field. He was alerted for overseas duty on two occasions, but the war ended prior to his deployment. While Mr. Colbert never saw combat, he learned to fly with the best, and became a Red Tail. Mr. Colbert has always considered his contribution to the Tuskegee Airmen as what he was called to do as a U.S. citizen. He did so without expectation of fame or fanfare.

When Mr. Colbert returned to Cumberland after his military service, he worked as a tire builder for the Kelly-Springfield Tire Company for 33 years until his retirement. He became a member of Fulton Myers American Legion Post. He and his wife had two children but lost one due to complications of childbirth. They raised their son William Augustus Colbert, III, who went to Bowie State University, where he met and married his wife Anna Hudson Colbert. Mr. Colbert has been blessed with four grandchildren and six great-grandchildren. Last July, Mr. Colbert became a great-great-grandfather. He is an admired family man who has opened his home, heart, and talents—including hunting, fishing, photography, and jazz—to family and friends alike. Mr. Colbert has enjoyed gardening and carpentry, and he personally ensured that the U.S. flag was raised and lowered each day on the former Pine Avenue playground, which was located directly across the street from his house.

The contributions of Mr. Colbert and his fellow Tuskegee Airmen—the first African American combat unit in the Army Air Corps—played a crucial role in integrating the U.S. armed services. They helped to shatter stereotypes through their distinguished service at home and abroad.

In the 109th Congress, I was honored to cosponsor legislation awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to the Tuskegee Airmen in recognition long overdue of their unique military record, which inspired revolutionary reform in the Armed Forces, and to join the President of the United States and my colleagues in Congress in presenting the medal to 300 members of the Tuskegee Airmen in a ceremony in the U.S. Capitol. The medal features three Tuskegee Airmen in profile—an officer, a mechanic and a pilot. The eagle symbolizes flight, nobility, and the highest ideals of our Nation. The years 1941–1949 indicate the years during which these airmen were assigned to segregated units. The reverse side depicts three types of airplanes flown by the Tuskegee Airmen in World War II: the P–40, P–51 and B–25. The original gold medal remains on display at the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Colbert was in failing health at the time, so he was unable to attend that ceremony and be presented with a copy of the medal. I am pleased to announce that on Friday, May 15, 2015, Mr. Colbert will finally receive the recognition he has earned during a presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal along with presentations by State and local elected officials, veterans service organizations, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, in his hometown of Cumberland, MD.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing sincere appreciation and congratulations to Mr. Colbert for his outstanding service to our country in uniform and in his community.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MARY ELIZABETH CUNNINGHAM

● Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to a Connecticut resident who recently demonstrated extraordinary capability and

heroism. Mary Elizabeth Cunningham, a resident of Niantic, who works as an emergency room nurse at Yale-New Haven Hospital, was flying from Chicago to Hartford on April 22. When she heard an announcement over the loudspeaker seeking the assistance of any medical professionals on board, she quickly volunteered to help a passenger experiencing respiratory difficulties. After successfully providing aid, Ms. Cunningham was about to return to her seat when she was asked to help another passenger, who had lost consciousness. While assessing the situation, she began to feel dizzy herself, along with other passengers and members of the flight crew.

Despite the challenging circumstances, she did not panic but instead urged the flight crew to make an emergency landing, fearing something was wrong. The pilot swiftly landed the plane in Buffalo, and although 17 passengers were later evaluated by medical personnel, it appears that everyone has made a full recovery. Had Ms. Cunningham not been on the plane to assist with handling the situation, that might not have been the case.

Ms. Cunningham deserves the highest praise, not just for her choice to become a health provider, but for her speedy and decisive actions to help those in need and recognizing a potentially disastrous situation. I am particularly pleased to recognize her on National Nurses Day, when we recognize the essential services nurses provide in hospitals and communities all across the country. I know all of Connecticut joins me in honoring and thanking Ms. Cunningham for her exemplary performance in the line of duty.●

TOP MONTANA TEAM IN CAPITOL HILL CHALLENGE

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a group of Montana students and their teacher, who truly embody the innovative and hardworking spirit that has, for so long, been the engine of our great Nation.

Ms. Jennifer Zirbel and her class at Lone Peak High School in Gallatin Gateway, MT, recently represented Montana well in the Capitol Hill Challenge with their exemplary performance in the 12th annual Stock Market Game.

There were 5,000 high school and middle schools teams from all 50 States that participated in the Challenge. As the top performing Montana team in the competition, they have demonstrated exemplary knowledge of math, economics, business and the global economy. They have made Montana proud. They are outstanding young Montanans who have proven that hard work and dedication can lead to tremendous success in whatever you set your mind to. The real world financial and business skills that they have gained through their participation in this program will no doubt serve them well in their future as active citizens.●

TRIBUTE TO CHEYENNE BRADY

● Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I congratulate Ms. Cheyenne Brady, a resident of the great State of North Dakota, on being crowned the 2015–2016 Miss Indian World.

The Miss Indian World competition is the largest and most prestigious cultural pageant for young Native women and was recently held during the Gathering of Nations Powwow at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque. Twenty contestants from across the United States and Canada were judged on public speaking, a personal interview, talent presentation, traditional dance, and an essay. Throughout the competition, contestants demonstrated an in-depth knowledge of their culture and tribal history. Cheyenne won awards for the Best Essay as well as Best Dancer categories.

Cheyenne is a member of the Sac and Fox Nation, and also represents the Hidatsa Arikara, Cheyenne, Pawnee, Otoe, Kiowa Apache, and Tonkawa tribes. At 22 years old, she is a student at North Dakota State University majoring in behavioral health and was recently accepted into North Dakota State University's graduate school program for American Indian Public Health. As Congress works to support Native youth and address their holistic needs that include behavioral and mental health issues, it is heartening to see Cheyenne specialize in areas so critical to helping her tribe and community members succeed.

I wish Cheyenne well as she travels across the United States and Canada in her role as Miss Indian World. During her reign, Cheyenne hopes to instill a sense of pride in Native youth and will encourage them to embrace their culture. It is truly a great honor to have such a talented young woman represent North Dakota and Indian Country on the world stage.●

TRIBUTE TO STEVEN LEACH

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the inspiring accomplishments of Steven Leach, a 20-year U.S. Army veteran and past department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars from Pawlet, VT, who is known by his fellow veterans, friends, and acquaintances as ''The Monument Man.'' Steve has long been a strong leader within the veterans' community, especially as a member of Harned-Fowler VFW Post 6471 in Manchester Center, VT, and a passionate advocate for veterans and their family members.

Most recently, Steve has dedicated himself to preserving the memory of the service and sacrifice of wartime veterans for future generations of Vermonters, as well as visitors to the Green Mountain State. In 2010, he spearheaded a major initiative to erect a monument commemorating the thousands of Vermont veterans who served in the Korean war, including the 94 Vermonters who were killed in action during ''the forgotten war'' and the 20 who remain missing to this day. For more than 3 years, Steve planned, designed, coordinated, and fundraised to make the monument a reality, and on August 5, 2013, he helped inaugurate the Vermont Korean War Monument in Manchester, VT.

Inspired by the overwhelming support for that effort and not one to rest on his laurels, Steve set out to erect a similar monument in honor of World War II veterans, to be installed at the new Bennington Welcome Center on Route 279, also known as the Vermont World War II Veterans Memorial Highway. That project is almost complete and will be dedicated on August 15 as part of the events commemorating the 70th anniversary of the conclusion of World War II. On that date, thanks in large part to Steve's efforts, Vermonters will gather to unveil a monument recognizing the sacrifices of those who contributed to the defeat of tyranny 70 years ago, including the more than 1,200 Vermonters who died as a result of combat.

Between the two monument campaigns, Steve has logged hundreds of volunteer hours, travelled thousands of miles, raised tens of thousands of dollars, and, most importantly, touched the hearts of countless Vermonters in his quest to honor the service of our State's veterans.

Steve Leach is another one of those extraordinary veterans we all have in our home States, who, although he took off his uniform, never really quit serving his country. This humble man will be rather embarrassed that I have chosen to place him in the spotlight for his selfless devotion to public service. His tireless efforts deserve special recognition in this body, and I am so proud to share his accomplishments with my colleagues.●

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–22. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing the United States Congress to require the U.S. Department of Defense to ensure that replacement aircraft are assigned to Selfridge Air National Guard Base to compensate for the proposed elimination of the A-10 fleet; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 29

Whereas, The proposed U.S. Department of Defense budget would eliminate the nation's

A-10 fleet, including aircraft at Michigan's Selfridge Air National Guard Base. Selfridge currently is home to 18 A-10 Thunderbolt II aircraft, directly supporting 535 jobs related to that mission; and

Whereas, The proposed cuts would have a dramatic effect on the lives and morale of the dedicated men and women who choose to serve our country at Selfridge Air National Guard Base and other U.S. military bases. The elimination of the A-10 fleet would place in jeopardy more than 400 jobs at Selfridge alone; and

Whereas, In Michigan, these proposed cuts would have immeasurable impacts on Macomb County and the local communities surrounding the Selfridge Air National Guard Base. For nearly a century, the base has been a source of community pride and local jobs, with the local economic benefit worth more than $700 million to residents and businesses in several surrounding cities and townships. In addition, the base is a key component of disaster response for the entire state and a vital base for our nation's homeland security; and

Whereas, The A-10 fleet should not be eliminated until an enduring fighter aircraft mission, or suitable enduring non-fighter mission supplementary to the KC-135 Air Refueling Tanker, can be assigned to Selfridge Air National Guard Base. The elimination of the A-10 fleet will make Selfridge vulnerable to closure in future Base Realignment and Closure Commission recommendations. Assigning replacement aircraft would not only maintain the viability of this important base for homeland security, but would also be cost-effective: the Air National Guard can operate aircraft at about half the cost of an active duty unit; and

Whereas, The brave pilots and crew who serve in the A-10 unit based at Selfridge Air National Guard Base have performed brilliantly against the enemies of freedom on battlefields across the globe providing desperately needed close air support for our nation's warriors. It is vital to our national security that those skilled airmen continue to be utilized to defend our nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to require the U.S. Department of Defense to ensure that replacement aircraft are assigned to Selfridge Air National Guard Base to compensate for the proposed elimination of the A-10 fleet; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–23. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming requesting the United States Congress to eliminate the freeze on longer combination vehicles and consent to the creation of a voluntary compact between Western States that will establish uniform size and capacity, routes, configuration, and operating conditions for longer combination vehicles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Whereas, one of the most significant ways to improve freight system performance on the highways of the western United States is through the use of more efficient trucks and track combinations; and

Whereas, over the past two (2) decades, longer combination vehicles (LCVs), which are tractor-trailer combinations with two (2) or more trailers that have a gross weight exceeding eighty thousand (80,000) pounds, have demonstrated considerable benefits to the general public through increased productivity, higher safety ratings, increased fuel savings, emissions reductions and congestion mitigation; and

Wereas, a Federal Highway Administration freeze on state authority to expand the of LCVs has been in place since 1991, and since that time there has been substantial population, traffic congestion and vehicle registration growth and a significant increase in vehicle miles traveled and vehicle emissions; and

Whereas, eliminating the freeze on LCVs for the affected states, including Wyoming, will give these states the flexibility to establish uniformity in LCV, oversight and find ways to benefit from LCV operations in each of the affected states and throughout the western United States; and

Whereas, consenting to a voluntary compact or agreement between the states of Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wyoming will allow these states to establish uniform size and weight limits for LCVs, which are not to exceed one hundred twenty-nine thousand (129,000) pounds gross vehicle combination weight or one hundred (100) foot cargo carrying length, and adopt LCV routes, configurations and operating conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Members of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

Section 1. That Congress is urged to lift the freeze on longer commercial vehicles for the affected Western states, including Wyoming, in order to take advantage of new transportation strategies to improve highway efficiency and reduce vehicle miles traveled, traffic congestion, fuel consumption and air pollution emissions.

Section 2. That Congress consent to the creation of voluntary compact or agreement between the states. of Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wyoming that will establish uniform LCV size capacity, routes, configurations and operating conditions.

Section 3. That the Secretary of State of Wyoming transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to the Wyoming Congressional Delegation.

POM–24. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming calling on the United States Congress, state, and local authorities to take action to prevent further damage and remediate damages caused by free-roaming feral horses on rangelands in the West and to develop effective fertility control methods to reduce the populations of free-roaming feral horses in the West; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION 3

Whereas, Wyoming has recognized the Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971 and free-roaming horses are defined as feral under W.S. 11–48–101(a) (iii); and

Whereas, the federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM) estimates that almost fifty thousand (50,000) feral horses roam BLM managed rangelands in the West, with nearly three thousand (3,000) of those feral horses, the majority of which descend from animals turned out by ranchers, roaming public rangelands in Wyoming; and

Whereas, free-roaming feral horses have virtually no natural predators in Wyoming nor the West and BLM evidence suggests the population of feral horses can double in size about every four (4) years if left uncontrolled; and

Whereas, BLM estimates that the current free-roaming population of feral horses significantly exceeds the number that can exist in healthy balance with other public rangeland resources and uses, including wildlife and domestic livestock grazing; and

Whereas, free-roaming feral horses, among other things, trample and destroy vegetation, hard-pack soil, over-graze and decimate riparian areas causing degradation in areas that provide important habitat for native species such as pronghorn, mule deer, bighorn sheep and sage grouse; and

Whereas, the state of Wyoming has a federally approved sage grouse conservation plan, the efficacy of which is being compromised by continuing habitat damage resulting from free-roaming horses; and

Whereas, the number of free-roaming feral horses removed from public rangelands in the West by BLM in compliance with the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971, now far exceeds the number of feral horses adopted or sold; and

Whereas, those feral horses not adopted by the public are held in long-term pastures or short-term corrals, costing BLM nationally an estimated fifty-eight million dollars ($58,000,000.00) per year; and

Whereas, evidence suggests the development and use of effective fertility control methods can limit the populations of free-roaming feral horses, lessen the need to remove free-roaming feral horses from the state's rangelands, improve the health of the rangelands in the West, conserve wildlife habitat and save taxpayers money; and

Whereas, the following reports provide, among other things, data, statistics and recommended strategies to manage free-roaming feral horses in the West and protect the state's rangeland resources and uses: Rangewide Interagency Sage-grouse Conservation Team, Near-Term Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Action Plan (September 2012); Ted Williams, Horse Sense, Audubon (September/October 2006); David Ganskopp and Martin Vavra, Habitat Use by Feral Horses in the Northern Sagebrush Steppe, Journal of Range Management Volume 39(3) (May 1986); K.W. Davies and C.S. Boyd, Effects on Feral Free-Roaming Horses on Semi-Arid Rangeland Ecosystems: An Example from the Sagebrush Steppe, Ecosphere Volume 5(10) (October 2014); Linda Zeigenfuss et al., Influence of Nonnative and Native Ungulate Biomass and Seasonal Precipitation on Vegetation Production in a Great Basin Ecosystem, Western North American Naturalist Volume 74(3) (2014); Erik Beever and Peter Brussard, Examining Ecological Consequences of Feral Horse Grazing Using Exclosures, Western North American Naturalist Volume 60(3) (2000); Kelly Crane et al., Habitat Selection Patterns of Feral Horses in Southcentral Wyoming, Journal of Range Management Volume 50(4) (July 1997); Erik Beever, Management Implications of the Ecology of Free-Roaming Horses in Semi-Arid Ecosystems of the Western United States, Wildlife Society Bulletin Volume 31(3) (2003); and Erik Beever and Cameron Aldridge, Influences of Free-Roaming Equids on Sagebrush Ecosystems, with a Focus on Greater Sage-Grouse, Studies in Avian Biology Volume 38 (2011): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Members of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

Section 1. That the Wyoming Legislature calls on Congress and federal agencies to adequately fund and support all efforts to manage free-roaming feral horses on rangelands in the West at the appropriate management level, utilizing all management and control methods authorized by Section 3(d) of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act.

Section 2. That the Wyoming Legislature calls on Congress in conjunction with all appropriate state and local governments to engage in cooperative efforts to remediate and minimize the environmental impact of free-roaming feral horses on rangelands in the West. These efforts should include the development and use of effective fertility control methods to reduce the free-roaming populations of feral horses on rangelands in the West.

Section 3. That the Wyoming Legislature calls on Congress to prohibit the reintroduction of feral horses back onto the western rangelands outside the current herd management areas, nor onto existing herdo management areas at or above the authorized management levels.

Section 4. That the Wyoming Legislature calls on Congress and federal agencies to prioritize these requested management activities to the sage grouse core areas and priority habitat strongholds in order to reduce the possibility of an endangered listing for the sage grouse and to stop the resource-damage now occurring.

Section 5. That the Secretary of State of Wyoming transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Wyoming Congressional Delegation, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Land Management and the Director of the Wyoming Office of the Bureau of Land Management.

POM–25. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the President of the United States and the United States Congress to establish a Presidential Youth Council; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, Young people have always played an important role in the nation's history and development but continue to play a disproportionately small role in American government; and

Whereas, Just over ⅓ of the United States population is comprised of Americans age 24 and under; and

Whereas, Youth participation, involvement and engagement should be universally recognized as safeguards of democracy but the existing mechanisms of the Federal Government are designed in ways that inhibit youth participation, leading to the underrepresentation of young people in the policymaking process; and

Whereas, Policy decisions made today will have a profound impact on future generations and all Americans should have a voice in government, especially with regard to policies that directly affect them; and

Whereas, A Presidential Youth Council would offer young persons in America with a means of sharing their perspectives and voicing their opinions at the highest level of government while also providing the President and Congress with a bipartisan source of information on the concerns facing youths across the country; and

Whereas, Members of Congress, governors, state legislatures and mayors have created youth councils that have proven to be effective means of receiving input from young people and have lead to more efficient policies and practices affecting young people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts General Court hereby encourages the creation of a Presidential Youth Council to advise the President and Congress on the perspectives of young people, to assist in the design and implementation of youth policies and to allow young people to provide solutions on the most pressing issues facing the future of America; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from the commonwealth.

POM–26. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to work together to create a comprehensive and workable approach to reform the nation's immigration system according to specified principles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, This country was built by immigrants seeking a better life; and

Whereas, Estimates suggest that there are 11 million undocumented immigrants living in the shadows in the United States, including millions of children brought to this country undocumented who have grown up here, call the United States home, and are suffering from our dysfunctional immigration policy; and

Whereas, A logical and streamlined path to citizenship for individuals after they gain legal status would stimulate the economy by allowing these individuals to get college degrees and driver's licenses, buy homes, start new companies, and create legal, tax-paying jobs, affording them a chance at the American Dream; and

Whereas, The United States Congress last enacted major immigration legislation more than 25 years ago; and

Whereas, Since that time, fragmented attempts at immigration reform have failed to create the rational and effective systems needed to maintain international competitiveness. Whether in industries like agriculture, which requires large numbers of workers able to perform physically demanding tasks, or in industries like technology or health care, where the demand for employees with advanced degrees is projected to exceed supply within the next five years, immigration policy must be designed to respond to emerging labor needs in all sectors of the United States economy; and

Whereas, Our national interests and security are not served by our outdated, inefficient, and slow-moving immigration system. Patchwork attempts to mend its deficiencies undermine our potential for prosperity and leave us vulnerable and unable to meet the needs of the modern world; and

Whereas, Labor mobility is crucial to our economic prosperity and our country's recovery from the economic crisis. Yet our rigid, outdated immigration policies are making it difficult for our companies and our nation to compete. Information released in a study by the University of California, Los Angeles, states that legalizing the status of undocumented immigrants working and living in the United States would create approximately $1.5 trillion in additional gross domestic product growth over the next 10 years and increase wages for all workers. Another study by the University of California, Davis, indicates that the last large wave of immigrants, from 1990 to 2007, inclusive, raised the income of a native-born American worker by an average of $5,000; and

Whereas, California has the largest share of immigrants in the country. These immigrants are a vital and productive part of our state's economy and are active in a variety of industries, including technology, biotech, hospitality, agriculture, construction, services, transportation, and textiles. They also represent a large share of our new small business owners and create economic property and needed jobs for everyone; and

Whereas, Keeping these families, business owners, and hard workers in the shadows of society serves no one; and

Whereas, Our state, for economic, social, health, security, and prosperity reasons, must support policies that allow individuals to become legal and enfranchised participants in our society and economy; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform should include a reasonable and timely path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants who are already living and working in the United States. Immigration reform should also include comprehensive background checks, require demonstrated proficiency in English and payment of all current and back taxes, and have the flexibility to respond to emerging business trends; and

Whereas, The Migration Policy Institute, a nonpartisan research group in Washington, D.C., estimates that in 2012, the federal government spent $18 billion on immigration enforcement, and since 2004, the number of United States Border Patrol agents has doubled; and

Whereas, Increased enforcement has given the federal government the ability to prioritize the deportation of lawbreakers and dangerous individuals and to ensure our border's security. Nevertheless, this enforcement should not be done in an inhumane way; and

Whereas, Immigration enforcement should continue to focus on criminals, not on hard-working immigrant families, and not at the expense of effective trade with two of our top three economic partners; and

Whereas, The United States loses large numbers of necessary, highly skilled workers due to the lengthy and complicated processes currently in place to get or keep a legal residency option; and

Whereas, Reform should include an expedited process for those residing abroad and applying for legal visas. Additionally, reform should offer permanent residency opportunities to international students in American universities who are highly trained and in high demand, and in so doing avoid an intellectual vacuum after their graduation; and

Whereas, Reform should recognize the societal and cultural benefits of keeping the family unit intact. The system should take into account special circumstances surrounding candidates for probationary legal status, such as those of minors who were brought to the country as children or workers whose labor is essential to maintain our country's competitiveness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges the President and the Congress of the United States to work together and

create a comprehensive and workable approach to solving our nation's historically broken immigration system, using the principles described in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

POM–27. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, urging the United States Senate to introduce and pass legislation similar to H.R. 343, that would allow volunteer firefighters and emergency medical and rescue personnel to claim services as a charitable contribution to their department; to the Committee on Finance.

POM–28. A resolution adopted by the Tompkins County Legislature of the State of New York asking the United States Congress and the President of the United States to halt the ''Fast-Track'' process of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and instead, to allow the Trans-Pacific Partnership a fully transparent, public debate in Congress until its impact are fully assessed by all stakeholders, in order to protect the rights of the people of Tompkins County, the best interests of local businesses and workforce, the health of the environment, and the sovereignty of all levels of government; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 651. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office''.

S. 179. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building''.

S. 994. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building''.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*David Michael Bennett, of North Carolina, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2018.

*Mickey D. Barnett, of New Mexico, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2020.

*Stephen Crawford, of Maryland, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for the remainder of the term expiring December 8, 2015.

*Stephen Crawford, of Maryland, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2022.

*James C. Miller, III, of Virginia, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2017.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1200. A bill to promote competition and help consumers save money by giving them the freedom to choose where they buy prescription pet medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1201. A bill to advance the integration of clean distributed energy into electric grids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1202. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to assist States in adopting updated interconnection procedures and tariff schedules and standards for supplemental, backup, and standby power fees for projects for combined heat and power technology and waste heat to power technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. VITTER, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1203. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing by the Department of Veterans Affairs of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1204. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement to provide for management of the free-roaming wild horses in and around the Currituck National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1205. A bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1206. A bill to address the concept of ''Too Big To Fail'' with respect to certain financial entities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1207. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a grant program under which the Secretary shall make grants to eligible partnerships to provide for the transformation of the electric grid by the year 2030, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1208. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require gas pipeline facilities to accelerate the repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of high-risk pipelines used in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1209. A bill to establish State revolving loan funds to repair or replace natural gas distribution pipelines; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. CASSIDY, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1210. A bill to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to oil and gas production and distribution; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1211. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that payment under the Medicare program to a long-term care hospital for inpatient services shall not be made at the applicable site neutral payment rate for certain discharges involving severe wounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RISCH, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1212. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 1213. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 and the Federal Power Act to facilitate the free market for distributed energy resources; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1214. A bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1215. A bill to amend the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000 to provide for the development of methane hydrate as a commercially viable source of energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1216. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to modify a provision relating to civil penalties; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1217. A bill to establish an Interagency Rapid Response Team for Transmission, to establish an Office of Transmission Ombudsperson, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1218. A bill to establish an interagency coordination committee or subcommittee with the leadership of the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, focused on the nexus between energy and water production, use, and efficiency, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1219. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to provide for the safe and reliable interconnection of distributed resources and to provide for the examination of the effects of net metering; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1220. A bill to improve the distribution of energy in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1221. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to require periodic reports on electricity reliability and reliability impact statements for rules affecting the reliable operation of the bulk-power system; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1222. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for reports relating to electric capacity resources of transmission organizations and the amendment of certain tariffs to address the procurement of electric capacity resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1223. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to improve the loan guarantee program for innovative technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1224. A bill to reconcile differing Federal approaches to condensate; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1225. A bill to improve Federal land management, resource conservation, environmental protection, and use of Federal real property, by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to develop a multipurpose cadastre of Federal real property and identifying inaccurate, duplicate, and out-of-date Federal land inventories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1226. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands to promote a greater domestic helium supply, to establish a Federal helium leasing program for public land, and to secure a helium supply for national defense and Federal researchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1227. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to develop an implementation strategy to promote the development of hybrid micro-grid systems for isolated communities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1228. A bill to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1229. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to submit a plan to implement recommendations to improve interactions between the Department of Energy and National Laboratories; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1230. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program under which the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall enter into memoranda of understanding with States providing for State oversight of oil and gas productions activities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1231. A bill to require congressional notification for certain Strategic Petroleum Reserve operations and to determine options available for the continued operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1232. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to modify provisions relating to smart grid modernization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1233. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to expand the electric rate-setting authority of States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1234. A bill to enhance consumer rights relating to consumer report disputes by requiring provision of documentation provided by consumers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1235. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to authorize Regional Corporations and Village Corporations to establish energy assistance programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1236. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to modify certain requirements relating to trial-type hearings with respect to certain license applications before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING:

S. 1237. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to limit the authority of the Secretary of Energy to approve certain proposals relating to export activities of liquefied natural gas terminals; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. KIRK, Mr. REID, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 170. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BURR, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. VITTER):

S. Res. 171. A resolution congratulating the students, parents, teachers, and administrators of charter schools across the United States for making ongoing contributions to education, and supporting the ideals and goals of the 16th annual National Charter Schools Week, to be held May 3 through May 9, 2015; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COONS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. Res. 172. A resolution honoring the vital role of small businesses and the passion of entrepreneurs in the United States during ''National Small Business Week'', from May 4, through May 8, 2015; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 173. A resolution condemning atrocities committed by Bashar al-Assad of Syria and his regime, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 85

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 85, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a simplified income-driven repayment plan, and for other purposes.

S. 125

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 125, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 386, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 507

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 507, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to pay higher wages to their employees.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 676

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 676, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent tax-related identity theft and tax fraud, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings.

S. 804

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

S. 849

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases.

S. 853

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 853, a bill to improve the efficiency and reliability of rail transportation by reforming the Surface Transportation Board, and for other purposes.

S. 1043

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1043, a bill to ensure that transportation and infrastructure projects carried out using Federal financial assistance are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are produced in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1088

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1088, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for voter registration through the Internet, and for other purposes.

S. 1117

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1117, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to remove senior executives of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct to include removal of certain other employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1127, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill relating to the modernization of C–130 aircraft to meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1142

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1142, a bill to clarify that noncommercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not in interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1193

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1193, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent and expand the temporary minimum credit rate for the low-income housing tax credit program.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1232. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to modify provisions relating to smart grid modernization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Smart Grid Act of 2015.

America's trillion-dollar electricity grid is ill-equipped to meet the needs of the future. Grid outages and interruptions are estimated to cost taxpayers $150 billion annually, according to the U.S. Department of Energy DOE. At the same time, electricity demand is expected to grow 24 percent by 2040 and electricity costs for American consumers are expected to increase 18 percent over that same period.

Yet the news is not all grim, the U.S. Department of Energy estimates that $46 billion to $117 billion could be saved in the avoided construction costs of power plants and transmission lines over 20 years, if the United States transitions to ''smart grid'' technologies.

This bill promotes a more efficient and flexible electricity grid—an electricity grid that supports low-cost renewable energy, electric vehicles and energy storage, and helps consumers save money while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The bill extends cost-share grant programs created in the Energy Independence and Savings Act of 2007, EISA2007, and sets DOE on a path to help create technology communication standards that will pave the way for innovation in new household appliances and save consumer dollars.

Specifically, the bill will establish two DOE competitive grant programs to promote the modernization of the electricity grid. Among critical areas identified by the electricity industry, the new authorizations will promote grid efficiency and real time rate adjustments, in addition to driving innovations and deployment of new energy technologies. The grant programs would require an equal matching investment from the grant recipient to ensure that beneficiaries are also held accountable. The grant recipients will be required to exchange information and ideas to further the development of a modernized electric grid. The bill will also direct DOE to begin developing standards for data sharing and communication between electricity users and providers on the grid, to improve grid efficiency and reliability.

I encourage my colleagues to review and ultimately support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1232

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Smart Grid Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. SMART GRID INTEROPERABILITY WORKING GROUP.

Section 1303 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17383) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and heading and inserting the following:

''SEC. 1303. SMART GRID ADVISORY COMMITTEE; SMART GRID TASK FORCE; SMART GRID INTEROPERABILITY WORKING GROUP.'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) SMART GRID INTEROPERABILITY WORKING GROUP.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary, in collaboration with the National Institute of Standards and Technology of the Department of Commerce, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and the Smart Grid Interoperability Panel, shall establish a working group, to be known as the 'Smart Grid Interoperability Working Group'—

''(A) to identify additional efforts the Federal Government can take to better promote the establishment and adoption of open standards that enhance connectivity and interoperability on the electric grid;

''(B) to study the market and policy barriers to deploying responsive appliances at scale; and

''(C) to develop a plan for establishing and promoting the widespread adoption of interoperability standards.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Smart Grid Interoperability Working Group shall include such representatives as the Secretary determines to be appropriate from—

''(A) appliance manufacturers;

''(B) utilities;

''(C) software providers;

''(D) energy efficiency and environmental stakeholders; and

''(E) relevant Federal departments and agencies.

''(3) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Smart Grid Interoperability Working Group shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes the initial findings and recommendations of the Smart Grid Interoperability Working Group, as described in paragraph (1).''; and

(4) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking ''and Smart Grid Task Force'' and inserting '', the Smart Grid Task Force, and the Smart Grid Interoperability Working Group''.

SEC. 3. SMART GRID TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM POLICY.

Section 1304 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17384) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the second sentence, by inserting ''and lessons learned from demonstration projects implemented under this section'' before the period at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) to identify best practices for the implementation of the Fair Information Practice Principles (FIPPS) of the Federal Trade Commission for the collection, use, disclosure, and retention of individual customer information.''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking the subparagraph designation and heading and all that follows through ''the initiative'' and inserting the following:

''(A) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, subject to clause (ii)''; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) REQUIREMENT.—In selecting smart grid demonstration projects to receive assistance under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(I) geographical diversity; and

''(II) diversity among types of electricity markets and regulatory environments.'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (F) as subparagraphs (C) through (G), respectively;

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) ADDITIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FUNDING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, in addition to financial assistance provided under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide grants, on a competitive basis, for demonstration projects in any of the following 7 program areas:

''(I) TRANSACTIVE ENERGY.—Projects that implement a system of economic or control mechanisms that optimizes the dynamic balance of supply and demand across the electrical infrastructure, using economic value as a key operational parameter.

''(II) INNOVATION IN VALUATION OF NEW TECHNOLOGY GRID SERVICES AND EFFICIENCY.—Projects that implement innovative ways of valuing the grid services provided by demand response, energy efficiency, distributed generation, electric vehicles, and storage.

''(III) RATE DESIGN–DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.—Projects that implement rates, such as 3-part rates, to equitably ensure cost-recovery and the reliability of the distribution grid, while also supporting the increased penetration of distributed generation, storage, and electric vehicles.

''(IV) RATE DESIGN–CONSUMER ACCEPTANCE OF TIME-BASED PRICING.—Projects that—

''(aa) study consumer adoption of time-based retail electricity rates through the implementation of time-based rates, in conjunction with randomized control trials; and

''(bb) may—

''(AA) provide to customers a range of time-based pricing options, as well as options to adopt enabling technology; and

''(BB) implement a heterogeneity of marketing and outreach approaches.

''(V) ENERGY STORAGE.—Projects that demonstrate innovative approaches for using energy storage for grid services, including—

''(aa) flexibility; and

''(bb) the integration of intermittent renewable energy.

''(VI) SMART ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING.—Projects that—

''(aa) demonstrate innovative approaches for integrating electric vehicles into grid operations; or

''(bb) produce, test, and certify to IEEE/UL standards bidirectional power electronics for electric vehicles.

''(VII) OTHER PROGRAM AREA.—Projects in 1 additional program area that the Secretary may identify, by regulation.

''(ii) PRIORITY REQUIREMENTS.—In selecting demonstration projects to receive grants under clause (i), the Secretary shall give priority to—

''(I) for demonstration projects described in subclause (I) of clause (i), projects that—

''(aa) incorporate real-time prices and technologies that allow prices to be directly delivered to end-user devices (an approach commonly known as 'prices to devices'); or

''(bb) advance device visibility in grid system operations;

''(II) for demonstration projects described in subclause (II) of clause (i), projects that address valuation of ancillary services, capacity, and services offered in price-responsive markets;

''(III) for demonstration projects described in subclause (III) of clause (i), projects that assess—

''(aa) the impact of the rates described in that subclause on customer electricity consumption patterns;

''(bb) customer interest and enrollment in the new rates;

''(cc) the impact of rates on the economics of distributed generation and storage;

''(dd) the impact of rates on consumer adoption patterns of distributed generation and storage; or

''(ee) the effectiveness of various educational outreach measures in presenting the rates to customers;

''(IV) for demonstration projects described in subclause (IV) of clause (i), projects that—

''(aa) investigate the effects on customer participation and satisfaction rates of—

''(AA) choice architecture, such as defaulting to an opt-in, versus an opt-out, program; and

''(BB) enabling technology; or

''(bb) demonstrate how the lessons learned from the study described in that subclause can be used to develop a rate transition plan that facilitates significant and lasting enrollment in the new rates with a high degree of customer satisfaction;

''(V) for demonstration projects described in subclause (V) of clause (i), projects that maximize—

''(aa) benefits to intermittent renewable energy generation; and

''(bb) the range of grid services provided by storage; and

''(VI) for demonstration projects described in subclause (VI) of clause (i), projects that demonstrate methods of—

''(aa) maximizing the grid services provided by electric vehicles; and

''(bb) minimizing load spikes and grid costs associated with electric vehicles.'';

(iv) in subparagraph (C) (as redesignated by clause (ii))—

(I) by striking ''subparagraph (A) shall be carried out'' and inserting the following:

''subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be—

''(i) carried out'';

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) given priority in selection for assistance based on the extent to which the project demonstrates strong collaboration among—

''(I) State energy agencies;

''(II) State public utility and public service commissions;

''(III) electric utilities;

''(IV) power aggregators; and

''(V) if applicable, independent system operators, regional transmission organizations, or wholesale market operators.'';

(v) in subparagraph (D) (as redesignated by clause (ii)), by striking ''subparagraph (B)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (C)'';

(vi) in subparagraph (E) (as redesignated by clause (ii)), by striking the subparagraph designation and heading and all that follows through ''No person'' and inserting the following:

''(E) ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER FUNDING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A person or entity that receives financial assistance for a demonstration project in any program area described in subparagraph (A) or any of subclauses (I) through (VII) of subparagraph (B)(i) may be eligible to receive assistance under any other such program area, if the person or entity establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary a synergy between the program areas.

''(ii) INELIGIBILITY.—No person''; and

(vii) in subparagraph (F) (as redesignated by clause (ii))—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(i) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEARINGHOUSE.—The Secretary'';

(II) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following:

''(ii) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—As a condition of receiving financial assistance under this subsection, a utility or other participant in a smart grid demonstration project shall provide such information as the Secretary may require, to become available through the smart grid information clearinghouse and for purposes of producing the reports described in subclauses (IV) and (V) of clause (iv), in such form and at such time as the Secretary may require.'';

(III) in the third sentence, by striking ''The Secretary shall assure'' and inserting the following:

''(iii) PROTECTED INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall ensure''; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) WORKING GROUPS.—

''(I) ESTABLISHMENT.—For each program area described in subparagraph (A) or any of subclauses (I) through (VII) of subparagraph (B)(i), the Secretary shall establish a working group, to be composed of representatives of each project selected to receive assistance within that program area.

''(II) MEETINGS.—Each working group established under subclause (I) shall meet not less frequently than once every 90 days.

''(III) PARTICIPATION REQUIRED.—As a condition of receiving financial assistance under this subsection, the owner or operator of a demonstration project shall designate a representative of the project to serve as a member of the applicable working group established under subclause (I), including by attending each meeting of the working group under subclause (II).

''(IV) REPORTS.—Each working group established under subclause (I) shall submit to the Secretary reports regarding the demonstrations projects carried out by members of the working group, at such times and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(V) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall periodically publish reports and other appropriate informational materials for use, within each program area described in subclause (I), by—

''(aa) State regulators;

''(bb) wholesale market operators;

''(cc) electric utilities; and

''(dd) such other individuals and entities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.''; and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021.''.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL MATCHING FUND FOR SMART GRID INVESTMENT COSTS.

Section 1306(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17386(f)) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021''.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1233. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to expand the electric rate-setting authority of States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the PURPA PLUS Act.

In my home State we have numerous emerging small renewable energy technologies, such as wave energy buoys, hydropower turbines in irrigation canals, biomass burning cogeneration facilities and rooftop solar installations. Like Oregon, many States have sought to advance such new electricity technologies by allowing utilities to pay higher than normal power purchase rates, called ''incentive rates'', for power from these desirable technologies. Incentive rates allow individuals and small businesses deploying these desirable technologies to recover the money they invest in the infrastructure, such as solar panels or other electricity generation equipment, over a reasonable period of time. The ability of States to award such incentive rates for small projects is currently hampered by the need to go through a case-by-case review process before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC.

The PURPA PLUS Act simply provides States the legal authority to set incentive rates for small renewable energy projects. Currently, under the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, PURPA, the FERC regulates the price that utility companies pay for electricity from small, independent power providers. Such prices can be no higher than what it would normally cost a utility company either to generate or to buy additional power from the lowest cost provider. This structure sets a limit on prices that is often too low for small renewable energy projects to be financially viable, despite other clear benefits they provide, such as local job creation, lower investment in high-voltage transmission lines, diversity in an area's power generation portfolio, and the environmental benefits of green energy.

PURPA PLUS would transfer the authority for setting power purchase rates for small power projects of less than 2 megawatts from FERC to the States on a voluntary basis. If a State chose to exercise this authority to promote small wind energy development, or solar, or cogeneration projects, it could. If a State chose not to use this authority, FERC would continue to regulate these projects as before. By capping the project size at 2 megawatts, PURPA PLUS only extends this new authority for small projects that are providing very small amounts of power to the local utility company, leaving regulation of large wind farms, hydropower and other large renewable energy projects unchanged.

While I acknowledge that the power from these small projects may be more expensive than a large central generation station powered by coal or gas, I believe that States, if they choose, should be able to consider the associated benefits of small renewable power and set higher prices, when the market demands such action and when the benefits outweigh the costs.

I urge my colleagues to review and ultimately to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1233

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''PURPA's Legislative Upgrade to State Authority Act'' or ''PURPA PLUS Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a–3)—

(A) established a new class of nonutility generators known as ''qualifying cogeneration facilities'' and ''qualifying small power production facilities''; and

(B) encouraged the development of alternate sources of energy with the requirement that utilities purchase energy offered by qualifying facilities;

(2) since the date of enactment of that section, materials and designs for qualifying facility technologies have advanced and placed renewable resources and cogeneration facilities within the reach of more consumers, including technologies such as—

(A) solar photovoltaic panels;

(B) small wind turbines;

(C) storage technologies to support renewable energy;

(D) small hydroelectric generators on existing dams, diversions, and conduits;

(E) hydrokinetic generators;

(F) gas microturbines;

(G) steam-cycle turbines;

(H) Stirling engines;

(I) fuel cells; and

(J) biomass boilers;

(3) States need additional regulatory flexibility and authority to be able to incentivize the qualifying facilities; and

(4) the avoided cost caps on qualifying facilities should be removed so that States can set the rates for qualifying facilities of not more than 2 megawatts capacity.

SEC. 3. STATE AUTHORITY TO INCENTIVIZE QUALIFYING FACILITIES.

Section 210(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a–3(b)) is amended in the last sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that the rule shall provide that a State regulatory authority or nonregulated electric utility, acting under State authority, may set rates that exceed the incremental cost of alternative electric energy for purchases from any qualifying cogeneration facility or qualifying small power production facility of not more than 2 megawatts capacity''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 170—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK AND HONORING THE VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TRAVEL AND TOURISM TO THE UNITED STATES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. KIRK, Mr. REID, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 170

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week was established in 1983 through the enactment of the Joint Resolution entitled ''Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning May 27, 1984, as 'National Tourism Week' '', approved November 29, 1983 (Public Law 98–178; 97 Stat. 1126), which recognized the value of travel and tourism;

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week is celebrated across the United States from May 2 through May 10, 2015;

Whereas more than 120 travel destinations throughout the United States are holding events in honor of National Travel and Tourism Week;

Whereas 1 out of every 9 jobs in the United States depends on travel and tourism, and the industry supports 15,000,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry employs individuals in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and all the territories of the United States;

Whereas international travel to the United States is the single largest export industry in the country, generating a trade surplus balance of approximately $74,000,000,000;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry, Congress, and the President have worked to streamline the visa process and make the United States welcoming to visitors from other countries;

Whereas travel and tourism provide significant economic benefits to the United States by generating nearly $2,100,000,000,000 in annual economic output;

Whereas leisure travel allows individuals to experience the rich cultural heritage and educational opportunities of the United States and its communities; and

Whereas the immense value of travel and tourism cannot be overstated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Travel and Tourism Week;

(2) commends the travel and tourism industry for its important contributions to the United States; and

(3) commends the employees of the travel and tourism industry for their important contributions to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 171—CONGRATULATING THE STUDENTS, PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND ADMINISTRATORS OF CHARTER SCHOOLS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES FOR MAKING ONGOING CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION, AND SUPPORTING THE IDEALS AND GOALS OF THE 16TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK, TO BE HELD MAY 3 THROUGH MAY 9, 2015

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BURR, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. VITTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 171

Whereas charter schools are public schools that do not charge tuition and enroll any student who wants to attend, often through a random lottery when the demand for enrollment is outmatched by the supply of available charter school seats;

Whereas high-performing public charter schools deliver a high-quality public education and challenge all students to reach the students' potential for academic success;

Whereas public charter schools promote innovation and excellence in public education;

Whereas public charter schools throughout the United States provide millions of families with diverse and innovative educational options for children of the families;

Whereas high-performing public charter schools and charter management organizations are increasing student achievement and attendance rates at institutions of higher education;

Whereas public charter schools are authorized by a designated entity and—

(1) respond to the needs of communities, families, and students in the United States; and

(2) promote the principles of quality, accountability, choice, high-performance, and innovation;

Whereas, in exchange for flexibility and autonomy, public charter schools are held accountable by the authorizers of the charter schools for improving student achievement and for sound financial and operational management;

Whereas public charter schools are required to meet the student achievement accountability requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) in the same manner as traditional public schools;

Whereas public charter schools often set higher expectations for students, beyond the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), to ensure that the charter schools are of high quality and truly accountable to the public;

Whereas 43 States and the District of Columbia have enacted laws authorizing public charter schools;

Whereas, as of the 2014–2015 school year, more than 6,700 public charter schools served more than 2,900,000 children;

Whereas in the United States—

(1) in 150 school districts, more than 10 percent of public school students are enrolled in public charter schools; and

(2) in 12 school districts, at least 30 percent of public school students are enrolled in public charter schools;

Whereas public charter schools improve the achievement of students enrolled in the charter schools and collaborate with traditional public schools to improve public education for all students;

Whereas public charter schools—

(1) give parents the freedom to choose public schools;

(2) routinely measure parental satisfaction levels; and

(3) must prove the ongoing success of the charter schools to parents, policymakers, and the communities served by the charter schools or risk closure;

Whereas, between 2010 and 2015, research studies have found that students attending public charter schools perform better academically than their peers;

Whereas at least 500,000 students are on waiting lists to attend public charter schools across the country before the start of the 2014–2015 school year; and

Whereas the 16th annual National Charter Schools Week is scheduled to be celebrated the week of May 3 through May 9, 2015: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the students, families, teachers, administrators, and staff of public charter schools across the United States for—

(A) making ongoing contributions to public education;

(B) making impressive strides in closing the academic achievement gap in schools in the United States, particularly in schools with some of the most disadvantaged students in both rural and urban communities; and

(C) improving and strengthening the public school system throughout the United States;

(2) supports the ideals and goals of the 16th annual National Charter Schools Week, a week-long celebration to be held May 3 through May 9, 2015, in communities throughout the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to hold appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities during National Charter Schools Week to demonstrate support for public charter schools.

SENATE RESOLUTION 172—HONORING THE VITAL ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESSES AND THE PASSION OF ENTREPRENEURS IN THE UNITED STATES DURING ''NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK'', FROM MAY 4, THROUGH MAY 8, 2015

Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COONS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 172

Whereas 2015 marks the 52nd anniversary of ''National Small Business Week'', a designation that every President since 1963 has endorsed;

Whereas, as of 2008, the approximately 28,400,000 small businesses in the United States, the leading force of the economy of United States, created 63 percent of net new private sector jobs and generated close to 50 percent of the private, non-farm gross domestic product of the United States;

Whereas 22,735,915 of the small businesses of the United States have no employees, and 86 percent are sole proprietorships;

Whereas, as of 2007, 2,450,000 veterans were small business owners, which accounted for 9.3 percent of all businesses in the United States;

Whereas, in 2013, veteran small business owners accounted for 9 percent of all business owners and 9 percent of the adult population in the United States;

Whereas small businesses owned by women increased as a share of total businesses in the United States from 26.4 percent in 1997 to 29.6 percent in 2007, and, as of 2007, totaled nearly 7,800,000 businesses;

Whereas small businesses employ about 56,100,000 million people of the United States, which is approximately half of the private workforce of the United States;

Whereas small businesses account for 37 percent of employment in the high-tech sector;

Whereas high-patenting small businesses produce 16 times more patents per employee than large patenting firms;

Whereas small businesses in the United States represent nearly 98 percent of all exporters and produce 33 percent of the export value of the United States;

Whereas, on July 30, 1953, Congress created the Small Business Administration to aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small businesses in order to preserve free and competitive enterprise, to ensure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Federal Government property are made to small businesses, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the United States;

Whereas, for more than 50 years, the Small Business Administration has helped more than 10,000,000 entrepreneurs reach the dream of creating and maintaining a small business, and has played a key role in fostering local and national economic growth; and

Whereas the President has designated the week beginning May 4, 2015, as ''National Small Business Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the vital role of small businesses and entrepreneurs in the United States during ''National Small Business Week'';

(2) supports the designation of ''National Small Business Week'';

(3) recognizes the important role of the Small Business Administration as a valuable resource for entrepreneurs in the United States;

(4) supports and encourages young entrepreneurs to pursue their passions and create more start-up businesses;

(5) recognizes the importance of creating policies that promote a business-friendly environment for small business owners that is free of unnecessary and burdensome regulations and red tape;

(6) recognizes the National Small Business Person of the Year and the National Lender of the Year; and

(7) supports efforts to—

(A) encourage consumers to shop locally; and

(B) increase awareness of the value of locally-owned small businesses and the impact of locally-owned small businesses on the economy of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 173—CONDEMNING ATROCITIES COMMITTED BY BASHAR AL-ASSAD OF SYRIA AND HIS REGIME, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 173

Whereas Bashar al-Assad, through his actions and decisions, has lost his legitimacy as a leader of the Syrian people;

Whereas forces loyal to the Assad regime have committed war crimes and crimes against humanity, including starvation, systematic murder, torture, rape and sexual violence, enforced disappearance, and used weapons of mass destruction including chemical weapons;

Whereas the actions of the Assad regime have egregiously violated international laws of war and shocked the global conscience;

Whereas the United Nations has documented the Assad regime's campaign to defeat opposition forces by starving rebels and civilians through calculated efforts to cut off food supplies in opposition-controlled areas such as eastern Aleppo and Homs;

Whereas there is evidence that the Assad regime conducted systematic torture and killing of people who were detained by regime forces;

Whereas rape and sexual violence against civilians by regime forces has been cited as a primary reason families flee Syria;

Whereas it has been reported that more than 11,000 people have disappeared after being taken into custody by forces loyal to the Assad regime;

Whereas the Assad regime continues to use helicopters to indiscriminately drop barrel bombs, even after the United Nations Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 2139 on February 22, 2014, that ''[d]emands that all parties immediately cease all attacks against civilians, as well as the indiscriminate employment of weapons in populated areas, including shelling and aerial bombardment, such as the use of barrel bombs. . .'';

Whereas Syria once possessed one of the most advanced chemical weapons programs in the Middle East;

Whereas there were multiple documented cases of chemical attacks committed by the Assad regime, including the deployment of sarin gas in Aleppo in March and April 2013, as well as the devastating sarin and conventional attack committed near Damascus in August 2013 that killed more than 1,400 innocent civilians, including 426 children;

Whereas sarin is banned under the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, done at Paris January 13, 1993, and entered into force April 29, 1997 (commonly known as the ''Chemical Weapons Convention'');

Whereas, in September 2013, the Assad regime agreed to eliminate its chemical weapons stockpile by handing over all of its chemical weapons to international control, providing inspectors immediate and unfettered access to all suspected sites, and allowing international forces to destroy the entire stockpile and production facilities;

Whereas the September 2013 agreement mandated that Syria accede to the Chemical Weapons Convention;

Whereas, after Syria's accession to the Chemical Weapons Convention, there continue to be numerous documented reports that the Assad regime has repeatedly attacked civilians, including women and children, and armed opposition groups with chlorine gas, a substance that is banned for use as a weapon under the Chemical Weapons Convention;

Whereas, on March 6, 2015, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 2209 by a vote of 14 in favor, zero against, and 1 abstention condemning in the strongest terms the use of chlorine as a weapon in Syria and vowing that any future use would result in the imposition of Chapter VII measures;

Whereas, on March 6, 2015, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Samantha Power stated, ''Despite having acceded to the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Assad regime has again demonstrated its brutality by turning to chlorine as another barbaric weapon in its arsenal against the Syrian people. . .. Let's ask ourselves who has helicopters in Syria? Certainly not the opposition. Only the Assad regime does and we have seen them use their helicopters in countless other attacks on innocent Syrians using barrel bombs'';

Whereas it is clear that Bashar al-Assad has repeatedly lied to the international community about using chemical weapons, deploying barrel bombs, and targeting civilians, demonstrating again and again that he cannot be trusted;

Whereas internationally recognized tribunals have been used in the past to hold leaders accountable for war crimes;

Whereas the conflict in Syria has resulted in the loss of countless innocent lives, has displaced millions of people, and has destabilized the Middle East; and

Whereas the organization known as the Islamic State, the al Qaeda-affiliated Jabhat Al Nusra, and other armed opposition groups have also carried out atrocities in Syria: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

The Senate—

(1) condemns the actions of Bashar al-Assad and his regime for committing brutal acts of violence against the Syrian people, for committing systematic murder, torture, rape and enforced disappearance against the Syrian people, and for using weapons of mass destruction including chemical weapons against the Syrian people;

(2) condemns the loss of innocent civilian life during the course of the civil war in Syria;

(3) supports the diplomatic efforts of the international coalition to drive Bashar al-Assad from office and preserve the institutions of government required to restore stability to Syria; and

(4) objects to any role for Bashar al-Assad in any final settlement to the civil war.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as an authorization for the use of military force.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1202. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1203. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1202 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1204. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1205. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1204 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1206. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1207. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1206 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1208. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1209. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1208 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1210. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1211. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1210 submitted by Mr. CARDIN and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1212. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1213. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1214. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 125, to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

SA 1215. Mr. INHOFE (for Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1124, to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1202. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 1203. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1202 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''.

SA 1204. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 1205. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1204 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

SA 1206. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 5 days after enactment.

SA 1207. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1206 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''5 days'' and insert ''6 days''.

SA 1208. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 7 days after enactment.

SA 1209. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1208 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not

taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''7 days'' and insert ''8 days''.

SA 1210. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, strike lines 17 through 19 and insert the following:

''(ii) may substantially reduce the breakout time of acquisition of a nuclear weapon by Iran, if deployed.

SA 1211. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1210 submitted by Mr. CARDIN and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 4, of the amendment, strike ''breakout time of'' and insert ''breakout time for''.

SA 1212. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

''(L) An assessment of whether any country is providing to Iran, through sales, leases, or other lending, weapons systems in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1929 (2010) or sophisticated air defense systems.

SA 1213. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, strike line 1 and insert the following:

''(h) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.—

''(1) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

''(A) The Islamic Republic of Iran continues to advance its intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) program.

''(B) On February 2, 2015, the Islamic Republic of Iran successfully launched its Safir long-range missile system to send a satellite into orbit.

''(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

''(A) remains concerned about the threat posed by Iran's ballistic missile development program to the security of the United States and its allies; and

''(B) calls on the President to urge the Government of Iran to comply with United Nations Security Council resolution 1929 regarding their intercontinental ballistic missile program.

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

SA 1214. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 125, to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, line 11, strike ''$30,000,000'' and insert ''$25,000,000''.

SA 1215. Mr. INHOFE (for Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1124, to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''WIOA Technical Amendments Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO WORKFORCE INNOVATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) DESIGNATION OF AREAS SERVED BY RURAL CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS AS LOCAL AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 106(b) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3121(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) AREAS SERVED BY RURAL CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.—The Governor may approve, under paragraph (2) or (3), a request for designation as a local area from an area described in section 107(c)(1)(C).''.

(b) LOCAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARDS.—Section 107(i)(1)(B) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3122(i)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''the day before the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''the day before the date of enactment of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998''.

(c) PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.—Section 116 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3141) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv), by striking ''clause (i)(IV)'' and inserting ''clause (i)(VI)''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking ''for a program described in subsection (d)(2)(A)''.

(d) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—Section 132(b) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3172(b)) is amended, in paragraphs (1)(B)(iv)(I) and (2)(B)(iii)(I), by inserting ''less than'' after ''fiscal year that is''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 102(b)(2)(D)(i)(III) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3112(b)(2)(D)(i)(III)) is amended by striking ''section 106(b)(5)'' and inserting ''section 106(b)(6)''.

(2) Section 129(b)(1)(C) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3164(b)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''subsections (b)(6) and (c)(2) of section 106'' and inserting ''subsections (b)(7) and (c)(2) of section 106''.

(3) Section 134(a)(2)(B)(ii) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3174(a)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking ''section 106(b)(6)'' and inserting ''section 106(b)(7)''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 400(b) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 780(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b)(1) Each member of the National Council shall serve for a term of 3 years.

''(2)(A) No member of the National Council may serve more than two consecutive full terms beginning on the date of commencement of the first full term on the Council. Members may serve after the expiration of their terms until their successors have taken office.

''(B) As used in this paragraph, the term 'full term' means a term of 3 years.

''(3) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which such member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if enacted 1 day after the date of enactment of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Fish and Wildlife Service: The President's FY2016 Budget Request for the Fish and Wildlife Service and Legislative Hearing on Endangered Species bills.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor,

and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, on May 6, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: The Role of Consumer Information in College Choice.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2015, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Ensuring an Informed Citizenry: Examining the Administration's Efforts to Improve Open Government.''

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2015, at 2:15 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Impact of Federal Labor and Safety Laws on the U.S. Seafood Industry.''

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2015, at 2 p.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Aging in Place: Can Advances in Technology Help Seniors Live Independently.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Subcommittee Oversight of Multilateral and Bilateral International Development Programs and Policies.''

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

WIOA TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 61, S. 1124.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1124) to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Alexander-Murray substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to. I further ask that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 1215) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''WIOA Technical Amendments Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO WORKFORCE INNOVATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) DESIGNATION OF AREAS SERVED BY RURAL CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS AS LOCAL AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 106(b) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3121(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) AREAS SERVED BY RURAL CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.—The Governor may approve, under paragraph (2) or (3), a request for designation as a local area from an area described in section 107(c)(1)(C).''.

(b) LOCAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARDS.—Section 107(i)(1)(B) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3122(i)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''the day before the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''the day before the date of enactment of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998''.

(c) PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.—Section 116 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3141) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv), by striking ''clause (i)(IV)'' and inserting ''clause (i)(VI)''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking ''for a program described in subsection (d)(2)(A)''.

(d) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—Section 132(b) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3172(b)) is amended, in paragraphs (1)(B)(iv)(I) and (2)(B)(iii)(I), by inserting ''less than'' after ''fiscal year that is''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 102(b)(2)(D)(i)(III) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3112(b)(2)(D)(i)(III)) is amended by striking ''section 106(b)(5)'' and inserting ''section 106(b)(6)''.

(2) Section 129(b)(1)(C) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3164(b)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''subsections (b)(6) and (c)(2) of section 106'' and inserting ''subsections (b)(7) and (c)(2) of section 106''.

(3) Section 134(a)(2)(B)(ii) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3174(a)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking ''section 106(b)(6)'' and inserting ''section 106(b)(7)''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 400(b) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 780(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b)(1) Each member of the National Council shall serve for a term of 3 years.

''(2)(A) No member of the National Council may serve more than two consecutive full terms beginning on the date of commencement of the first full term on the Council. Members may serve after the expiration of their terms until their successors have taken office.

''(B) As used in this paragraph, the term 'full term' means a term of 3 years.

''(3) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which such member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if enacted 1 day after the date of enactment of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.).

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

The bill (S. 1124), as amended, was passed.

CONDEMNING ATROCITIES COMMITTED BY BASHAR AL-ASSAD OF SYRIA AND HIS REGIME

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 173.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 173) condemning atrocities committed by Bashar al-Assad of Syria and his regime, and for other purposes.

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

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

table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 173) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 170, National Travel and Tourism Week; S. Res. 171, National Charter Schools Week; and S. Res. 172, National Small Business Week.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 7, 2015

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 7; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1191, with the time until the cloture vote equally divided in the usual form; finally, that the filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to substitute amendment No. 1140 and H.R. 1191 be at 10 a.m.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. INHOFE. Senators should expect a cloture vote on the pending substitute amendment at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. INHOFE. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:28 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 7, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 7, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 11

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SR–222

6 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold closed hearings to examine the commercial, political, and security implications of the U.S.-China Civil Nuclear Agreement.
SH–219

MAY 12

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 883, to facilitate the reestablishment of domestic, critical mineral designation, assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, workforce, education, and research capabilities in the United States.
SD–366

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Federal Communications Commission.
SD–138

11 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SR–222

2 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SD–106

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the civil nuclear agreement with China, focusing on balancing potential risks and rewards.
SD–419
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the implementation and future of the Veterans Choice Program.
SR–418

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SD–106

5:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SD–106

MAY 13

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine protecting the constitutional right to counsel for indigents charged with misdemeanors.
SD–226

2 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine securing the border, focusing on fencing, infrastructure, and technology force multipliers.
SD–342

2:15 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider S. 986, to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Indian Education, focusing on organizational challenges in transforming educational opportunities for Indian children.
SD–628

3 p.m.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine pending benefits legislation.
SR–418

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine regulatory issues impacting end-users and market liquidity.
SD–106
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the National Labor Relations Board.
SD–124

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SR–222

SENATE—*Thursday, May 7, 2015*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by His Holiness Aram I, Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia, Armenian Apostolic Church in America, from New York, NY.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Almighty God, we ask You to guide our reflection, our action, and all our endeavors, and we ask Your guidance, especially in the deliberations and decisions of this noble body because strong, wise, and visionary leadership is essential for the well-being of nations.

This year is the centenary of the Armenian genocide—the first genocide of the many that followed in the 20th century. In commemorating 1½ million Armenian martyrs, we claim justice. Indeed, justice is a gift of God, and violation of justice is a sin against God.

We beseech You, O Lord, to bless the United States of America and its people. Empower them to continue serving humanity through Your goodness, as they did when they sheltered the remnants of the Armenian nation and all those who sought freedom and justice.

O Lord, give Your children wisdom, love, and compassion so that they may live and prosper with the gifts of Your Spirit: justice, truth, freedom, and righteousness.

May Your Name be praised forever and ever. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 7, 2015.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 1314.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Joni Ernst, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, Thad Cochran, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, John McCain, James Lankford, Patrick J. Toomey, Roy Blunt, Ron Johnson, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, David Vitter, Ben Sasse.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am honored to be here today to welcome His Holiness Aram I, Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia.

Since 1995, His Holiness has served as the leader of Armenian communities across the globe, including many members of the Armenian diaspora in my State of Rhode Island.

His Holiness will be visiting Sts. Vartanantz Armenian Apostolic Church in Providence on May 30, and members of the Armenian community in Rhode Island look forward to welcoming him.

He is an accomplished scholar, a devoted humanitarian, and a strong spiritual shepherd.

Recently, we marked the 100th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, which claimed the lives of nearly one and a half million Armenians, exiled over a half a million survivors, and deeply impacted all Armenians throughout the world.

On this centennial, we reflect on this exceptionally grave tragedy, and looking to the future, continue to work to promote both peace and human rights worldwide.

And there is no one better to help us do so.

It is indeed an honor to welcome His Holiness, to hear his words of prayer and reflection, and to go forward knowing that he is a powerful force for tolerance and decency. I thank him for being here today and for sharing his words of wisdom with the Senate and the Nation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is good to see the Senate——

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could ask the distinguished majority leader if he would be willing to go into a quorum call for a brief conversation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT AND BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL TRADE PRIORITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is good to see that the Senate will soon be passing another important piece of bipartisan legislation.

The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act offers the best chance for our constituents, through the Congress they elect, to weigh in on the White House's negotiations with Iran. And make no mistake—they need to have that opportunity.

The American people were led to believe these negotiations would be about ending Iran's nuclear program and—and—its enrichment capabilities. But the current interim agreement makes one thing very clear: These talks have devolved into something else altogether. Instead of ending Iran's nuclear program, the interim agreement would actually bestow international blessing for Iran to continue it. Rather than meaningfully roll back Tehran's enrichment capability and dismantle its nuclear infrastructure, the interim agreement would actually permit Iran to become a nuclear threshold state poised right at the edge of obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Iran would love nothing more than for the international community to recognize its threshold program. The Iranian regime would also love to be rid of the crippling sanctions that forced it to the table in the first place. Iran would, of course, divert those new funds to support the Assad regime, finance terrorist proxies such as Hezbollah, modernize its conventional capabilities, and further support the Houthis in Yemen. This would only reaffirm the fears of moderate Sunni allies that America is withdrawing—withdrawing—in the face of Iran's determined effort to expand its sphere of influence.

For all this, what would the United States gain from such an agreement from Iran? We would have given up our best leverage over the regime. And for what? That is a very good question—a very good question.

If a final agreement is reached that looks much like the interim agreement we have seen, it is not hard to perceive the possibilities of negative consequences. But let me be clear. A bad agreement seems far more likely to eventually lead to the kind of military conflict everyone wants to avoid than no agreement at all. President Obama would also be leaving the task of dealing with violations of an agreement to his successor.

I say all this to underline the need for the bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act which is before us today.

If we didn't face the threats of filibusters or the blocking of amendments or the specter of Presidential vetoes, this bill would be a heck of a lot stronger, I assure you. But the truth is, we face all those things. We do. That is the frustrating reality. The response to this should not be to give the American people no say at all on a deal with Iran; the response should be to overcome these challenges in a way that will give Congress and the American people the best possible chance to review any possible deal and affect its outcome.

So I would urge Members of both of our parties here in the Senate to join me in supporting this bill. And make no mistake—that will not be the end of the story, either. This Congress is determined to pursue other avenues to address Iran's aggressive campaign of expansion and intimidation in the months to come.

On the topic of aggressive campaigns in pursuit of expansion and intimidation, there are several other countries around the world that come to mind—China, for one. China is determined to dominate its neighbors. China wants to diminish American influence in the Pacific. And China wants to substitute American-style rules of global economic fair play for Chinese-style rules of monopolistic cartels and mercantilism. That is not an outcome any American should be willing to accept.

We are a Pacific nation. We have important allies in the region—nations such as Japan, Australia, South Korea, and New Zealand—that are today just as much of a modern, democratic, and market-oriented West as we are.

The 21st century also promises to be an Asia-Pacific century. If we care about preserving and extending American leadership globally, then we cannot cede the most dynamic region in the world to China. One way to preserve our leadership would be to invest in the weapons systems and platforms that would fulfill the Obama administration's would-be pivot to Asia. Another important way would be to demonstrate our economic leadership. That is just one more reason why passing the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act is so important.

The United States is currently negotiating an agreement with a whole host of Pacific nations—not just Japan and Australia but also countries such as Canada and Chile—that would cement and enhance our role in the world's fastest growing region. The so-called Trans-Pacific Partnership would lower unfair trade barriers to American-made goods and American produce sold in the Pacific. That would represent a huge win for American workers and American farmers, to say nothing of the far-reaching geopolitical implications for our country. But our trade negotiators cannot bring this Pacific agreement back to Congress for careful review and deliberation unless Congress assures our trading partners that the agreement is going to get a fair up-or-down vote. That is just what the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act would do.

This bipartisan bill would also force America's trade negotiators to meet congressional objectives and consult with Congress regularly throughout the process. It would ensure that an agreement such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership could not be enacted without explicit congressional approval.

It is a commonsense bill that was supported by a large number of Republicans and Democrats in committee, passing by a vote of 20 to 6. So there is no reason we shouldn't turn to this bill and then pass it.

The other countries in the region have made clear that they will have regional trade agreements with or without us, whether we participate or not. And if we walk away, China will step right in, no question about that.

So we will soon turn to the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act, and when we do, we will have a choice to make: Would we rather seen Chinese workers and Chinese farmers or American workers and American farmers reap the economic benefits of selling more to this dynamic region?

TRIBUTE TO DON RITCHIE

Mr. President, on one final matter, I would like to bid a fond farewell to one of the smartest guys around here, Don Ritchie, who will be leaving us later this month. He has been the Senate's Historian since 2009. Don is only the second one we have ever had. His immediate and only predecessor, Richard Baker, hired him when the Senate Historical Office came into being in the mid-1970s. There were a lot of applicants to be Baker's No. 2 back then, but Don quickly rose to the top of the heap. Baker said he received ''several extremely heartfelt letters'' of recommendation for Don that were just literally ''over the top.'' One, he said, was from ''a leading diplomatic historian . . . who said that in his whole 30-odd years of teaching he had never encountered a more perceptive or diligent . . . [or] brighter student than Don.''

''No more superlatives,'' he said, ''could have been used.'' Apparently, no more superlatives were needed because Don Ritchie got the job, and, so it is clear, he hasn't disappointed, even though he did have to wait three decades for the big promotion.

Don came into the Senate with all the hype of New Coke, but his performance and staying power have had more of a Coke Classic feel. Don likes to say he has ''a front-row seat to the best show in town.''

Don is the only one we turn to when we want to learn more about where the Senate has been so we can chart a better course for where it is going. He has been a great resource for my staff and me over the years. Don's office is there as a resource for the American public, too. He is the guy you see on TV explaining the historical significance of events such as swearing-in ceremonies and inaugurations.

I don't think any of us would want to face him on ''Jeopardy.'' His depth of knowledge really is something to behold. I am sure he has gained a lot of that knowledge from the part of his job he loves the most, which is conducting the Senate Historical Office's Oral History Project. He has interviewed just about everyone you could imagine, from Senators, to clerks, to police officers. He even got to interview a man

who once worked as a congressional page—listen to this—during the Presidency of William Howard Taft. That page provided ''some very good information,'' Don said, even if he kept ''falling asleep several times during the interview.''

Here is how Roll Call once described Don Ritchie: the Senate's ''memory keeper.''

It is fitting, then, that the Senate voted recently to designate Don Ritchie as Historian emeritus. It is not as though he plans to slow down in retirement, anyway. ''Historians never retire,'' Don says, ''they just have more time to research.''

Along with research, Don also plans to spend more time with his three beloved grandchildren and to do some traveling with his wife Anne. The Senate wishes him the very best in retirement and sends its heartfelt congratulations to a man who has been an institution around here for four decades—four decades.

The Senate would also like to offer its congratulations to Betty Koed, who has just been announced by the Secretary of the Senate as our next Senate Historian. We also wish Kate Scott well in her promotion to Associate Historian.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

TRIBUTE TO DON RITCHIE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, three decades ago, when Senator Robert Byrd began drafting a series of lectures on the history of the United States Senate, to whom did he go for help? Don Ritchie. Ten years ago, when Dan Brown, the popular author of the best-selling ''DaVinci Code,'' wanted information about the Capitol for his new novel, to whom did he go? Don Ritchie. Even now, when famed historian and biographer Robert Caro needs facts for his five-volume work on Lyndon Johnson, he goes to Don Ritchie. Well, for 39 years, any person needing valuable insight into the United States Senate and its history has known where to go—the Senate Historian, Don Ritchie. And Don has obliged, sharing his wealth of knowledge with anyone who asked—Senators, staff, authors, historians, and visitors.

But after four decades of service, Don will officially retire from the Senate Historical Office at the end of this month.

As the senior Senator from Kentucky stated, from his first day here in the Senate, Don Ritchie made this institution a better place. The first-ever Senate Historian, Don's predecessor, Richard Baker, once said, ''March 8, 1976—that's a date, like my wedding anniversary, that I remember.'' Indeed, that was the day Don Ritchie was hired as an Associate Historian in the newly formed Senate Historical Office.

Don Ritchie, a former marine, was fresh out of graduate school at the University of Maryland, having received his Ph.D. in history just a year earlier. He was getting his start in the profession, driving all over the DC area, teaching at George Mason, Northern Virginia Community College, and University College. He was also working part time with the American Historical Association. When offered a job in the Senate Historical Office, he jumped at the chance. The rest is, as they say, history.

Don has served honorably as Senate Historian. Prior to that, he worked as Associate Senate Historian for 33 years. Over the combined 40 years of service, Don has authored 12 books, 3 textbooks, and a fourth is now on the way. He has lectured on Senate history at just about every major historical society in America. He has become a fixture on C–SPAN. But his crowning achievement would be his development of the Senate Oral History Project. Don has recorded countless interviews with people who worked in the Senate, from Parliamentarians, to clerks, to pages. Future generations of historians will better understand the Senate of the 20th and 21st centuries because of Don Ritchie's Oral History Project. That is an accomplishment which will stand forever.

On a more personal note, I have so appreciated Don's insight and expertise. Every week, I begin my caucus by calling on the Senate Historian, and he talks to us about so many fascinating things, things we do not ordinarily know about, but they are all interesting, whether it is Prohibition, whether it is events that took place in the first or second Roosevelt administration—it does not matter what it is. These are times I look forward to, and, quite frankly, it shuts up my caucus. When he shows up, they are suddenly attentive. I would like to think they are not more attentive to him than to me, but I would think that is the case. As I said, our lunches can be fairly boisterous, and they stop all conversation to listen to Don Ritchie. That is because so often Senators walk away from his lectures with a better understanding and appreciation of the Senate.

He has been invaluable to me and every other Senate Democrat. As we heard from the majority leader, he also has been very good for the Republicans.

As he prepares for a new chapter in his life, I wish him the very best. It is good news that he and his wife Anne will be jumping into retirement together. As we have heard, for historians, retirement only means more time to pore through books and find out what someone else missed and try to take another run at writing something that is interesting.

After a successful career as an archivist and historian, his wife Anne is retiring from the National Gallery of Art. Together, Anne and Don will have plenty of time to spend with their two daughters, Jennifer and Andrea, and their three grandchildren, Cami, Jack, and Boone.

Even in retirement, Don will continue reading and researching about this institution he and I love so dearly—the Senate. After all, as Don himself points out, ''Historians don't retire''—as Senator MCCONNELL said—''they just get more time to research.''

Thank you, Don Ritchie, for your four decades of service to the Senate and your country. You really will be missed.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, may I ask the minority leader if it would be possible to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a quorum call.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Through the Chair, I ask my friend from Indiana how long the Senator wishes to speak as in morning business.

Mr. COATS. No more than 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. I do not care. I would just like to know. That is fine.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Indiana be recognized for up to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. COATS. I thank the minority leader for this opportunity.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. President, recently on this floor, I spoke about the need to pass the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act with robust, veto-proof, bipartisan majorities. That is asking a lot, but I did so because this is the only chance we have to prevent President Obama from having a free and totally independent hand to conclude a flawed agreement with the Government of Iran. We cannot allow that to happen.

This Congress has pleaded for and worked for and will achieve the opportunity to play a major role in this decision, which is a decision of historic consequence.

Let me repeat what I just said. This bill is the only chance we have now to prevent President Obama from having

a completely free hand, with no opportunity to address it in a bipartisan way, to achieve success in rejecting a bad agreement.

Passage of the bill before us will result in either forcing critical and absolutely necessary improvements in the deal now being cooked with our Secretary of State and the President and his people or defeating a bad deal if a bad deal is presented to us.

The stakes in this game are beyond calculation. I personally regard this as the most consequential issue of my entire public career. Our failure to have an opportunity to have this Congress—the representatives of the American people—bring before the American people what is in this deal and the consequences if this deal is not a good deal that will prevent Iran from having nuclear weapons capability—this is absolutely essential. The only chance we have to exercise our constitutional right, which I believe, but our right to address something of this consequence is to pass the Corker-Cardin bill.

It is not the perfect bill. It is not the bill that I think perhaps even Senator CORKER would have preferred. But it is where we are. The only way we could get here and get bipartisan support for this was to do this.

This gives us the opportunity to do the following: A Congressional review period will be provided before implementation. An opportunity for Congress to vote on the agreement will be provided under Corker-Cardin.

A limitation on the President's use of waivers to suspend sanctions that have been put in place by this body will be taken away. A requirement that Congress receive the final deal will be lost. The requirement that the President certify that Iran is complying will be taken away. A mechanism for Congress to rapidly reimpose sanctions in the event of violations will be lost. Reporting on Iran support for terrorism, ballistic missile development, and human rights violations will be lost. All of this is lost if we do not stand together and insist on the right to engage in this. We must pass this or the defeat will be of historical consequence.

This bill is the only chance, as I said, that Congress has to weigh in on a potential agreement. The stakes are too high. The consequence is too great to engage in changes. Many well-intended statements have been made by my colleagues, and I endorse every word of what has been said. Amendments have been offered that, had they not been offered by someone else, in a different fashion, I would have wanted to offer. We can still offer those going forward.

But in order to achieve the bipartisan support necessary to deny the President the opportunity to have a free hand in cutting any deal he wants and the concessions already given—this should raise alarms in each of us in terms of support for this bill which is before us.

What are the stakes? What are the consequences? Former Secretaries Kissinger and Shultz and other foreign policy experts did a recent Wall Street Journal piece and said this:

If the Middle East is ''proliferated'' and becomes host to a plethora of nuclear-threshold states, several in mortal rivalry with each other, on what concept of nuclear deterrence or strategic stability will international security be based?

They continue:

It is in America's strategic interest to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war and its catastrophic consequences. Nuclear arms must not be permitted to turn into conventional weapons. The passions of the region allied with weapons of mass destruction may impel deepening American involvement.

In closing, I want to address statements offered by some who argue that passing this bill is unnecessary because in 2017 we will have a new President in the White House and that President will be a Republican. Well, I hope that is so, but there is obviously no guarantee of that. But in the meantime—in the meantime—Iran will achieve a free hand to go forward with newly acquired wealth, the will to achieve and the technical capability to achieve nuclear weapons capability.

Let me conclude by supporting a statement that was made by Max Boot, a respected foreign policy analyst:

Skeptics about the looming nuclear accord with Iran may be taking comfort from the promises of Republican presidential candidates to tear up the treaty as soon as they reach the Oval Office. They shouldn't be. Even assuming a Republican wins the White House next year—

Which, as we know, is not a certainty. Hopefully, from our standpoint, we hope that is the case—

pulling out of the agreement won't necessarily fix its defects. In fact, it could make the situation even worse.

The U.S. would then get the worst of both worlds: Iran already would have been enriched by hundreds of billions of dollars of sanctions relief—and it would be well on its way to fielding nuclear weapons with de facto permission from the international community. To avoid this nightmare scenario, the best play from America's standpoint could well be to keep the accord in place to at least delay Iran's decision to weaponize.

In short, don't expect salvation in 2017. If the accord is signed its consequences will be irrevocable. Whatever a future president does or does not do, Iran's hard-line regime will be immeasurably strengthened by the agreement. That makes it all the more imperative to stop a bad agreement now—not two years from now.

I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to vote to give Congress—this Congress—the right and the opportunity to scrutinize every single word of what is being negotiated with the Iranians, to inform the American people, and then achieve what I would hope would be an overwhelming rejection of the agreement if it does not achieve the goal of denying Iran its nuclear weapons capability. This is a very important vote before us. I think we need to look at what the end goal is and how we can best get there under the circumstances which we now are in. We would all like to be in a different position. But to achieve and get to this particular point, we are looking at this particular bill to give us a say—a meaningful say—and an opportunity to reject a bad agreement which at this particular point in time, in my view, does not achieve what we need to achieve and should be thoroughly scrutinized by us and the American people.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1191, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1140, in the nature of a substitute.

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1179 (to amendment No. 1140), to require submission of all Persian text included in the agreement.

Blunt amendment No. 1155 (to amendment No. 1140), to extend the requirement for annual Department of Defense reports on the military power of Iran.

Vitter modified amendment No. 1186 (to amendment No. 1179), to require an assessment of inadequacies in the international monitoring and verification system as they relate to a nuclear agreement with Iran.

Cotton amendment No. 1197 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140), of a perfecting nature.

Cotton (for Rubio) amendment No. 1198 (to amendment No. 1197), to require a certification that Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until the cloture vote will be equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I will have to ask for a unanimous consent request on something in just a moment, but I think they are still working out some details.

Before I move to that, I thank the Senator from Indiana. He has done so much to further this cause of us having a congressional review on whatever is negotiated with Iran. All of us want a good agreement, but we want to ensure that we play a role in ensuring that is the case. I cannot thank the Senator

enough for his leadership on this issue and so many other issues that matter relative to our national interests around the world and the safety of our citizens. Again, I thank the Senator so much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the pending substitute amendment at 2 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m., Senator LANKFORD be recognized to deliver his maiden speech and that the time from 11:30 a.m. until 12:50 p.m. be equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the second half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

BALTIMORE AND CVS HEALTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, yesterday, I took the floor to talk about the events in Baltimore over the last 10 days, 2 weeks, and I spoke about how Baltimore is coming together and recognized that in order to move forward, there are two pillars we need to work on, and one of those is public safety and justice. I talked about some initiatives we are looking at, including legislation that I filed that will eliminate profiling by police and how we need to deal with the restoration of voting rights and other issues that deal with accountability of police.

I also talked about rebuilding and dealing with the core issues of our urban centers. I just want to supplement those remarks with a conversation we had with CVS Health. I mention that because it was the CVS pharmacy that was destroyed a week ago Monday night in Baltimore. I think that was seen not only in this country but around the world. It was one of the major assets in a community that for too long a period of time did not have access to a pharmacy. It was tragic to see that it was destroyed during the events in Baltimore.

I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention that CVS has spoken about that episode, and they have made a commitment to restore the two pharmacy locations, which will be rebuilt in the same communities in which they were destroyed. They are committed to return to the community as quickly as possible with those services which are critically important to those communities.

I just want to point that out that they have gone further than that. Previously, I said we need the Federal Government's help in rebuilding and dealing with the core problems, we need State and local governments, and we need the private sector to step up and help us. CVS has listened to that.

First, one of the things they are doing is providing a $100,000 donation to the United Way of Central Maryland's Maryland Unites Fund and the Baltimore Community Foundation. These are funds that will be used to help rebuild Baltimore.

This is a quote from the CVS release:

These funds will help provide immediate and longer-term support to people in hard-hit areas and give those communities much-needed resources.

I also wish to point out what CVS did, and I think this is very important.

This is also a quote.

To help minimize the financial impact of the store closing for its Baltimore employees, CVS/pharmacy paid them their regularly scheduled hours the week of the protests, whether or not they were able to work. All displaced employees who want to work in other CVS/pharmacy locations will able to do so.

To me, that is part of rebuilding and dealing with the problems in our community; that those employees, through no fault of their own, could have been at a tremendous disadvantage and will get their full paychecks. They have a job to return to, and we are going to have those pharmacies relocated in the communities which desperately need that. That is the private sector helping us in rebuilding and dealing with the problems in our city. I just wanted my colleagues to know about the work of CVS Health.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ISIL AND AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate an anniversary, as well as to challenge my colleagues in Congress.

Today marks the completion of 9 months of America's war against ISIL. Tomorrow, May 8, starts the 10th month of this war.

In the war on ISIL, here is what has happened so far. We have deployed thousands of troops far from home to support military operations in Iraq and Syria. A significant number of them are from Virginia, including the Roosevelt Carrier Strike Group based in Norfolk.

We have conducted more than 3,000 U.S. air strikes on ISIL from land bases in the region as well as from aircraft carriers.

We have spent more than 2 billion American taxpayer dollars—and counting.

We have lost the lives of American servicemembers and seen American hostages killed by ISIL in barbaric ways.

And while we have seen some significant progress on the battlefield in Iraq, we have also witnessed ISIL spread and take responsibility for attacks in Afghanistan, Libya, and Yemen. We have seen other terrorist groups, such as Nigeria's Boko Haram, pledge alliance to ISIL. We have seen acts of terrorism in Europe and now in the United States that have been influenced or at least inspired by ISIL.

All of this has happened in 9 months.

Here is what hasn't happened. Congress, the article I branch whose most solemn power is the duty to declare war, has not done its job, has not debated this war, has not taken any formal step to authorize what was started unilaterally by the President 9 months ago.

As of today, ISIL has no indication whether Congress cares one iota about the ongoing war. Our allies in the region who are most directly affected by the threat of ISIL have no indication whether Congress cares one iota about the ongoing war. And most importantly, the thousands of American troops serving in the region and serving in the theater of battle have no indication whether Congress cares one iota about this ongoing war.

In the Senate there has been no authorization vote or even debate on the floor. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee did report out a war authorization in December, but it died without floor action at the end of the 113th Congress. In the House, there has been no debate or authorization on the floor. In fact, there has been no action in any House committee during the 9 months of this war.

The silence of Congress in the midst of this war is cowardly and shameful. How can we explain to our troops, our public, or ourselves this complete unwillingness of Congress to take up this important responsibility?

President Obama maintains that the authorizations voted on by Congress in 2001 and 2002 give him the power to wage this war without Congress. Having reviewed the authorizations carefully, I find that claim completely without merit. The 2001 authorization allows the President to take action against groups that perpetrated the attacks of 9/11. ISIL was not a perpetrator of the 9/11 attack; it was not

formed until 2 years after the attacks, in 2003. It is not an ally of Al Qaeda; it is now fighting against Al Qaeda in certain theaters. The only way the 2001 authorization could be stretched to cover ISIL is if we pretend that the authorization is a blank check giving the President the power to wage war against any terrorist group. But that was precisely the power that President Bush asked for in 2001, and Congress explicitly refused to grant that broad grant of power to the President, even in the days right after the 9/11 attacks.

The 2002 authorization to wage war in Iraq to topple the regime of Saddam Hussein also has no relevance here. That regime disappeared years ago.

The War Powers Resolution of 1973 does grant the President some ability to initiate military action for 60 to 90 days prior to congressional approval, but it also mandates that the President must cease military activity unless Congress formally approves it. Here we have blown long past all of the deadlines of the act, Congress has said nothing, and yet the war continues.

So the President does not have the legal power to maintain this war without Congress. Yet Congress—this Congress—the very body that is so quick to argue against President Obama's use of Executive power, even threatening him with lawsuits over immigration actions and other Executive decisions, is strangely silent and allows an Executive war to go on undeclared, unapproved, undefined, and unchecked.

So 9 months of silence leaves the impression that Congress is either indifferent about ISIL and the threat that it poses or lacks the backbone to do the job that it is supposed to do.

That is why I rise today to challenge my colleagues to take this seriously and promptly debate and pass an authorization for military action against ISIL. We should have done this months ago. By now, all know that ISIL is not going away soon. This problem will not just solve itself.

I am given some hope by recent actions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and this body on the pending matter, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. On a challenging and important national security issue, because of strong leadership by Senators CORKER, CARDIN, and MENENDEZ, we have shown the ability to act in a bipartisan way to assert an appropriate congressional role in reviewing a final nuclear deal with Iran. We are taking an important stand for the congressional role in matters touching upon diplomacy, war, and peace, and we have fought off thus far the temptation to play politics with this important matter.

This gives me some hope that we might do the same with respect to the war on ISIL, because the role of Congress in war is undisputable. The Framers of the Constitution were familiar with a world where war was for the Monarch, the King, the Sultan or the Executive. But they made a revolutionary decision to choose a different path and place the decisions about the initiation of war in the hands of the people's elected legislative branch.

They did so because of an important underlying value. The value is this: We shouldn't order young servicemembers to risk their lives in a military mission unless Congress has debated the mission and reached the conclusion that it is in the Nation's best interest. That value surely is as important today as it was in 1787.

To conclude, I hope we will remember that right now in places far from their homes, thousands of members of the American Armed Forces are risking their lives on behalf of a mission that Congress has refused to address for 9 long months. Their sacrifice should call us to step up, do our job, and finally define and authorize this ongoing war.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I want to echo the sentiments of my colleague from Virginia, who is also my colleague in the Foreign Relations Committee, for taking action on authorization for use of military force against ISIL. This is an issue that has confronted us for a while, and the Senator from Virginia has stood up forcefully time and again to insist that Congress fulfill its necessary role here, and yet we have not.

As he mentioned, the United States has led a multination coalition since September of last year to achieve the President's stated objective to ''degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL.'' The White House insisted when operations began that it didn't need an AUMF for this mission because it was on solid legal footing by using the AUMF which Congress had passed in 2001—2001—14 years ago. That authorization for use of force went after Al Qaeda and the Taliban in the wake of the 9/11 attacks. Many of us took umbrage with the assertion at the time, and we pushed for the administration to work with Congress to authorize a mission against ISIL. It was important then and it remains important now for Congress to voice its support for the mission and to signal to our allies, as well as our adversaries, as well as our troops who are in harm's way, that our commitment will not change based on prevailing political winds.

It wasn't until the Foreign Relations Committee took initiative to consider its own view on that, that the administration was forced to engage with Congress. The President submitted a draft AUMF to Congress in February of this year and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings thereafter. Yet movement of this vital piece of legislation has seemingly stalled. It remains a stalemate because the majority and minority parties can't agree on how to address the use of combat troops in this conflict. This is damaging to the effort to defeat ISIL. Frankly, it is also damaging to the credibility and relevance of this institution with regard to the conduct of foreign affairs.

The war against ISIL has been waged continuously since September of last year with Congress appropriating funds for its operations. Yet Congress has yet to authorize the mission itself. What kind of message does that send to our allies? What kind of resolve does it provide to ISIL? And what does it portend for others who are out there watching to see what Congress will do?

Members of both parties in the House and the Senate pushed the President to send us an AUMF so we could authorize this mission, and in the end we were successful. The White House did send language in February of this year. When we demand engagement from the President on this issue—an issue as vital as this one—and then we disengage ourselves due to internal discord, it provides those who would choose not to take Congress seriously, perhaps, further reason to avoid it.

Those who might be watching, whether at the White House or anywhere else in the world, might be left wondering whether this Congress means what it says. Last Congress, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee marked up and voted on two authorizations for use of military force: one to address Bashar al-Assad's use of chemical weapons and the other to authorize the mission against ISIL. Both resolutions went no further than recorded votes in committee. That would lead some to question the relevance of the committee, when resolutions as grave and as important as these are simply allowed to languish.

The committee needs to reassert itself. We need to reassert our relevance by marking up a resolution to authorize military force against ISIL and to advance it to the floor where it can get a strong bipartisan vote. We all know this needs to be a bipartisan product. I am convinced that working with other Members of the committee, we can arrive at a bipartisan product. Obviously, I look forward to working with my colleague from Virginia on this matter.

When we look just over the past couple of years at the engagements that we have had overseas, particularly at Libya, where we had for several months a bombing campaign without Congress weighing in at all, would we not have benefitted with a fulsome debate on that engagement and for Congress to speak and delineate our involvement there? Now we are faced with a situation where we have basically a failed state that spawns terrorists. We cannot continue to do that. We

have to take ourselves more seriously and this institution more seriously by taking action on this AUMF.

Along with the Senator from Virginia, I have been encouraged by the actions of the committee and this Congress recently on the Iran review package that we will likely vote on later today. That vote bodes well for bipartisanship here. We need to return to the time, to the extent possible—and we are not naive to those who believe that partisanship can always stop at the water's edge—but we have to have a situation where we have a bipartisan foreign policy and where the Senate Foreign Relations Committee takes its traditional role in formulating that policy in authorizing these engagements.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEBT, DEFENSE, AND DIRECTIVES AND THE WORK AHEAD

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, it is my honor to represent my family, my neighbors, and the millions of people in my very diverse State of Oklahoma. I am an ordinary Oklahoman. I do not come from a prominent political family or from any kind of political machine. My wife of 23 years, Cindy, is here in the Gallery today. We have walked through life together and have raised two incredible girls who love God and love our Nation. Stepping into this body was a high cost for my family. We took this on together.

We have a tremendous staff, both here in Washington, DC, and in Oklahoma, who sacrifice incredible time and energy for the future of our Nation. Every day they work incredibly hard to solve the issues that we face as a nation. I am grateful to serve in this Chamber and for this to be my very first time to be able to speak in this Chamber. There are a few issues that I want to be able to raise and address in our conversation today.

I have the opportunity to be able to live in a heritage of distinguished Oklahomans who have served in this Chamber. I serve alongside Senator JIM INHOFE, who has stood for conservative principles in this body for two decades. I am humbled to follow the irreplaceable Dr. Tom Coburn. For those of us who are Dallas Cowboy fans, my coming here is kind of like being Danny White after Roger Staubach.

There have been 17 other Senators from Oklahoma, great names such as Don Nickles, Henry Bellmon, Robert S. Kerr, David Boren, and Mike Monroney, just to name a few. I have the honor to sit at the same desk on this Chamber floor used by fellow Republican Senators Tom Coburn, Dewey Bartlett, and Edward Moore.

In the 1930s, Oklahoma's favorite son and humorist, Will Rogers, said:

> Congress is so strange. A man gets up to speak and says nothing. Nobody listens, and then everybody disagrees.

This is my first official moment to join the ranks of those who step up to speak, but I want to speak about a few things that I consider essential to the work ahead for all of us—what I call the three Ds, which I talk about all the time: debt, defense, and directives.

Let me take those in reverse order. The directives. People ask me all the time: What do Oklahomans want from their Federal Government? The answer is simple. They want to be left alone. They do not want someone else, over 1,000 miles away, telling them what to do, how to run their business, and how to run their lives. It is not that people in Oklahoma are antigovernment—far from it. We have a strong patriotism that drives us to serve our Nation and honor those who give their lives to public service.

Twenty years ago, Oklahoma and the Nation were devastated by a truck bomb in the Oklahoma City Federal building, killing 168 people, most of those Federal employees. We are grateful for people in government who serve faithfully every day.

But we also understand that our Federal Government has a task, and it also has a territory. Federal officers should do their task efficiently with great transparency and accountability, but they also stay out of other people's tasks and do theirs with great effectiveness. When I step into a restaurant, I may have an idea for a new recipe. But I cannot just wander back into the kitchen and start cooking and changing the way the restaurant works. Neither can a Federal regulator drift into every business and decide they are going to redo how that business is done. That is not their territory. That is not their job.

But today in America, if you want to start or run a business, you will find out that the government has already made most of the decisions for you about how you will run your business. Well, an Oklahoma company recently paid a fine for not reporting to a Federal agency that they had nothing to report. Now, I am fairly confident that the Founding Fathers, when they were envisioning a country of the people, by the people, and for the people, were not envisioning that citizens of the country would pay fines to their government for reporting they have nothing to report.

In the past week, I have started a bipartisan initiative called the Cut Red Tape Initiative to try to identify ways to streamline government, to return decisions back to individuals and local governments, and clear the clutter of regulations that benefit the government but slow down business. Just so that people would know that this process is difficult, I have faced weeks of red tape here in the Senate to start an initiative called Cut Red Tape. We will work through that.

In the past few years, over 30,000 pages have been added to the Federal Register. Nothing in American life does not face a Federal regulation. To make sure the government considers the cumulative effect of all of those regulations, agencies are required to do a regulatory lookback to evaluate problem regulations each year. But most don't take it seriously.

The Department of Labor has 676 regulations and rules. This year, their regulatory lookback includes 4 regulations—4 of 676. That is not a serious review. The new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has no accountability to the American people, and it has no limit to its authority. They are becoming a fourth branch of government with no checks or balances.

The EPA spends their time looking for gray areas of law in places where they can reinterpret old laws to fit their new agenda. Consent decrees and novel interpretations of statutes have superseded consistent rulemaking and statutory and State primacy of enforcement. Agencies now write rules, interpret their rules, enforce their rules, and establish the punishment for not following their rules. Many people want to blame this administration. I disagree. This administration has become expert at pushing the boundaries; that is true. But the rise in the regulatory state is not new. For decades, the Congress has delegated responsibilities to agencies and given them very few boundaries.

Since the 1970s, in the Chevron case, the courts have increased the power of the regulatory agencies by allowing them to have deference to determine their own rules. This is not a Republican or Democrat issue. It is an American issue, which will not improve until this body demands its constitutional authority back and clarifies to the courts that the Constitution states that all legislative authority shall lie in Congress—not in an agency.

The American people want to give the Federal Government their own directive: Leave us alone. Now, I am willing to work with anyone who is willing to work on some of these issues. So far this session, I have coauthored or cosponsored bills and worked on ideas with TED CRUZ, ELIZABETH WARREN, GARY PETERS, JOHN CORNYN, HEIDI HEITKAMP, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, ORRIN HATCH, MIKE LEE, STEVE DAINES, TIM SCOTT, ROB PORTMAN, TOM CARPER, ANGUS KING, RAND PAUL, JEANNE SHAHEEN, JOHN MCCAIN, MIKE ENZI, KELLY AYOTTE, MARK KIRK and RON JOHNSON, just to name a few.

I did not have to sacrifice my conservative values, but I did have to admit that anyone can have a good idea. Just because we disagreed on one thing does not mean I have to belittle people. I told my wife several years ago, when I first came to the House of Representatives, that I had this déjà vu moment, thinking I had felt this way before. I have never been in politics or Congress, but I know this feeling. After about 6 months I called her and I said: I finally figured out what this feeling is to be in Congress. It is the emotion you have in middle school lunch. It is that feeling that I get more popular by sitting at my table and making fun of everyone else at everyone else's table. And if I ever say something nice about someone else at another table, my table shakes their head and says: Why would you do that? But if I ever say something unkind, everybody says: Way to go. Welcome to Congress.

Only we can turn this around. We will strongly disagree on areas, but we should find the areas of common ground where we do not have to sacrifice our values and be able to find ways to work together.

The second issue is defense—directives and defense. Our freedom is foreign to most of the world, and it is a threat to them, not because the United States is an aggressor nation—far from it—but because the liberty we export is so powerful they know well it can depose their dictatorships and weaken their control. Many government leaders around the world would rather keep their people poor and closely managed than allow them to be prosperous and free.

Iran is on the rise. Since the 1979 revolution, Iran has exported terrorism around the world. I am convinced that some individuals—even in this administration—trust Iran's words more than they trust history, the facts on the ground or even their own intuition. We cannot allow the largest exporter of terrorism in the world to have nuclear weapons. We cannot do that.

Dictatorial governments around the world and totalitarian Islamic leaders consistently test our mettle, probe our infrastructure and computer systems, test our passion for freedom and our resolve for the dignity of every person. By the way, that is one of our core values. Every person—even people we disagree with—is valuable. It is why the issue of race—just as a side note—is so important to us in America—because we understand that in many parts of the world if you are from the wrong family, the wrong tribe, the wrong race or the wrong faith, you cannot get a job, you cannot get government services, you cannot get housing—all of those things.

That is how other places do it. That is not us. We have chosen not to be like that as a nation. Where injustice exists, we want to bring freedom and equality—within our boundaries or around the world.

We believe every person is created equal and is endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—every person. When brutal thugs attack innocent nations, we have the moral high ground to call out the aggressor and to stand with the oppressed. We always work with resolve to solve the issues peacefully. We understand this proverb: ''A gentle answer turns away wrath.''

Our diplomacy leads the way. But when nations and philosophies will not stop their aggression, they learn that we do not bear the sword for nothing. I have the privilege—and I do count it as a privilege—of serving thousands of men and women and their families who faithfully protect our Nation every day in all branches of the military—first responders on our streets, in the intelligence community, at our ports, in the air, training, equipping, and protecting hundreds of thousands in Oklahoma. In fact, without Oklahoma, just so this body will know, our Nation could not sustain our Air Force, train our pilots, rearm our munitions, fire artillery or rockets, talk to our subs, train our young soldiers, refuel our aircraft, control battlefield airspace or deliver supplies. So you are welcome for what happens in Oklahoma every day.

Our Guard and Reserve units have fulfilled everything that has been asked of them by their Nation, some of them to their last full measure of devotion. But in Oklahoma our patriotism also challenges us to deal with military waste when it takes money, especially directly from the warfighter. Why would we call waste in defense patriotism? Let's solve it. We want the intelligence community to be well equipped. We want them to be attentive to the issues around the world, but we also want our Fourth Amendment freedoms protected. Remember, Oklahomans like to just be left alone.

The third issue is our debt—directives, defense, and debt. Our economy runs on increasing debt. That is how we are actually managing life day to day nowadays. We gamble every year that interest rates will not go up and the rest of the world will still want our bonds. This year we paid $229 billion in interest payments. Think about that for a minute—$229 billion.

The highway trust fund is short just $10 billion, and we are spending $229 billion just in interest payments this year. CBO estimates that we will spend over $800 billion in interest payments by the end of the 10-year window. That is more than we spend on all defense spending, education, transportation, and energy combined—what we will do just in interest payments in the years ahead.

We need to fix two things in this budget hole: efficiently manage Federal spending and a growing economy, duplication in programs. All these things need to be resolved.

Let me take a couple of these things. Efficiency in the Federal Government. We need to deal with the tremendous fraud and waste and duplication. Where we see it, we should go after it. For the past 2 weeks, I have held a bill that funds a grant program for bulletproof vests.

I am not opposed to the program. I am opposed to the fact that we have two programs that do the same thing—two different applications, two different sets of processes, two programs that do the same thing. If we see it, we should solve it. Yesterday, we marked up and passed a bill in committee that I authored called the Taxpayer Right to Know Act, which will identify duplicative programs, the administrative cost, the number of full-time staff, and how and if programs are evaluated.

It is a commonsense thing to do that, and it passed by a voice vote out of the committee. In the days ahead, I hope we will use that tool wisely to be able to actually identify where we have duplication, and instead of complain about it, we solve it as a body. The goal is to find those and eliminate them.

A friend of mine in Oklahoma is a former marine. His name is Hank. Hank runs a small business. Hank is a guy who if you see him, you need to brace yourself because when he shakes your hand you know it. Hank runs his small business from a desk in his unair-conditioned garage.

When I think about the way we spend money, I often think of Hank. Hank is not a guy who wants to have our government suffer or our Nation do something weak. Hank is an incredible patriot, but he wants us to spend money wisely, and when we find waste, he would expect us to get rid of it. He does. He would expect that we do.

A good example of that may be Social Security disability. It is a difficult issue for us to talk about because we want a safety net for the truly vulnerable, but we all know there is incredible waste in that program, and there are people who are ripping off the system. To have a strong safety net for the vulnerable doesn't mean we allow people to freeload off the top. Disability is designed for people who cannot work in any job in the economy, not someone who just doesn't want to.

Let's find a way to protect our vulnerable but incentivize those who are freeloading off the system to engage them back into work. We need people to work.

The earned-income tax credit is another one of those. We read the reports every year: a 24-percent fraud rate, the highest fraud rate in the Federal Government. Last year, there was $14.5 billion in loss; one program, $14.5 billion.

We have to pay attention to this. We have to get the economy going or we will never fix the debt. We can't just fix it by reducing spending. We all

know that well. Tax reform seems to be the elusive dream of our economy. I can only hope that as a body we will not continue to strive for large-scale tax reform and fail to do some things that are significant and possible.

Banking reform must be done. Dodd-Frank is choking out lending. Now, I don't want to attack any individual who voted for it, but I am very well aware that there are many unintended consequences that have come down, especially on community banks.

People can feel our economy tightening and the lending tightening. They don't know why. Main Street community banks are dealing with uncertain regulations. We have to get our community banks back in business. We can do that by exempting traditional banks from heavy regulatory burdens that complex banks face and replacing simple capital requirements. This isn't controversial or complicated. We just need to work on some simple things while we still work on the complex.

Trade. We are a nation that believes in trade. Quite frankly, our Navy was created in the infancy of our Republic to protect our trade. In fact, one of our grievances that we had with King George in the original Declaration of Independence was the King was cutting off our trade with all ports of the world. Trade has been a big deal to us as a nation since before we were a nation.

Currently, this ongoing debate about whether we will be a nation of trade seems to be a little odd to me. Yes, we are going to be a nation of trade. We always have been. Let's work it out and let's continue to grow our economy.

Energy issues. The past 6 years the brightest star in our economy has been energy. If we want to have the economy grow, energy is going to be a major part of that formula. If anyone disagrees with that, I would love to get a chance to meet them because I can show you all the job growth that has happened in America just circled around energy. But we all know EPA policies make energy development harder and increase the energy cost of everything for every person in America.

Energy jobs are great-paying jobs, but they are suddenly fading away because of this mixture of low oil prices and bad energy policy. A few years ago, America was led to believe they were running out of oil and gas and our supplies were going away. Now our supplies are at record numbers and we keep finding more.

In the past 6 months, America has lost 100,000 jobs because we have stopped drilling because our tanks are full and the prices have collapsed. If we could only sell that oil, what a difference that might make to our economy. You see, we can sell our coal and we can sell our natural gas, but for whatever reason we as a nation are still thinking we can't sell oil. Now, we can sell gasoline, just not oil. It would be kind of like saying you can sell flour, but you can't sell wheat.

Currently, we import about 27 percent of our crude. Most of that is heavy oil that is imported. Most of that is done by foreign ownership, foreign ownership of refineries. They are bringing in their own oil. Most of our new finds are in light sweet oil, a different type of oil that our refineries don't need. Do you know who needs this? Mexico needs it, Canada needs it. So, literally, while our storage tanks are at maximum capacity and the prices continue to drop in America, the rest of the world is craving our oil, and we are debating whether that is a good idea. It is the ultimate irony right now that the administration is in negotiations to open the sale of Iranian oil to the world market, and we cannot sell oil from America on the world market.

Let's pay attention to American jobs. Let's get our economy going. There are some basic things we can do.

All this talk about security, economy, and liberty boils down to one thing, though—our families. Nothing is bigger in our Nation than our families—nothing. We are not a nation of wealth, we are a nation of families. The rise of government is directly connected to the collapse of families. It is not that government is pushing down families, it is that families are collapsing and government is trying to rise to fix that. It will not fix it. Government can't fix a family, but we can make sure there is no marriage penalty in our tax law. We can make sure we don't incentivize broken families and our social welfare programs. We can actually use our moments in our times when we speak to state the obvious. America is strongest when American families are strong. Let's not be afraid to step out and protect what we know works. We don't live in a nation with no hope. We live in a nation of incredible hope.

The seeds are all still there. It is a matter of how much we are going to engage in those things, whether we are going to be an exporter of freedom and of our basic values. That is what I think we should do.

We should export our freedom to the world. We should export our values to the world. We will do that best as we protect our families and as we rise to speak about the things we know are right.

There is a tremendous diversity of American opinion, freedom of speech, but before the Framers even mentioned free speech, they mentioned the free exercise of religion. It is popular culture now for people to be intolerant of people of faith and people who live their faith. You can say you have faith, but you are pushed down if you actually practice the faith you say you have. I served 22 years in ministry before I came to Congress. I have a little different perspective than some on that. I see our Nation with a great spiritual hunger. I don't criticize Washington, though, in the process. Quite frankly, I believe Washington perfectly reflects our culture, and to people who are frustrated with what Washington has become, I remind them, this is who we are as a nation.

What we are going to do about it becomes the big issue. What are we going to become? While we beat ourselves up, we lose track that the rest of the world still looks at us, and they still want to be us.

Last September, I was in Central America for a few days meeting with some of the leaders there talking about immigration. I don't know if anyone has noticed, but there are a few issues about immigration now. We had this conversation about immigration and started talking about what are we going to do and how are we going to limit the number of these unaccompanied minors coming in and what is actually driving them to come.

One of the leaders there said: Sir, I don't know if you have noticed, but you are the United States of America. Everyone in the world wants to go there. There doesn't have to be a driving factor to go to your nation. Everyone wants to be your nation.

We do not have open borders, nor should we. But it was another lesson learned that while we argue among ourselves, we have the opportunity to be able to serve in the greatest Nation, in the greatest body in the world. We still lead the world with our values. We should represent that well. That is our greatest export, our values.

This is the National Day of Prayer, and I thought it would be entirely appropriate to be able to end this conversation with both a reminder to call our Nation to prayer and to remember Psalm 46:1–2:

> God is our refuge and strength, an ever-present help in trouble. Therefore we will not fear.

So we not only remember that, but let us actually call this Senate to pray.

Let us pray.

Our Father, I pray for our Nation. I pray that You would give us wisdom and direction. I pray for this body, incredible men and women who have set aside their families, their careers, and their life, to come serve their Nation. I pray that You would give us unity of attitude and diversity of opinion and that You give us the capacity to be able to solve the issues ahead of us.

I pray for President Obama, for Vice President BIDEN, the Supreme Court, for the House of Representatives, for the men and women around the world right now who are serving quietly in ways of intelligence, publically as first responders and leaders, and our military scattered across the Earth. God,

would You protect them and would You allow us, as families and as leaders, to represent You and the values of our Nation to a world that needs our leadership still.

God, use this time. Use us. As broken as we are, we know that You are an ever-present help in time of trouble, and we will not fear.

Thank you, Jesus. Amen.

Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The majority leader.

CONGRATULATING SENATOR LANKFORD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I wish to say to my new colleague from Oklahoma, what an insightful assessment of the challenges facing our country and an extraordinary list of solutions to those challenges, not to mention reminding us all that we are the envy of the world.

So I congratulate our new colleague from Oklahoma. I wish him well and thank him for his fine remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Under the previous order, the time from 11:30 a.m. until 12:50 p.m. will be equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the second half.

NSA COUNTERTERRORISM PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, since the unlawful leaks of NSA programs, opponents of our counterterrorism program have painted a distorted picture of how these programs are conducted and overseen by exploiting the fact that our intelligence community cannot discuss classified activities. So what you have is an effort to characterize our NSA programs, and the officials who conduct them cannot discuss the classified activities. So they are clearly at a disadvantage.

Since September 11, 2001, FISA has been critically important in keeping us safe here in America. According to the CIA, had these authorities been in place more than a decade ago, they would likely—likely—have prevented 9/11. Not only have these tools kept us safe, there has not been a single incident—not one—of an intentional abuse of them.

The NSA is overseen by the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our government. They are not running rogue out there. The NSA is overseen by the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our government. The employees of NSA are highly trained, supervised, and tested.

The expiring provisions of FISA are ideally suited for the terrorist threats we face in 2015. These provisions work together to protect us from foreign terrorists abroad who use social and other media to conspire and eventually plan attacks inside the United States.

ISIL uses Facebook, uses Twitter, its online magazine, and other social media platforms to contact and eventually radicalize recruits online. If our intelligence community cannot connect the dots of information, we cannot stop this determined enemy from launching attacks.

Under section 215 authority, the NSA can find connections—find connections—from known terrorists overseas and connect that to potential terrorists in the United States. But the NSA cannot query the database, which consists of call data records such as the number calling, the number called, and the duration, without a court order.

Let me say that again. NSA cannot query the database, which consists of call data records such as number calling, the number called, and the duration, without a court order. Under section 215, the NSA cannot listen to phone calls of Americans at all. Under section 215, the NSA cannot listen to the phone calls of Americans at all.

Despite the value of the section 215 program and the rigorous safeguards that govern it, critics of the program either want to do away with it or make it much more difficult to use. Many of them are proposing a bill—the USA FREEDOM Act—that they say will keep us safe while protecting our privacy. It will do neither. It will neither keep us safe nor protect our privacy. It will make us more vulnerable and it risks compromising our privacy.

The USA FREEDOM Act would replace section 215 with an untested, untried, and more cumbersome system. It would not end bulk collection of call data. Instead, it would have untrained—untrained—corporate employees with uncertain supervision and protocols do the collecting. So it switches this responsibility from the NSA, with total oversight, to corporate employees with uncertain supervision and protocols. They get to do the collecting. It would establish a wall between the NSA analysts and the data they are trying to analyze. At best, the new system envisioned by the USA FREEDOM Act would be more cumbersome and time consuming to use when speed and agility are absolutely crucial. At worst, it will not work at all because there is no requirement in the legislation that the telecoms hold the data for any length of time. Put differently, section 215 helped us find the needle in a haystack, but under the USA FREEDOM Act, there may not be a haystack to look through at all.

In short, the opponents of America's counterterror programs would rather trust telecommunication companies to hold this data and search it on behalf of our government. These companies have no programs, no training or tools to search the databases they would need to create, and if that isn't bad enough, we would have to pay them to do it. The taxpayers would have to pay them to do it.

In addition to making us less safe, the USA FREEDOM Act would make our privacy less secure. The section 215 program is subject to rigorous controls and strict oversight. Only a limited number of intelligence professionals have access to the data. There are strict limits on when and for what purpose they can access the data. Their access to the data is closely supervised with numerous—numerous—levels of review. These safeguards will not apply to the untried and novel system under the USA FREEDOM Act, and rather than storing the information securely at NSA, the information would be held by private companies instead.

There was an excellent editorial today in the Wall Street Journal pointing out the challenges we face. It was entitled the ''Snowden Blindfold Act.'' The ''Snowden Blindfold Act'' was the headline in the Wall Street Journal today.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of that article.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 7, 2015]

THE SNOWDEN BLINDFOLD ACT

Congress moves to weaken antiterror surveillance while France expands it.

At least one of the gunmen who shot up a Texas free speech event on Sunday was known to the FBI as a potentially violent radical and was convicted in 2011 on a terror-related charge. The Islamic State claimed credit for this domestic attack, albeit an unproven connection. So it is strange that Congress is moving to weaken U.S. surveillance defenses against the likes of shooters Elton Simpson and Nadir Soofi.

Two years after the leaks from Edward Snowden's stolen dossier, a liberal-conservative coalition is close to passing a bill that would curtail the programs the National Security Agency has employed in some form for two decades. Adding to this political strangeness, France of all places is on the verge of modernizing and expanding its own surveillance capabilities for the era of burner cell phones, encrypted emails and mass online jihadist propaganda.

The Patriot Act expires at the end of the month, and a fragile House-negotiated compromise on reauthorization would end NSA sweeps of telephone metadata—the date, time stamps and duration of calls. The content of those calls isn't collected without a separate warrant. The measure also includes mostly cosmetic nuisance changes such as a panel of outside amicus lawyers to advise the secret Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) that supervises and approves NSA activities.

But the metadata eulogies are premature before what ought to be a sturdy debate in the Senate. Majority Leader Mitch McConnell introduced a ''clean'' extension of current law as a base bill that the chamber will

open to amendments later this month. The Senate narrowly defeated a bill similar to the House measure last year, and we hope it does so again.

Senators should think carefully about the value of metadata collection, and not only because the technical details of the House bill are still being parsed by security experts. In January 2014, President Obama tried to suppress the Snowden wildfire by pronouncing the end of ''bulk metadata program as it currently exists,'' via executive order. Civil libertarians rejoiced. Yet NSA transparency disclosures show the FISC court approved 170 search applications of the database in the same calendar year.

Presumably the NSA continued to analyze metadata—despite pro forma White House opposition—because these details provide intelligence that is useful for uncovering plots, preventing attacks and otherwise safeguarding the country. The NSA must demonstrate to FISC judges a ''reasonable, articulable suspicion'' to gain approval for each ''selector,'' or search query.

In other words, there is little invasion of privacy because the searches are narrow. The NSA isn't even using automated algorithms to reveal suspicious patterns the way that credit card companies and retailers mine consumer data every day. The NSA's 170 metadata searches involved merely 160 foreign targets and 227 known or presumed U.S. citizens.

There is still no evidence that the data have been abused. The Supreme Court has held since Smith v. Maryland in 1979 that the Constitution provides no guarantee of metadata privacy. Domestic police and prosecutors in routine criminal investigations enjoy more warrantless access to metadata well beyond even the NSA status quo.

The House bill pretends not to undermine intelligence collection by requiring telecom and tech companies to retain metadata business records. The NSA could then request these documents with FISC consent or unilaterally in an emergency. But assembling this information retroactively may be too slow in a true crisis—in return for little or no added privacy protection. After the hacking breaches at Sony, Target and a string of health insurers, Americans may reasonably wonder if their data are safer fragmented across many private third-party repositories.

The Members of Congress who know the most about intelligence know all this, but they say that ending metadata collection is the price of blocking a political stampede that might also kill more important provisions such as Section 702 that authorizes foreign-to-foreign wiretaps. That might have been true immediately after the Snowden heist, but it may not be true after the attacks on Charlie Hebdo and in Texas by Islamic State-inspired jihadists.

Those shootings show that surveillance is more crucial than ever to prevent mass murder on U.S. soil by homegrown or foreign radicals. The French understand this, which is why they are widening their intelligence reach. No prevention can ever be perfect. But the House measure is a deliberate effort to know less and blind U.S. spooks to potentially relevant information. This self-imposed fog may be politically satisfying now, but deadly if there is another attack.

Mr. McCONNELL. Finally, I would like to ask the senior Senator from North Carolina, who is the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, the following question: Why was it necessary to enact the provisions of the PATRIOT Act after the attacks of 9/11/2001, and why are they relevant today given the threat we face from ISIL and Al Qaeda?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I appreciate the question the leader has asked, and, also, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my Republican colleagues.

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

Mr. BURR. The leader raises a great question, and it is really the purpose for which section 215 was created. It is the reason the NSA looked at ways to effectively get in front of threats that take us back to 9/11 and the attacks.

As we reacted, through our law enforcement tools within the United States, we used an instrument called a national security letter. They produced a national security letter. They had to go to the telecoms and ask that they search their systems for this information.

The leader alluded to the fact that many looking back to pre-9/11 said that had we had the tools we have today, we might have stopped this attack. But over a series of years, Congress, the executive branch, the Justice Department, and our intelligence community worked to refine the tools we thought could effectively be used to get in front of a terrorist attack.

That brings us to where we are today. Over those years, we created section 215, the ability to use bulk data. What is bulk data? Bulk data is storing telephone numbers—we have no idea to whom they belong—that are foreign and domestic. The whole basis behind this program is that as a cell phone is picked up in Syria and we look at the phone numbers that phone talked to, if it is someone in the United States, we would like to know that—at least law enforcement would like to know it—so we can understand if there is a threat against us here in the homeland or somewhere else in the world.

Section 215 allows the NSA to collect, in bulk, telephone numbers with no identifier on them. We couldn't tell you who that American might be. And if for a reason they believe they need to look at that number because of an Executive order from the President, they go to a judge, and the judge is the one who gives them permission to search or query that data. If, in fact, they find a number that connects with one of a known terrorist, they have to go back to the court and prove there is reason for them to know whose number that is and the duration of time of the conversation. Further information requires further judicial action.

Why are we here today? Because this expires on May 31. Some would suggest it is time to do away with it.

Over the same period of time, we added something the American people have been very close to. It is called the TSA. Every time we go to an airport, we go through a security mechanism. Americans have never complained about it. Why? Because we know that when we get on the airplane, there is a high degree of likelihood that there is not a terrorist, a bomb, or some type of weapon that is going to be used against us.

The leader said there has not been a single instance of a breach of privacy. Yet, those who suggest we need to change this do it 100 percent on the fact that privacy has been invaded. Let me say to all my colleagues, to the public, and to both sides of the Hill, today every American now has a discount grocery card on their key chain. They go and buy groceries and they proudly scan that card because it gets them a discount, it gets them coupons, it gets them a gas reduction. Here are the facts: Your grocery store collects 10 times the amount of data that the NSA ever thought about collecting on you.

There is a big difference between the NSA and your grocery store: The NSA doesn't sell data; your grocery store does. From the data they collect, they could do a psychological profile on an individual. They could tell you how old they are, what their health is, where they live, how often they shop, therefore when they work. We are not in the business of doing that. They are. But I don't hear anybody complaining about the grocery stores' discount card because you get a discount, so you are willing to do that.

What we haven't shared with the American people is, what do you get through this program? You get the safety and security of knowing we are doing everything we possibly can to identify a terrorist and the act and to stop it before it happens.

So we are here today with a choice. The choice is whether we are going to reauthorize this program, which has been very effective, with the same conditions the President has in place—you have to go to a judge—and with important controls on privacy by professionals with rules, or whether we are going to roll it back to the telecoms. Make no mistake about it—the compromise legislation rolls us back to the same thing we were doing pre-9/11.

So whether we let it expire or we reauthorize it, those are the two choices because this compromise bill actually forces it back to telecoms—very cumbersome, time-consuming, and, I would say, fraught with privacy issues, as the leader pointed out. It is my choice to continue the program because the program has worked.

NSA only has less than three dozen people who have the authority to look at this data. I will bet there would be more people in every telecom company who are authorized to search data.

Let me suggest this to my colleagues: If their argument is valid,

then they should be on the floor with a similar bill eliminating the TSA. I am not sure anybody invades my privacy any more than the TSA process. When I go through, they x ray me, they look at my luggage. In some cases, they stop me and wand me and, in some cases, hand-check me. I am not sure there are any more blatant privacy concerns than that. But they are not in here suggesting we do away with TSA because they know the public understands the safety TSA provides to aviation.

Our big mistake is we haven't been out here sharing with the American people why it has been so long since there has been an attack. We were lucky this week in Garland, TX—lucky because 40-some Texas law enforcement officers happened to be at a museum, and everybody there was carrying. We are not going to be lucky every time.

I remind my colleagues and the public, in the same week, ISIL went on social media networks and said: America, don't think that you have got this in your rearview mirror. There are over 70 terrorists that we have in America in 15 States, and it is a matter of time before it happens.

Why in the world would we think about rolling back the tools that are the only tools that put us post-9/11 versus pre-9/11?

The threat is greater today domestically and around the world than it has ever been, and the argument we will be consumed with is whether we do away with tools that have been effective for law enforcement to protect America.

I would suggest that we reauthorize this bill for 5.5 years as is and that we make the same commitment to the American people we do when we reauthorize and fund the TSA: No matter where you are, we have controls. We are going to keep America safe. We are not going to let it revert back to where we are susceptible to another 9/11.

With that, I turn to Senator COTTON, my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, and ask whether he agrees that the collection of telephone and call data does not raise any reasonable expectations of privacy under the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina, and I appreciate his work and the majority leader's work on this critical issue. I have been working hand in glove with them all along.

I would say the answer to the question is, no, this does not raise any reasonable concern about privacy. In fact, the program does not collect any content. It does not surveil any phone call. It doesn't even include any personally identifiable information.

I have spent hours with the intelligence officers and the FBI agents who are responsible for administering these programs—not merely the general counsels or the directors of these agencies but the men and women who administer them. I have asked them what they think poses a greater risk to their privacy—the discount grocery card the Senator from North Carolina mentioned or the fact that e-commerce Web sites have their name, address, credit card number, and personal history? And to a person, every one of them said a greater threat to their privacy is commercial marketing practices, not this program.

The program has been approved 40 times by 15 different independent Federal judges based on 36 years of Supreme Court precedent and has been approved by two Presidents of both parties. If President Obama wanted to end the program tomorrow, he could, but he hasn't. That is because this program is lawful, it is faithful to the Constitution, it is smothered with safeguards against abuse, and it is needed to fight a rising terrorist threat that we face today. In fact, those threats today are greater than they were on 9/11. And that is not my opinion; that is the testimony of this administration's senior intelligence officials.

The rise of Al Qaeda affiliates in Africa and the Arabian Peninsula and the broader Middle East illustrates the metastasis of Al Qaeda following its retreat from Afghanistan. These groups are larger and more spread out than their predecessors. They are also more technologically and operationally savvy, developing new, nonmetallic bombs, recruiting westerners, and using the Internet to spread their hatred. They even publish ''how to'' manuals for becoming a successful terrorist at home.

Of course, there is the Islamic State—the Obama-described ''JV team''—which has cut the heads off of innocent Americans, is torturing and murdering Christians and other religious minorities, and has sadistically burned people alive. More than 20,000 foreigners have gone to Syria and Iraq to join this enemy. Some have returned to their home countries, including the United States, some have remained in their home countries, becoming more radicalized and ready to inflict harm against Americans.

We don't have to look any further than this past week, when two Islamic State-inspired jihadists decided to open fire in Texas. Press reports indicate that one of the attackers was in contact with an ISIS supporter currently located in Somalia. This conduct illustrates why this program is so important. It helps close the gap that exists between foreign intelligence gathering and stopping attacks here at home. This is the gap that contributed in part to our failure to stop the 9/11 attacks.

There are also open source reports of ISIS cells in Virginia, Maryland, Illinois, California, and Michigan. As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I receive regular briefings on such threats, and I invite all my colleagues to receive these briefings if they doubt that the wolves are at the door or even in our country.

This highlights one challenge of this debate: Most of the information surrounding the plots and the programs is classified. The intelligence community has been very accommodating in providing classified briefings to Members of the Senate and the Congress. The issue, though, is often getting Members to attend or to visit with the agencies. That is why I believe the Senate may have to enter a closed session as we debate these programs, so that Members are not woefully ignorant of the threats America faces.

Under consideration in the House and proposed in the Senate is the so-called USA FREEDOM Act, which will eliminate the essential intelligence this program collects. Proponents of the bill claim that it provides alternative ways for the intelligence community to obtain critical information needed to stop terrorist attacks and that it doesn't compromise our counterterror efforts. But let me be clear. This is wrong. The alternatives to the current program do not come close to offering the capabilities we now have that enable us to protect Americans.

One alternative offered by opponents is to have phone companies retain control of cell data and provide the NSA only the data responsive to searches phone companies would run on the agency's behalf. This isn't technologically feasible.

At the request of the President's own Director of National Intelligence, the independent National Research Council examined this proposal, and its experts concluded that the technology does not currently exist that would enable a system spread among different carriers to replace the capabilities of the current NSA metadata program. Any such system would create holes in our ability to identify terrorist connections.

First, phone companies don't store the data for longer than 180 days and oftentimes for much shorter periods, and nothing in the USA FREEDOM Act requires them to store it any longer. The current NSA program, however, stores data for 5 years, which allows the NSA to discover potential terrorist links during that time period. A system that keeps data with multiple carriers that store their data for much shorter time periods is close to useless in discovering terrorist network and sleeper cells, many of which lie in wait for years before launching an attack.

Second, a system that tries to search multiple carriers and then collects and unifies their responses is cumbersome and time-consuming. In many investigations, the loss of valuable minutes, hours, and days may mean the difference between stopping an attack or seeing it succeed.

Third, data stored with phone companies rather than the NSA is more vulnerable to hackers who would seek to abuse queries of the stored metadata.

Fourth, the costs are unknown, and the American people will bear them—either as taxpayers if the telecom companies ask to be reimbursed or as consumers as the companies pass along the costs on your phone bill, perhaps as an NSA collection fee.

Fifth, to those people who say that this is technologically feasible and that we can easily execute it, I would remind you that this is the Federal Government that brought you healthcare.gov.

A second alternative offered is to pay a third-party contractor or quasi-private entity to store data and run the program. I would argue that this is untested and unworkable.

First, the proposal would also require an indefinite stream of taxpayer dollars to fund it.

Second, the private entity may be subject to civil litigation discovery orders as it may hold information relevant to cases, which would expose Americans' data to judicial proceedings with no connection to national security and without the security and privacy protections in place today.

Third, a new organization will create the need for heavy security, top-secret clearances for employees, and strong congressional oversight. As more resources are devoted to such an entity, what we end up with is a reconstituted NSA program but at additional cost to taxpayers and greater threats to privacy.

As I mentioned, I have taken the opportunity in recent months to go and visit the men and women who work at the NSA and FBI. I can tell you all that they are fine Americans with the highest character. I spent hours with the very small number of men and women at Fort Meade who are allowed to search this data. I would ask how many critics of the program have actually done that.

Let's examine in detail how these men and women search this data. An independent Federal court regularly approves NSA's authority to collect and store the data in the first place. But for these men and women to even look at the data, it must go through a multistep process that includes approval by four different entities at the NSA, numerous attorneys at the Department of Justice, and those very same judges who sit on that court. Even if a search request is granted, not just anyone at the NSA can access the data; access is limited to this small group of men and women, all of whom undergo regular background checks, drug tests, and are subject to regular polygraphs, many of whom are military veterans.

To prevent abuse of the program in retrospect, searches of the data are automatically recorded and regularly audited by both the inspector general and the Department of Justice, with strict penalties for anyone found to have committed abuse.

Moreover, I, the Senator from North Carolina, and other members of the intelligence committees of both Houses of this Congress participate in these reviews. This is a robust and layered set of protections for Americans, their privacy, and these protections would not exist under the proposed USA FREEDOM Act.

There are also protections that almost definitely will not be adopted by private telecom providers, which some wrongly suggest might retain exclusive control of this data.

These multiple safeguards are why to date these programs have a sterling record, with no verified instances of intentional abuse, not a single one.

In conclusion, in the wake of the traitorous Snowden disclosures, Senator Chambliss and Senator FEINSTEIN showed great leadership when they came together to defend these programs as both legal and effective. As Senator FEINSTEIN wrote when she was chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, to end this program will substantially increase the risk of another catastrophic attack in the United States. That is a proposition with which I wholeheartedly agree.

I now see my colleague from the Judiciary Committee on the floor. He is a former U.S. attorney and State attorney general, and I wonder if he agrees that this program is both constitutional and does not differ in substantial ways from the traditional tools prosecutors can use against criminals while also providing adequate safeguards to American privacy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, that is an important question. First, I would like to thank the Senator for volunteering to serve in the forces of the United States to protect the security of our country and the Middle East and dangerous areas.

We do need to protect our national security. We lost almost 3,000 people on 9/11. The Nation came together. I was a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee at the time, and we evaluated what to do about it. We worked together in a bipartisan way and in a virtually unanimous agreement passed the PATRIOT Act to try to help us be more effective in dealing with international terrorism.

What I have to tell you is what we were facing. Many people were shocked to see the improper obstacles that were placed in the way of our intelligence community as they sought to try to figure out how to identify and capture people who wanted to do harm to America. It was stunning. There was a wall between the CIA, which did the foreign intelligence, and the FBI. They could not say to the FBI: We have intelligence that this person might be a terrorist. The FBI has jurisdiction within the United States. That wall was eliminated when we developed these intelligence tools. And we did other things in an overwhelmingly bipartisan way.

As a person who spent 15 years as a prosecutor, I would say there is nothing in this act that alters the fundamental principles of what powers investigators have to investigate crime in America.

A county attorney can issue a subpoena from any county in America—and they do every day by the hundreds of thousands—including subpoenas to phone companies for telephone toll records. Those toll records have the name, the address, and the phone numbers called and how many minutes. What is maintained in this system basically is just numbers.

Not only can a county attorney, who is a lawyer, but also a drug enforcement agent and an IRS agent can issue an administrative subpoena on the basis that there is information in telephone toll records regarding John Doe that are relevant to the investigation they are conducting. They can get that information. It is done by law, and there is a written document, but that is the way it is done every day in America. There does not have to be a court order to get those records. We are talking about hundreds of thousands of subpoenas for telephone toll records.

In every murder case, virtually every robbery case, every big drug case, the prosecutor wants to use those toll records to show the connection between the criminals. It is extremely valuable for a jury. This is part of daily law practice in America.

To say that the NSA analysts have to have a court order before they can obtain a telephone toll record is contrary to everything that happens every day in America. I am absolutely amazed that the President has gone further than the law requires and is requiring some form of court order.

Apparently, this bill would go even further, this FREEDOM Act. It is not necessary. You do not get the communications. All you get is—the person may be a terrorist in Yemen, and they are making phone calls to the United States, and you check to see what those numbers are and who they may have called. You might identify a cell that is inside the United States that it is on the verge of having another 9/11, hijacking another airplane to blow up the Capitol. I mean, this is real life.

I think we only had a couple hundred queries. I think that is awfully low. One reason is, I am sure, we have such a burden on it.

I would say, let's not overreact on this. Please, let's not overreact on this.

Former Attorney General Mukasey, a former Federal judge himself, has really pushed back on this, and he believes

it is the wrong kind of thing for us to be doing at this time.

This is what he said:

To impose such a burden on the NSA as the price of simply running a number through a database that includes neither the content of calls nor even the identity of the callers is perverse. The president said that this step may be dispensed with only in a ''true emergency,'' as if events unfold to a musical score with a crescendo to tell us when a ''true emergency'' is at hand.

He was talking about the additional requirements the President put on it.

One more thing. This is the way the system works and has worked for the last 50 years—40 years at least. A crime occurs. A prosecutor or the DEA agent investigates. They issue a subpoena to the local phone company that has these telephone toll records—the same thing you get in the mail—and they send them in response to the subpoena. They send those documents. They maintain those records.

Now the computer systems are more sophisticated. There are more phone calls than ever. The numbers are by the tens of millions, probably almost billions of calls. So they are reducing the number that they are maintaining in their computers—I believe Senator COTTON said it was 18 months. Maybe they abandon or they wipe out all these records. Well, an investigation into terrorism may want to go back 5 years.

The government downloads the records, they maintain them in this secure system, and they are accessible just as they had been before but actually with less information than the local police get when they issue a subpoena.

I believe this would be a big mistake.

Senator BURR.

Mr. BURR. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes on the majority side and 5 additional minutes on the minority side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I am very curious to hear what my colleague Senator RUBIO has to say and whether he is in agreement with what we have said on the floor to this point.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I think my colleagues have made an excellent point today in outlining all the details of how this program works. Let me back up and point out why we are even having this debate, other than the fact that it is expiring. It is because the perception has been created—including by political figures who serve in this Chamber—that the U.S. Government is listening to your phone calls or going through your bills as a matter of course. That is absolutely categorically false.

The next time that any politician—Senator, Congressman—talking head, whoever it may be, stands up and says ''The U.S. Government is listening to your phone calls or going through your phone records,'' they are lying. It is not true, except for some very isolated instances—in the hundreds—of individuals for whom there is reasonable suspicion that they could have links to terrorism.

Those of us in this culture in our society are often accused of having a short attention span. We forget that less than a year ago, Russian separatists shot down a commercial airliner armed by the Russians. Maybe even the Russians themselves did it. We forget that it was not long ago that Assad was using chemical weapons to slaughter people in Syria. The world moves on.

What we should never forget is what happened here on the 11th of September of the year 2001. There are a number of seminal moments in American history that people always remember. They remember when President Kennedy was assassinated. Everyone in this room remembers where they were and what they were doing on that morning of the 11th of September of the year 2001 when the World Trade Center was attacked and the subsequent attacks happened.

Here is the truth. If this program had existed before 9/11, it is quite possible we would have known that 9/11 hijacker Khalid Al Mihdhar was living in San Diego and was making phone calls to an Al Qaeda safe house in Yemen. There is no guarantee we would have known. There is no way we can go back in time and prove it. But there is a probability we would have; therefore, there is a probability American lives could have been saved.

This program works as follows: If the intelligence agencies of the United States believe there is an individual who is involved in terrorist activity—a reasonable belief—and that individual might be communicating with people as part of a plot, they have to get an order that allows them access to their phone bill. The phone bill basically tells you when they called, what number they called, and how long the call was. Why does that matter? Because if I know that subject X is an individual who is involved in terrorism, of course I want to know whom they are calling. I would not be as interested in the calls to Pizza Hut or the local pharmacy, but I would be interested in calls overseas or calls to other people because they could be part of the plot as well. That is why this is such a valuable tool.

My colleagues have already pointed out that if the IRS wants your phone bill, they just have to issue a subpoena. If virtually every agency—any agency of American Government—if your local police department wants your phone bill—in fact, if you are involved in a proceeding in a civil litigation and they want access to your phone bill because it is relevant to the case, they can just get a subpoena. It is part of the record. The intelligence agencies actually have to go through a number of hoops and hurdles, and that is fine. That is appropriate because these are very powerful agencies.

I will further add that the people who are raising hysteria—what is the problem we are solving here? There is not one single documented case, not one single documented case—there is not one single case that has been brought to us as an example of how this program is being abused. Show me the story. Give the name to the world. Show us who this individual is who is going out there and seizing the phone records of Americans improperly. There is not one example of that—not one. And if there is, that individual should be fired, prosecuted, and put in jail. The solution is not to get rid of a program at a time when we know the risk of homegrown violent extremism is the highest it has ever been.

We used to be worried about a foreigner coming to the United States and carrying out an attack, and then we were worried about an American traveling abroad and coming back and carrying out an attack. Now we are worried about people who may never leave here, who are radicalized online and carry out an attack.

This is not theoretical. Just last weekend two individuals who were inspired by ISIS tried to carry out an attack in the State of Texas. One day—I hope that I am wrong—there will be an attack that is successful. The first question out of everyone's mouth will be: Why didn't we know about it? And the answer better not be because this Congress failed to authorize a program that might have helped us know about it. These people are not playing games. They don't go on these Web sites and say the things they say for purposes of aggrandizement. This is a serious threat, and I hope we reauthorize this bill.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I thank my colleagues for their participation, and I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their accommodation.

I will conclude by saying that in the very near future this Congress will be presented two choices: to reauthorize a program that works or to roll back our tools to pre-9/11. I don't believe that is what the American people want, and I don't believe that is what Members of Congress want.

I urge my colleagues to become educated on what this program is, what it does, and more importantly, how effective it has been implemented.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG CHEMICAL SAFETY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following

Senators be added as cosponsors to S. 697, the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act, a bill to reform the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976: Senators BARRASSO, BOOKER, CORNYN, COTTON, ISAKSON, KAINE, MCCASKILL, MERKLEY, MURKOWSKI, MURPHY, RUBIO, SCOTT, SHAHEEN, and WHITEHOUSE.

There is a substantial list here that brings the total up to 36 cosponsors on this piece of legislation.

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

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I came from a press conference on the third floor, with Chairman INHOFE, Senator VITTER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator MERKLEY, about the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act. So I thought I would talk a little bit about what we are trying to do and where we are headed.

Americans trust that when they go to the grocery store or when they are in their own homes, the products they reach for are safe. The current system fails that trust. It fails to provide confidence in our regulatory system, and it fails to provide confidence in our consumer products. We cannot let that failure continue.

I rise today to urge support for the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act. It is the best chance we have—possibly for many years—to protect our kids from dangerous chemicals.

The Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976, or TSCA, is supposed to protect American families. It does not. There are over 84,000 known chemicals and hundreds of new ones every year. Of all of these chemicals, how many have been regulated by the EPA? Less than half a dozen. The EPA cannot even regulate asbestos, a known carcinogen, since losing a court battle in 1991. So for decades, the risks and the dangers are there, but there is no cop on the beat.

Some States are trying to fill the gaps by regulating a few chemicals. But my home State of New Mexico, and the vast majority of other States, have no ability to test chemicals. They have no department to write regulations. Without a working Federal law, they have no Federal protection—no protection at all.

Even in the 7 years since California—which probably has the greatest capacity of all States to test and regulate—passed a law to regulate chemicals, it has only begun the process on three. We have an opportunity and an obligation to reform our broken chemical safety law. That is why I and others have worked so hard to find compromise. That is why I introduced the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act.

I have been privileged to work with Senator VITTER on this bill. I thank the Senator from Louisiana and our colleagues who have worked with us. This is a true bipartisan effort. We don't always agree, but we have one goal. Reform is overdue—40 years overdue.

Our esteemed former colleague, the late Senator Lautenberg, led the way for many years with great determination. His bipartisan effort with Senator VITTER to reform TSCA was the last major legislation he introduced.

Two years ago, the New York Times endorsed the Lautenberg-Vitter bill. The Times said correctly that previous efforts at reform had gone nowhere and the bill ''deserves to be passed because it would be a significant advance over the current law.''

I was honored to take over as the lead Democrat on the bill. Since then, I have listened to concerns, I have reached across the aisle, and I have brought everyone into the room—or at least tried to. With Senator VITTER we have improved the bill.

By working with three of our colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee—Senators WHITEHOUSE, MERKLEY, and BOOKER—we made more progress. I thank them and Senator VITTER for coming to the table and working with us.

I also thank our cosponsors. We are up to 36 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle—half Democrats, half Republicans. This is a big accomplishment.

The bill is even stronger now with more protections for consumers and a stronger role for States to play in keeping their citizens safe.

I want to talk for a moment about how this bill moves forward. First, the manufacturer of a new chemical cannot begin until the EPA approves it. More than 700 new chemicals come into commerce each year. Our bill gives the EPA the time it needs and keeps these chemicals out of American homes in the meantime.

Second, the current TSCA has no requirement for evaluating existing chemicals—none. Our bill does and includes deadlines even more aggressive than the EPA itself said it was ready for.

Third, we require a stronger safety standard for all chemicals to be evaluated. No longer will the EPA be required to choose the least burdensome regulation. Its criteria will be safety, science, and public health—never costs or convenience.

Fourth, our bill requires, for the first time, that the EPA protect our most vulnerable populations—pregnant women, infants, the elderly, and workers—from chemicals in commerce or manufacturing.

Fifth, TSCA is silent on animal welfare and testing. The Lautenberg act minimizes animal testing and develops a strategy to do so.

Finally, we limit the protection of confidential business information so that businesses cannot hide information from the public.

Let's be clear. We have a choice. We can continue with a law that has failed, we can continue to leave the American people unprotected or we can actually make a difference. I believe the choice is obvious. Our bill will make Americans safer—and not just for Americans fortunate enough to live in States with protections. All Americans, no matter where they live, will be protected.

For those Americans in States with existing safeguards, that will not change. Those safeguards will stay in place. Any regulations in place as of August of this year will remain. And there is a role for States to play to help with the thousands of chemicals that the EPA will not be able to evaluate. But the EPA has the largest staff on chemical safety of any country in the world. They should be able to put that staff to good work. To do otherwise is wasted opportunity and continued failure.

This has not been an easy process, but it has been a necessary one. I believe it will result in a good bill. We welcome a healthy debate, we welcome constructive amendments, and at the same time we should not lose sight of the key goal to actually pass a bill.

I believe we can do this, and Senator Lautenberg, who was a great environmental champion, believed we could as well. He used to talk a lot about his children and grandchildren and that this bill might save more lives than anything he had ever done.

We have a historic opportunity to create a chemical law that works and provides American families with the protections they expect and deserve. Let's work together. Let's make that happen. Let's not wait another 40 years.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I may speak again after Senator DURBIN has finished his statement on the floor.

I thank Senator DURBIN. I have had some very good exchanges with him on this bill. I look forward to working through the issues that Illinois has. I know that Illinois is a big State, and the Senator cares about chemicals and chemical safety. I want to make sure the Senator is comfortable with what we have in this bill and will try to work with my colleague as we move down the road.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I commend my colleague from New Mexico. It is difficult to put in words the way I feel about his effort on this subject.

It was first brought to my attention when there was a series in the Chicago Tribune about fire retardant chemicals in furniture. It turned out that many people who were making furniture were putting fire retardant chemicals in the

fabric of the upholstery, as well as in the cushions of chairs and couches.

After further examination, we found that these chemicals were not, in fact, fire retardant, and secondly, they had properties that were dangerous and, frankly, should not be in our homes.

I thought about that series over and over again because my wife and I have two of the cutest grandkids on Earth who are a little over 3 years old. I thought to myself: Every time I plop down on the couch to play with the kids, I am pushing down on that cushion and spraying those chemicals into the room. I thought long and hard about it. I didn't know what those chemicals meant, what they could do to my grandkids or what they could do to innocent people. It never crossed my mind.

Senator UDALL has taken on what is in many ways a thankless task but a very important one—to try to come up with some standards for new chemicals so they are reviewed and so we know they are safe for Americans and for families.

He has taken his share of grief in the process. I may have given him a little of grief along the way because it is a critically important subject. But he is right to invoke the name of Senator Frank Lautenberg.

The Senator's widow, Bonnie Lautenberg, was in to see me yesterday. We talked about Frank and all the things he had done over the years. He was my Senate sponsor when I was a House originator of the bill banning smoking on airplanes 25 years ago. Frank Lautenberg carried the flag over here in the Senate. He was my partner.

One of the last press conferences I ever had with him was on this subject, the toxic chemicals and the review of these chemicals. I remember that it was right outside.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico for continuing this. I am not one of the cosponsors, but I might be. I have three or four issues I want to sit down and go over with my friend and make sure I understand them and maybe suggest some changes. But I commend the Senator for sticking with this. I know it has not been easy. There are those who disagree with him, even within our own caucus.

Again, I thank the Senator for trying, on a bipartisan basis, to deal with an issue that we should deal with as a nation. I commend the Senator for that. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his leadership.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Madam President, for several years I have been coming to the floor and giving speeches—which some of the staff here can repeat because they have heard them so often—about the for-profit colleges and universities in America. I always preface my talk about these for-profit colleges and universities by saying: I am going to give you three numbers that are going to be on the final. So get out your pen and paper, students, because this will be on the final.

Ten percent of college students go to for-profit colleges and universities. Who are the for-profit colleges and universities? The biggest ones are the University of Phoenix, Kaplan University, DeVry University, and many others that I will mention. Ten percent of college students go to these colleges and universities that are run for profit. How do they find them? They cannot avoid them. Ask a high school student when the last time was that they logged in on the Internet with the word ''college'' or ''university'' and whether they were not inundated for ads to go to for-profit schools. They are on billboards and on television. They are everywhere. So 10 percent of students go to these schools. That is the first question on the final.

The second question: What percentage of Federal aid to education goes to for-profit colleges and universities? The answer is 20 percent—20 percent of Federal aid to education. Why so much? Ten percent of the students and 20 percent of the Federal aid? These schools aren't cheap. They charge a lot of money. Students have to borrow a lot more money to go to school.

So the Federal aid to education, which includes student loans to for-profit schools, is 20 percent. Ten percent of the students; 20 percent of the Federal aid to education.

But here is the important number: 44. Forty-four percent of all of the student loan defaults in the United States are from students at for-profit colleges and universities. Why? Well, there are two reasons—maybe more but two that are obvious. They accept everyone. If a student is low income—particularly a minority student—they can't wait to bring them in the door. Why? Because they automatically qualify for about $5,000 in Pell grants that the school can get right away, and they automatically qualify for college loans because their family doesn't have a lot of money. So those are the great opportunity students: low-income students.

What happens to those students? They start in these schools. They sign up and pay to the schools what they can afford. They take their grant money and give it to the schools, and then they sign up for student loans and they start their classes. Then they find, for a variety of reasons, they can't continue. Maybe they are not ready for college. Maybe—just maybe—they start adding up all of the loans they have taken out and say, I have to stop; it is getting too much—because the indebtedness of students coming out of for-profit colleges and universities is twice what it is for those who go to public universities. It is a very expensive undertaking.

Then there is the other category: those who finally finish at these for-profit colleges and universities but can't get a job. One of them was at a press conference with me last Monday in Chicago—a sweet young woman who was born in West Virginia and raised in Eastern Kentucky. She moved to Chicago, went to Everest College in Chicago, a for-profit school owned by Corinthian Colleges. She didn't quite finish, but she spent several years there. Then she learned something after she went out looking for a job. The employers would look at her and say: Corinthian, that is not a good college. Why did you go there? Don't put that on your resume. Stop putting that on your resume because it makes you look bad.

Here she is in debt $20,000 to this for-profit college and her employers are saying stop putting that on your resume; it is not a real college.

This poor young woman, now in City Colleges, is trying, at a very young age, to put it back together again.

So that is where we start: for-profit colleges and universities, 10 percent of the students, 20 percent of the Federal aid to education, and 44 percent of all of the student loan defaults.

I have been giving this speech on the floor for literally years saying something is wrong. Why are we accrediting these schools that have such dismal records? Why are we looking the other way when the students who go to these schools have massive debt and can't pay back their student loans? When are we going to wake up as a Federal Government and stop shoveling hundreds of millions—and billions—of dollars at this industry?

For-profit colleges and universities' share of Federal aid to education—if it were a separate line item in the Federal budget, would be the ninth largest Federal agency. That is how much money we send to these people. These are for-profit, private sector companies—baloney. Their revenues—80 to 95 percent of their revenues come right from the Treasury. This is the most heavily subsidized industry in America.

But now something historic has happened. Corinthian Colleges, one of the largest for-profit colleges and universities, announced its bankruptcy last week, and that isn't the end of the story. Yesterday, Career Education Corporation, headquartered in my home State of Illinois, announced it would teach out, which means close, its 14 Sanford-Brown institutions across the country and online. This follows the decision to close its Harrington College of Design in Chicago and to look for a buyer for its Le Cordon Bleu culinary schools. Ever heard of those? I can guarantee my colleagues that high school kids have heard of them. I have run into students at these places.

Harrington College of Design. I cannot tell my colleagues how many students went there, took out the loans, and found out it was worthless, and

then contacted my office and asked, What are we supposed to do next?

I had a hearing on for-profit colleges and universities in Chicago and there were students from these for-profit colleges picketing ''Durbin is unfair.'' I went out to the students and I said: Where do you go to school?

One student said: I go to the Institute of Art of Chicago. Now, there is a Chicago Art Institute, but this play on words turned out to be significant.

I said: What are you studying there?

The student said: I am going to be a super chef.

Oh, really. How much is it going to cost you to take the culinary courses to be a super chef?

It is $54,000 in tuition.

To be a chef? I have asked the major restaurants in Chicago; they don't even want to see those degrees. They don't look for them. They don't value them. These poor kids, these young men and women who watch these cooking shows on TV and get all caught up in it and say, That is for me, end up getting suckered into these schools.

Le Cordon Bleu is another one. Le Cordon Bleu—doesn't that sound great? My wife has a cookbook that says that on it. These students quickly sign up for this French-sounding culinary school and get in debt and deeply in trouble. Now they are in more trouble because the school is in the process of going out of business.

In a public statement about their decision, CEO Ron McCray of Career Education Corporation blamed a more difficult higher education environment and challenging regulatory environment. Do people know what the challenge is? The Department of Education is finally challenging these schools when they say to the Department, Oh, our kids all get jobs—when they graduate, they all get jobs.

When they challenged Corinthian Colleges, here is what they found out. Corinthian graduates would be employed—check the box—after they graduate for about 30 days, sometimes less. Corinthian had cooked a deal with employers to hire their graduates for 30 days, and it paid them to do it, and they were caught redhanded and eventually went out of business. Fraud—fraud in reporting to the government, fraud on the taxpayers leading to the collapse of Corinthian Colleges.

Career Education Corporation, incidentally, is under investigation—this for-profit school—by 17 different State attorneys general relating to recruitment practices and graduate placement statistics, among other things. In 2013, this company, Career Education Corporation, settled with the New York attorney general for 10 million bucks. The company is on the Heightened Cash Monitoring list, meaning they are suspect, of the U.S. Department of Education.

What else happened yesterday? This is all within the last 2 weeks.

Education Management Corporation—EDMC—announced that it was going to close 15 of these art institute campuses. Remember that one? I told my colleagues about that costs $54,000 tuition to become a cook? They are going to close 15 of these campuses, including reportedly one in Tinley Park, IL. They have been financially faltering for some time. They had recently tried to do a debt restructuring which apparently didn't work. They are currently being sued by the Department of Justice for false claims violations.

The Justice Department alleges that this one, Education Management Corporation, falsely certified compliance with provisions of the Federal law that prohibit the university from paying financial incentives to its admissions staff that is tied to the number of students they recruit. We made it a law that said you can't pay a bounty for bringing in kids and signing up in the school. They did it anyway.

In addition, this company is under investigation by 17 State attorneys general, just like the other one, related to, among other things, marketing and recruitment. EDMC is also on the Department of Education's Heightened Cash Monitoring list.

Let me say a word about ITT Tech. We have to watch the names of these places because they sound like real schools. We have an Illinois Institute of Technology that is a real university, one of the best in the Nation—one of the best in the world—when it comes to engineering and science. So along comes a for-profit school and makes a little change. It is ITT Tech, hoping the Illinois students will not catch it. They are another company under heavy scrutiny.

They have been sued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau for predatory lending to students. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau alleges that ITT pushed students into high-cost private loans that they knew were going to end in default. Sometimes these students are still eligible for government loans at low interest rates and good terms and these schools don't care. They push them into private loans with high interest rates.

Do my colleagues know how high the interest rates on the student loans were from private lenders to these kids at ITT Tech? How about 16.25 percent. Think about that for a minute. At a time when the interest rates in our country are at rock bottom, these kids were paying 16 percent to the lenders for private loans.

There is something else we should know. Unlike virtually any other loan that we take out in America, student loans are not dischargeable in bankruptcy. No matter how deep a hole these kids get into—and their families—no matter how deep the hole, if they go bankrupt over student loans, they can't discharge them in bankruptcy. Student loans follow you to the grave. That is what these kids at age 19 and 20 are getting into. Sadly, these for-profit schools are dragging them in that direction.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau believes ITT misrepresented the basics, including how often you can get a job, the quality of the diploma. Does this sound familiar? It is a recurring theme in this industry. ITT is under investigation by everybody in sight: 15 State attorneys general, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the New Mexico attorney general is suing them, and ITT is on the Department of Education's Heightened Cash Monitoring list.

What happens when these schools go bankrupt, when they close or teach out and finish? Well, Corinthian ended up closing many of their campuses a week or so ago and now the students who are in debt because they went to school there have an opportunity. They can walk away from the credits they earned at a Corinthian college and then walk away from their college debt associated with them since their school closed. But some of these other students will not be so lucky. They will have ended their education at these worthless schools and have a mountain of debt to show for it and the school will go out of business.

This isn't fair. There comes a point where we are supposed to step in, the government is supposed to step in. This is our money, hundreds of millions of dollars from taxpayers going to these rotten schools that are abusing students, leaving them deeply in debt and then going out of business.

We shouldn't be surprised to learn that the CEOs of these schools do quite well. The CEO of Corinthian College that went bankrupt: $3 million a year—not bad for what turned out to be a fraudulent enterprise.

That is why this week I joined several of my colleagues and sent a letter to the Department of Justice. The Department of Education said we don't know how to go after these individual wrongdoers at these for-profit college corporations. So we said to the Attorney General: We hope you will investigate this. Take a look at it. If you cheat on your income tax or you defraud the government, you are going to be held responsible for it. Why shouldn't these people who took hundreds of millions of dollars not only from Federal taxpayers but at the expense of students now burdened with the debt of their schools also be investigated? I think it only stands to reason they should be.

Madam President, I have another statement to make, but I see two of my colleagues. I will come back a little later in the day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I would ask the Chair to notify me when I have consumed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I rise to support the President's negotiations with the P5+1 and Iran and to speak about the tremendous work—especially at our national laboratories—to create a framework agreement that meets the scientific requirements to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

I also wish to express my support for the Corker-Menendez bill as passed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Congress must have an oversight role; there is no doubt about that. While I do not believe this bill is necessary to have such a role, I do believe it is the best compromise to ensure a congressional oversight role without weakening the President's hand to continue critical negotiations.

First, let's be clear, we all agree on one basic point: a nuclear-armed Iran is a serious threat. No one doubts this. No one questions the history of Iran's deception. That history is well documented and the danger is evident. This is the greatest nuclear nonproliferation challenge of our time. It is of tremendous import to our Nation, to the Middle East region, and to our ally, Israel. It is a challenge we must meet. We do not disagree on the danger; we disagree on the response.

The Corker-Menendez bill is truly bipartisan. It passed the Foreign Relations Committee on which I am proud to serve unanimously. I wish to thank Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN for their leadership and all of their hard work to find a compromise solution. This is a solid bill. It gives Congress the opportunity to review a final agreement, to hold hearings and ask tough questions, and it creates an orderly method for Congress to approve or disapprove of any final agreement, providing more than enough time for both.

The administration still has work to do and needs time to do it. I believe the framework agreement has promise to stop Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, to protect Israel, and to prevent a new war in the Middle East. And it would take longer for Iran to secure the nuclear materials needed to make a bomb. As a result the United States and its allies would have much more time to respond if Iran attempted to break out and build a nuclear weapon.

This is not speculation. This is not wishful thinking. Energy Secretary Moniz and Secretary of State John Kerry make this commitment clear. If anyone doubts this, visit our nuclear security experts at the labs in New Mexico, California, and Oak Ridge, TN, or Argonne in Illinois. Talk to the engineers and scientists who know the most about nuclear weapons and what is needed to make them.

The Secretary said in his recent oped in the Washington Post:

> An important part of the parameters is a set of restrictions that would significantly increase the time it would take Iran to produce the nuclear material needed for a weapon—the breakout time—if it pursued one. The current breakout time is just two to three months . . . that would increase to at least a year for more than 10 years, more than enough time to mount an effective response.

Secretary Moniz goes on to say: ''The negotiated parameters would block Iran's four pathways to a nuclear weapon—the path through plutonium production at the Arak reactor, two paths to a uranium weapon through the Natanz and Fordow enrichment facilities, and the path of covert activity.''

These negotiations must continue. The President and his team must have room to proceed. Let's not kid ourselves. This process is complex. It is daunting. Success is not guaranteed.

I will oppose any amendments to the Corker-Menendez bill that would tie the President's hands. Efforts such as the letter sent by 47 Members of this body and other efforts to derail negotiations only serve to confound and weaken our position. Politics must stop at the water's edge.

The Senate will have ample time to review any agreement and to approve or reject any agreement. But our debate is within these halls. It is with each other and with our fellow Senators and with our President. The Ayatollah has no place in that debate. The Congress should give the President the room he needs to negotiate. This is a world of imperfect choices. And if negotiations fail, make no mistake, our options are limited and likely costly.

We are dealing with an unstable region. Use of force or regime change has unforeseen consequences. That path may seem simple. It is not. Both recent history in Iraq and the history of our interactions with Iran in the 20th century surely have taught us that much.

Senators CORKER and CARDIN have given us a solid bill, one that is in the best tradition of the Senate and in the best interest of our country. I commend them for this, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise to speak on the Corker-Menendez Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. As I have said from the start, bipartisanship on this legislation has always been the key to making sure that Congress has the ability to review any agreement with Iran—a nation that we cannot trust. It is critically important that bipartisanship is preserved.

As we head to a 2 o'clock vote on cloture to move forward on this bill, let me just say I want to thank Chairman CORKER for his leadership. I want to thank Ranking Member CARDIN for taking up the cause and for helping to bring this legislation to this point, starting with a unanimous vote out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. At the end of the day, we can pass a bipartisan bill almost as Senator CORKER and I first envisioned it.

It has been a long and difficult process. There has been debate, disagreement, and some amendments, but we have almost reached the finish line. Despite the good intentions—and I would say the good intentions of many of the amendments, some which I agree with—we cannot risk a Presidential veto. And we cannot at the end of the day risk giving up congressional review and judgment.

That is the critical core issue before the Senate. Will we have congressional review and judgment on probably the most significant nuclear nonproliferation national security—global security—question, I think, of our time? We cannot risk having no oversight role, and without the passage of this legislation, we will have missed an opportunity to send a clear message to Tehran.

As we near the finish line and, hopefully, agree to govern as we should, I believe we will ultimately pass legislation without destroying what Senator CORKER and I carefully crafted and was passed unanimously out of the committee. From the beginning, we fashioned language to ensure that Congress plays a critical role in judging any final agreement. I want to also recognize Senator KAINE, who had significant input as we were devising the bill, for his support.

The bill we crafted was intended to ensure that if the P5+1 and Iran ultimately achieved a comprehensive agreement by the June deadline, Congress would have a say in judging that agreement. A core element of the framework agreement that is the foundation of the negotiations leading into June is about sanctions relief as a core point, at least from the Iranian perspective. The sanctions relief that the administration is proposing is at the heart of these negotiations from their perspective. For us, it is about their nuclear infrastructure and their drive for a nuclear weapon. Why are they seated in negotiations in the first place? As the administration itself recognized, it is because of the sanctions. Well, the sanctions were crafted by Congress and enacted by Congress, and we should be the ones to make a determination as to whether or not it is appropriate to relieve those sanctions.

I have to say, as one of the authors of those sanctions, I never envisioned a wholesale waiver of sanctions against Iran without congressional input and without congressional action. The message I believe we can send to Iran—and I hope we will do it powerfully—is that sanctions relief is not a given and it is not a prize for signing on the dotted line.

Make no mistake. Having said that I hope we can have a strong bipartisan vote on this bill, I have serious questions about the framework agreement as it stands today, from the different understandings that both sides have of the agreement—which is, I guess, part of the challenge of not committing it to one document in writing—and about the pace of sanctions relief. I increasingly get alarmed that there is a suggestion that there will be greater upfront sanctions relief. I don't believe that Iran should get a signing bonus. I am concerned about the recent statement by the President that he could consider greater sanctions relief coming upfront for Iran. I have real questions about where the spectrum is of Iran's research and development authority as we move forward and how far they can advance their research and development as it relates to nuclear power. Greater research and development means, among other things, more sophisticated centrifuges that can spin faster and dramatically reduce breakout time towards a nuclear bomb.

I am concerned about the ability to snap back sanctions if there are violations of any agreement. Certainly, what I have seen in the first instance—which sounds like a committee process—doesn't guarantee that a snapback will take place or that it will be done in a timely fashion. Ultimately, snapback, in and of itself, is a challenge because it doesn't recognize the time it takes for sanctions actually to take effect. So even if you snap them back and say that we won't have to go to the law again to have them take place, to have them take effect and to pursue enforcement, we have learned that it takes time, and time is something that is ultimately not on our side.

I am concerned about the International Atomic Energy Administration's inability to obtain at any time and place snap inspections. We have already heard the Iranians say they are balking at that. They are also balking about the possibility that the IAEA believes that such a location might be on a military installation. They are saying: Oh, no, we are not going to allow any of our military installations to be inspected. That is a surefire way to guarantee that if you want ultimately to violate a deal, then do it at a military site where you are not allowing inspections to take place.

I am concerned that I hear the administration is trying to differentiate between the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and the Quds Force to provide greater sanctions relief. Both, as far as I am concerned, are terrorist groups. As far as I am concerned, they are clearly covered by U.S. law. So trying to get the Treasury Department to differentiate is really problematic and concerning.

I am deeply disturbed that the agreement does not speak to the long-established condition that Iran must come completely clean on the question of their possible weaponization of their nuclear program. We need to know how far along Iran has progressed in their weaponization so that we can understand those consequences as it relates to other breakout time issues.

Above all, I am concerned that when you read about the framework agreement, while it does talk about something in longer timeframes, the core question as to when Iran could advance its nuclear program in a way they want to—and which I think is problematic—is that the expiration is 10 years. Does that mean we are ultimately destined to have Iran as a nuclear weapons State after that period of time? That cannot be and should not be the ultimate result.

I state all of those concerns to say to my colleagues that, even though I passionately believe this legislation is critical for us, it is not that I don't have concerns. This legislation is the vehicle by which we can judge. Now, maybe these issues will be resolved in a negotiation. I don't know. Ultimately, without this vehicle we have no final say on an agreement, and we have no oversight role with established parameters for compliance.

I am concerned that the sanctions relief comes without what appears to be a broader Iran policy, in terms of how we contain its acts of terrorism. It clearly is the largest State sponsor of terrorism. We see its hegemonic interests. We see it as a major patron of Assad in Syria, what is happening in Yemen, what is happening in different parts of the region. I am concerned about its missile technology. So there are a lot of elements here of concern at the end of the day.

I would say to my colleagues who feel passionately about some of these amendments they have offered, this isn't the only bill in which we could consider these issues. I stand ready to work with colleagues immediately on pursuing other concerns, such as missile technology, terrorism, their human rights violations, their anti-Semitism, and the Americans who are being held hostage; and to look at either sanctions or enhanced sanctions that may already exist on those elements that we should be considering and which are separate and apart from the nuclear program. I would be more than willing to work with my colleagues to deal with all of those issues.

I will say that even as we have worked to give the administration the space to negotiate and believe very passionately in this legislation, it bothers me enormously that just last week Reuters reported that Great Britain informed the United Nations sanctions panel on April 20 of an active Iranian nuclear procurement network, apparently linked to two blacklisted firms, Iran's Centrifuge Technology Company, called TESA, and Kalay Electric Company, KEC.

If what Great Britain brought before the U.N. Security Council sanctions panel is true, how can we trust Iran to end its nuclear weapons ambitions and not be a threat to its neighbors when, even as we are negotiating with them, they are trying to acquire illicitly materials for their nuclear weapons program in the midst of the negotiations?

Forgetting about everything they are doing in Yemen and Syria, forgetting about their hostility to ships in the Strait of Hormuz, forgetting about their actions of terrorism, this is square-on trying to ultimately use front companies to get materials for their nuclear program. So we cannot build this on trust alone. I know the administration says we are not going to trust them, we are going to verify, but it goes beyond that.

It can't be a fleeting hope that Iran will comply with the provisions and change their stripes. I believe they will not. It cannot be built from the aspirations or good intentions, like the North Korea deal, not when Iran continues to sponsor terrorism, not while it asserts its interests from Yemen to Bahrain, from Iraq to Lebanon, not as events in Syria continue to worsen.

I just had the U.N. relief coordinator in on Syria. This is a human tragedy of unimaginable proportions. We have become almost desensitized. We do not hear about it on the Senate floor anymore. It is all supported, encouraged, and financed by Tehran, and not while Iran 's fingerprints remain in the dust of the bombings of Israel's Embassy and Jewish community center in Argentina, even as it seeks to bargain with that country's leaders for absolution.

That is the Iran we are dealing with. That is the state we are being asked to hope will change. Well, hope is not a national security solution when it comes to dealing with Iran. Congress having a say on any final agreement is critical to how we deal with Iran. So I urge my colleagues to have a strong vote on cloture and I hope, after that, a unanimous vote on passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to address legislation before us, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which sets up a deliberate process for congressional review of a final nuclear agreement with Iran. The United States, our citizens, our President, and probably every Member of the Senate and House stand united in our commitment to prevent Iran from securing a nuclear weapon.

Nuclear proliferation is a huge danger to human civilization on our planet. The more nations that possess nuclear weapons, the more opportunities there are for misunderstandings between nations to trigger first use of a

nuclear weapon. The more nations that possess nuclear weapons, the more opportunities there are for failures in command and control to result in the unintended use of a weapon.

The more nations that possess nuclear weapons, the more opportunities there are for terrorist groups to gain acquisition of a weapon. Certainly, the possibility of Iran possessing a nuclear weapon poses special security concerns. The Middle East is being torn asunder by longstanding conflicts and challenges. If Iran acquires a nuclear weapon, then other nations like Saudi Arabia are likely to also seek to secure a nuclear weapon.

Moreover, in the fervent rivalry between Shia Islam and Sunni Islam, which brings powers into bloody and extensive conflict from Syria, to Yemen, to Iraq, there are abundant scenarios that could generate potential use of a nuclear weapon, either through misunderstandings or misguided perceptions of military advantage. None of us will ever forget that the Government of Iran has put forth a steady stream of invectives against our close ally Israel calling for her destruction.

Iran's possession of a nuclear weapon would pose a very real threat to the existence of the State of Israel. For all of these reasons, Americans are united. Our 100 Senators are united in believing it is imperative that Iran does not secure a nuclear weapon, but the question we must debate and resolve is, Which strategy is most effective to achieve this outcome? There are three basic options: a negotiated dismantlement of Iran's nuclear weapons program with an intrusive inspection and verification regime to ensure Iran is keeping its word; second, a reliance on indefinite extension of tough multinational economic sanctions in hopes that will continue to dissuade Iran from pursuing a nuclear weapons program; third, a military option designed to destroy critical components of Iran's nuclear weapons infrastructure. Of these options, for reasons I will explain in due course, the first is the far superior option. To understand this set of possibilities, however, we have to understand the current situation. The United States has imposed sanctions against Iran since 1979.

Many of the sanctions Iran faced in that time from 2008 were unilateral. These sanctions, however, were largely ineffective. Iran's trade with the United States was diminished, but sanctions had little overall effect because Iran was able to continue trading through other nations.

President Obama, coming into office in 2009, saw this clearly. He recognized the importance of enforcing existing U.N. resolutions, passing stronger ones, and convincing our allies to go beyond those resolutions and truly tighten the web of restrictions on Iran's trade and finances. The result was coordinated with the P5+1—France, United Kingdom, Germany, United States, Russia, and China.

These multilateral sanctions have come about in several phases. In 2010, Congress enacted a series of sanctions targeting Iran's banking and oil sectors. In 2011, section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 was passed. In 2012, we passed the Iran Threat Reduction Act and Syria Human Rights Act. In 2013, we passed the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act. Those sanctions—the American sanctions—and the multilateral sanctions have had an enormous impact on the economy of Iran.

Their crude oil exports fell from around 2.5 million barrels per day in 2011 to about 1.1 million barrels per day at the end of 2013. Trade between Europe and Iran plunged. It plunged from almost $32 billion in 2005 to about $9 billion today. Iran's economy has taken a huge hit. Iran's current President was elected on a platform of negotiating with the goal of alleviating the enormous economic impact created by the sanctions.

The sanctions have accomplished their intended goal. They have brought Iran to the negotiating table in search of an agreement based on a simple, straightforward formulation. Iran will forgo a nuclear weapons program if the international coalition will, in return, lift its devastatingly effective sanctions.

That is the background to the negotiations underway today between Iran and the P5+1. But when these negotiations got into full motion, they were not just about talking, they agreed on a set of conditions to free and, to some degree, reverse elements of Iran's domestic nuclear program, not waiting until the conclusion of the negotiations but as a condition of the negotiations.

This Joint Plan of Action or JPA that Iran and the P5+1 agreed to has a substantial number of elements. I will mention a few. First, Iran has to refrain from any further advances of its activities at three critical nuclear facilities: at the Fordow underground uranium enrichment facility, at the Natanz underground commercial scale uranium enrichment facility, and further activity at the Arak heavy water reactor that could—that reactor could, when completed, produce plutonium that could be utilized in a bomb.

Second, Iran, in this Joint Plan of Action, has agreed to provide the International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA, with additional information about its nuclear programs, as well as access to sensitive nuclear-related facilities, to which Iran's IAEA safeguards agreement does not require access.

Third, and again as a condition of the negotiations, Iran agreed not to produce 20 percent enriched uranium. That is a form of uranium—uranium hexafluoride or enriched uranium—in Iran's stockpile that has caused the most concern. Fourth, Iran has agreed to fully eliminate its existing stockpile of 20 percent enriched uranium by diluting half of that stockpile to uranium hexafluoride, containing no more than 5 percent of uranium 235, and converting the rest of the material to a uranium compound unsuitable for further enrichment.

These conditions, in effect as I speak on the floor of the Senate, have not only frozen Iran's nuclear program during the negotiations, they have also given the P5+1 coalition members enormously improved understanding of Iran's nuclear program. That understanding of Iran's program has increased the ability of the P5+1 to shape a framework for a final agreement designed to block all the possible pathways to a nuclear weapon.

There are four Iranian pathways to a bomb. One pathway is to utilize fissile material from the Fordow underground uranium enrichment facility. This is the secret uranium facility—formerly secret uranium facility—built deep underground beneath a base of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, massively reinforced with concrete and steel to enable it to withstand most bombing assaults.

The second pathway is to utilize fissile uranium made in the Natanz underground enrichment facility. The third pathway is to utilize, at some future point, plutonium processed from spent fuel at the Arak heavy water reactor. I say at some future point because this reactor is still under construction. The fourth pathway is to utilize covert operations to acquire or to make sufficient fissile material for a bomb.

On April 2, last month, Iran and the P5+1 coalition announced a framework for a joint comprehensive plan of action on Iran's nuclear program intended to address and block all four of these pathways to a bomb. Now, as reported by the State Department, I am going to review a few of those details of this framework. These are essentially the bones of the agreement that have to be fleshed out in the weeks to follow.

Let's talk first about the Fordow, this deep underground, massively reinforced, formerly secret uranium enrichment facility. Iran would repurpose Fordow for peaceful nuclear research. Iran would not retain any fissile material at this installation. They would not enrich uranium at this facility. Iran would remove approximately two-thirds of the centrifuges. The remaining centrifuges and related infrastructure would be placed under IAEA monitoring.

Let's turn to Natanz. Here are a few of the restrictions to the second pathway—second possible pathway for an

Iranian nuclear weapon. Iran would remove the 1,000 IR–2M centrifuges currently installed at Natanz and place them under IAEA monitoring for 10 years. Iran would engage in limited research and development with some of its advanced centrifuges according to a schedule and parameters agreed to by the P5+1.

Iran would use only its less-efficient first-generation centrifuges to enrich uranium at Natanz, a process that would be closely monitored. Beyond 10 years, Iran would abide by its enrichment R&D plan submitted to the IAEA under the addition protocol, resulting in certain limitations on enrichment capacity.

Let's turn to the third pathway. That is the possibility of plutonium secured from nuclear fuel used at this heavy water reactor. To block this pathway to a nuclear bomb, Iran would agree to ship all of its spent fuel out of the country and to not build a reprocessing facility for such nuclear fuel.

Iran would redesign and rebuild its heavy water reactor in Arak based on a design that is agreed to by the P5+1.

The original core of that reactor, which would enable the production of significant quantities of weapons-grade plutonium, would be destroyed or removed from the country, and Iran would not build any additional heavy water reactors.

Finally, the framework provides major design—provides high confidence that Iran is not employing covert operations to develop a bomb. This is the fourth pathway, the covert pathway.

Under the agreement, the IAEA would have regular access to all of Iran's nuclear facilities, including Natanz and Fordow. Inspectors would have access to the supply chains, starting with the uranium mines, the uranium milling. They would have continuous surveillance at the uranium mills. They would have continuous surveillance of Iran's centrifuges.

In addition, all of the centrifuges and enrichment infrastructure removed from Fordow and Natanz would be placed under continuous monitoring by the IAEA.

Iran and the P5+1 would establish a dedicated procurement channel for Iran's nuclear program to monitor and approve the supply, sale, or transfer to Iran of certain nuclear-related and dual-use materials and technology.

Iran would be required to grant the IAEA access to investigate suspicious sites or allegations of a covert enrichment facility, conversion facility, centrifuge production facility, or yellowcake production facility anywhere in the country.

Iran would implement an agreed set of measures to address IAEA's concerns regarding the possible military dimensions of its program.

Many of the framework elements I have just described are to last 10 years. Some have a lifetime of 15, 20, or 25 years under this initial framework. So this framework, as many have pointed out, does not lock into place all of these elements for an eternity. But by building a deep cooperation, consultation, and coordination over a 10-year period, we create the best possible chance of forging a long-term enduring agreement that will preclude the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East.

The challenge now is to take this framework as articulated by the State Department and generate detailed agreement language. That will not be an easy task. Already, you can tell the complexities from just the elements I have mentioned on each of these four pathways.

Earlier, I noted that while Senators are united in believing we must prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear bomb, there is disagreement over the best strategy. I have laid out the main elements of the negotiated strategy, but in addition to the negotiated verified dismantling of Iran's nuclear program, there are two other options that are widely discussed.

One option that has been articulated by Members of this Chamber and others would be simply to end negotiations and try to continue with an intensified, multilateral sanctions regime. It is important to note, however, that if you end negotiations, it means an end to the measures that are currently in place, measures in place today as I speak on this Senate floor. It would mean an end to the freeze on construction of the Arak reactor; an end to the negotiated elimination of stockpiles or the modification of the 20-percent enriched uranium; an end to the inspections of Iran's nuclear facilities and infrastructure, which has enabled us to learn so much about their activities.

Moreover, without any interim agreement on inspections, Iran could decide to vastly expand its nuclear program—an outcome that is in direct contradiction of the security interests of the United States and our allies.

Furthermore, there is no guarantee that if the United States ends negotiations, multilateral sanctions would survive. If our partners in the P5+1 believe the United States has deliberately undermined the success of the negotiations, the partners may very well be unwilling to maintain and enforce a strong, multilateral sanctions regime. And that is not just speculation. Representatives from Britain, France, and Germany have conveyed strong concerns that to undermine the negotiations to withdraw could fracture the international coalition that has made the sanctions effective.

Where are we, then? Without effective multilateral sanctions, Iran would have achieved its top negotiating objectives. Its economy would improve, and the pressure to make concessions on nuclear activities and international monitoring would evaporate.

In short, pursuing aggressive sanctions as an alternative to negotiations could have disastrous consequences, with our major objectives undermined, Iran's economy improved, and Iran's nuclear program unleashed—an outcome that would further degrade international security.

The third option discussed in this Chamber is to destroy Iran's nuclear infrastructure through military force.

Advocates for the use of force point to Israel's 1981 attack on Saddam Hussein's Osirak reactor in Iraq and Israel's 2007 destruction of a Syrian reactor. Advocates for this military option paint a picture in which a small group of American bombers conduct limited strikes using bunker buster bombs. Thus, they argue, the United States could easily break key links in a nuclear fuel cycle and set Iran's program back by 3 to 5 years.

This simplistic analysis is way off the mark. Military experts paint a very different picture. I encourage all of my colleagues to read the analysis prepared by the Center For Strategic and International Studies entitled ''Analyzing the Impact of Preventive Strikes against Iran's Nuclear Facilities,'' revised September 10, 2012. This analysis recognizes that a competent campaign would involve many complicated offensive and defensive elements. Here are a few of them: an extensive strategy to diminish Iranian anti-aircraft radars, missiles, and batteries; an extensive strategy to destroy Iran's ballistic missiles and other weapons Iran could use in a retaliatory strike; an extensive strategy for the direct assault on Iran's nuclear facilities; extensive refueling and supply logistics; a rigorous strategy to prevent Iran from shutting down the Strait of Hormuz; extensive strategies to protect neighboring Gulf States and Israel from retaliatory fights; and a huge effort to defend against asymmetrical attacks on American assets throughout the world.

That is just a modest list of the complexities of the military option. I again encourage folks to read the analyses by serious military analysts. Hopefully you get the picture. There is nothing quick, nothing easy about a military option.

Moreover, retaliatory threats to the United States and our allies might come from sources other than Iran. Attacks by Shia groups or a nation sympathetic to Iran are a possibility.

One thing is clear: The course of war is messy and unpredictable. What we can be sure of is that in the chaos and complexity of war, there will be significant detrimental developments. We know this because it is true of virtually every war ever fought.

Our recent history provides more than enough evidence that, once unleashed, a military option that looks simple in the beginning can be very difficult to control and very costly.

Ask yourself this question: Which American leaders thought that our efforts to eliminate terrorist training camps in Afghanistan and destabilize that nation's government would lead to a 14-year occupation, thousands of deaths, a huge number of life-debilitating injuries, and the loss of vast national treasure exceeding $1 trillion?

Ask yourself this question: Which American leaders thought that attacking Iraq to eliminate phantom weapons of mass destruction would shatter that nation, strengthen Iran, and unleash ISIS?

In addition, the military option has a substantial risk of increasing rather than decreasing Iran's determination to acquire a nuclear weapon. Iranian leaders, after attack, might well decide it is their top national priority to acquire nuclear weapons no matter the cost so that neither the United States nor any other nation would dare to attack Iran in such a fashion again.

So if the United States chooses a military option, it is most likely committing to a cycle of war as Iran rebuilds a nuclear program in the future with more steel, more concrete, and more depth underground.

So let's return to the three options before us.

A negotiated and verifiable agreement for Iran to dismantle its nuclear program promises the possibility of achieving our core security objectives without a massive cost in terms of lives, injuries, and treasure. It addresses uranium, plutonium, and covert pathways to a bomb.

Compare this to the second option: ending negotiations and resuming the toughest possible sanctions. Under this option, there is a substantial possibility that the multilateral coalition will fracture, ending multilateral sanctions, with the additional disadvantage that all the uranium nuclear programs that are frozen or diminished under the current negotiating process will be free to operate again.

Let's turn to the third option. The third option will be extraordinarily expensive in blood and treasure. It could generate a cycle of warfare that would diminish rather than enhance the security of the United States and our allies. This is an option that could motivate Iran and other nations not to give up their nuclear programs but to redouble their efforts to secure a nuclear weapon.

So the single-best option, if achievable, is a negotiated, verifiable agreement for Iran to dismantle its nuclear program. Thus, we in Congress, we in the Senate Chamber, should do everything possible to increase the likelihood of this option succeeding.

One valuable role of this Chamber and of the House is to articulate the need to have key elements of an agreement well designed. My colleague from New Jersey was raising a series of questions. These are the types of questions the State Department negotiations will be paying close attention to so that when an agreement is delivered for our consideration, there will be strong answers.

We need ironclad assurances about the dismantlement, storage, and control of key materials and equipment; rigorous and enforceable boundaries on any ''research'' nuclear program; extensive and effective inspection protocols; and strong snapback provisions in the event Iran breaks its obligation.

We need an orderly process in which to conduct this assessment of an agreement to confirm that it meets these standards. Such a coherent congressional process has several advantages. First, it strengthens our President's hand in negotiation. The President and his team must strive to get all key elements nailed down, knowing they will be reviewed by a sometimes skeptical Congress. Second, such a review strengthens the agreement as an enduring framework that will provide the transition to the next Presidency. This can contribute confidence that phased implementation will be honored by both sides and help generate the momentum necessary to hammer out the final agreement.

Thus, I support the bill reported out in the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously on April 14 and currently under debate before the Senate. This bill gives Congress the right to review the agreement and classified and unclassified versions of a verification report Secretary Kerry must provide to Congress. It gives Congress the right to disapprove of the agreement. It requires the President to provide important information to Congress, including evidence of material breaches of the agreement, of Iran's involvement in acts of terrorism, Iran's violation of human rights, and advances in Iran's ballistic missile capabilities.

In addition, the President must certify that Iran has not materially breached the agreement or, if they breached, they have cured that breach; that Iran has not taken any action that would advance its nuclear weapons program; that the suspension of sanctions is both appropriate and proportionate to Iran's efforts under the agreement and vital to the national security interests of the United States; and that the agreement does not compromise in any way our enduring commitment to Israel's security.

Congress shaped the sanctions regime that put the pressure on Iran and forced them to the negotiating table. It is logical, therefore, that Congress should be involved in making sure the results of these negotiations fully serve the security interests of our Nation and our allies. What we must not do, however, is turn this bill, this structure, or appropriate and valuable congressional review into an instrument designed to undermine or poison the success of the negotiations in order to pave the path for war.

I will oppose the adoption of any poison pill amendment designed to undermine the viability of the negotiations. What is at stake is much bigger than the ordinary day-to-day politics of this Chamber. The content of any final agreement with Iran is of profound significance to the national security of the United States, the national security of our allies, and to international peace and stability.

I urge my colleagues to carry the weight of this responsibility, of this topic, of this process, this concern over nuclear proliferation—and particularly, proliferation that could put a nuclear weapon in the hands of Iran—and to keep our eyes on the prize.

I urge my colleagues to work together in partnership with our President to develop and implement a tough, verifiable end to Iran's quest for nuclear weapons.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee.

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

COMMITTEE EXAMINATION OF ISSUES IN THEIR JURISDICTION

Mr. SULLIVAN. I rise today to speak about the importance of additional congressional consideration during the congressional review period of a final negotiated nuclear agreement. The involvement of other committees in examining the issues in their jurisdiction will be important. I think my distinguished colleague would agree with me that extended committee consideration means more American voices in the process, and an agreement of this significance—and the resulting implications of possible violations—call for supplemental review. Senator CORKER has reaffirmed the benefits of this process and so I thank him for his support.

I appreciate the leadership of my colleague and look forward to working with him to further advance constructive, deliberative consideration of an agreement that has multilateral effects on the security of our nation and its people.

Mr. CORKER. I agree with my colleague, the Senator from Alaska, that other committees should consider the relevant issues in their jurisdiction. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee will, of course, consider any resolution of approval or disapproval, but the involvement of other committees in the hearing process will certainly assist the full Senate as it debates this issue.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

I intend to vote for this bill because it provides appropriate congressional review of a tremendously important executive agreement that is now being negotiated by the world's major powers and Iran.

First of all, I want to point out that a final agreement with Iran would not be a treaty. It would be an executive agreement which follows agreements in the past going back at least until 1972.

In 1972, President Nixon signed the Shanghai Communique, which reestablished relations with China.

In 1975, the Ford administration signed the Helsinki Final Act, which eased tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War.

In 1986, at Reykjavik, Iceland, President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev discussed the possibility of complete nuclear disarmament. Even though no agreement was made, Reykjavik laid the groundwork for the 1987 Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty and the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty.

The next year, in 1987, the Reagan administration established the Missile Technology Control Regime. To this day it helps restrict the proliferation of nuclear-capable missiles and related technology.

In 2013, the United States and Russia came together and disarmed Syria of its most lethal chemical weapons.

Like a potential deal with Iran on its nuclear program, these examples are not treaties and did not require formal ratification by the Senate.

That said, I don't believe there has been an agreement in recent memory that has been as difficult or as complicated as the P5+1 negotiations.

Perhaps more than any other single subject in the 22 years I have been in the Senate, there has never been more secure briefings—both for the leadership of national security committees and the entire Senate—as we have received on the negotiations with Iran.

This constant engagement with Congress has created an opportunity for us to get involved in a constructive manner.

The elected representatives of this country should have an opportunity to weigh-in on and review this agreement.

Several bills have been offered by the Banking Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, but I believe the bill that was negotiated by Senators CORKER and CARDIN is an appropriate mechanism for Congress to review any agreement with Iran.

What this legislation is about is an agreement preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Nothing else. To put other issues on this bill jeopardizes the agreement taking shape between the United States, Russia, Germany, China, France, and the U.K. And that is because the only thing discussed in the negotiation has been a nuclear agreement.

Rather than adding extra issues, we should be evaluating the final agreement as it comes together over the coming months.

The bottom line is that this bill—as currently written—does not interfere with the ongoing negotiations. Adding extra issues at this time, no matter how important they may be, could derail diplomacy. As such, I will oppose them.

If a final agreement is reached, the bill requires Congress to review it within 30 days. If Members wish to prevent implementation of the agreement, the bill requires two-thirds of the Senate to vote in favor of a resolution of disapproval. The bill's requirement of an overwhelming majority to disapprove provides significant deference to the President, which is entirely appropriate. If an overwhelming majority of the Congress stands in opposition to an agreement, there is a high likelihood that the agreement will not work regardless of passage, since Congress would likely not vote to lift sanctions—something that has to be factored in to any long-term agreement.

I would like to speak briefly on the framework agreement announced on April 2, 2015. In my view it is strong and deserves to be supported.

For me, the technical assessment of Energy Secretary Moniz is critical. Secretary Moniz is an extremely distinguished nuclear physicist and a man I deeply respect. According to Secretary Moniz, the framework blocks Iran's four possible pathways to a nuclear weapon. Those are the plutonium pathway through the Arak heavy water reactor, the uranium pathway through the Natanz facility, the uranium pathway through the Fordow facility, and the covert pathway, where Iran enriches nuclear material for a weapon in secret.

When each of these pathways is explained in detail, the strength of the framework is apparent.

First, the agreement requires Iran to redesign the Arak heavy water reactor, making it impossible to produce weapons-grade plutonium. Iran will be required to ship the reactor's spent fuel abroad for the life of the reactor; prohibited from building another heavy water reactor, and indefinitely barred from researching the critical technologies needed to build a plutonium weapon. Under the framework, Iran will be prevented from developing a plutonium bomb forever.

Second, with regard to the Fordow facility, Iran will not be able to store nuclear material or conduct any enrichment-related research and development at the site. Only 1,000 of Iran's least efficient centrifuges will remain in the facility, about a third of what it has today. And they will not be used to enrich uranium. The facility, set deep in a mountainside, will become a nuclear medical research center, not a proliferation risk.

Third, with regard to Natanz, Iran will operate no more than 5,060 of its first-generation centrifuges, and it will enrich uranium far short of weapons grade. As Secretary Moniz has said, not only are the 5,060 centrifuges a stark decrease from their current inventory of nearly 20,000, but they are Iran's oldest and least capable model. Iran will place its more-advanced and more-capable second-generation centrifuges in storage under IAEA seal and supervision. Natanz will be the only location where Iran is permitted to enrich uranium, and solely for peaceful purposes.

Further, Iran will not be able to stockpile much of the material it can enrich at Natanz. Iran will only retain 300 kilograms of uranium gas enriched to 3.67 percent. That is a fraction of the nearly 10,000 kilograms of near-5 percent enriched uranium it has today.

Finally, the framework agreement blocks Iran's covert pathway to a nuclear weapon. The framework requires unprecedented inspection of all of Iran's nuclear facilities, including suspect sites.

In addition, Secretary Moniz notes that this access applies to ''the full uranium supply chain, from mines to centrifuge manufacturing and operation.''

Having eyes on Iran's entire supply chain makes it impossible for Iran to breakout using covert facilities. For instance, if uranium cannot be accounted for or if centrifuges go missing, the onus will be on Iran to explain what happened. If it cannot do so, sanctions can—and will—be reimposed. Iran will also be required to implement the Additional Protocol and Modified Code 3.1, which forever increase Iran's obligations to provide access to all of its nuclear sites anywhere in the country.

The combination of strict limits on Iran's nuclear program and highly intrusive inspections will extend Iran's breakout time—that is the time it would need to develop enough nuclear material for one nuclear weapon—from the estimated 2 to 3 months today to a year.

Under the framework, the international community will know if Iran attempts to skirt its obligations and will have sufficient time to respond.

If the P5+1 nations and Iran reach a final accord that reflects the framework agreement, Iran will be blocked from developing a nuclear weapon.

In addition to this important goal, an agreement could possibly reopen Iran to the world. It could provide Iran an opportunity to decrease its destabilizing activities in the region. A deal could potentially lead Iran to drop its financial and military support for Hezbollah and other proxies. Perhaps

more importantly, the nuclear deal could open the door to soliciting the help of Iran and Russia on an intractable and to date unsolvable issue: ending the Syrian civil war.

The regime, backed by Iran, of Bashar al-Assad has killed more than 200,000 of its own people and continues to commit war crimes with chemical weapons. Besides the sheer magnitude of the death toll, the manner in which Assad has killed so many—through the continued use of chemical weapons, barrel bombs, and even starvation—is abhorrent.

Further engagement with Iran could also aid our efforts to rid Iraq and Syria of ISIL and its grotesque campaign of terror.

It is far from certain that Iran will change its behavior, but it is far more likely with a nuclear deal than without. Without an agreement, the likelihood of a major military confrontation in the Middle East—as well as more chaos and instability—increases dramatically. This is to no one's benefit. Without an agreement, Iran's nuclear program would be unconstrained, directly jeopardizing the security of our partners and allies in the region, including Israel.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for this bill so that a comprehensive agreement with Iran will be strengthened by congressional review. It is my hope that this bill does not become a vehicle to scrap a verifiable agreement capable of preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. The coming months will bear that out.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I just want to clarify a few aspects of this legislation and to make clear the collective understanding of the Senate in acting on this bill.

First, we should be clear that the bill as it stands would prohibit, during the review period, any sanctions relief that goes beyond the JPOA or any materially identical extension, including but not limited to any increase in the amount of hard currency or other assets that Iran has access to under the JPOA.

That is, during the review period, the amount of relief available under the JPOA could still be offered, if an extension was agreed to in the timeframe provided for in the bill, but no additional amounts could be provided.

Second, the term ''statutory sanctions'' as used in the legislation means sanctions that Congress has imposed or specifically authorized with respect to Iran, including but not limited to all of the sanctions imposed with respect to Iran under the Iran Sanctions Act, the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act, and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

That is, the term statutory sanctions as used in the bill, means all of the sanctions contained in these statutes and other Iran-related sanctions that Congress has imposed.

Finally, as discussed during the committee markup, we all agree that the period for review only begins when all the documents required to be submitted along with the agreement itself and all of the annexes and other materials that are covered by the definition of agreement in the bill have been submitted to Congress.

That is, the period for review under our bill only begins to run when all of the documents that make up the agreement and have to be submitted with it are submitted to Congress, as provided in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the Corker substitute amendment No. 1140, that a point of order against all of the pending nongermane amendments be in order and be considered to have been made; that the Corker amendment No. 1179 be withdrawn; that the Senate consider and agree to the Corker-Cardin technical amendment No. 1219; that the Corker substitute amendment No. 1140, as amended, be adopted, the cloture motion on H.R. 1191 be withdrawn, and the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of H.R. 1191, as amended, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor to speak about the risk Iran poses to the world as a result of the legislation before the Senate at this moment.

A lot has been talked about in the media over the last months—years, quite frankly—about the notion we are going to work out a deal with Iran that will prevent war. Sadly, I believe the direction the deal is headed almost guarantees war at some point, certainly in our lifetime, but maybe before the end of the decade.

Let me back up and first describe the issue at hand. The issue at hand is that Iran, run by a radical Shia cleric—its government, I should say. Its people perhaps don't partake in this thought process, but its government whose head and supreme decisionmaker is a radical Shia cleric has made two decisions: The first is they feel it is their obligation to export their Islamic revolution everywhere in the world, and of course it begins with the Middle East; two, they have decided they want to become the hegemonic power in the region. They want to become the dominant nation, the dominant movement in the Middle East and in that entire region.

So how do you achieve that? First, it requires you to drive the Americans out of the area, which is why we have seen them invest in all sorts of asymmetrical capabilities, such as these small little swarm boats they sometimes use to harass U.S. naval vessels. That is why we saw them just a week ago basically hijack a commercial vessel in international waters.

The second thing they do is they sponsor terrorism. They have all these proxy groups in all these countries in the region doing their bidding. That is also asymmetrical warfare—asymmetrical meaning it is not frontal. It is using some nontraditional method to expand or to show their power. They use groups such as Hezbollah or the Houthis they are now involved with in Yemen and other parts of the world.

The threat is, if you attack Iran, these terrorist groups will attack you. In fact, we have seen the hand of the Iranian Government in terrorist attacks. For example, we saw an attempt to assassinate the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia here in Washington, DC. We know that in 1994 there was a bombing in Buenos Aires linked to Iran. So they sponsor terrorism.

The third aspect of their desire to become the hegemonic regional power is a nuclear weapon. What do you need to acquire a nuclear weapon? You need three things: The first thing you need is a bomb design. The truth is you can buy a bomb design. The second thing you need is a delivery system, an ability to deliver the weapon whether it is on an airplane or on a missile.

That is why Iran is developing long-range rockets. They are expending a lot of money—despite all the sanctions on them, they are expending a lot of money to build these long-range rockets. That isn't for some fancy fireworks show or to put a man on the Moon. They are building these long-range rockets because they understand that is the second critical component of a nuclear weapons program.

The third thing is you have to be able to get your hands on enriched uranium or reprocessed plutonium. No one in the world is going to import to them weapons-grade uranium or plutonium, so they have decided to build the infrastructure to do it themselves, and they do it the way North Korea did it. They do it the way other nations have done it when they tried to hide their programs. They do it by claiming they have a peaceful nuclear program they are trying to build. In essence, their argument is we don't want to build a weapon. We are just trying to build a nuclear reactor so we can provide electricity.

That argument makes no sense for two reasons: The first reason is this is an oil-rich country. They do not really need nuclear energy in order to provide cost-effective energy for their country, and the other reason is it costs so

much money to build the equipment to enrich and reprocess, they could just buy it already reprocessed or enriched. They could bring it into the country the way South Korea does and the way other nations do.

So if it would be cheaper to bring these things in by simply importing it, as opposed to spending all this money enriching and reprocessing it themselves, why are they spending all this money on the infrastructure? The answer is because, at some point in the future, they know they are going to want a nuclear weapon. Now, perhaps they haven't made the decision they need it today, next week or next year, but they certainly, at a minimum, want to have the option to be a threshold nuclear power.

I believe, knowing everything we know about them—both open source and classified—that whether they have decided to build a nuclear weapon or not, they will decide to build a nuclear weapon because it provides for them the sort of regime stability they crave.

The radical Shia cleric who heads that country looks at North Korea and he looks at Libya and he says: Libya is what happens when you don't have a nuclear capability. North Korea is what happens when you do. Muammar Qadhafi is dead and out of power, but North Korea is still run by that madman. Why? Because he has a nuclear weapon. You can't invade him or touch him because of what he will do in response.

I think they are guided by that principle. They are guided by the principle that they want to be the regional hegemonic power and nuclear weapons gives them that role. They are guided by a third equally sinister motivation; that is, the open and repeatedly stated desire to destroy the State of Israel, to wipe it of the face of the Earth. They haven't said this once in passing, the Supreme Leader of Iran has said this on hundreds of occasions.

In fact, every Friday in Iran, at government-sanctioned religious events, they chant ''Death to America'' and ''Death to Israel.'' If there is one lesson in history, it is that when a nation or leader repeatedly says that we are going to kill you, you should take that seriously. When the nation that says we are going to kill you is using its governmental money to sponsor terrorism, you should take that even more seriously. When the nation that is going out saying we are going to kill you and wipe you off the face of the Earth is reprocessing plutonium or enriching uranium, you have a right to be extremely scared.

The world understood this 8 years ago, 10 years ago, so it imposed U.N. Security Council sanctions on Iran—international sanctions. They were not easy to put together. A lot of countries in Europe had companies in those countries that were dying to do business in Iran. They didn't want these sanctions, but they did it. They were put in place. Then, about a year and a half or two ago, the President decided it was time to try to open up to Iran and try to work out a deal with them.

Look, in normal circumstances, there is nothing wrong with that; right? Two countries that have a disagreement on some issues can work things out. There is a place for diplomacy in the would. The problem is the issue we have with Iran is not based on a grievance. They are not mad we did something and so that is why they are acquiring a nuclear weapon and if only we stopped doing what it is that aggrieved them they would go away. This is not a grievance-based problem. This is an ideological problem.

If you read the founding documents of the Islamic Republic, it doesn't describe the Supreme Leader as the leader of Iran. Iran happens to be the country from which they operate. It describes him as the Supreme Leader of all Muslims in the world. That is why they believe it is their mandate, it is their calling to export their revolution to every corner of the planet but beginning in the Middle East, and the nuclear weapons capability would give them leverage in carrying out the goal they have. In their mind, nothing would be more glorious than the destruction of the Jewish State.

So the President enters these negotiations, and it has been a process of constant appeasement, moment after moment. We went from saying no enriching or reprocessing, to you can enrich and reprocess at 5 percent, to you can enrich up to 20 percent for research purposes. We went from saying no enrichment ever to saying in 10 or 15 years all bets are off.

There are still items in the negotiations that are not clear. The White House put out a fact sheet, a piece of paper, and it said this is what we agreed to. Iran put out a piece of paper just like it except it sounded like a totally different deal.

For example, the U.S. fact sheet said sanctions on Iran would not come off until Iran complied, but Iran's fact sheet said no, no, sanctions come off immediately. Now, when you press the White House on it, they refuse to say that, in fact, it will be phased in and not immediate.

That is why I filed an amendment. Even though I thought the President's deal as outlined in the fact sheet was not good enough, I filed an amendment to at least hold them to that. The amendment to this bill read very simply. It just said that whatever deal the President crafts has to reflect the fact sheet he provided the Senate, but we couldn't get a vote on it.

The other amendment I filed is that any deal with Iran should be conditioned on Iran recognizing Israel's right to exist, and here is why that was so important. That was important because this is not just about the nuclear program. The deal the President is trying to sign is about removing sanctions, meaning money is now going to flow back into the Iranian Government's coffers. What are they going to do with this money? Are they going to build roads, hospitals, donate it to charity? No. Are they going to buy food and medicine for people hurting around the world, the hundreds of thousands who have been displaced by Assad, their puppet? No. They will use that money to sponsor terrorism, and the prime target of the terrorism they sponsor is the State of Israel.

We couldn't get a vote on that amendment either. Apparently, there are Senators terrified of voting against that amendment, so they would rather not have a vote at all.

So I am deeply disappointed by the direction this debate has taken because I felt—and I understand this deal was carefully crafted because I am on the committee that passed it, but I also understand that every Member of the Senate has a right to be heard in this debate. Unfortunately, only a couple of amendments were allowed to be voted on, with no one else having an opportunity to get their amendments voted on, amendments I thought would make this bill much more meaningful.

Now we have reached this point where the majority leader has filed cloture on the bill because it is time to move on to these other issues, and I respect that. We now have to make a decision. The decision is not whether we are going to pass the bill we want or nothing at all, the decision is are we better off as a country with this bill or with no bill.

If we don't pass a bill, the Senate can still weigh in on the Iranian deal, but the Iranian deal kicks in immediately, and unless and until the Senate acts, the sanctions will be off. At least the U.S. sanctions will be off. There is also no guarantee the White House will even show us the agreement if we don't pass a bill.

If we pass a bill, it delays the sanctions being lifted for a period of time. It requires the White House to submit the deal to us so we can review it, and ultimately it calls for a vote—up or down—on approving the deal or not. It actually requires that the vote will have to happen, and there can't be any procedural process to impede it, for the most part.

So at the end of the day, while this bill does not contain the amendments—we didn't even get a vote on the amendments we wanted—it doesn't contain the different aspects I thought would make it stronger, if left with the choice we have now, I don't think there is any doubt we are in a better position if this bill passes because, at a minimum, it at least creates a process whereby the American people, through

their elected representatives, can debate an issue of extraordinary importance.

If I am troubled by anything, it is that while this issue gets a lot of coverage, I am not sure the coverage accurately reflects what a critical moment this is. I said at the outset that I think a bad deal almost guarantees war, and here is why. Because the State of Israel—such an important ally to the United States—is not thousands of miles away from Iran. Put yourself in their position for a moment. This small country, with a small population, 9 miles wide at its narrowest point—with a neighbor to the north that openly and repeatedly says it wants to destroy them and is on the verge of acquiring a nuclear capability—feels like their very existence is being threatened. Faced with that, Israel may very well take military action on their own to protect themselves. I think a bad deal exponentially increases the likelihood of that happening.

I also think we look at the other nations of the region, because Iran is a Shia country—a Shia Persian country—but its Sunni Arab neighbors aren't big fans of the Shia branch of Islam.

For example, Saudi Arabia, an incredibly wealthy country, has already said: Whatever Iran gets, we are going to get. If Iran gets the right to enrich and reprocess, we will enrich and reprocess. If Iran builds a weapon, we will build a weapon. And so it creates the very real specter that we will have an arms race—a nuclear arms race—in the Middle East. We are talking about a region of the world that has been unstable for 3,800 years.

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

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. We are talking about a region of the world that could have a nuclear arms race—one of the most unstable regions of the planet.

So I hope we are going to get a good deal. I am not hopeful that we will. But I think we are better off if we have this process in place. So I hope this bill passes here today so that at least we will have a chance to weigh in on an issue of critical importance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, my colleague from Florida knows the personal affection I have for him, and I enjoy so much his friendship and working with him on issues regarding Florida.

I think this is an example of how two Senators from the same State can come to different conclusions, apparently not about this legislation—advancing it, because this Senator will in fact vote to move this legislation forward—but on the ultimate judgment that we have to make.

Senator RUBIO has correctly stated, in my opinion, that Iran's is a regime that is bent on aggression, that they cannot be trusted, that Israel is threatened, and that we are basically the backstop protector of Israel. All of those things are very true.

But the question is what is in the interest of the national security of the United States—which, in most cases, always folds into what is in the interest of the national security of Israel as well—and the Senator and I come to different conclusions.

First of all, we don't know the final details. But we do know a framework that was put out, and if that framework is fleshed out, as is suggested, with the details by June 30, then the simple bottom line for this Senator is if it prevents Iran from building a nuclear weapon over at least a 10-year period, with the sufficient safeguards, intrusions, inspections—unannounced, as well—that prevent them from having a nuclear weapon without our getting, conservatively, a year's advanced notice and we know that is a guarantee for a 10-year period—if not 15 and 20 years—is that in the interest of the United States? And this Senator has concluded that yes, it is.

I hope the agreement comes out as suggested by the framework. I will be looking forward to examining that. And, as a result of our passing this legislation today, we will have a guarantee that we will vote on parts with regard to the lifting of sanctions, and we will be able to weigh in on the specifics.

It is interesting how two Senators from the same State can come out with such different conclusions having shared a lot of the similar information, as this Senator has served on the Intelligence Committee for 6 years and Senator RUBIO is on the Intelligence Committee as well.

It will be an interesting debate as we get into the details.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, it is interesting that I am not a Senator from Florida but I am a Senator who was born in Florida.

With due respect to my friend, Senator NELSON, there was something the Senator said that I had not thought to talk about, but I think we have to. It has to do with a bit of a shift in the thinking of this President, unlike any other President in the last 40 years, since the Ayatollahs have come into power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I hate to object. There is only 10 minutes remaining and all the time on the Republican side has been used up.

Would my colleague limit his remarks perhaps to 3 minutes so I could have a little bit of time on our side?

Mr. TILLIS. Yes, Mr. President.

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

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, with the limited time, first, I am concerned now that we have gone away from President after President saying that Iran could never have a nuclear weapon, to the words of: Well, Iran shouldn't be able to have one at least for 10 years. Or, if they do get one before 10 years, we will know about it a year in advance. That is a fundamental change in the direction of negotiations with this hostile regime.

That is the other thing in my limited time that I wish to point out. I think those of us who are voting for this bill today are voting in large part because of a distrust we have for the Supreme Leader and the regime in Iran. This is not about the Iranian people. There are tens of millions of Iranians that I believe are concerned with this deal as well. They are concerned that this is going to enable the Iranian government to continue to fund terror throughout the world through the Iran terror network. They are funding even Hamas, a natural enemy, to destabilize the region.

We need to worry about what the Prime Minister of Israel said just a few months ago here in this Chamber: This represents a dire threat. Does anyone think that Israel can stand by on their own and allow Iran to continue to be unfettered and potentially move forward with a nuclear program? I don't think so.

But I also want to make sure that the Iranian people know we are also concerned that we have a President who is willing to negotiate with a regime that is guilty of human rights violations, that is guilty of spreading terror through the world, that is guilty of meddling in the affairs of other Middle Eastern nations. And we are sitting along the sidelines and saying maybe we can still move this deal through, because at least knowing when Iran gets a nuclear weapon is better than the current state.

I think the current state is working. Sanctions are working. Pressure on Iran to respect human rights, to get out of the terror business is very important.

The last slide I wanted to show and that I wanted to spend more time on—how on Earth does anyone think that a nation that is not intent on launching a nuclear missile at some time would invest in this sort of infrastructure to reach different parts of the globe? It is

only a matter of time. Now, we have heard that maybe it will only be 10 years or maybe a year from when we find out about it. But make no mistake about it. If Iran is left alone, they are going to have the ability to deliver this sort of terror anywhere in the world.

That is why I will be supporting the bill, and hopefully, we can defeat any bad deal that comes from the administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, after 2 weeks on the floor, in a few moments we will have a chance to advance the Iran bill to passage and then vote on passage. I urge my colleagues to support the cloture motion and to support final passage.

First, I thank Senator CORKER. Senator CORKER has been an incredible partner, and the two of us have worked in the best interests not only of the Senate but in the best interests of our country. We recognize this Nation is stronger when in foreign policy we are united and speak with one voice. That is exactly what we were able to do in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 19 to 0.

This is an extremely controversial area. We understand that. But we reached a position where we could get a 19-to-0 vote in the committee. We were able to bring that forward and were able to get the administration to work with us on this. So the bill will be signed by the President of the United States.

I just want to thank Senator CORKER for his incredible leadership through these very difficult times so that we could reach this point.

It gives us the best chance to accomplish our goal. Our goal is to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state—pure and simple. We will be in a stronger position to achieve that objective with the passage of this legislation.

We understand what that means. We understand that it has to be an agreement that prevents Iran from a breakout capacity to have a nuclear weapon in a period of time where we would be compromised, because we know we have to be able to inspect, we have to be able to see what they are doing, and we have to be able to react if they cheat. This bill allows us to have that type of an oversight over such an agreement.

It spells out the proper role for Congress. It was in the 1990s that Congress started to impose sanctions against Iran for its nuclear weapons program. Only Congress can remove those sanctions or permanently change them. So it is in our interests to be able to have an orderly way to review an agreement. And it is an orderly review because it requires the President to submit the agreement to us so we have opportunities for open hearings and for closed hearings, to do what we need to in order to make our judgment as to how to proceed. There is no required action, but we could take the appropriate action, and we have the time to take the appropriate action.

Congress would then have oversight of the agreement. The administration would be required to report to us on a quarterly basis that Iran is in compliance with the agreement. If there is a material breach, there are expedited procedures for us to be able to take action to reimpose and strengthen the sanctions regime that is in place.

So it really gives us the opportunity not only to have oversight on a potential agreement if one is reached but then to monitor to make sure that the agreement is complied with.

But we go beyond that. I have heard a lot of my colleagues talk about Iran and what it is doing on its sponsoring of terrorism, what it is doing on human rights violations, their ballistic missile programs. We understand that. We require reports from the administration as to their activities in each of these areas. It is very clear, as the President made in his summary of the April 2 framework, that nothing in this agreement affects the other sanctions that are imposed against Iran because of ballistic missiles, because of terrorism or because of human rights issues.

So I think we have found the right balance.

Lastly, let me say we have also made it very clear in this agreement that the security of Israel is critically important, and we have spelled that out in our legislation.

So for all those reasons, I think the fact that we were able to reach this type of an agreement—we had a couple votes. The votes were pretty decisive as to how they came out on the floor. I thank all our colleagues for the way they cooperated with us on being able to reach this moment.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the time to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished ranking member. I will be very brief.

I thank our ranking member, who could not have been more of a gentleman, more of a leader on this issue, and I cannot thank him enough for his efforts and his staff's.

I thank also Senator MENENDEZ, who before was ranking member of the committee and is such a leader on this and has been from day one relative to the sanctions on Iran and bringing them to the table.

I would also thank Senator GRAHAM. We began this process in July of last year. And so many others have been involved. Senator GRAHAM obviously helped drive this. So did Senator KAINE, on the Democratic side of the aisle. But we have had so many rocks, such as JEFF FLAKE and others who have just been steady in helping make this happen.

Since there is only a short amount of time, I do want to encourage my colleagues here in the Senate to support this cloture motion. We have been on the floor now for 2 weeks, and I know there have been a lot of process issues that we have dealt with.

At the end of the day, without this bill there is no review of what happens relative to Iran. So we worked hard to create a great bipartisan balance. I think we have an opportunity to do something that really is in some ways a landmark piece of legislation, in that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a bipartisan way with a 19-to-0 vote has basically taken back the power that the President now has to work collaboratively to make sure that we have the opportunity to see the details, as my colleague has mentioned, of any deal that may be negotiated with Iran, that it stand before the Senate and give us time to actually go through those details, that we see all the classified annexes and everything that go with this. We have the opportunity, should we choose, to pass a resolution of approval or disapproval. And then, very importantly, the President has to certify every 90 days that Iran is in compliance.

So let me just restate that, without this bill, there is no limitation on the President's use of waivers to suspend the sanctions Congress has put in place. There is no requirement that Congress receive full details of any agreement with Iran. There is no review period for Congress to examine and weigh in on an agreement. There is no requirement that the President certify Iran is complying. And there are really no expedited procedures for Congress to reimpose rapidly sanctions should Iran cheat.

So, in summary, no bill, no review; no bill, no oversight. I think the American people want the Senate and the House of Representatives on their behalf to ensure that Iran is accountable, that this is a transparent process, and that they comply.

With that, I concede that the Presiding Officer wants to move ahead.

Again, I thank our ranking member for his distinguished service and all of my colleagues who have brought us to this moment.

I yield the floor.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Corker amendment No. 1140 to H.R. 1191, an

act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Joni Ernst, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, Shelley Moore Capito, Thad Cochran, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Kelly Ayotte, Cory Gardner, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, John Cornyn.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Corker amendment No. 1140 to H.R. 1191, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Ayotte	Franken	Paul
Baldwin	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cardin	Johnson	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott
Cassidy	Kirk	Sessions
Coats	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cochran	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Corker	Markey	Thune
Cornyn	McCain	Tillis
Crapo	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Vitter
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Enzi	Mikulski	Warren
Ernst	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—6

Cotton	Grassley	Moran
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan

NOT VOTING—1

Boxer

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). On this vote, the yeas are 93, the nays are 6.

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

Under the previous order, amendments Nos. 1155; 1186, as modified; 1197; and 1198 fall, as they are not germane.

Amendment No. 1179 is withdrawn.

Amendment No. 1219 is agreed to.

The amendment agreed to is as follows:

(Purpose: To make technical changes)

On page 7, line 17, strike ''the Congress'' and insert ''both Houses of Congress''.

On page 7, strike line 24 and insert ''such passage''.

On page 8, line 6, strike ''the Congress'' and insert ''both Houses of Congress''.

On page 9, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

''(7) DEFINITION.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this subsection, the terms ''transmittal,'' ''transmitted,'' and ''transmission'' mean transmittal, transmitted, and transmission, respectively, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

On page 10, lines 13 and 14, strike ''the Congress adopts, and there is enacted,'' and insert ''there is enacted''.

On page 10, lines 17 and 18, strike ''the Congress adopts, and there is enacted'' and insert ''there is enacted''.

On page 13, line 17, strike ''enhance'' and insert ''reduce''.

On page 17, line 9, strike ''covert action'' and insert ''covert activities''.

On page 19, strike lines 8 through 17 and insert the following:

''(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION.—

''(1) INITIATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the event the President does not submit a certification pursuant to subsection (d)(6) during each 90-day period following the review period provided in subsection (b), or submits a determination pursuant to subsection (d)(3) that Iran has materially breached an agreement subject to subsection (a) and the material breach has not been cured, qualifying legislation introduced within 60 calendar days of such event shall be entitled to expedited consideration pursuant to this subsection.

''(B) DEFINITION.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this paragraph, the terms 'submit' and 'submits' mean submit and submits, respectively, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute amendment, No. 1140, as amended, is agreed to.

The cloture motion on H.R. 1191 is withdrawn.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Ayotte	Gardner	Paul
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cardin	Johnson	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott
Cassidy	Kirk	Sessions
Coats	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cochran	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Corker	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	Markey	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Cruz	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Vitter
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Enzi	Mikulski	Warren
Ernst	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Wyden
Flake	Murray	

NAYS—1

Cotton

NOT VOTING—1

Boxer

The bill (H.R. 1191), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the title amendment to H.R. 1191, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 1220) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.''.

Mr. CORKER. I yield the floor.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Thank you, Mr. President.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Before my colleagues leave the floor, let me just offer my congratulations to the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Maryland, who have shepherded this important piece of legislation, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, across the Senate floor.

I think we are all reminded every time we take up some consensus legislation and find all the traps and obstacles to passage that this is not an easy process. But it was not designed to be

easy. It was designed to force consensus before a bill actually is passed into law. Thanks to the patience and the tenacity of our colleague from Tennessee and our colleague from Maryland, we have done that today, and I thank them very much for that.

This legislation guarantees that Congress will have the opportunity and the time to scrutinize any agreement reached between the administration and the P5+1 nations with regard to Iran's nuclear program. This is to my mind the single greatest threat—not only to regional peace but to world peace—and that is the prospect of an Iranian nuclear program, a nuclear weapon.

This bill prohibits the President from lifting sanctions that Congress has worked on for so long during this period of time. That is another important feature. But the most important part of this is the fact that Congress will have the right to vote for or against any change in the status quo when it comes to Iran. This bill will serve as a congressional check if there is a bad deal with Iran, and it will allow the American people through their elected representatives to consider carefully whether this potential agreement is a good one.

I have been amazed to read in the newspaper and to see on TV that the President has negotiated a deal. When one asks to read the deal, you find out there is no deal. There is a so-called framework. But if a deal is reached between our negotiating team negotiating with Iran and the P5+1 countries, then Congress will have an opportunity—and through us the American people will have the opportunity—to read it and to understand it. We will have the opportunity then to debate it, and as I said, we will have the opportunity then to vote up or down on this deal once a deal is struck, if a deal is struck.

But I wonder sometimes about the naivete of the administration when it comes to negotiating with the world's foremost State sponsor of international terror. This is a regime that has been killing Americans—mainly by proxy—since the early 1980s. Of course we should not and we cannot trust Iran to do the right thing. It makes it even more necessary for Congress to put all aspects of any deal under a microscope, as we will.

While the President has been negotiating this vague and convoluted framework, the Iranian regime has done nothing to earn the trust of the American people or our allies. Just the opposite is true. Iran has only proven that it is untrustworthy and that it will stop at nothing to further its influence throughout the Middle East at the expense of the United States and our allies.

You don't have to look any further than the New York Times to find a relevant example of Iran's doublespeak—speaking out of both sides of its mouth. Just last month in a New York Times op-ed, Iran's Foreign Minister argued that the United States and the P5+1 countries should reach a final agreement in order to promote the stability and security of the region.

The Foreign Minister, Mohammad Zarif, wrote of the need for ''a regional dialogue'' to ''promote understanding . . . on a broad spectrum of issues,'' among them, ''ensuring freedom of navigation and the free flow of oil and other resources. . . .''

Well, this very article proves that to think we can negotiate with Iran in good faith is pure fiction. Just this past week, it was reported that U.S. Navy warships have had to accompany British and American commercial vessels through the Strait of Hormuz, an international shipping lane that links the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, after the Iranian navy seized a commercial vessel last week.

Reports of another naval scuffle between the United States and Iran was reported yesterday just off the coast of Yemen. Is this how Iran has been working to ensure freedom of navigation in this region?

Well, of course this is just one example of Iran's most recent deceptive tactics. This is the kind of regime that has been, as I said, on our State Department's list as the lead State for sponsorship of terrorism since 1984.

Now the Obama administration seeks to cut a deal with the regime, a country that publicly admits wanting to destroy Israel and to build its empire and influence in places such as war-torn Syria and Iraq. The Obama administration's framework does nothing to hold Iran accountable for its proxy wars or for this type of regional adventurism. Even more concerning, this ambiguous understanding that the President released last month would abandon longstanding U.S. policy of preventing a nuclear-armed Iran and replace it with a feeble plan to contain it.

I remember, as the Presiding Officer no doubt remembers, Prime Minister Netanyahu was just here a few weeks ago. He said that rather than prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, this framework would pave the path toward a nuclear Iran. The deal also forces the American people to trust the Iranian leadership with threshold nuclear capabilities, without allowing for adequate inspections of all of Iran's nuclear sites by international agencies, both civilian and military. This is unacceptable and dangerous. It also underscores why this legislation that we just passed is so important.

This legislation is vitally important because it is a congressional backstop against an Iranian regime that is well known for its lies and international deception. Guaranteeing the time and the opportunity for Congress to scrutinize this misguided deal is essential. Providing the American people with the kind of transparency they deserve to understand what has been negotiated on their behalf is absolutely critical.

America's elected representatives must be able to get every and any detail on this emerging deal. That is one reason why I think this legislation is so important. We need the time and space to review it. This bill provides for that. It gives us an opportunity to understand its terms and debate its implications.

I am encouraged by the vote we just had, a near unanimous vote on this legislation. This is important because this President has shown a predisposition to try to go it alone, not only in foreign affairs and national security matters but on immigration, health care, and the like.

It is past time for Congress to stand up and tell the President that he cannot act alone. Our Constitution contemplates three coequal branches of government, and Congress on behalf of the American people cannot be frozen out of the debate and the decisionmaking when it comes to something as important as an Iranian nuclear negotiation.

I see another Senator ready to speak.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER AND SOLVING PROBLEMS IN OUR COMMUNITIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today is the National Day of Prayer. It is a day where we as a nation have an opportunity simply to get on our knees and ask God for Divine intervention and ask the Lord for help.

Our Nation is, indeed, an amazing nation, a great nation, a nation with a destiny. I think it is important for us to take the time to remind ourselves, as part of the foundation of this very Nation, that there is a foundation of faith.

As I think about that foundation of faith and the need for prayer, it is hard not to remember that the last year has proven to be a difficult time for low-income communities and minority communities throughout this country. It is time for us to have a national conversation about solving some of the problems that we see arising in communities around the Nation. Whether those communities are in Ferguson or Baltimore, Ohio or Oklahoma or in my hometown of North Charleston, SC, finding solutions is critical.

I believe that a part of the puzzle includes body cameras to be worn by our officers. Body cameras are simply not a fantasy but a part of a larger puzzle to provide solutions to communities that are distressed. I know firsthand that the solutions in my Opportunity Agenda work.

As a kid growing up in a single parent household, I drifted in the wrong

direction. I struggled in school. I had a difficult time. I was a hopeless kid in a challenging situation. I will state that as I look around the Nation, many of the challenges we see today are kids just like me, growing up in places like where I grew up, looking for hope, looking for leadership.

I believe that embedded in my Opportunity Agenda we have some of the solutions that can help heal and restore as well as direct and instruct these communities into places of hope and opportunity. I believe that too often we see impoverished communities and distressed communities as high-risk communities. I prefer to see them as high-potential communities, communities where greatness breeds and lives. We just need to find an avenue to harness the potential and move forward.

I am hopeful that as we focus on the issues that are embedded in the Opportunity Agenda—issues such as education, and I mean a quality education in every ZIP Code in America and that we should have high-performing schools in those ZIP Codes. That includes school choice, whether it is charter or virtual or home schools or public schools. We need to have a serious and robust conversation about school choice.

Work skills are so important. In so many of these communities the unemployment rate is over 30 percent—a 30-percent unemployment rate. We can challenge those statistics by looking at the work skills and also by looking at apprenticeship programs, where you can earn and learn at the exact same time. We are breathing new hope into these communities. I also think that when we think about the future, we must think about the chance to save the future of so many of these young kids who may be losing hope in our country, who may be losing hope in their communities, and perhaps losing hope in themselves.

We have a chance to make a difference in this next generation.

I thank Senator GRASSLEY, our chairman of the Judiciary Committee, along with Senator GRAHAM, our subcommittee chair, for agreeing to hold a hearing on the use of body cameras in the next few weeks. I believe the hearing on body cameras will produce important information on how we can deal with some of the challenges in some of our distressed communities.

I believe we can find ways to restore hope and create opportunities for every single child in America.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CELEBRATING THE 10TH ANNUAL SEÑORAS OF EXCELLENCE AND SEÑORES OF DISTINCTION AWARDS GALA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 10th Annual Señoras of Excellence and Señores of Distinction Awards Gala hosted by the Foundation for Excellence and Distinction in Las Vegas, NV.

The Foundation for Excellence and Distinction was created by Sandy and Roger Peltyn with the sole purpose of raising funds to award scholarships for young Nevada students pursuing excellence in higher education. Over the last 10 years, the Foundation has awarded more than 700 scholarships through local charities, including the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, UNLV, Foundation, Nevada State College, Nevada Hospital Association, the Center for Academic Enrichment and Outreach at UNLV, College of Southern Nevada, Puerto Rican Association Scholarship Fund, HEART for children with AUTISM, Latin Chamber of Commerce Scholarship Fund, City Impact Center, and Miss Nevada Scholarship Organization. These scholarships would have not been possible without the support of the people of Nevada and the immeasurable contributions and collaboration from Karen Cashman and Ellie Hirschfield.

The foundation has recognized many strong señoras and señores throughout the community for their work to encourage the success of future generations. A Señora of Excellence can best be described as a woman who is confident in her beliefs, loyal to family and friends, accepts victories and disappointments with grace, and rises above life's challenges. A Señor of Distinction is a man who bases his life on principles, raises spirits, never lets people down, and makes sacrifices for future generations without expecting to receive anything in return.

We pay tribute to this year's award recipients and the previous honorees of the Señoras of Excellence and Señores of Distinction, Lifetime Achievement, Corporation of Distinction, and Humanitarian of the Year awards. This year, my dear friend Wayne Newton is the recipient of the Humanitarian of the Year award. I am grateful for his commitment to supporting education and his fierce advocacy for improving the lives of our Nation's service men and women.

I thank the foundation for their continued leadership and commitment to youth education and congratulate this year's award recipients. I wish the foundation continued success in the years to come.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, we have reached a tipping point in President Obama's quest for a ''legacy''. Ukraine is on fire; Senior Chinese generals openly boast of their desire to settle millennial scores with their neighbors; Al Qaeda is stronger than ever; ISIS is massacring Christians with a genocidal savagery the likes of which we have not seen since World War II; and Israel feels abandoned. American foreign policy is rudderless, bringing to mind Lewis Carroll's comment from Alice Through the Looking Glass, ''If you don't know where you are going any road can take you there.''

Now the President has staked his name on reaching a deal with the Ayatollahs no matter how dangerous or destabilizing the final accord is. If the Iranians agree to this, and from their own hegemonic interest they would be foolish not to, the Israeli hand will be forced as it was with the Iraqi Osirik reactor in 1981; or at the least, a Middle East nuclear arms race, that pulls in Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and the Gulf States, will begin.

Mr. Obama has turned his back on decades of assurances from Presidents of both parties that Iran would not acquire nuclear weapons. He has willfully ignored 40 years of hostility from Tehran. If the President does not recognize that we are at war, the mullahs certainly do. They are the chief sponsor of global terror. They have never stepped back from their desire to obliterate Israel and to destroy the United States. Our Arab friends see Iran creating a satellite ''Shia Crescent'' stretching to the Mediterranean and consisting of Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon. To their south and west, they see Iran gaining control of Yemen. Shia Iran is so obsessed with its race to dominate the Middle East that it is funneling millions of dollars to the Sunni terrorist group Hamas, to fund their war against Israel, even though the Sunnis are religious enemies.

Tehran has a 9-figure line item in its budget to support terrorism, sending hundreds of millions of dollars to various groups each year; the payments to Hezbollah alone are as much as $200 million annually. According to Canadian intelligence, ''[I]n February 1999, it was reported that Palestinian police discovered documents that attest to the transfer of $35 million to Hamas from the Iranian Intelligence Service (MOIS), money reportedly meant to finance terrorist activities against Israeli targets.'' Illustrating how such support is part of official government policy, from 2001 to 2006, Iran transferred $50 million to Hezbollah fronts

in Lebanon by sending funds from its central bank through Bank Saderat's London office.

Mr. President, 40 years ago, Richard Nixon confronted Soviet incursions into the Middle East. The so called Nixon Doctrine laid the foundation for a peaceful pro-Western resolution of the various crises in the region. Nixon made it clear to everyone that the United States would not abandon Israel. Israel would be backed by the power of the United States in any conflict with its Soviet backed Arab neighbors and against the Soviet Union itself. One by one, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and the Emirates, recognized the futility of armed hostility to Israel and backed away from Moscow and made peace, an imperfect peace but peace nonetheless. Golda Meir called President Nixon ''the best friend Israel ever had.''

In the region's west, Nixon promoted a secular pro-Western Iran, albeit under the imperfect leadership of the Shah. Nevertheless, the Shah bottled the Soviet Navy from entering the Persian Gulf and Iran's economy took off—until Jimmy Carter decided to aid the transfer of the Ayatollah Khomeini from his Paris exile back to Iran—in the name of human rights. We have reaped the whirlwind.

Now we have the Obama Doctrine. America is the problem. Israel is viewed as an obstacle to peace and Iran is treated as another oppressed constituency with legitimate grievances against the West, so much so that when millions of Iranians took to the streets against the mullahs, President Obama did nothing and said nothing—strengthening the hand of the clerics. When the Egyptian generals overthrew the Muslim Brotherhood, who were waging war against Coptic Christians and openly spoke of renewing the fight against Israel—the State Department condemned them as ''undemocratic.'' The old American alliances are collapsing in confusion and fear and the only answer from the administration seems to be to clear Iran's path toward a nuclear weapon.

The greatest concession in the current negotiations has been the abandonment of the original U.S. position of preventing Iran from having a nuclear-weapons capability. This was the stance of the Bush administration. It was also the position of the Obama administration until November 2013. This is a disaster. Here is what we know as acknowledged by the Obama administration negotiators including the Secretaries of State and Energy:

There will be no limits on Iran's ballistic-missile force, the means for delivering its nuclear weapons. The U.S. position of seeking limits on the missile force was abandoned when the Supreme Leader objected and Obama conceded.

There will be no resolution of Iran's weaponization activities. Iran will promise once again to cooperate with the IAEA, but no one expects anything other than more Iranian obstacles. A resolution of weaponization activities was also a precondition for an agreement.

Inspections will be based on managed access but only on Iran's terms. At one point, the U.S. insisted that effective verification required full access to facilities and people. Under the Obama plan there will be no inspections of military sites much less suspected covert facilities such as the Lavizan-3 site or the Fordow weapons complex buried deep in the Iranian mountains.

Obama will allow the Arak heavy-water reactor to be modified but not in any way that prevents Iran from using it to produce plutonium for weapons. Again, the initial Obama position was that the reactor must be dismantled.

The economic sanctions, particularly the banking freeze that wrecked the Iranian economy will be lifted. In fact, Tehran has already received billions of dollars just for continuing the negotiations. It has already freed the Russians to sell the advanced S–300 air defense system. As agitation against the mullahs was growing we have given them a lifeline. Squeezing Iran economically, aided by the fall in worldwide oil prices, was the surest way to force concessions. Once the sanctions are lifted it will be nearly impossible to go back.

The restrictions on Iran's nuclear program will reportedly be phased out after 10 years, a period shorter than the time it has taken to negotiate the agreement. The original U.S. position was that restrictions would be permanent. As Henry Kissinger said, far from enabling the President's goal of disengaging from the Middle East, the framework will necessitate a deepening involvement in the region under a complex ''new order'' dictated by a nuclear Iran.

Iran will be allowed to operate thousands of centrifuges to enrich uranium and to pursue research and development of more advanced systems. The original U.S. position—backed by multiple U.N. Security Council resolutions demanding complete suspension of all enrichment activities—was zero enrichment and zero centrifuges. Under President Obama, zero was abandoned as unrealistic, and the number of permitted centrifuges moved up, according to the Secretary of Energy from 1,000 to 4,000 to 6,000. Iran has rejected each offer as insufficient, only to be rewarded with a better one. That is how the administration negotiates—from behind.

In his 1987 State of the Union Address, Ronald Regan warned us:

> Our approach is not to seek agreement for agreement's sake but to settle only for agreements that truly enhance our national security and that of our allies. We will never put our security at risk or that of our allies just to reach an agreement . . . No agreement is better than a bad agreement.

There you have it. Our allies—Israel, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf States, Jordan, and Egypt—are worried. Tehran is on the march and moving closer to nuclear status. As Charles Krauthammer noted, ''the one great hope for Middle East peace, the strategic anchor for forty years'', is giving the green light to both. That is not a legacy of which to be proud.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE NEVADA APPEAL'S 150TH BIRTHDAY

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize the 150th birthday of the Silver State's oldest daily newspaper, the Nevada Appeal. I am proud to honor this publication that brings high-quality news to Nevada's capital.

Growing up in Carson City, this newspaper has played a role in my life since I was a young boy. Each morning, two of my brothers would deliver the Nevada Appeal to the local community. Of course, I was their No. 1 substitute whenever they were unable to go. During this time, the paper was located at the Brewery Art Center. We went there each morning to fold the papers and take off to deliver them. These are memories I will never forget. It gives me great pleasure to see this publication celebrate 150 years, making it the longest continuously operating business in Carson City.

The Nevada Appeal, originally called the Carson Daily Appeal, was founded on May 16, 1865, by local businessmen E.F. McElwin, J. Barrett, and Marshall Robinson. Original editor Harry Mighels joined the team only a few days later. Over the next 100 years, the Nevada Appeal would see about 30 competitors. By 1868, Mighels had bought a few of the other local publications, and in 1870, he sold to C.L. Perkins and H.S. Street. In February of 1872, John Boothe, a newsman of Gold Hill, Virginia City, and Unionville, bought the paper. Following this in September of 1872, Mighels re-bought the newspaper and kept it in the family until 1945, when it was bought by W.L. Davis. In 1947, the paper was sold to Arthur Suverkrup, who changed the name to Nevada Appeal. Donrey Media bought out the paper in 1951 and then sold it to an investor group in 1993. Finally, in 1995, the Nevada Appeal was sold to Swift Communications, which remains the owner today.

The newspaper is delivered 6 days a week, Tuesday through Sunday, in the mornings and has a daily readership of over 25,000, including 35,000 on Sundays. It has been recognized by the Nevada Press Association, Associated Press, and Swift Communications, receiving numerous awards. The accolades are

well deserved, recognizing the hard work of the staff and quality of the writing.

Throughout its 150 years, the Nevada Appeal has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of journalism. I am both humbled and honored to call this publication a historic piece of Nevada. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Nevada Appeal on its 150th birthday.●

CONGRATULATING FAVIL WEST

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Favil West, cofounder and president of the Foundation Assisting Seniors, on receiving Nevada Senior Citizen of the Year for 2015. It gives me great pleasure to recognize his years of hard work and dedication to Southern Nevada's senior community.

Mr. West started the nonprofit organization in 2002, seeking to improve the quality of life for seniors. The foundation assists with challenges during times of illness, recovery, confinement at home, and coping with loss of a loved one, as well as provides assistance with everyday tasks such as household maintenance and transportation. Mr. West leads the board of trustees and also works with the foundation committees to ensure all seniors are being served effectively and efficiently. The individual committees provide transportation to drive seniors to health service appointments and to the grocery store, provide minor home maintenance services, deliver an inventory of durable medical equipment, and maintain a resource directory with information on free services. Each year, the foundation responds to thousands of requests to care for senior citizens in Southern Nevada. Mr. West's work in the local community is invaluable.

He has contributed greatly to growing the foundation, which now serves multiple communities throughout Southern Nevada. He spearheaded a new program, the HowRU Program, which is designed to minimize risks of seniors living alone by maintaining contact with clients. Subscribers are contacted daily to eliminate unreported injuries in the senior community. He has also improved outreach to garner more volunteers and community support to aid in transportation, equipment, and home maintenance needs.

Mr. West received the ''Premier Community Award for Making a Difference in Their Neighborhood'' from the city of Henderson in December of 2014. He also received 8 News Now Acts of Kindness recognition in October 2014 and FOX 5 News Shining Star recognition in 2013.

It is not only Mr. West's work in the senior community that deserves recognition, but also his service to our great Nation as a Vietnam-era combat veteran. I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. West for his courageous contributions to the United States of America. His service to his country and his bravery earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation.

I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing Favil West, whose work is both noble and charitable. I am humbled and honored to recognize Mr. West for his tireless efforts in helping our senior community, and I wish him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING CROWNS 4 KIDS

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, many of our Nation's successful small businesses started as an idea that took root from big dreams and even bigger imaginations. This week's Small Business of the Week, Crowns 4 Kids of Madisonville, LA, is an excellent example of how our next generation of Louisianians are dreaming big and influencing the world around them.

Earlier this year when Harlan Jackson Adams began painting acrylic pictures of crowns for his mother, Erica Adams, he had no idea how far his fun, quirky canvases would go. Word quickly spread across his mother's social media accounts that her talented son had found a new hobby. Friends and family began requesting crown paintings of their own, and within 2 weeks, young Harlan had over 200 orders to fill.

Demand for Adam's simple, elegant crowns grew so much among friends and family that the young entrepreneur decided to share his success with kids in need. Erica was astonished when her 7-year-old proclaimed that he wanted to donate his profits to the cancer center at Children's Hospital New Orleans. Unaware that Harlan knew about or understood what cancer is, Erica was overwhelmingly proud of her son's humility and generosity when he explained that two kids he knew were battling cancer and he wanted to help. Harlan is now an honorary member of the Distributive Education Clubs of America, a youth entrepreneurship organization, and plans to continue his charitable work.

When our young folks take the initiative to help others in the capacity that young Harlan has, we owe them our utmost respect and recognition. It is my great honor to recognize Harlan Jackson Adams and Crowns 4 Kids as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for inspiring both kids and adults to dream big and give generously.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following concurrent resolution was read, and placed on the calendar:

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution stating the policy of the United States regarding the release of United States citizens in Iran.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1238. A bill to provide for an accounting of total United States contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1239. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1240. A bill to designate the Cerro del Yuta and Rio San Antonio Wilderness Areas in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1241. A bill to provide for the modernization, security, and resiliency of the electric grid, to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs for research, development, demonstration, and information-sharing for cybersecurity for the energy sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING:

S. 1242. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to consider regional constraints in natural gas supply and whether a proposed LNG terminal would benefit regional consumers of natural gas before approving or disapproving an application for the LNG terminal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KING):

S. 1243. A bill to facilitate modernizing the electric grid, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1244. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish signal quality and content requirements for the carriage of public, educational, and governmental channels, to preserve support of such channels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 1245. A bill to provide for oversight of, and place restrictions on, Federal programs that provide equipment to law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1246. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to revise the definition of municipal solid waste for purposes of the renewable electricity production credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1247. A bill to designate Union Station in Washington, DC, as ''Harry S. Truman Union Station''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1248. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to reform the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1249. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide protections for active duty military consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1250. A bill to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1251. A bill to implement the Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, as adopted at Lisbon, Portugal on September 28, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1252. A bill to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1253. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of certain disposable medical technologies under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1254. A bill to provide for the issuance and sale of a semipostal by the United States Postal Service to support effective programs targeted at improving permanency outcomes for youth in foster care; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1255. A bill to designate certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to authorize certain land exchanges in the State of Oregon, and to convey certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Oregon to Wheeler County, Oregon, for economic and community development purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 1256. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy storage research program, loan program, and technical assistance and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1257. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 1258. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a distributed energy loan program and technical assistance and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1259. A bill to establish a grant program to allow National Laboratories to provide vouchers to small business concerns to improve commercialization of technologies developed at National Laboratories and the technology-driven economic impact of commercialization in the regions in which National Laboratories are located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1260. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to revise and update its sponsorship identification rules applicable to commercial and political advertising; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 1261. A bill to ensure that methods of collecting taxes and fees by private citizens on behalf of State and local governments are fair and effective and do not discriminate against interstate commerce for wireless telecommunications; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax-preferred Small Business Start-up Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1263. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Fund to assist United States businesses with exporting clean energy technology products and services; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 15. A joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 174. A resolution recognizing May 2015 as ''Jewish American Heritage Month'' and honoring the contributions of Jewish Americans to the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

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

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Con. Res. 16. A concurrent resolution stating the policy of the United States regarding the release of United States citizens in Iran; placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children

with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 373

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 389

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 389, a bill to amend section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that annual State report cards reflect the same race groups as the decennial census of population.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 619

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to include among the principal trade negotiating objectives of the United States regarding commercial partnerships trade negotiating objectives with respect to discouraging activity that discourages, penalizes, or otherwise limits commercial relations with Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 841

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 841, a bill to expand eligibility for health care under the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to include certain veterans seeking mental health care, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1109

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1109, a bill to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1126

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

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 168, a resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 174—RECOGNIZING MAY 2015 AS ''JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH'' AND HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JEWISH AMERICANS TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 174

Whereas in May of each year, people across the United States recognize and celebrate over 350 years of Jewish contributions to the United States through recognizing Jewish American Heritage Month;

Whereas Congress has a decades-long tradition of officially recognizing Jewish American heritage.

Whereas, in the words of President Ronald Reagan, ''[a]t this time of year, it is appropriate for all Americans to acknowledge how much our country has benefitted from the contributions of American Jews'';

Whereas May has been designated Jewish American Heritage Month since 2006;

Whereas the United States has always been a nation built on the achievements of immigrants, and Jewish Americans have strengthened the society of the United States and contributed significantly to all areas of life in the United States since the time when Jewish immigrants first arrived on the shores of the United States;

Whereas the success of Jewish Americans is a reminder of the gift of religious freedom and the importance of strong commitment to community and faith;

Whereas 2015 is the 70th anniversary of the end of the Holocaust and honoring the survivors of the Holocaust and their remarkable stories is more important than ever;

Whereas much work has been done in diverse cities such as New York to foster transformational social change and unite people of every racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious background; and

Whereas countless Jewish Americans and Jewish organizations have enriched the society of the United States and shaped this great country, including—

(1) a Czechoslovakian immigrant who survived the Holocaust as a small child, authored an inspiring story of her survival, *A Candle in the Heart*, and has devoted her life to telling her story to make the world a better place and stop hatred;

(2) Jewish Americans who fight for justice on behalf of those least able to defend themselves;

(3) Jewish Americans who are devoted to advancing civil rights for all people of the United States and promoting intercultural understanding;

(4) a Bukharian Chief Rabbi who came to the United States as a young immigrant and worked to build the Bukharian American community from a small group into a vast community of over 65,000 members, many of whom immigrated to the United States seeking a better life free from oppression; and

(5) Aish HaTorah International, the largest Jewish outreach organization of its kind in the world, which demonstrates that in the United States, people may freely connect with their culture and religious heritage and contribute to the fabric of life in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes May 2015 as Jewish American Heritage Month and will celebrate Jewish American heritage on May 20, 2015; and

(2) expresses appreciation for the significant contributions made by Jewish Americans to the United States of America.

SENATE RESOLUTION 175—RECOGNIZING THE ROLES AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE TEACHERS OF THE UNITED STATES TO BUILDING AND ENHANCING THE CIVIC, CULTURAL, AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 175

Whereas education and knowledge provide the foundation of the current and future strength of the United States;

Whereas teachers and other education staff have earned and deserve the respect of students and communities for the selfless dedication of the teachers to community service and to the futures of the children of the United States;

Whereas the purpose of National Teacher Appreciation Week, celebrated from May 4 through May 8, 2015, is to raise public awareness of the unquantifiable contributions of teachers and to promote greater respect and understanding for the teaching profession; and

Whereas students, schools, communities, and a number of organizations representing educators are hosting teacher appreciation events in recognition of National Teacher Appreciation Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate thanks the teachers of the United States and promotes the profession of teaching by encouraging students, parents, school administrators, and public officials to participate in teacher appreciation events during National Teacher Appreciation Week.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—STATING THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES REGARDING THE RELEASE OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN IRAN

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. CON. RES. 16

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON RELEASE OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Saeed Abedini of Idaho is a Christian pastor unjustly detained in Iran since 2012 and sentenced to eight years in prison on charges related to his religious beliefs.

(2) Amir Hekmati of Michigan is a former United States Marine unjustly detained in 2011 while visiting his Iranian relatives and sentenced to 10 years in prison for espionage.

(3) Jason Rezaian of California is a Washington Post journalist credentialed by the Government of Iran. He was unjustly detained in 2014 and has been held without a trial.

(4) Robert Levinson of Florida is a former Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) official who disappeared in 2007 in Iran. He is the longest held United States citizen in United States history.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that—

(1) the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran should immediately release Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, and Jason Rezaian, and cooperate with the United States Government to locate and return Robert Levinson; and

(2) the United States Government should undertake every effort using every diplomatic tool at its disposal to secure their immediate release.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1216. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1217. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1218. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1219. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, supra.

SA 1220. Mr. CORKER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1191, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1216. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, line 18, insert '', including any agreed text for any United Nations Security Council resolutions to be considered with respect to Iran'' after ''future''.

SA 1217. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 16, strike ''agreement; and'' and insert ''agreement;''.

On page 3, line 15, strike ''purpose.'' and insert ''purpose; and''.

On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

''(D) the agreed text or agreed parameters of any United Nations Security Council resolutions to be considered with respect to Iran.

SA 1218. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

''(L) An assessment of the relationship between Iran and any country of proliferation concern, as that term is defined in section 1055(g)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (50 U.S.C. 2371(g)(2)), including specifically an assessment of any sharing or transfer of any goods, materials, technology, or information related to the creation, research, development, deployment, or use of dual use material, ballistic missiles, fissile material, nuclear weapons, or related items.

SA 1219. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1140 proposed by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill H.R. 1191, to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 7, line 17, strike ''the Congress'' and insert ''both Houses of Congress''.

On page 7, strike line 24 and insert ''such passage.''.

On page 8, line 6, strike ''the Congress'' and insert ''both Houses of Congress''.

On page 9, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

''(7) DEFINITION.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this subsection, the terms ''transmittal,'' ''transmitted,'' and ''transmission'' mean transmittal, transmitted, and transmission, respectively, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

On page 10, lines 13 and 14, strike ''the Congress adopts, and there is enacted,'' and insert ''there is enacted''.

On page 10, lines 17 and 18, strike ''the Congress adopts, and there is enacted'' and insert ''there is enacted''.

On page 13, line 17, strike ''enhance'' and insert ''reduce''.

On page 17, line 9, strike ''covert action'' and insert ''covert activities''.

On page 19, strike lines 8 through 17 and insert the following:

''(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION.—

''(1) INITIATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the event the President does not submit a certification pursuant to subsection (d)(6) during each 90-day period following the review period provided in subsection (b), or submits a determination pursuant to subsection (d)(3) that Iran has materially breached an agreement subject to subsection (a) and the material breach has not been cured, qualifying legislation introduced within 60 calendar days of such event shall be entitled to expedited consideration pursuant to this subsection.

''(B) DEFINITION.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this paragraph, the terms 'submit' and 'submits' mean submit and submits, respectively, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SA 1220. Mr. CORKER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1191, to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 7, 2015 at 10 a.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''A Review of Child Nutrition Programs.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 7, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Jihad 2.0: Social Media in the Next Evolution of Terrorist Recruitment.''

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 7, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''S. 1137, the ''PATENT ACT''—Finding Effective Solutions to Address Abusive Patent Practices.''

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 7, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bianca Ortiz Wertheim, a member of my staff, be given floor privileges today.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. CON. RES. 16

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. Con. Res. 16, submitted earlier today, be placed on the calendar; and that at 5 p.m. on Monday, May 11, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 16; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form and the Senate then vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution with no intervening action or debate.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1314

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the cloture vote with respect to the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 occur at 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 12.

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

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

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 11, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 11; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators COTTON and CARPER.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT L. HITE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

TRIBUTE TO ADAM SCHILDGE AND MIA BEERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

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

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

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

Throughout my time in public office, including during my time on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, which I have been a member of now for about 14 years and which I chaired for the last 2 years, I have had the great pleasure of meeting with any number of dedicated and accomplished public servants. In talking

with them, I have been able to learn more about their work, more about their families, learn more about their commitment to public service that they share with all of us.

Today, I would like to take a couple minutes to highlight the outstanding service of some of our public servants across our Federal Government. In these cases, their extraordinary service has directly impacted the lives of the Americans they serve. In fact, the two individuals I plan to highlight today are finalists for something called the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals that are awarded by the Partnership for Public Service each year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

According to Mia's colleagues, her robust leadership and coordination helped to steer the worldwide response out of the crisis mode and to stem the tide of the deadly global outbreak. According to Mia, it was all because of—these are her words—''the dedication and passion and knowledge'' of the people who she worked with.

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

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

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

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

Let me close with this, if I could. I say through the Presiding Officer to my friend Senator SESSIONS: I was reading earlier this week in the newsclips that come to me from my staff—I was reading the results of an interview, I think, from interviews with maybe 1,500 very senior-level Federal

employees. They were basically being asked: How do you like your job? A lot of them, frankly, reported they did not have the sense of satisfaction that they really had hoped for and expected they would have.

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

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

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

So it is a remarkable thing, and we want to believe in trade, and I do, but the United States has interests, our trading partners have interests, and our trading partners are far more mercantile, far more focused on increasing exports to foreign countries—to the biggest market in the world, the United States—and far more focused on blocking imports that would compete against locally manufactured products than the United States has been producing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I asked him:

> You have asked Congress to approve fast-track legislation (Trade Promotion Authority) that would allow international trade and regulatory agreements to be expedited through Congress for the next six years without amendment. Fast-track, which proponents hope to adopt within days, would also ensure that these agreements—none of which of have yet been made public—could pass with a simple majority vote, rather than the 67 votes applied to treaties or the 60 votes applied to important legislative matters.
>
> This is one of the largest international compacts in the history of the United States. [It amounts to 40 percent of global GDP.] Yet, this agreement will be kept a closely-guarded secret until after Congress agrees to yield its institutional powers and provide the administration with a guaranteed ''fast-track'' to adoption.

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

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

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

So I continued to write:

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

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

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

growth. They are pulling down our economy.

I continue to quote:

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

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

Continuing:

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

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

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

Look, we know there are wage advantages in Asia, but wages are going up in a lot of Asian countries too. It is getting closer, and we have an advantage on better management. We have advantages on better infrastructure, and we have advantages on better energy prices. So this is a huge loss to us. At some point we have to defend our American working people's interest.

I write:

Former Nucor Steel Chairman Daniel DiMicco argues that we have not been engaged in free trade but in ''unilateral trade disarmament and enablement of foreign mercantilism.''

In other words, our agreements with trade have not overcome our trading competitors, our trading partners' desire to maximize their exports and minimize their imports from us. We have to be honest about that; it is not theory. Simply eliminating tariffs does not solve the problem. History tells us that.

So I continue to President Obama:

Due to the enormity of what is at stake, I believe it is essential Congress have answers to the following questions before any vote is scheduled on ''fast-track'' authority.

1. Regarding the ''Living Agreement'': There is a ''living agreement'' provision in TPP that allows the agreement to be changed after adoption—in effect, vesting TPP countries with a sweeping new form of global governance authority. TPP calls this new global authority the ''Trans-Pacific Partnership Commission.'' These measures are unprecedented.

We have not had anything like a living agreement in a trade agreement before.

Continuing:

While I and other lawmakers have been able to view this provision in secret [the chamber downstairs], I believe it must be made public before any vote is scheduled on TPA, due to the extraordinary implications.

I think it ought to be reviewed by independent scholars, lawyers, trade experts, to help us decide just what we are doing when we allow, apparently, the members who signed this agreement to meet at any point in time to adjust the meaning of the agreement and the provisions of the deal in order to adjust to changing circumstances. It is kind of like what the Supreme Court has been doing to our Constitution.

2. Regarding trade deficits—

I asked this question, colleagues. Isn't it a fair question to ask, when we are asked to vote for this fast track—

Will TPP increase or reduce our cumulative trade deficit with TPP countries overall, and with Japan and Vietnam specifically?

I want to know that. Don't you want to know whether or not we are going to increase our deficit in trade with these member countries, in particular Japan and Vietnam, where we can expect real problems in the future, it seems to me?

By the way, by far the biggest trade partner in our economy is the Japanese economy, in this agreement. Vietnam, with 100 million people, has the potential to become a small China, as one expert said, and really be, very much, a competitor to the textile industry, hurting—most of all, one expert has said—Central American countries, such as Honduras, El Salvador. Those countries that have been developing a textile industry may find themselves undercut by Vietnam under this agreement.

3. Regarding jobs and wages: Will TPP increase or reduce the total number of manufacturing jobs in the United States generally, and American auto-manufacturing jobs specifically, accounting for jobs lost to increased imports? Will average hourly wages for U.S. workers, including in the automobile industry, go up or down and by how much?

Let's have a report on that. Shouldn't we know that?

4. Regarding China: Can TPP member countries add new countries, including China, to the agreement without future Congressional approval?

Some say it can't be done. Let's have a clear answer to that. At first glance, it would appear that is possible.

5. Regarding foreign workers, TPA is a 6-year authority to the President of the United States to negotiate trade deals. He can submit them to the Congress, and these agreements can be passed without amendment in a simple majority vote. So this is a 6-year authority which concludes into the future. We have had President Clinton, President Bush, President whoever—Rubio, Cruz or whoever could be our President. So it would have that authority.

Finally, I asked whether the administration can state unconditionally that no agreement or Executive action, throughout the lifetime of TPA, will alter the number, duration, availability, expiration enforcement, rules or processing time of guest worker, business, visitor, nonimmigrant or immigrant visas to the United States.

I think those are fair questions. I think we need to have answers to those before we vote on TPA, but I can tell you what the American people think. There have been some studies that say large numbers of people tend to be right when they express an opinion on things.

This is Mr. Frank Luntz—I believe it is his poll. He asked this question on international trade. ''Do free trade agreements the United States has signed with other countries over the past 2 decades benefit other countries or the United States?''

That is a simple question. He asked the American people: What do you think? Do these agreements we have passed over the last 20 years—and I voted for a lot of them in the last 18 years I have been here—are they benefiting other countries or the United States? This is what the American people say: Seventy percent say it benefits other countries. Only 30 percent say it benefits the United States.

I think people are deeply skeptical about what we have been doing regarding trade, and it is easy to dismiss their concerns and their skepticism, to say they are just not knowledgeable and we know more and that this movement of capital from New York, to Beijing, to Seoul, to Japan, to Chile is just fine and wonderful and it is going to make your life better. But the American people are not seeing that.

Another poll asked the question: What about the effect of the free-trade agreements on wages the American people make.

This is the question:

Free trade agreements are treaties between countries reducing trade barriers, such as reducing tariffs for imported goods, agreeing to common standards and allowing market access to foreign companies. Do you think the United States making free trade agreements with other countries increases or decreases the level of wages paid in the United States or makes no difference?

They asked this of the American people. This is a YouGov poll.

Answer: Increases the level of wages paid in the United States—11 percent.

Now, we are told repeatedly: Oh, we need to sign these trade agreements. It is going to make your wages go up. It is going to be good for everybody. Don't we hear that? And I have hoped that would be true, but only 11 percent of the American people think trade agreements have moved their wages up.

What about the answer to the other part of that question. Decreases the wages paid in the United States—34 percent.

So by more than a 3-to-1 majority the American people believe that trade agreements over the last 20 years are decreasing the level of wages in the United States rather than increasing them. Nineteen percent say it makes no difference and one-third say they do not know.

We have to consider, colleagues, what is it that is happening. How is it this might be happening? Because, in theory, comparative advantage doctrine

means that multiple countries can benefit from trade agreements. I acknowledge that theory and believe it is fundamentally valid, but let's take a tremendous trading partner such as Japan. We have a tremendous trading relationship, where billions of dollars are exchanging hands between our countries every year, and that will be covered by this trade agreement—Japan. So what do we find? We find that we have a 2.5-percent tariff on imported Japanese automobiles to the United States and a 25-percent tariff on the import of light trucks into the United States from Japan.

I didn't know the numbers were that high, but it is as a result of various events that occurred over time where retaliation took place.

What about Japanese tariffs on automobiles going to Japan. There are none. Japan does not have tariffs on automobiles going into Japan. Yet we have a huge trade deficit with Japan. Why is this happening? It is because of nontariff trade barriers, institutional matters, and the like.

One of the biggest is that it is very difficult in Japan to get an automobile dealership up and operating effectively. Hyundai has tried to do it and failed. You can't get a distribution network for vehicles. Maybe there is a cultural loyalty in Japan that makes people far more likely to buy a Japanese automobile than a foreign automobile. There are other factors.

So the TPP, as written, will do nothing that advances the export of U.S. automobiles to Japan because those exports into Japan have been reduced substantially through nontariff barriers. Got it? Those nontariff barriers are not fixed in this agreement, but we are going to be reducing ours.

One expert who negotiated with Japan for President Ronald Reagan, Clyde Prestowitz, who opposes this agreement and who has written a book on trade, says there is no doubt we are going to have an increase in our trade deficit with Japan.

Now, look, I don't have a hard feeling about Japan. In fact, they are fabulous allies. They are putting up money to help in mutual defense. We have Honda and Toyota automobile companies in my home State of Alabama, and I am proud of what they do. But we are not going to see an increase in exports to Japan unless some things are changed other than the tariff, and, in fact, they are not changing the tariff because it is already at zero.

Well, maybe that is why the theories don't always work as well as they are projected to work.

Mr. Dan Dimicco, whom I mentioned earlier, an outspoken commentator on the issues relating to trade—lived with it and is the chairman emeritus of Nucor Steel today—wrote a very valuable piece in Forbes magazine back in December in which he discussed the trade deals and problems that occurred. He goes through virtually every issue that is raised in these discussions and presents a contrary view to conventional wisdom.

I really think we have to listen to some of this. We can't just blithely go by and pretend that the American people, by more than a 2-to-1 margin, are all wrong about salaries and wages when, in fact, I think the record will show that wages have dropped as these trading agreements have increased. From 2009 until today, we have had a net decline of family income of $3,000 in the United States. Wages are down since the 1970s. The percentage of Americans actually with a job who are in the working years is the lowest we have had since the 1970s. Wages have declined basically since the year 2000. We have had virtually no increase in wages since that time.

So what is it that is happening that is allowing the stock market to go up and business profits to go up but wages are not? We have had a decline in manufacturing. The numbers are unmistakable, and a large part of this is foreign competition.

Colleagues, the time has come when we should enter into no trade agreement—not one—in which we lose a single job in this country as a result of unfair competition.

Mr. DiMicco goes on at length. I ask unanimous consent to have his article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Forbes, Dec. 16, 2014]

'FAST TRACK' TO NOWHERE: CONGRESS SHOULDN'T GIVE OBAMA POWER TO RAM THROUGH TPP

(By Daniel DiMicco)

If the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade and global governance agreement has any chance at passage, it will require the usual alliance of Wall Street Democrats and Wall Street Republicans. Disgruntled citizens voted to ''throw the bums out'' because they were not delivering jobs and prosperity. Yet there is a danger that President Obama and the Republican leadership did not get the message.

The Obama administration may soon be enabled by some in the GOP to pass the globalists' biggest wish: ''fast-track'' trade authority on the road to the massively misguided Trans-Pacific Partnership.

It has made for titillating journalism to speculate on how these strange bedfellows will overcome opposition from blue collar Republicans and Democrats, and the fractiousness of the current Congress, to collaborate on further gutting America's productive supply chains through unilateral trade disarmament and enablement of foreign mercantilism. The kumbaya trade agreement cheerleader crowd has convinced itself that 40 years of trade deficits don't matter, even as the shrinkage of GDP growth has rendered the U.S. a dwindling superpower teetering on the brink of second class economy status.

MISUNDERSTANDING TRADE

The left-right Wall Street alliance of TPP cheerleaders relies upon a fundamental misunderstanding of trade, its role in the world and its role in economic growth. National income accounting makes it clear that gross domestic product is the sum of four factors: consumption, investment, government procurement and net trade (exports minus imports).

That's net trade—not gross trade. In other words, net exports increase our economic size while net imports shrink it. This is not a liberal plot, or a Tea Party plot, or a protectionist plot. It is basic and uncontroversial economic math that the TPP cheerleaders either don't understand or don't want to.

In 2013, the U.S. economy amounted to $16.8 trillion. Consumption was about 68% of GDP. Investment was about 16%. Government procurement was about 19%. But net trade subtracted about 3% from our economy (because imports exceeded exports). This shrinkage is cumulative, compounding year after year.

America is the picture of an unbalanced economy, disproportionately relying upon unsustainable consumption. Investment is too small, and should be 4% to 6% higher. Net trade should add to our economy, or at least not subtract from it. Consumption should increase in absolute terms, but should be a smaller percentage of our economy.

Stated another way, we need to produce more of what we consume. Right now we underproduce and engage in debt-driven consumption. We live beyond our means. Investment is down below sustainable levels. We are slouching towards Gomorrah. We must produce more to employ people and grow wealth so that we can export more (on a net basis), save more and engage in income-driven consumption.

Thus, the battle is not between free traders and protectionists, as the beltway think tanks and pundits often assert. It is between misguided Gross Traders and factually accurate Net Traders. It is not about opening or closing the borders to trade, but balancing trade flows over time. The seminal economist David Ricardo envisioned balanced trade over time, as did the drafters of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Free trade was crafted as an antidote to mercantilism, not an enabler of it.

MARKETS VERSUS MERCANTILISM

There is a twisted ideological school that promotes unilateral American trade disarmament. The trade disarmament advocates naively convince themselves that foreign mercantilism is irrelevant and the basic trade principle of reciprocity can be ignored. Big Government market intervention by other countries is just fine even as Big Government here is bad.

President Reagan gave a speech that established the principle of ''free and fair trade with free and fair traders.'' More specifically, he established the 3 R's: Rules, Reciprocity and Results.

''Rules'' mean that the trade must be rules based and every nation should follow them. ''Reciprocity'' meant that there will be a reciprocal reduction in tariffs, quotas and other barriers rather than one-sized reduction. ''Results,'' the point forgotten most, meant that America must gain a net benefit from trade arrangements rather than being taken advantage of.

The Wall Street Republican and Democrat ''free traders'' are not pursuing free trade at all. They are practicing ''mercantilism enabling'' trade. They want a deal that says ''free trade'' on the front cover even as the actual text incentivizes and enables scores of creative mercantilist tactics.

Modern mercantilism is not tariffs or quotas. It is not Smoot-Hawley. Foreign currency manipulation, via domestic currency controls or government intervention in foreign exchange markets, is a massive problem undertaken by many countries, some of those countries are part of the TPP negotiations. While the communist government in China is the poster child for using competitive currency devaluation to gain a trade advantage, South Korea, Japan and Singapore do it as well. The WTO includes a provision prohibiting countries from ''frustrating'' the intent of the agreement with exchange rate actions. But that provision has been ignored to the detriment of the global trading system, the global monetary system and the US standard of living.

Tariff reductions are often replaced by increased consumption taxes, which are charged at the border, in other countries. After NAFTA, Mexico enacted a 15% value added tax which is applied to all U.S. exports there. The border tax replaced the Mexican tariff reductions. The Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) countries generally enacted a new 12% consumption tax to replace their tariff reductions. So American companies still pay similar tariff/tax amounts at their border.

State-owned enterprises are modern forms of epic industrial subsidization. Over 50% of Chinese industry is state owned. Telecommunications, steel, shipbuilding, etc. are state-owned enterprises. They receive free or low cost land, credit, energy and other inputs. Production decisions are not driven by market forces so much as by government bureaucrats. Pricing decisions are made to undercut U.S. or global competitors and gain market share rather than by supply and demand.

A basic principle of trade agreements is that countries should not engage in actions that ''nullify or impair'' the benefits the contracting parties bargained for. But the U.S. has not enforced those provisions, they are hard to enforce in existing agreements, and the TPP cheerleaders keep pushing new deals without addressing the modern forms of mercantilism.

NAME CALLING AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CONSISTENCY

Deprived of past economic success to base their argument upon, a recent Cato Institute article engages in grade school name calling against those on the right and the left who oppose fast-track trade authority and recycled trade deals like the TPP. The attempt at character assassination by association is an unfortunate substitute for real data.

Even as the economy suffers from overfinancialization, deindustrialization, debt-driven consumption and asset bubbles, the Wall Street TPP cheerleaders advocate a solution in more flawed trade and global governance deals. Never mind that we now have the WTO and bilateral agreements with more countries than ever. Never mind that they predicted an economic nirvana that never materialized when promoting those prior agreements.

The medicine didn't work. So the solution is to take more medicine.

The Tea Party groups that oppose fast-track trade authority do so for core constitutional reasons as well. Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the authority to conduct trade policy. Congress, in the past, typically passed bills designating the countries to negotiate with and mandated the goals. Congress chose the countries to negotiate with, set goals, oversaw the negotiations, and did not pre-approve the final product before it was negotiated or concluded. The checks and balances system set up by our Founding Fathers was very intentional in dividing authority among the legislative, executive and judicial branches so the mistakes or abuse of power in one branch could be checked by another.

Today's fast-track trade authority not only suspends the ''regular order'' of Congress to approve an agreement, it pre-approves a trade deal before it is even negotiated. The so-called negotiating objectives in the fast-track bill are merely for show. They are mere friendly congressional suggestions that do not bind the executive branch and are often ignored. Congress never verifies that the president achieved the objectives.

A read of past fast-track legislation reveals many ''negotiating objectives'' that were neither attempted nor achieved by the executive branch negotiators. Yet, the president can and does sign the agreement before Congress views or votes on it.

Then, the president writes implementing legislation, which is Congress' job. Congress cannot, under fast track, amend the implementing legislation or the agreement but instead has only 45 days for committees to consider and vote, then 15 days for a floor vote. Only 20 hours of debate are allowed on a complex international document that runs to thousands of pages.

Modern fast track goes far deeper into Congress' constitutional authority than mere tariffs and quotas. The president becomes a super-Congress legislating through diplomacy in domestic policy areas. He can and does negotiate with other countries regarding immigration, financial services, tax, food and product safety rules, domestic procurement, labor standards and many other domestic issues. The final agreement may overturn past acts of Congress or include new standards previously considered but rejected by Congress.

If and when the deal is approved by Congress, the new rules are adjudicated by international tribunals that issue decisions which penalize the U.S. if we do not comply. Future Congresses are forever restricted from considering a wide range of policy changes to benefit our citizens, barred by global rules or the decisions of international tribunals.

The recent WTO ruling against American's country of origin labeling for food laws is only the most recent example. Americans did not think they agreed to a treaty that prohibited them from identifying where their food comes from.

Contrary to conventional wisdom, it's an open question as to whether a majority of economists or politicians would support modern trade and global governance deals if they actually read them. The debate becomes twisted into the low-brow rhetoric of free trade versus protectionism. Or by ideological name calling. Or by the identity politics of ''this group could be working with that group, which is a very bad thing.''

America became great by becoming an economic superpower. We innovated, we built supply chains based upon that innovation, we employed and paid people well, we created wealth, we built the first durable middle class in the world. That gave us cash to not only improve our standard of living, but also to build the world's dominant military. We thus became the sole global superpower.

Modern fast-track legislation began with the Trade Act of 1974. We have had 40 years of trade deficits shrinking our economy ever since. It has been a net detriment rather than a net benefit. It is time to focus upon true free trade with rules, reciprocity and results, while fighting the increasing scourge of global mercantilism. We must seek balanced trade flows over time rather than be condemned to serve as the global importer of last resort.

It is also time to preserve our constitutional system of checks and balances and refrain from giving more power to global institutions that displace our legislative and judicial branches.

Only then can America return to a more broadly shared prosperity.

Mr. SESSIONS. He says:

It is time to focus upon true free trade with rules, reciprocity and results, while fighting the increasing scourge of global mercantilism. We must seek balanced trade flows over time rather than be condemned to serve as the global importer of last resort.

He also said:

It is also time to preserve our constitutional system of checks and balances and refrain from giving more power to global institutions that displace our legislative and judicial branches.

I think that is good advice, too.

Again, what Mr. DiMicco says is that while we remove trade barriers and open our markets to importing competition, our allies, even when they reduce their tariff barriers, don't reduce other institutional barriers.

They also utilize currency manipulation. This currency manipulation can provide a far more substantial advantage in trade than even a tariff does. Mr. Volcker—the former Federal Reserve Chairman under President Reagan and widely regarded as having done a magnificent job—said tariffs can be overcome in a matter of minutes by currency manipulation. Europe has seen its currency drop over 20 percent. Korea has moved its currency down. Japan has moved its down. China has ensured its yuan remains at a level below where it should be on economic terms. As a result, they have gained a trade advantage, and as a result, they have decimated American industries, closed factories all over this country when they wouldn't have closed if they had a fair dollar-to-yuan currency relationship. They have been found to be manipulating their currency year after year. The Treasury makes it clear, but the Treasury has taken no action to do anything about it. As a result, good American people have lost jobs, had their factories closed and their towns and communities damaged economically by unfair trade. We have enough trouble competing in the world market. We don't need to have the unfair trade.

I thank the Chair for allowing me to share these remarks. I don't pretend to know all the answers. I try to be supportive of trade. I remain supportive of trade. But I think we need to listen to the American people a little bit. I don't think their concerns are unfounded. By a more than 2-to-1 margin, they say these trade agreements have advantaged our competitors rather than us.

It is time for us to make sure that if we do a trade agreement or trade promotion authority, the product that is going to be passed into law and become a worldwide trade agreement serves the American people's interests—somebody's interests other than some theoretician in a university, somebody's interests other than some foreign capital, somebody's interests other than the canyons of New York where capital is moved all over the world. Somebody needs to be looking out for the interests of the American people. We need to ask that question first.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 11, 2015, at 3 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 3 p.m., Monday, May 11, 2015.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:35 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 11, 2015, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JENNIFER ZIMDAHL GALT, OF COLORADO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MONGOLIA.

DAVID R. GILMOUR, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE TOGOLESE REPUBLIC.

JAMES DESMOND MELVILLE, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA.

PETER F. MULREAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI.

EDWIN RICHARD NOLAN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SURINAME.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

KAREN BOLLINGER DESALVO, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE HOWARD K. KOH, RESIGNED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED PERSONS OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ERIC DEL VALLE, OF NEW JERSEY
LEILA DOULALI, OF VIRGINIA
MING–HUN LIU, OF FLORIDA
MAMESHO MACAULAY, OF MARYLAND
JOHN SLATTERY, OF OHIO
JAN SMID, OF MARYLAND
RYAN TRUXTON, OF NEW JERSEY

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DANIEL L. ANGERMILLER, OF ARIZONA
MICHAEL P. ARDAIOLO, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
JESSICA NADINE ASFOUR, OF MAINE
KATHERINE M. BALENSKY, OF VIRGINIA
ETHAN MEHL BECK, OF FLORIDA
ROMAN V. BELOKONEV, OF VIRGINIA
DARREN A. BESSINGPAS, OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES CARLOS BLAKE III, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IVAN GOLDMAN BOEKELHEIDE, OF CALIFORNIA
MATTHEW A. BOWEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SEAN ROBERT BRENNAN, OF NEW YORK
JUSTIN L. BRYANT, OF VIRGINIA
FIONA J. CANDLISH, OF VIRGINIA
GRACE CORINA CARROLL, OF WASHINGTON
JEREMY YUE–KEI CHAN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
HSIAO CHING CHANG, OF CALIFORNIA
KELLY JENEE COATES, OF MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER M. CONWELL, OF VIRGINIA
SUSAN S. COPELAND, OF MISSISSIPPI
JOHN DAVID CRAWFORD, OF VIRGINIA
IDALIDES C. CUELLO, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK SHERIDAN CUNNINGHAM, OF ARIZONA
CHRISTIAN PAUL DENCKLA, OF ILLINOIS
BRIAN ALEXANDER DITO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LAUREN ROSE DORGAN, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID C. DRYER, OF VIRGINIA
SABINA DZANO, OF VIRGINIA
KIMBERLY ANN EGGERTON, OF OHIO
ERIC JOSEPH EGGLESTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JESSICA A. FARNHAM, OF VIRGINIA
ANATOLE FAYKIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
SCOTT M. FICKLIN, OF IDAHO
JOHN ROBERT FORCE, OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC DAVID FOY, OF VIRGINIA
AMPARO GARCIA, OF TEXAS
DB GATES, OF WASHINGTON
GREGORIO W. GONZALES, OF TEXAS
ALEXANDER JAMES GOULD, OF VIRGINIA
BAMBI LYNNE GRANGER, OF VIRGINIA
ISABEL I. GRIEDER, OF VIRGINIA
ADAM J. GROSS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEFFREY RICHARD HALE, OF CALIFORNIA
KATHERINE HALVORSON, OF VIRGINIA
ZACHARY K. HANSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SUSAN CAROL HAWKS, OF VIRGINIA
BARRY B. HINTZ, OF NEW YORK
KEVIN T. JENKINS, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL C. JESADA, OF VIRGINIA
RYAN TRAVIS KELLEY, OF VIRGINIA
KATHARINE L. KELLY, OF VIRGINIA
TIMOTHY MICHAEL KLUCK, OF NEW JERSEY
ROBERT P. KNUTH, OF VIRGINIA
KYLE WILLIAM KONRAD, OF VIRGINIA
LAUREN ASHLEY KRETZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JULIANNE SPRAIGHT LANGER, OF MINNESOTA
MAXWELL RUSSELL LARSEN, OF MARYLAND
JASON ROBERT LEMONCELLI, OF VIRGINIA
BRYAN C. LUPTON, OF VIRGINIA
ADAM MCGOWAN MARLOWE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JUAN A. MARTINEZ, JR., OF VIRGINIA
KATELYN PATRICIA MCMAHON, OF VIRGINIA
GEOFFREY W. MOORE, OF VIRGINIA
EDWARD P. MULLIN, OF VIRGINIA
KEAVY C. NAHAN, OF TEXAS
SUZANNE A. OHANESIAN, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN S. OLSON, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN PAUL ORAK, OF VIRGINIA
MARIDELA MARGARITA ORTIZ, OF TEXAS
MARK WILLIAM PIFHER, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA NATALIE POWERS–HEAVEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CARLA A. RIGA, OF VIRGINIA
AICHA NASSER ROBINSON, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES KENNETH ROGERS, OF ARIZONA
TIMOTHY C. SARRAILLE, OF NEW YORK
MICHAEL A. SEAN, OF VIRGINIA
AMISHA SHAH, OF ILLINOIS
MATTHEW STEPHEN SIMON BARTHOLOMAUS, OF WASHINGTON
KIWOO R. SONG, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS P. SPARE, OF VIRGINIA
ADAM SEAN STARR–KING, OF FLORIDA
HANS–MICHAEL W. SUMNER, OF VIRGINIA
BRITTANY DANIELLE THOMPSON, OF VIRGINIA
AARON D. TIFFANY, OF WASHINGTON
JONATHAN ALEX TOLAND, OF VIRGINIA
PHILLIP J. VALDIVIA, OF CALIFORNIA
WILLIAM L. VALENTE, OF VIRGINIA
DIMITRI VARMAZIS, OF NEW MEXICO
JOSE MARIA VEGA, OF VIRGINIA
DEREK T. VONDERHEIDE, OF INDIANA
JESSE M. WALD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CONNIE M. WARD, OF VIRGINIA
MONIKA L. WARGO, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY DAVID WATSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HEATHER WIGGINS, OF VIRGINIA
CASSANDRA ROCHELLE WRIGHT, OF VIRGINIA
CATHERINE R. YANCOVITZ, OF VIRGINIA
WALID ZAFAR, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

TANIA CHOMIAK–SALVI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DAVID S. ELMO, OF NEW YORK
JONATHAN DAVID FRITZ, OF FLORIDA
STUART MACKENZIE HATCHER, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICIA A. MILLER, OF MARYLAND
LAURA MERRITT STONE, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BRUCE MATTHEWS, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AMI J. ABOU–BAKR, OF IDAHO
GEORGE E. ADAIR, OF VIRGINIA
VANESSA LEILANI ADAMS, OF CALIFORNIA
IKE H. ADIGWE, OF VIRGINIA
ALYCE S. AHN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARVIN E. ALFARO, OF NEW YORK
ERNESTO L. ALFONSO, OF FLORIDA
LOUIS ALVARADO, OF VIRGINIA
LISA NICOLE ANDONOVSKA, OF VIRGINIA
TERESA ANDRE, OF VIRGINIA
NAOMI ANISMAN, OF NEW YORK
WILLIE J. ARMSTRONG, OF CALIFORNIA
VANESSA LYNN ARNESS, OF VIRGINIA
ERICA MARIE AUGUSTENBORG, OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDER CARROLL AUGUSTINE–MARCEIL, OF VIRGINIA
NICHOLAS D. AUSTIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BENJAMIN R. AVENIA–TAPPER, OF VERMONT
YVONNE C. BADGER, OF CALIFORNIA
CAROLINE BAKER, OF FLORIDA
CHARLES M. BALCK, OF VIRGINIA
AGNES M. BAPTISTE, OF MARYLAND
DAVID PAUL BARGUENO, OF VIRGINIA
AARON BARNARD–LUCE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEFFREY RICHARD BARRETT, OF VIRGINIA
JILL Y. BARWIG, OF COLORADO
JUANITA M. BATISTE, OF MARYLAND
DARIEN B. BATZER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CAITLIN BAUER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
PAUL W. BAUER, OF NEW JERSEY
GREGORY W. BAUS, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES C. BAYNE, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTINA ELENA BEARD, OF FLORIDA
COLLIN D. BELL, OF NEW YORK
DAVID P. BENCHENER, OF VIRGINIA
AMANDA M. BERG, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH D. BERRETT, OF TEXAS
HEATHER NICOLE BLAINE, OF VIRGINIA
RONALD A. BLAINE, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT A. BLANCO, OF MASSACHUSETTS
MARIA KIRSTEN BLEES, OF WASHINGTON
CHRISTOPHER DAVID BLINKY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
PATRICK ANIM BOATENG II, OF MARYLAND
ANDREW BENJAMIN BOCKUS, OF VIRGINIA
FREDERICK BOLAGEER, JR., OF NEW YORK
DAVID P. BOLES, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER BETH BOOKBINDER, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC BORGMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LEAH ANGELLE BOYER, OF LOUISIANA
ELIZABETH A. BRENNAN, OF VIRGINIA
GARY M. BRENNIS, OF CALIFORNIA
NORA S. BRITO, OF FLORIDA
JOHN J. BRITTAIN, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW L. BROWN, OF OHIO
APRIL N. BROWN, OF VIRGINIA
JANINE E. BROWN, OF NEW YORK
JUAN CARLOS BROWN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TIFFANY J. BUFORD, OF TEXAS
DARIA BUIE, OF MARYLAND
JOSHUA DAVID BULL, OF GEORGIA
COSTON L. BURNES, OF MARYLAND
JOSEF BURTON, OF OREGON
ELIJAH BUSH, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW RYAN BYRLEY, OF INDIANA
KAREN J. CALDERON, OF VIRGINIA
NICOLE LEAH CALLRAM, OF MINNESOTA
JEFFREY CAMPBELL, OF MINNESOTA
THERESA H. CANAVAN, OF VIRGINIA
GABRIELA SOFIA CANAVATI, OF TEXAS
ALLISON M. CARRAGHER, OF FLORIDA
BRYAN SCOTT CARROLL, OF WASHINGTON
ELIZANN CARROLL, OF TEXAS
OLIVER S. CASS, OF NEW YORK
KYLE R. CASSILY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
WILLIAM PATRICK CHAMBERS, OF VIRGINIA
AMIT SINGH CHANDA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRIAN C. CHANDLER, OF NEW YORK
ANTHONY CHANG, OF CALIFORNIA
TERESA CHANG, OF CALIFORNIA
XUAN CHAU, OF VIRGINIA
RONGJIE CHEN, OF ILLINOIS
JEUNG HWA CHOE, OF TEXAS
GARY K. CHOW, OF CALIFORNIA
JULIAN B. CIAMPA, OF COLORADO
MATTHEW CIESIELSKI, OF INDIANA
HAZEL M. CIPOLLE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JAMES PATRICK CLARKSON, OF UTAH
JAMES OZZIE COKER II, OF TEXAS
RANDY E. COLE, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA
CHERYL R. COLLINS, OF VIRGINIA
GARETH R. COLLINS, OF ILLINOIS
RYANN M. COLLINS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JESSICA COPELAND, OF COLORADO
MATTHEW E. CORCORAN, OF WISCONSIN
JORGE CORDOVA, OF FLORIDA
LESTER L. CORNELISON II, OF INDIANA
BRIANA C. CORSO, OF CALIFORNIA

NATHANAEL Q. COX, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROBIN JEAN CRAM, OF OHIO
NATHANIEL DOUGLAS CROOK, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL CULLOP, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RENEE MARY CUMMINGS, OF WASHINGTON
FRANCIS G. DAVENPORT, OF VIRGINIA
BROOKE CHELSEY DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA
EVAN LAMAR DAVIS, OF OHIO
TAYLOR DEWEY, OF VIRGINIA
KALI JANINE DEWITT, OF INDIANA
CHRISTY L. DIAZ, OF CALIFORNIA
JASON A. DILKS, OF TEXAS
JOSEPH DIRENZO, OF VIRGINIA
SHANEISHA DODSON, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL C. DONAHUE, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS A. DOUGLAS, OF VIRGINIA
ERIKA L. DOVE, OF VIRGINIA
KAREEM JULES DRIGHT, OF CALIFORNIA
ANDREW DUBINSKY, OF VIRGINIA
YUZZY GAINA DUBUISSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CLAIRE DUFFETT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOSHUA EARLEY, OF TEXAS
EDWARD H. EBERT, OF NEVADA
CHRISTOPHER L. EDDIE, OF TEXAS
JILL K. EGAN, OF MARYLAND
MICHAEL ELKIN, OF FLORIDA
EMILY GRACE ENRIGHT, OF VIRGINIA
PETER JAMES EPTON, OF ALASKA
KIMBERLY MICHELLE EVERETT, OF ALABAMA
MATHEW M. FALKOFF, OF CALIFORNIA
NATHANIEL FARRAR, OF FLORIDA
JUSTIN HOWARD FAULKNER, OF INDIANA
ASHLEY M. FAY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
COREY STANICH FEINSTEIN, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER S. FIELDS, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTA KAY FISHER, OF VIRGINIA
KYLE ALEXANDER FISHMAN, OF FLORIDA
KRISTIN R. FITZGERALD, OF VIRGINIA
KYLE WILLIAM FONAY, OF VIRGINIA
LINCOLN FRAGER, OF COLORADO
KATHRYN LYNETTE FRANKO, OF NEW YORK
ERIC R. FREDERICK, OF ARIZONA
JOHN TAYLOR FREELAND, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW R. FREEMAN, OF TENNESSEE
TARYN A. FRENCH, OF TEXAS
RYAN FUGIT, OF VIRGINIA
OLIVER W. GAINES, OF TEXAS
ADELITO NICHOLAS GALE, OF VIRGINIA
SEANN C. GALE, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID ALAN GALLES, OF WASHINGTON
BRADLEY GARDNER, OF CALIFORNIA
DANIELLA A. GAYAPERSAD–CHAN, OF MARYLAND
JEANNE CHADWICK GEERS, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH ALLISON GEISLER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CHRISTOPHER P. GEURTSEN, OF TENNESSEE
NARDOS GHEBREGZIABHER, OF COLORADO
KATHRYN GLUCKMAN, OF FLORIDA
RYAN A. GOCONG, OF NEW YORK
JESSE GOLLAND, OF COLORADO
JACOB LYON GOODMAN, OF NEW MEXICO
NORA P. GORDON, OF NEW YORK
PIERRE A. GORHAM, OF MARYLAND
ROBERT GRASSO, OF NEVADA
ROBERT D. GREENE, OF CALIFORNIA
ABIGAIL SARAH GREENWALD, OF MINNESOTA
MARK D. GREENWELL, OF VIRGINIA
CHASE JAMES GUINN, OF OHIO
NEIL GUNDAVDA, OF FLORIDA
JOHN LESLIE HALEY, OF OKLAHOMA
SHEENA R. HALL, OF INDIANA
DANIEL P. HAMEL, OF VIRGINIA
CLARE J. HATFIELD, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN A. HAWLEY, OF VIRGINIA
COLIN T. HEALEY, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK JOSEPH HEALEY, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREA JEAN HEILAND, OF TEXAS
JON THOMAS HEIT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL G. HENLEY, OF MARYLAND
EMILY ELIZABETH HENNELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SARAH C. HENNESSEY, OF GEORGIA
TAMEISHA HENRY, OF MARYLAND
MANUEL G. HERNANDEZ, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN HOOD HEYWOOD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MEGHAN L. HIGGINS, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM HARVEY HINE-RAMSBERGER, OF COLORADO
ERIKA RUTH HOLLNER, OF VERMONT
KALISHA HOLMES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KAYLA HOWE, OF IOWA
MARTHA A. HOWELL, OF VIRGINIA
TODD R. HUGHES, OF FLORIDA
TIMOTHY J. HUIZAR, OF TEXAS
WILLIAM JOHN HUSSEY, OF TEXAS
D. SCOTT HUTCHISON, OF UTAH
JOSEPHINE HWANG, OF VIRGINIA
TETYANA IVANISHENA, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MATTHEW JAMRISKO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHELLE JANZEN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
FRANCES S. JEFFREY-COKER, OF MARYLAND
MATTHEW JENNINGS, OF TEXAS
MAN SIK JEON, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE JERNIGAN, OF TEXAS
JENNIFER ELIZABETH JOHNSON, OF COLORADO
MEGAN PATRICIA JOHNSON, OF NEBRASKA
NEAL H. JOHNSON, JR., OF MARYLAND
JOSEPH JONES, OF NEVADA
KAMEKO JONES, OF VIRGINIA
STEVEN GARETH JONES, OF FLORIDA
TIMOTHY K. JONES, OF VIRGINIA
ALENA VENIECE JOSEPH, OF MARYLAND
JACHELLE R. JOSEPH, OF VIRGINIA
TYLER JOYNER, OF TEXAS
GENEVIEVE NATALIE JUDSON-JOURDAIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
BRIAN JUNGWIWATTANAPORN, OF NEW YORK
BENJAMIN ERIC KALT, OF ARIZONA
JACOB BRIAN KASPER, OF VIRGINIA
KEITH P. KELLY, OF VIRGINIA
AUDREY KERANEN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
BENJAMIN LEE KESSLER, OF CALIFORNIA
FAROUK KHAN, OF NEW YORK
SADAF KHAN, OF TEXAS
DAVID ANDREW KIERSKI, OF ILLINOIS
JONGMI ESTHER KIM WIODEK, OF VIRGINIA
JACQUELINE KINGFIELD, OF MARYLAND
NICHOLAS E. KNISKA, OF FLORIDA
CHARLES A. KOENINGER, OF VIRGINIA
WILSON M. KOROL, OF NEVADA
JOSEPH M. KRAFFT, OF CALIFORNIA
KARINA S. KRAJEC, OF OHIO
JESSICA KUHN, OF WASHINGTON
ZACHARY LANDAU, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOSEPH S. LANGDORF, OF VIRGINIA
F. CHRISTOPHER LANNING, OF NEW MEXICO
PETER S. LAU, OF WISCONSIN
LANCE LAUCHENGCO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DAVID LAWLER, OF NEW MEXICO
JESSICA LAZCANO, OF VIRGINIA
KAJAL A. LEARY, OF VIRGINIA
CARMEN GAYLE LECLAIR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHE KWANG LEE, OF TEXAS
SUN J. LEE, OF CALIFORNIA
JEREMY LEWIS, OF VIRGINIA
TANIA A. LEWIS, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW LINCOLN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ROSE VELMA LINDGREN, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN R. LINGEMAN, OF OHIO
KARL LOHSE, OF CALIFORNIA
ABEL TANGEMAN LOMAX, OF MINNESOTA
MATTHEW M. LOMBARDO, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW ALEXANDER LOOMIS, OF TEXAS
LEANA M. LOPEZ, OF WASHINGTON
JEANNETTA LORETTA LOVE, OF ALABAMA
DAVID M. LOYA, OF NEW MEXICO
MATTHEW ELROY LUNN, OF FLORIDA
JOHN DAVID LYNCH, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL L. LYONS, OF VIRGINIA
COLIN JUDE MACHADO, OF CALIFORNIA
LYNNE PATRICIA MADNICK, OF PENNSYLVANIA
STEPHEN ANDREW MANNING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KRISTIAN R. MARGHERIO, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA A. MARKS, OF MARYLAND
ROSE ANN MARKS, OF FLORIDA
VENOY V. MATTAMANA, OF FLORIDA
MARY MATTHEWS, OF MINNESOTA
DAVID W. MAURO, OF TEXAS
HEATHER S. MAXWELL, OF VIRGINIA
KATHLEEN MAXWELL, OF NEW YORK
MATTHEW REED MAYBERRY, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN MASON MCCOWN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
WILLIAM I. MCCOY, OF VIRGINIA
KELLY MCCRAY, OF TENNESSEE
PATRICK M. MCERLEAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BRIAN C. MCKEAN, OF FLORIDA
KEVIN T. MCNAMARA, OF NEW YORK
MELISSA G. MCPHERSON, OF VIRGINIA
JACKIE HART MEEKER, OF WYOMING
DEREK THOMAS MERCER, OF VIRGINIA
KARL EDSON MERCER III, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERIC A. MERIDETH, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA I. MERTSCH, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ALICIA M. MESSMER, OF VIRGINIA
GEORGE MESTHOS, OF MARYLAND
KIRSTEN ANNE MICHENER, OF CALIFORNIA
LINDSAY JO MIESKO, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CHRISTINE J. MILLER, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER J. MILLER, OF MARYLAND
SHANE A. MILLER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ADNAN AZAM-ALI MIRZA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ALISA MARIE MODICA, OF ILLINOIS
REBECCA MOLINOFF, OF OHIO
CHRISTOPHER LEE MOLITORIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ROSE MARIE MONACELLI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DANIEL EDWARD MONSON, OF VIRGINIA
CAROLINE KIM MONTOYA, OF MARYLAND
AMBER N. MOORE, OF TEXAS
JAMES W. MOORE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANGELA M. MORA, OF TEXAS
JEFFREY W. MORENCY, OF VIRGINIA
FRANCES A. MORENO, OF TEXAS
NATALYA V. MORIN, OF FLORIDA
JAMES T. MOSHER, OF OHIO
KAREN Y. MOZINGO, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL MUFFLEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CLARE MURPHY, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK R. MURPHY, OF WISCONSIN
AGNES NAM, OF MASSACHUSETTS
MICHAEL LOREN NEEDLE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PATRICK H. NEELEY, OF VIRGINIA
DOUGLAS J. NELSON, OF VIRGINIA
ERICA LEE NELSON, OF VIRGINIA
JAKE ROBERT NELSON, OF VIRGINIA
JONAH NEUMAN, OF NEW YORK
DAVID THOMAS NEWTON, OF ALABAMA
MIKE PHUONG ANH NGUYEN, OF CALIFORNIA
DANIEL THOMAS NIBARGER, OF VIRGINIA
LAGRETTA DORAN NICKLES, OF FLORIDA
MARI-JANA OBOROCEANU, OF FLORIDA
HARALD OLSEN, OF CONNECTICUT
ABIGAIL A. OLVERA, OF TEXAS
CAITLIN M. O'MALLEY, OF VIRGINIA
BESTY J. O'MEARA, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL J. O'ROURKE, OF ILLINOIS
STEPHANIE NATALIE OVIEDO, OF PUERTO RICO
TMITRI A. OWENS, OF GEORGIA
EROL OZAKCAY, OF CALIFORNIA
AMY MARIE PADILLA, OF TENNESSEE
MORTON S. PARK, OF CALIFORNIA
DIANE PARR, OF VIRGINIA
LISA ANN PARRINGTON, OF FLORIDA
MIRANDA S. PATTERSON, OF NORTH CAROLINA
BRANDON PEART, OF UTAH
MOLLY MURPHY PEDERSEN, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA CHANDLER PEFFLEY, OF MINNESOTA
THOMAS A. PEPE III, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ABDEL PERERA, OF FLORIDA
ERIN ELIZABETH PERETTI, OF VIRGINIA
RYAN PESECKAS, OF FLORIDA
KIRA MARIE PETERSON, OF MICHIGAN
TIMOTHY J. PETRO, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE PETTERSSON, OF NEW YORK
SUSAN PHEMISTER, OF NEW YORK
CHRISTINA ANGELINE PHILLIPS, OF LOUISIANA
GARVEY PIERRE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TIMOTHY J. PIRO, OF VIRGINIA
MARK PITUCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRIANT S. PLATT, OF UTAH
NEAL S. POSDAMER, OF VIRGINIA
THERESE M. POSTEL, OF NEW YORK
JESSE POTTER, OF WASHINGTON
MITCHELL H. PRAY, OF VIRGINIA
ASHLEY A. PRICE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANTHONY A. PRIDOTKAS, OF VIRGINIA
AYESHA QUIRKE, OF FLORIDA
TRUDE ENOLA RAIZEN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
RENATO RAMACIOTTI, OF TEXAS
MARJORIE JEANNE HABIT RAPP, OF NORTH CAROLINA
DAVID J. REDLINGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ALLISON JEAN REEDY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
KIRBY SCOTT REILING, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL RIES, OF FLORIDA
RYAN RIKANSRUD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TIMOTHY KEVIN RILEY, OF VIRGINIA
ROGER RODRIGUEZ RIOS, OF CALIFORNIA
ANDREW J. RIPLINGER, OF ILLINOIS
MARINA RITSEMA, OF CONNECTICUT
MITCHELL J. RITSEMA, OF CONNECTICUT
PAUL ALEXANDER RIVERA, OF FLORIDA
MARK T. ROBINSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELIZABETH M. RODRIGUEZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CHAD ROEDEMEIER, OF NEW YORK
SARAH ROHN, OF VIRGINIA
ANTONELLA P. ROMONA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DAVID B. ROSENBLUM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SHARON ANN RYAN, OF MISSOURI
NICHOLAS M. SAGNIMENI, OF VIRGINIA
TYLER SAMS, OF VIRGINIA
DANA SLADE SANDERS, OF WEST VIRGINIA
STEPHEN SANDERS, OF CALIFORNIA
NICOLE A. SATAR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NATHANIEL R. SAVIO, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA A. SAVITCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRYAN KENJI SCHELL, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID MATTHEW SCHNEIDER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PAUL SCOTT, OF ARIZONA
GOURI SEETHARAM, OF NEW YORK
NICHOLAS J. SESNAK, OF WASHINGTON
JESSE A. SHAW, OF CALIFORNIA
DANE ALAN SHELLY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRIAN D. SHERIDAN, OF VIRGINIA
MOON SHIN, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE ALLISON SHOEMAKER, OF NORTH CAROLINA
REBECCA K. SIMON, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN M. SMALL, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTIN SMITH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARK D. SMITH, OF MINNESOTA
AMY K. SNELLINGS, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES RICHARD SNODDY, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES THOMAS SNYDER, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE R. SOBEK, OF OHIO
STEVEN SOONG, OF VIRGINIA
CATHERINE S. SPEICH, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL SIDNEY STABLER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
INGRID H. STAUDENMEYER, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL A. STEMPEL, OF MARYLAND
BRITTNEY CONNAE STEWART, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL C. STIEG, OF CALIFORNIA
VANESSA STOTTS, OF TEXAS
JAMES A. STRICKLAND, OF VIRGINIA
DAGMAR STRONG–WITTMANN, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES M. STUHLTRAGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GRETA MARIE STULTS, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHELLE SUAREZ, OF FLORIDA
JACK SWETLAND, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEFFREY TANG, OF MASSACHUSETTS
SHEILA S. TANG–RABEONY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ALENA L. TAYLOR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SARAH M. TAYLOR, OF VIRGINIA
PETER JOHN THEIS, OF MINNESOTA
R. CHASE THOMPSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RONALD DANIEL THOMPSON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
HEATHER R. THORNTON, OF VIRGINIA
JASON W. TILLEY, OF VIRGINIA
SHEREE D. TINDER, OF KANSAS
ASHELY MICHELLE STOVER TOKIC, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JAMES D. TOMLINSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KRISTINA ERLEWINE TONN, OF OHIO
THOMAS TORRES, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN M. TORRO, OF VIRGINIA
MARY KATHARINE AIMEE TRECHOCK, OF CALIFORNIA
ABIGAIL TRENHAILE, OF HAWAII
TRAVIS L. TUCKER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CARYL MARIE TUMA, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KIMBERLY HERMINE MIHRAN TURLEY, OF VIRGINIA
DARRYL ALLEN TURNER, JR., OF ILLINOIS
KONRAD TURSKI, OF VIRGINIA
KEITH TYLECKI, OF VIRGINIA
ERIN CELESTE TYLER, OF VIRGINIA
ECHIKA UDIKA, OF MARYLAND
DANIEL VAN DYKEN, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICIA ANN VANDERWALL, OF FLORIDA
PETER VANDERWALL, OF FLORIDA
JESSICA TORRES VARDA, OF FLORIDA
ZINA Z. VARELAS, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL A. VASILOFF, OF VIRGINIA
MARIBEL VASQUEZ, OF NEW YORK
ZAHEERA WAHID, OF NEVADA
PAULA S. WALKER, OF NORTH CAROLINA
BRETT WALKLEY, OF CALIFORNIA
LEIF WALLER, OF VIRGINIA
PHILIP A. WALLISCH, OF VIRGINIA
KENNETH K. WAN, OF CALIFORNIA
JACOB ANDREW WARDEN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SARAH ELIZABETH WARDWELL, OF OREGON
COLLIN KENNETH WEBSTER, OF NEVADA
ELIZABETH SARA WEISMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RAYMOND E. WELCH, JR., OF NEW YORK
MATTHEW JAMES WELSH, OF NEW YORK
BRYN WEST, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL WESTENDORP, OF MICHIGAN
JOHN NATHANAEL WHEELER, OF ALASKA
BRYANT WHITFIELD, OF INDIANA
KELLEY M. WHITSON, OF MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER LOUIS WIEDEMER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BENJAMIN JOSEPH WILLIAMS, OF CALIFORNIA
MARCUS TAMBOURA WILLIAMS, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL G. WLODEK, OF VIRGINIA
CASEY S. WOHLFEIL, OF VIRGINIA
COURTNEY ANNE WOLFF, OF NEVADA
GORDON TATE WOOD, OF FLORIDA
KELLY WOOD, OF TEXAS
TIM WORM, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTINE NING–CHIUN YARNG, OF TEXAS
KEREN YOHANNES, OF KENTUCKY
LYNDSEY KANANI YOSHINO, OF WISCONSIN
AMANDA K. YOUNG, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELA L. YOUNG, OF TEXAS
CHARLOTTE YOUNG–FADARE, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CALVIN YIN–CHUNG YU, OF GEORGIA
EMILY YU, OF CALIFORNIA
SAMY ZAKA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HALEH H. ZAREEI, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN STEPHEN ZELAKIEWICZ, OF VIRGINIA

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on May 7, 2015 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

JUAN M. GARCIA III, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE JESSICA LYNN WRIGHT, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MARCH 19, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, May 8, 2015*

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 8, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Dominic Langevin, OP, Dominican House of Studies, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, order our distracted minds to Yourself. Help us to be humble, knowing that all works are worthwhile only insofar as they come from You and are oriented back to You.

Bless the work of this House. Strengthen its Members to build bonds that will last: bonds of collaboration among themselves, bonds of fraternity and opportunity in our land, bonds of peace on our planet.

May the cooperation of these elected servants free us all for virtuous excellence rather than the ease of wantonness or the doldrums of indifference.

And, loving Father, as we celebrate Mother's Day this weekend, accept our thanks for the love that You have shown us through our mothers. May we cherish the dignity and sacrifices of those women whom You have called to bear and sustain life.

Through Jesus Christ, the Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 223, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 6, 2015 at 9:18 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to the Conference Report accompanying the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 7, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 7, 2015 at 11:50 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1124.

That the Senate passed S. 125.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 7, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 7, 2015 at 4:26 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 1191.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE OFFICE OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from a staff member of the Office of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois:

MAY 4, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony, issued by the U.S. District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

After consultation with counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

MARGARITA ALMANZA.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONSTITUENT SERVICES SPECIALIST OF THE OFFICE OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Constituent Services Specialist of the Office of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 27, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

GENEVIEVE DEJEAN,
Constituent Services Specialist.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MAY 7, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, United States Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 3056 of the Carl Levin and Howard ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), I am pleased to make the following appointments to the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum:

Ms. Emily Rafferty of New York.

Ms. Pat Mitchell of Georgia.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On April 30, 2015, pursuant to section 3307 of Title 40, United States Code, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider resolutions to authorize two prospectuses, including one construction prospectus and one alteration prospectus included in the General Services Administration's FY2014 and FY2015 Capital Investment and Leasing programs, respectively.

The Committee continues to work to cut waste and the cost of federal property and leases. The resolutions include projects that will reduce space and support consolidations into Government-owned facilities. The space reductions and consolidations will result in saving $105 million in avoided lease costs. The projects as approved are within amounts included in the relevant appropriations bills.

I have enclosed copies of the resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on April 30, 2015.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—CONSOLIDATION ACTIVITIES PROJECTS, VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for the reconfiguration and renovation of space within government-owned buildings during fiscal year 2015 to improve space utilization, optimize inventory, and decrease reliance on leased space at a total cost of $70,000,000, a prospectus as amended by the FY2015 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Provided, that an Expenditure Plan for the balance of the authorized amount not reflected in the attached Expenditure Plan be submitted to the Committee prior to the expenditure of any remaining funds.

Provided, that consolidation projects result in reduced annual rent paid by the tenant agency over the term of any occupancy agreements.

Provided, that no consolidation project exceeds $20,000,000 in costs.

Provided further, that preference is given to consolidation projects that achieve an office utilization rate of 130 usable square feet or less per person.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
CONSOLIDATION ACTIVITIES PROJECTS
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PCA-0001-MU15

FY2015 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes the reconfiguration and renovation of space within government owned buildings during fiscal year 2015 to support the General Services Administration's (GSA's) ongoing consolidation efforts to improve space utilization, optimize inventory, decrease reliance on leased space, and reduce the government's environmental footprint.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested.....$100,000,000

Program Summary

As part of its ongoing effort to improve space utilization, optimize inventory, decrease reliance on leased space, and reduce the government's environmental footprint, GSA is identifying consolidation opportunities within its inventory of real property assets. These opportunities are presented through surveys and studies, partnering with client agencies, and through agency initiatives such as Client Portfolio Planning (CPP) and Transforming Real Property Information and Management (TRIM). Projects will vary in size by location and agency mission/operations, however, no single project will be more than $10M in costs or exceed a 5 year Estimated Economic Payback. All projects will aim for a typical Office Utilization Rate of 130 usf/per person or less.

Typical projects include the following:

- Reconfiguration and alteration of existing federal space to accommodate incoming agency relocation/consolidation. (Note: May include reconfigurations of existing occupied federal tenant space)
- Incidental alterations and system upgrades such as fire sprinklers or HVAC, needed as part of relocation and consolidation

Projects will be selected in line with the following criteria:

- First consideration will be given to projects that are identified as a reduction opportunity in a Customer Portfolio Plan which has been agreed to by both GSA and the subject agency and meet the remaining criteria.
- Proposed consolidation projects will result in a reduction in annual rent paid by the impacted customer agency.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
CONSOLIDATION ACTIVITIES PROJECTS
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PCA-0001-MU15

- Consolidation of expiring leases into GSA owned buildings will have preference over those business cases for lease cancellations
- Co-location with other agencies where there are shared resources/special space will receive preference over single agency occupancies
- Links to other consolidation projects will receive preference over stand-alone projects

Justification

Consistent with Administration initiatives such as the June 2010 Presidential Memorandum, *Disposing of Unneeded Federal Real Estate* and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-12-12, *Promoting Efficient Spending to Support Agency Operations*, as well as Congressional efforts to dispose of excess and underutilized properties, GSA is continually analyzing opportunities to improve space utilization and realize long-term cost savings for the government. Funding for space consolidations is essential to ensuring that GSA can execute those opportunities.

Projects funded under this authorization will enable agencies to relocate from either leased or federally-owned space to federally-owned space that more efficiently meets mission needs. These relocations will result in improved space utilization, cost savings for the American taxpayers, and a reduced environmental impact.

FY2015 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested.....$100,000,000

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - ALTERATION
CONSOLIDATION ACTIVITIES PROJECTS
VARIOUS BUILDINGS

Prospectus Number: PCA-0001-MU15

Certification of Need

Current Administration and Congressional initiatives call for improved space utilization, lower costs for the government and a reduced environmental footprint. It has been determined that the proposed consolidation program is the most practical solution to meeting those goals.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on March 6, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 and 2015 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan
March 19, 2015

FY 2015 – Original Submission

FY15 Projects	Original Total	Previous Change (Cumulative)	Current Change	New Total
Cotter Federal Building – Hartford, CT (IRS)	$ 4,247,000	$ 0	$ 0	$ 4,247,000
Varick Street – New York, NY (DHS/ICE)	$ 4,118,000	$ 0	$ 0	$ 4,118,000
George H. Fallon Federal Building – Baltimore, MD (VA)	$ 4,585,000	$ 0	$ 0	$ 4,585,000
George H. Fallon Federal Building – Baltimore, MD (EEOC)	$ 1,536,000	$ 0	$ 0	$ 1,536,000
Enterprise Computing Center – Martinsburg, WV (IRS)	$ 13,744,000	$ 0	$ 0	$ 13,744,000
AUTEC Federal Building – West Palm Beach, FL (SSA)	$ 5,213,000	$ 0	$ 0	$ 5,213,000
Quincy Court – Chicago, IL (USDA)	$ 1,032,000	$ 0	$ 0	$ 1,032,000
Minneapolis Federal Building – Minneapolis, MN (HUD)	$ 1,686,000	$ 0	$ 0	$ 1,686,000
300 North LA – Los Angeles, CA (IRS)	$ 1,919,000	$ 0	$ 0	$ 1,919,000
Total	**$ 38,080,000**	**$ 0**	$ 0	**$ 38,080,000**

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 and 2015 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan
March 19, 2015

Cotter Federal Building – Hartford, CT **$4,247,000**

The Department of Treasury - Internal Revenue Service (IRS) currently occupies space in both the Cotter Federal Building and in a lease of approximately 11,710 USF in Hartford. IRS has agreed to consolidate its Hartford operations into the Cotter Federal Building. The completed project is expected to reduce IRS's footprint by approximately 23,000 USF in both owned and leased space, reduce its annual rent by approximately $394,000, and save the taxpayer $267,094 in annual private sector lease costs. This project will improve the office utilization rate from 229 to 180 USF per person, representing a 21 percent reduction.

In addition to the $4,247,000 in Consolidation funding for build-out costs, IRS will provide approximately $25,000 for move and other project costs. IRS also plans to leverage GSA's FIT program to provide the $675,000 needed for furniture.

201 Varick Street – New York, NY **$4,118,000**

The Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) currently occupies 74,326 USF at 201 Varick Street, formerly used as ICE's Detention Center. Due to a change in mission, ICE no longer operates or maintains detention facilities in Manhattan. This project allows ICE to consolidate remaining functions in the building with a target footprint of approximately 23,000 USF.

The completed project is expected to reduce ICE's footprint by 51,409 USF and reduce the agency's annual rent by $2.5 million. It will improve the office utilization rate from 986 to 228 USF per person, representing a 77 percent reduction.

In addition to the $4,118,000 in Consolidation funding for build-out costs, ICE will provide approximately $3.4 million for furniture, move and other project costs.

G. H. Fallon Federal Building – Baltimore, MD **$4,585,000**

The Department Veterans Affairs (VA) currently occupies 104,785 USF in the George H. Fallon Federal Building. This project allows VA to release 25,431 USF by renovating 79,354 USF of space to accommodate the agency's mission. The completed project is expected to save the agency $500,000 annually in rental payments. The project also improves the office utilization rate by 41 percent, from 222 to 130 USF per person.

In addition to the $4,585,000 in Consolidation funding for build-out costs, VA will provide $1,975,000 for IT, furniture, move and other project costs.

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 and 2015 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan
March 19, 2015

G. H. Fallon Federal Building – Baltimore, MD **$1,536,000**

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) currently occupies 22,834 USF of leased space in a larger, multi-tenant lease that expires in March 2018. All agencies in this lease will be moving to coincide with EEOC's relocation. The EEOC move into the Fallon Federal Building by February 2017 will reduce its footprint by approximately 7,743 USF. This project will save the taxpayer $763,000 in annual private sector lease costs and reduce EEOC's annual rent by $322,000. The project will reduce the office utilization rate by 42 percent, from 208 to 121 USF per person.

In addition to the $1,536,000 in Consolidation funding for build-out costs, EEOC will provide $135,000 to address IT, move and other project costs.

Enterprise Computing Center – Martinsburg, WV **$13,744,000**

The Department of Treasury - Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is consolidating its data centers to reduce costs and save energy. The Enterprise Computing Center (ECC) located in Martinsburg, WV, is one of three mission-critical national data centers identified for consolidation. The current data center project affects 104,584 USF in the owned facility and an adjacent 106,500 USF leased building.

The proposed project will consolidate all functions currently housed in the lease space into the adjacent owned facility, saving the taxpayer approximately $3 million annually in private sector lease costs and reducing IRS' footprint by 106,500 USF. The project will eliminate an additional $3.4 million in annual operating and security costs IRS pays directly to the landlord.

By consolidating IRS into the ECC, IRS will save $1,615,000 in rent costs annually. The project will also implement IRS's new desk sharing/mobile work environment, reduce the number of workspaces by an estimated 29 percent, and reduce the office utilization rate from 183 to 90 USF per person.

In addition to the $13,744,000 in consolidation funds for build-out costs, IRS will provide approximately $5,146,792 to address IT, move, and other project costs. IRS also plans to leverage GSA's FIT program to provide the $3,360,385 needed for furniture.

AUTEC Federal Building – West Palm Beach, FL **$5,213,000**

The Social Security Administration's (SSA) vacated its West Palm Beach Field Office (20,715 USF of leased space) in July 2014 due to concerns with the operation of this facility. GSA is relocating this office to the AUTEC Federal Building. Providing SSA a long term office solution

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 and 2015 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan
March 19, 2015

is essential to SSA's continued operations in the West Palm Beach area, the busiest SSA office in the country.

This project will move SSA into vacant Federal space within the West Palm Beach central business district, closer to public transportation. The completed project yields a footprint reduction of 2,981 USF from their original leased location, saves SSA $356,703 in annual rent, and reduces the Government's annual leasing costs by over $670,000. The project also will reduce the office utilization rate by 14 percent, from 283 to 243 USF per person.

In addition to the $5,213,000 in consolidation funds for build-out costs, SSA will provide approximately $2,369,005 to address IT, furniture, move, and other project costs.

Quincy Court – Chicago, IL **$1,032,000**

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) Office of Inspector General is currently located in a lease of approximately 12,574 USF that expires November 30, 2018, with termination rights that will be exercised sooner. USDA will move into the 11 W. Quincy Federal Building in Chicago, IL and reduce its footprint by about 2,600 USF. The move will save the taxpayer $447,376 in annual private sector lease costs and save USDA $135,982 in annual rent. Additionally, the project will reduce office utilization rate by 21 percent, from 258 to 204 USF per person.

In addition to the $1,032,000 in Consolidation funding for build-out costs, USDA will provide $282,126 to address IT, move, and other project costs.

Minneapolis Federal Building – Minneapolis, MN **$1,686,000**

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) currently occupies 25,626 USF of leased space in Minneapolis. This project will backfill 21,000 USF of vacant space in the Minneapolis Federal Office Building when HUD's lease expires in September 2015.

Consolidating into Federal space is expected to reduce HUD's footprint by 9,263 USF and save the taxpayer $700,000 in annual private sector lease costs. During the five year amortization period for tenant improvements, the agency will experience a $29,000 increase in rent. However, after the tenant improvement amortization period ends, the agency will save $284,926 in annual rent, resulting in a rent savings of $1,279,630 for HUD over their ten year occupancy agreement term. Additionally, the consolidation project is expected to reduce the office utilization rate by 37 percent, from 307 to 193 USF per person.

In addition to the $1,686,000 in consolidation funding for build-out costs, HUD will provide $556,500 to address IT, furniture, move, and other project costs.

U.S. General Services Administration
FY 2014 and 2015 Consolidation Activities Expenditure Plan
March 19, 2015

300 North LA – Los Angeles, CA **$1,919,000**

The Department of Treasury - Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is currently located in a 26,856 USF lease at 611 6th Street in Los Angeles and is moving into 300 N. LA Federal Office Building. By consolidating IRS into the Federal building, its footprint will decrease by 18,972 USF, and IRS will save approximately $712,013 in annual rent. The taxpayer will save $1,259,249 in annual private sector lease costs.

The project will also implement IRS' new desk sharing/mobile work environment, reducing the number of workspaces by an estimated 69 percent and improving the office utilization rate from 232 to 123 USF per person, a 47 percent reduction.

In addition to the $1,919,000 in consolidation funds for build-out costs, IRS will provide $137,000 to address IT, move, and other project costs. IRS also plans to leverage GSA's FIT program to provide the $215,000 needed for furniture.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

CONSTRUCTION—FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, SAN JUAN, PR

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for construction of a 154,783 gross square foot federal complex, with 211 structured and 109 surface parking spaces, at 150 Carlos Chardon Avenue in San Juan, Puerto Rico, to consolidate operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at a design and review cost of $6,182,342, an estimated construction cost of $78,294,090 and a management and inspection cost of $824,568 for a total estimated project cost of $85,301,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution as amended by this resolution.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SAN JUAN, PR

Prospectus Number: PPR-FBC-HR14
Congressional District: 01

FY2014 Project Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes construction of a new federal complex at 150 Carlos Chardon Avenue, San Juan, PR, to consolidate the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for their locations. The proposed FBI complex includes a new FBI field office, annex building, and a visitor screening facility totaling 192,794 gross square feet (gsf) as well as a secure parking garage.

FY2014 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(ECC & M&I) $94,780,000

Overview of Project

As part of its FY2012 Capital Investment and Leasing Program, GSA proposed the construction of a new federal complex at 150 Carlos Chardon Avenue, San Juan, PR, to consolidate the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Design of the proposed facility and the construction of a new parking facility to support the continued need for parking at the adjacent facility were funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approved $145,506,000 for the purpose of constructing a new federal building, but the funds have not been appropriated.

This proposed FBI complex includes a new FBI field office, annex building for vehicle maintenance, and visitor screening facility totaling 192,794 gsf along with a secure parking garage. The FBI complex will share the 27-acre Federal site in San Juan with the existing Federico Degetau Federal Building (Degetau FB), Clemente Ruiz Nazario U.S. Courthouse (FB-CT), and Rainforest Kids Child Development Center. The FB-CT will remain undisturbed during the construction of the project.

Site Information
Government-Owned ..... 5 acres
Building Area
Building without parking ..... 192,794 gsf
Building with parking ..... 292,794 gsf
Structured parking spaces 211

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SAN JUAN, PR

Prospectus Number: PPR-FBC-HR14
Congressional District: 01

Project Budget

Design (ARRA Funding)	$ 12,107,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	88,608,000
Management and Inspection (M&I)	6,172,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)*	**$106,887,000**

*Tenant agencies may fund an additional amount for alterations above the standard normally provided by the GSA.

FY2014 Committee Approval and Appropriation Requested

(ECC & M&I) $94,780,000

Schedule	Start	End
Design	FY2010	FY2013
Construction	FY2014	FY2017

Tenant Agencies

FBI

Justification

The FBI is currently housed in the Federico Degetau Federal Building (Degetau FB) in San Juan, PR and the GSA Center in Guaynabo, PR, approximately 3.5 miles apart. The San Juan Field Office (FO) currently is located within the Degetau FB, occupying office space on one and a half floors. At present, there is no space within the Degetau FB for expansion purposes and the building cannot support the FBI mission in San Juan. The mechanical and electrical equipment in the existing facilities do not meet the FBI's identified requirements and cannot meet the anticipated personnel growth with projected staffing levels anticipated to increase in the coming years.

The FBI FO needs to integrate additional operational and technical capabilities that are currently located off-site at the GSA Center. Once construction of the proposed FBI facility is completed, the GSA Center will be disposed of.

The FBI's criminal and national security mission increasingly relies upon an intelligence-driven approach. Efficient and cost-effective facilities support the FBI's intelligence-driven strategy and enable the FBI to successfully carry out its mission. For example, this building will support deployment of secure work space needed to handle classified

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SAN JUAN, PR

Prospectus Number: PPR-FBC-HR14
Congressional District: 01

information and will promote cooperation between the FBI and its various Federal, State, and local partners. Consolidation of their operations in new federal space will enable the FBI to effectively perform its mission in Puerto Rico satisfying their security and long-term housing needs.

The proposed project will provide the FBI with a modern, state of the art, facility that will satisfy the agency's security and long-term space requirements and meet the objectives of flexibility of space, sustainable design, seismic safety, durability, and. New construction on this federally owned site maximizes use of the existing Federal land.

This project was proposed as part of GSA's FY2012 Capital Investment and Leasing Program. The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approved $145,506,000 for the purpose of constructing a new federal building, but the funds have not been appropriated. In the absence of construction-phase funding, FBI and GSA re-examined the project requirements and concept design, and re-scoped the project to reduce its cost. Further evaluation of the project site, based on the revised FBI requirements, led GSA to conclude that the previously planned relocation of the existing child care center was unnecessary and that only site work around the center is required. These adjustments have reduced the construction funding request.

Summary of Energy Compliance

This project will be designed to conform to requirements of the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service and will implement strategies to meet the Guiding Principles for High Performance and Sustainable Buildings. GSA encourages design opportunities to increase energy and water efficiency above the minimum performance criteria.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SAN JUAN, PR

Prospectus Number: PPR-FBC-HR14
Congressional District: 01

Prior Appropriations

Federal Bureau of Investigation San Juan[1] Prior Appropriations			
Public Law	**Fiscal Year**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
111-5 (ARRA)	2009	$35,935,000	Design, Construction
Appropriations to Date		**$35,935,000**	

Prior Committee Approvals

Federal Bureau of Investigation San Juan Prior Committee Approvals			
Committee	**Date**	**Amount**	**Purpose**
Senate EPW	12/8/2011	$145,506,000	Construction, M&I

Alternatives Considered (30-year, present value cost analysis)

New Construction $129,737,000
Lease $220,529,000

The 30 year, present value cost of new construction is $90,792,000 less than the cost of lease, an equivalent annual cost advantage of $5,124,000.

[1] Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, Congress appropriated $5.5 billion to the Federal Buildings Fund of which GSA allocated a total of $35,935,000 for design of a stand-alone FBI facility with setbacks located on the existing Hato Rey parking lot and construction of a parking facility to replace the existing parking spaces which will be lost due to the proposed FBI facility. The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approved $145,506,000 for the purpose of constructing a new federal building as part of GSA's FY2012 Capital Investment and Leasing Program, but the funds have not been appropriated.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS - CONSTRUCTION
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SAN JUAN, PR

Prospectus Number: PPR-FBC-HR14
Congressional District: 01

Recommendation

CONSTRUCTION

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on April 4, 2013

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Acting Administrator, General Services Administration

April 2013

Housing Plan
Federal Bureau of Investigation

PPR-FBC-HR14
San Juan, PR

Locations	Current						Proposed					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
150 E. CARLOS E. CHARDON												
Federal Bureau of Investigation	136	179	26,635	7,035	22,325	**55,995**						
Subtotal:	136	179	26,635	7,035	22,325	**55,995**						
GSA CENTER, INSULAR RD 28												
Federal Bureau of Investigation	32	62	6,283	2,587	9,921	**18,791**						
Subtotal:	**32**	**62**	**6,283**	**2,587**	**9,921**	**18,791**						
NEW FEDERAL BUILDING												
Federal Bureau of Investigation							398	398	60,136	33,720	49,790	**143,646**
Subtotal:							398	398	60,136	33,720	49,790	**143,646**
Total:	**168**	**241**	**32,918**	**9,622**	**32,246**	**74,786**	**398**	**398**	**60,136**	**33,720**	**49,790**	**143,646**

Utilization Rate		
	Current	Proposed
Rate	153	118

Current UR excludes 7,542 usf of office support space
Proposed UR excludes 13,230 usf of office support space

Special Space	
Restroom	1,120
Clinic	790
Physical Fitness	3,100
Conference/Training	12,710
Workbench	650
Vehicle Bays	8,900
Gun Vault	400
Shredder Room	500
Mail	850
Mug and Fingerprint	250
Breakroom	1,800
Evidence/Photo	1,600
ADP	16,620
Emergency Generator	500
Total:	**49,790**

NOTES:

[1]USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.

Program	FY14 prospectus		Updated plan	
Site Size	5 acres		6 acres	
Facility Size	192,794gsf		154,783gsf	
	165,193rsf		148,592rsf	
	143,646usf		118,835usf	
FBI Parking	211 Structured		211 Structured/ 109 Surface	
Funding	**ARRA**	**Prospectus**	**ARRA**	**Prospectus**
D/B RFP	-	-	$1,166,264	-
Design & Review	$12,106,746	-	-	$6,182,342
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	-	$88,607,564	-	$78,294,090
Management and Inspection (M&I)	-	$6,171,971	$3,107,381	$824,568
Subtotal	$12,106,746	$94,779,235	$4,273,645	$85,301,000
Total	**$106,885,981**		**$89,574,645**	

There was no objection.

HOUSE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

January 12, 2015:

H.R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance act of 2002, and for other purposes.

February 12, 2015:

H.R. 203. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

February 27, 2015:

H.R. 33. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care act.

March 4, 2015:

H.R. 240. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

March 7, 2015:

H.R. 431. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights act of 1965.

March 20, 2015:

H.R. 1213. An act to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability act of 1995.

April 1, 2015:

H.R. 1527. An act to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes.

April 7, 2015:

H.R. 1092. An act to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the ''Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building''.

H.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of David M. Rubenstein as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

April 16, 2015:

H.R. 2. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following date he had approved and signed a bill of the Senate of the following title:

April 30, 2015:

S. 535. An act to promote energy efficiency.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 125. An act to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1124. An act to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on April 1, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills and joint resolution:

H.R. 1092. To designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building.

H.R. 1527. To accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 10. Providing for the reappointment of David M. Rubenstein as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on April 16, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2. To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4(b) of House Resolution 223, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, May 12, 2015, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 12, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1394. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Paleontological Resources Preservation (RIN: 0596-AC95) received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1395. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the ''2015 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges'', as required by Sec. 366 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2003, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1396. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Greene County, NY, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8381] received May 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1397. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran'', pursuant to Sec. 1245(d)(4)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1398. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1-Octanol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0353; FRL-9924-81] received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1399. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's partial withdrawal of direct final rule — Partial Withdrawal of Technical Amendments Related to: Tier 3 Motor Vehicle Fuel and Quality Assurance Plan Provisions [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0135; FRL-9927-17-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS36) received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1400. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Revisions to Emissions Inventory Requirements, and General Provisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0636; FRL-9927-24-Region 6] received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; South Coast Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0087; FRL-9926-77-Region 9] received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus thuringiensis Cry2Ab2 Protein in Soybean; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0454; FRL-9925-85] received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Defensin Proteins (SoD2

and SoD7) derived from spinach (Spinacia oleracea L.) in Citrus Plants; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0834; FRL-9926-99] received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1404. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenazaquin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0075; FRL-9925-97] received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1405. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Travelers' Information Stations; American Association of Information Radio Operators Petition for Ruling on Travelers' Information Station Rules; Highway Information Systems, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking; American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Petition for Rulemaking [PS Docket No.: 09-19] (RM-11514) (RM-11531) received May 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1406. A letter from the Associate Chief, Auctions and Spectrum Access Division, Wireless Telecommunications and Media Bureaus, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Auction of FM Broadcast Construction Permits Scheduled for July 23, 2015; Notice and Filing Requirements, Minimum Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other Procedures for Auction 98 [AU Docket No.: 15-3] received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-019; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1408. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-029; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1409. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1410. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-008; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1411. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1730(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1412. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to Syria, originally declared on May 11, 2004, by Executive Order 13338, as modified, is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2015; (H. Doc. No. 114—34); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1413. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency, with respect to the Central African Republic, originally declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, is to continue in effect beyond May 12, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 114—35); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1414. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a letter providing the Web site link to the FY 2012 and FY 2013 inventories of commercial and inherently governmental positions in the U.S. Department of Transportation required by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 and the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1415. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment of H-2B Aliens in the United States (RIN: 1205-AB76) received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1416. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Construction and Development Point Source Category; Correcting Amendment [EPA-HQ-OW-2010-0884; FRL-9926-32-OW] received May 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1417. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Health Care for Homeless Veterans Program (RIN: 2900-AO71) received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1418. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to Sec. 1874A of the Social Security Act entitled ''Review of Medicare Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2013''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 336. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska (Rept. 114–103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 944. A bill to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1473. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (Rept. 114–105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1642. A bill to designate the building utilized as a United States courthouse located at 150 Reade Circle in Greenville, North Carolina, as the ''Randy D. Doub United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 114–106). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1806. A bill to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–107, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1892. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–108, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2048. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–109, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1806 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1892 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Financial Services and Intelligence (Permanent Select) discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2048 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 2243. A bill to suspend the current compensation packages for the senior executives of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and establish compensation for such positions in accordance with rates of pay for senior employees in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina (for herself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 2244. A bill to establish a Strategic Transformer Reserve program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina (for herself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 2245. A bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to consider including Smart Grid capability on Energy Guide labels for products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 2246. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H. Res. 253. A resolution recognizing the roles and contributions of America's teachers to building and enhancing the Nation's civic, cultural, and economic well-being; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3: (''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''), and 18 (''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof'').

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 2244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;''

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 2245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;''

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 2246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, and Amendment II of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 59: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 67: Mr. PAYNE and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 79: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 356: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 467: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 509: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 563: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 616: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 721: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 731: Mr. HONDA and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 767: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 869: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 885: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 915: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 920: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 986: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1062: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1078: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1087: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1133: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1135: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1188: Mr. FARR and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1221: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1401: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1413: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 1427: Ms. NORTON and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1441: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1474: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1475: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1516: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. DOLD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LANCE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SESSIONS, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1626: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1634: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1666: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1718: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. GRAHAM, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
H.R. 1752: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 1810: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1818: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1880: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1901: Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1902: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1974: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2002: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2031: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2048: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2147: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2156: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2201: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2237: Mr. KING of New York.
H.J. Res. 22: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. MOULTON.
H. Res. 12: Mr. RIGELL.
H. Res. 26: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H. Res. 128: Mr. HOLDING.
H. Res. 177: Mr. UPTON and Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 251: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANTHONY ''TONY'' ROSSI

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great American: Anthony ''Tony'' Rossi.

Tony was born in Italy and his family immigrated to the United States when he was young. He grew up in Hoboken, New Jersey and graduated from Demarest High School. Throughout his life he answered the call to serve; beginning in World War II, he joined the Army Air Corps and served as a bombardier. During the war, he was captured and held as a Prisoner of War in Germany for 18 months. His family says those experiences were transformational. When Tony returned home to Hoboken, his approach was: Keep your problems in perspective; accept each day as a blessing; and treasure your family and friends.

During the Korean war, Tony again answered the call to serve and, following the conflict, continued a career in the Air Force in Japan, England, and throughout the United States. After retirement from the Air Force, Tony worked for General Electric for 16 years and later retired to Florida in 1987.

He is survived by his wife of 42 years, Eileen Rossi; son, Michael (Marsha) Rossi; daughter, Renee (Robert) Faiks; and son, Charles Rossi; 6 grandchildren: Chris (Laura) Rossi, Karen (Rich) Rossi Pickup, Preston (Kristi) Faiks, Grant (Kim) Faiks, Gillian and William Rossi; and 6 great grandchildren: Audrey and Lillian Faiks, Jason and Sarah Faiks, Daniela Rossi, Jack Pickup.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 70th Anniversary of Victory in Europe Day and it is a great honor to recognize and celebrate Tony's honorable service to our country and reflect on his life. In June, our country will honor his service with a funeral at Arlington National Cemetery.

God bless Tony Rossi, his family, and the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING CHASE EWOLDT FOR HIS COURAGE AND SERVICE

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to recognize Chase Ewoldt, a brave, strong, and exceptional young man from the Sixth District of Illinois. Chase was recently named one of the five ambassadors nationwide for the St. Baldrick's foundation.

In July 2012, at the age of two, Chase was diagnosed with a rare, aggressive brain and spinal cancer. Experts believe this specific type of cancer is found in just 100 to 200 new patients every year in the United States and Chase was only given a 20% chance of survival. Over the next 14 months, his family and friends watched him undergo punishing cancer therapy every two to three weeks. Most of his time was spent in and out of hospitals. Nevertheless, Chase beat the odds and survived. In August of 2013 there was no longer any sign of the disease in his body.

Chase is not completely out of the woods, and will most likely struggle with aspects of the disease for the rest of his life, but for now the family is celebrating his health and trying to raise awareness about pediatric cancer, a testament not only to Chase's strength and resilience, but also the entire family's compassion and determination to help others. Chase is an inspiration to all with cancer and I am sure he will continue to be a light for those in darkness. As Chase told his mother, ''I am a survivor''. Let us celebrate the life of this survivor.

Mr. Speaker and Distinguished Colleagues, please join me in honoring and celebrating Chase Ewoldt's nomination as a nationwide ambassador for the St. Baldrick's foundation.

RECOGNIZING THE DODGE CITY COOPERATIVE FOR 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. TIM HUELSKAMP

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the Dodge City Cooperative. The cooperative, now doing business as Pride Ag Resources, is completing 100 years serving Dodge City and the southwest Kansas area.

As a fifth-generation farmer and one of just a handful of farmers currently serving in Congress, I understand the important role cooperatives play in our agricultural economy. Rural America has long depended on this unique business structure to move our products to the marketplace.

With the founding of one elevator in Dodge City in 1915, the hope, vision and needs of farmers for the past 100 years brought into existence fourteen additional elevators, four fertilizer locations, two feed mills, six car care centers, four Ace Hardware stores, plus another store soon. Dodge City Cooperative currently employs 200 employees with an annual payroll of over $9.2 million dollars. The hard work and services offered have filled a critical need in supplying area farmers, ranchers and the people of our communities with grain, feed, supplies and goods.

Thank you to Dodge City Cooperative and to all of the farmer-owned cooperatives in the ''Big First'' district who help strengthen our rural communities and make Kansas one of the top agricultural-producing states in the entire country.

WILLIAM C. PHELON, JR.

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Technical Sergeant William C. Phelon, Jr., and his distinguished contributions to the United States Army Air Force. Mr. Phelon enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Force immediately after graduating from Mineola High School in June of 1943 and entered active service August 16th 1943, the height of American involvement in World War Two. Mr. Phelon served valiantly for three years until March of 1946. Technical Sergeant Phelon flew as part of the illustrious 96th Bombardment Group as the Radio Operator Mechanic and Waist Gunner of a B–17 Flying Fortress. In this capacity he was responsible for all radio equipment aboard the B–17 while in flight. Technical Sergeant Phelon received many medals and awards as a result of his meritorious service to his country, including the prestigious U.S. Army Air Forces Air Medal.

In his position as airman, Technical Sergeant Phelon participated in Operation Chowhound; a humanitarian mission that helped deliver over 11,000 tons of food to Nazi occupied Holland during the Dutch Famine. This mission was so appreciated by the Dutch people that commemorative ceremonies have been held every five years in Holland to remember the service men that helped feed their starving people. The Third Air Division of the 8th Air Force was responsible for delivering 4,103 tons of food of which the 96th Bombardment Group dropped 366 tons. For his efforts Technical Sergeant Phelon was awarded the Conspicuous Service Cross by Governor Thomas Dewey on behalf of the people of New York.

Sadly, Mr. Phelon passed away in December, 2014. I rise today in memory of a brave man who was an exemplary member of the Armed Forces and the community at large, and to posthumously thank him for his years of dedication and service. I hope we all remember the courage and dedication shown by Mr. Phelon in all he did.

RECOGNITION OF CONSTANTINE (GUS) SARKOS

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to honor Mr. Constantine (Gus)

Sarkos. When it comes to fire safety aboard commercial aircraft, Gus Sarkos is the primary expert and a national treasure.

As head of the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Fire Safety Branch, Sarkos and his team have played an essential and critical role improving cabin and cargo safety in ways that have decreased the risk of injuries to airline passengers and saved lives.

According to Dennis Filler, Director of the FAA's William J. Hughes Technical Center, ''Gus Sarkos does the science that becomes the fire safety standards adopted by the whole world.''

His work testing materials and measuring the effectiveness of fire detection and suppression systems has led to more than a dozen significant changes to U.S. and foreign aircraft during the past three decades to stop fires and curtail the spread of blazes occurring in-flight or during crash landings, increasing the chances of passenger survival.

Most recently, Mr. Sarkos and his team have been examining and reporting on fire threats posed by lighter and potentially flammable materials now being used in airplanes, and by the combustibility of large quantities of lithium batteries that have been carried in cargo holds.

As a result of his team's work, the Department of Transportation (DOT) no longer allows non-rechargeable metal lithium batteries to be shipped in the cargo holds of passenger jets. In addition, a number of U.S. airlines this year unilaterally announced they will no longer accept rechargeable ion lithium batteries because of tests done by Mr. Sarkos and his team showing that a buildup of gases inside bulk containers can lead to explosions and violent fires. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the U.S. DOT currently are considering proposals to ban bulk shipments of these rechargeable batteries or to require safer packaging rules for air transport.

Katherine Rooney, chief of ICAO's cargo safety section, said the work by Mr. Sarkos' group on the batteries and many other issues has been ''absolutely invaluable.'' She added that passengers are ''in a safer situation thanks to the research they have provided.''

During his long tenure, Mr. Sarkos has participated in and overseen the development of such post-crash aircraft fire safety improvements as new fire blocking seat cushions, heat resistant evacuation slides, burn-through resistant fuselage insulation, and interior panels that release less heat and smoke.

''The FAA's goal'', Mr. Sarkos said, ''is to minimize the likelihood of an aircraft fire in-flight or improve survivability during a post-crash fire. If a fire occurs in-flight, the objective is to reliably detect, extinguish or suppress it until the aircraft can be safely landed. In the case of a post-crash fire,'' Sarkos said, ''the goal is to have materials that burn and spread fire more slowly, and releases less heat, so passengers have more time to escape.''

Director Filler noted how the work of Mr. Sarkos and his team came into play in 2013 when Asiana Airlines Flight 214 crashed and caught fire while landing in San Francisco. Three people died of injuries unrelated to the fire, while 304 survived the crash. He said the fire was slow in developing in large part because of the fire resistant material in the aircraft, and as a result, people had the time to evacuate.

Director Filler also cited a 2008 accident when a Continental 737 veered off the runway in Denver, skidded into a ravine, lost its landing gear and left engine, and caught fire. All 110 passengers and five crew members had time to evacuate. In 2005, an Air France A340 landed in Toronto during a severe thunderstorm, skidded off the runway and erupted into flames. While the fire eventually gutted the aircraft, all 297 passengers and 12 crew members survived.

''These are examples of three aircraft that caught fire and 728 people survived largely because of the work that Gus and his team have been able to promote throughout the industry,'' said Filler. ''His efforts have provided added time for passengers to evacuate. In the old days, materials would have burned faster or caused passengers to inhale toxic fumes, and they would have died in the aircraft.''

Mr. Sarkos said his work is challenging, but a source of pride because it has resulted in increased safety.

''The worst thing I ever had to do was meet with relatives of accident victims,'' said Mr. Sarkos. ''I am glad that in recent years that conditions have improved because of the work we have done and continue to do.''

I want to publicly commend Gus for being named a finalist to receive the Service to America Medal a.k.a. ''Sammies''. Gus' vision, leadership, and dedication to saving lives is a testament to his invaluable public service.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BARRINGTON, ILLINOIS

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the incorporation of Barrington, Illinois.

From its early origins, Barrington has been a model for other cities and towns to follow, through its continued dedication to building a friendly and welcoming community for residents and visitors alike. It is no surprise that the village motto is, ''A great place to live, work and play''.

In the years since its first mayor, Homer Wilmarth, and its incorporation in 1865, Barrington has become a center of culture and commerce, serving as a home to families, businesses, professionals, churches and organizations that have made this a vibrant and thriving community. What once started as a small railroad community now boasts a population of over 10,000 people. Over the years, Barrington has developed a well-deserved reputation as a village with hometown charm and small-town heritage.

On the occasion of this 150th Anniversary, we join together to celebrate Barrington's legacy of growth and prosperity and to look ahead to the opportunities facing this great city and our nation. Today both marks 150 years of working together to build a brighter future, and reminds us that our work continues.

Mr. Speaker and Distinguished Colleagues, please join me in recognizing the 150th anniversary of the incorporation of Barrington, Illinois and wishing her residents a very successful year ahead.

JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Jewish American Heritage Month. Nearly 360 years have passed since the establishment of the first Jewish community in North America. Since that time, Jewish Americans have contributed to the cultural richness and diversity of our nation in every field of community life, including business, government, medicine, law, the natural and social sciences, the arts and humanities, academia, religion, and the military.

There are approximately 5 million Jewish Americans and more than 100,000 of them live in Texas, nearly half of those, about 45,000, live in the Houston metropolitan area. Although their numbers may be small in a state with a general population over 20 million, the impact of Jewish Americans in Texas and in Houston has been great indeed.

Jewish Americans were there during the fight for Texas' independence from Spain and Mexico. Adolphus Sterne, an East Texas merchant, became a principal source of financial backing for the Texas Revolution and a close friend of Sam Houston. Albert Moses Levy was surgeon-in-chief in the revolutionary army. The De Cordova family helped develop the city of Waco and Henri Castro settled immigrants in several Texas towns. In 1859 the first synagogue in Texas was established in Houston.

Business and trade, especially the merchandising of food, clothing, jewelry with style, elegance, and distinction are the arenas in which many Jewish-Texan families made their most visual marks on the state of Texas. There is hardly a city in the Lone Star State whose history is without landmark stores founded and developed by Jewish entrepreneurs: Neiman, Marcus, Sanger in Dallas; Battelstein and Sakowitz in Houston; and Joske in San Antonio.

These cities and towns reaped the benefits not only in availability of goods, but also in owners' generous patronage of the fine arts and in contributions to civic life such as the historic Levy Opera House in Hillsboro and the Brin Opera House in Terrell. Other early Jewish Americans who contributed mightily to civic life include Anna Hertzberg, who served as president of the original San Antonio Symphony Orchestra before World War I, and Olga Bernstein Kohlberg of El Paso, who started Texas' first free public kindergarten in 1892. That tradition continues today with the Dell Children's Hospital in Austin established by Dell Computers founder and CEO, Michael Dell.

Mr. Speaker, it was 67 years ago this month that President Truman recognized the free, independent, and democratic State of Israel, making the United States the first country to welcome Israel into the family of nations. And for 65 years Israel and the United States have remained the best of friends and the strongest of allies. One reason for the enduring strength of this relationship is the enduring contributions made by Jewish Americans in enriching American life and culture.

Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the state of Texas which has welcomed Jews for more than three centuries, I join with my colleagues and President Obama in calling upon all Americans to learn more about the heritage and contributions of Jewish Americans and to observe this month with appropriate programs, activities, and ceremonies.

RECOGNIZING WALLACE HIGGINS, RECIPIENT OF THE 2014 CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent, Mr. Wallace Higgins.

Mr. Higgins was awarded the 2014 Congressional Gold Medal in recognition of his service with the Civil Air Patrol during World War II.

Mr. Higgins was born in Kendall, New York in November 1925. From a young age, he was intrigued by aviation. Mr. Higgins joined the Civil Air Patrol in 1943, during his senior year of high school. Later that year, he enlisted in the Army Air Force and was chosen to join the Tuskegee Airmen.

During his two enlistments with the Army Air Force, Mr. Higgins achieved the rank of Staff Sergeant and earned several commendations for his service, including the WWII Victory Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, and New York State Medal for Merit. After receiving his honorable discharge, Mr. Higgins settled in Alfred, New York.

Mr. Higgins has dedicated the past six decades to serving his community: he is entering his 50th year with the Alfred Lions Club, he is a life member of the Alfred Station Volunteer Fire Department, he is a member and former chairman of the Allegany County Office for the Aging Advisory Council, and he is a founding member of the Allegany Senior Foundation, where he currently serves as President Emeritus.

Wallace Higgins truly exemplifies the qualities that characterize the Congressional Gold Medal. It is my pleasure to present this award to Mr. Higgins in recognition of his life-long service to our country and our local community.

UNVEILING THE SOUTHBURY SENIOR CENTER WALL OF HONOR

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the unveiling of the Wall of Honor at the Southbury Senior Center.

Today, we recognize the senior citizens from Southbury who proudly served our country in uniform. These men and women answered the call of duty to protect our nation and defend its ideals. They served during war and during peace, at home and abroad. No matter their deployment or their mission, each of our veterans deserves the recognition and accolades they will receive during today's ceremony.

While we can never fully repay our veterans for their service and sacrifice, I believe it is important to take every opportunity to thank and honor them. I hope when the wall is revealed, each veteran will feel the appreciation and gratitude of our community and the entire nation.

I would like to thank Wayne Rioux and the staff and volunteers at Southbury Senior Center for creating this memorial to recognize these local American heroes.

HONORING MILITARY ENLISTEES

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor thirty high school seniors in Florida's 22nd District who have decided to enlist in the United States Armed Forces.

Of these thirty, four have joined the Army; their names are Margaro Hernandez, Brandon Iglesias, Dylan Reynolds, and Darren Ross.

Sixteen have joined the Marines; their names are Lamech Murzike, Joshua Scott, Connor Bunch, Yeicob Duran, Jose Ribot, Jonnathan Gonzalez, Davie Medina Perez, Kenton Ennis, Jacob Rodriguez, Luis Mendez, Mike-Rodman Lorissaint, Jose Vega, Gregory Spotts, Sean McCusker, Alyssa Pontier, Delone Griffin.

Four have joined the National Guard; their names are Trey Rawls, Merisanda Carstea, Spencer Hickey, and Warren Dutes.

Six have joined the Navy; their names are Destiny Huntley, Marco Juarez Jr., Anthony Lewis, Amanda McCarthy, Sergio Santiago, Pedro Jose Silva.

It is in thanks to the dedication of patriots like these that we are able to meet here today, in the United States House of Representatives, and openly debate the best solutions to the diverse issues that confront our country. On behalf of myself and all of my constituents in Florida's 22nd District, thank you for your service and best of luck as you pursue this challenging endeavor.

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. Throughout the history of the United States, Asian American and Pacific Islanders have contributed to our greatest undertakings and our vibrant cultural diversity. They have become leaders in business, in the community, and in politics, overcoming adversity and prejudice in pursuit of the American Dream.

Today, there are more than 20 million Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and more than 1 million of them live in Texas. A majority of them are concentrated in the cities, particularly Houston. At 80,049, the Vietnamese American community in the City of Houston has the third largest in the country. Houston is also home to sizable populations of Chinese Americans, Indian Americans, and Filipino Americans These communities have transformed the city, bringing their cultures, religions, and businesses and creating a new home.

The first recorded Asian Americans in Texas were 250 Chinese laborers, who came to Houston to work on the railroad in 1870. It was thankless, dangerous work, but they helped to build the backbone of our state's economy. Although many of them would leave soon after the work was done, several stayed behind in Houston, and in the early 1900s the first Chinese business districts were opened.

The Asian American population in Houston remained quite low until the 1970s, when a new wave of immigration brought tens of thousands of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the city. Many of these early immigrants were Vietnamese refugees fleeing the country with the aid of the Indochinese Assistance and Refugee Assistance Act of 1975. Others were Chinese, drawn by the growth of the Chinese Merchants' Association throughout the decade.

Today, there are more than 100,000 Asian American and Pacific Islanders living in Houston. As of 2007, they operate 16,000 businesses, and there are multiple temples dedicated to Buddhism, Hinduism, and Sikhism. The city offers official documents in Vietnamese, Chinese, and Urdu. Neighborhoods from Little Saigon to Chinatown to the Mahatma Gandhi District are vibrant community centers for Asian Americans and other residents alike.

But for all their contributions to our state and our country, there are still unacceptable challenges facing Asian American Pacific Islander communities. There is an urgent need to fix our broken immigration system by passing legislation that will support families, strengthen small businesses, protect workers and grow our nation's economy. These communities have also had historically low enrollment in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which would otherwise help them to achieve stability and security.

Mr. Speaker, as a representative for tens of thousands of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, I join with my colleagues in recognizing the contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to not just our history, but our economy and our future. I call on all Americans to celebrate Asian Pacific American Heritage month by deepening their understanding about these contributions, and pledge to support and serve Asian American and Pacific Islander families.

UNITED NATIONS GLOBAL ROAD SAFETY WEEK

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the third annual United Nations Global Road Safety Week and to celebrate the contribution of the Association for Safe International Road Travel (ASIRT) to the global effort to reduce the number of road crashes around the world.

ASIRT is extremely active in the global movement to promote and improve road safety. Tens of thousands of people are injured as a result of traffic collisions each year. More than 500 children are killed every day in road crashes and 186,300 children under 18 die from road traffic crashes annually. The rates of road traffic death are three times higher in developing countries than in developed countries.

As part of the Decade of Action for Road Safety, ASIRT has joined with the United Nations Road Safety Collaboration to announce #SaveKidsLives, a global campaign focused on delivering a Child Declaration on Road Safety to the policymakers who can make a difference. During UN Global Road Safety Week, the #SaveKidsLives Campaign seeks to highlight the plight of children on the world's roads and generate action to better ensure their safety. The campaign features hundreds of events hosted by governments, international agencies, civil society organizations, and private companies, including the delivery of the ''Child Declaration for Road Safety'' to policymakers.

During this Global Road Safety Week, I salute ASIRT and the United Nations for the work they are doing to promote road safety domestically and around the world.

RECOGNIZING UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI PRESIDENT DR. DONNA SHALALA

HON. CARLOS CURBELO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of University of Miami President Dr. Donna Shalala, a woman who has made such mark on our community since her first day on June 1, 2001. As a two-time University of Miami graduate, I have witnessed my alma mater's immense development during President Shalala's tenure; a reflection of her tremendous dedication to our community. During her tenure, UM has solidified its position among top research universities in the country. The University's two successful Momentum campaigns have raised $3 billion dollars in private support towards its endowment, academic research programs, and world-class facilities. Born in Cleveland, Ohio, President Shalala received her A.B. degree in history from Western College for Women. One of the country's first Peace Corps Volunteers, she served in Iran from 1962 to 1964. She earned her Ph.D. degree from The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. She has held tenured professorships at Columbia University, the City University of New York (CUNY), and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. She served as President of Hunter College of the City University of New York from 1980 to 1987 and as Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Thank you President Shalala for your commitment to UM, for being a mentor, an educator, and a friend to our country's next generation of leaders.

IN HONOR OF ALL THE MOTHERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of all the Mothers of The Armed Forces who have served, or who have family members who have served. Let us remember their sacrifice and give thanks to them and their families on this Mother's Day. I submit this poem penned in their honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

FOR ALL THE MOTHER'S

For all of the Mother's of war.
For all the Mother's across our shores.
Whose son's and daughters burdens bore.
And for all the families who have been separated by war.
While, mommy for our nation so fought for.
And all those hours of worry and pain.
And all of that heartache with them which now remains.
As they rebuild from the scars and loss of war.
And for all those Mothers who aren't coming home.
For all their sons or daughters.
Who now lie in such cold dark graves so all alone.
Remember them this Mother's Day,
and say a prayer for all of them . . . please say.
And for of those Mothers who must learn to walk again.
And son's and daughters must somehow start their new lives,
so begin.
Without arms and legs,
and with scars and burns upon their faces.
all in such places.
As they help them rebuild,
so face this.
Lets give thanks and praise for all of them.
And for all of those little boys and girls,
who have now lost their best friends in the world.
Their Mother's who are the heart of the home.
Mommy ain't coming home.
Who now on Mother's Day sit with tear in eye.
not understanding why mommy didn't say goodbye.
For the Mother is the heart of the home.
They give us life and they give us love.
And in our darkest of all hours help us to rise above.
And how they cry,
when their most beloved daughters and sons die.
A pain that can not be healed by time.
Only when in heaven they reunite.
As they teach us even more.
About faith and courage,
and with hope how to overcome the scars of war.
This Mother's Day carry them with you in your thoughts,
upon your way as you pray.
And give thanks for what they give,
and what they gave.
For all the Mother's this Mother's Day!

TRIBUTE TO YOUNG STAFF MEMBERS FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 8, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we know well, perhaps better than most, how blessed our nation is to have in reserve such exceptional young men and women who will go on to become leaders in their local communities, states, and the nation in the areas of business, education, government, philanthropy, the arts and culture, and the military.

We know this because we see them and benefit from their contributions every day. Many of them work for us in our offices as junior staff members, congressional fellows, or interns and they do amazing work for and on behalf of the constituents we are privileged to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no higher calling than the call to serve a cause larger than ourselves. That is why I ran for public office. I was inspired to serve by President Kennedy who said, ''Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country,'' and by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. who said:

> ''Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. . . . You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.''

By this measure, there are several other great young men and women who served as volunteers this year in my offices. They may toil in obscurity but their contributions to the constituents we serve are deeply appreciated and that is why today I rise to pay tribute to six extraordinary young persons for their service to my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas and to the American people. They are: Kenya Metters, Chelsea Ukoha, Ryan Wallace, Gregory Butchello, Fabian Rubio, and Danielle Konerth.

Mr. Speaker, the energy, intelligence, and idealism these wonderful young people brought to my office and those interning in the offices of my colleagues help keep our democracy vibrant. The insights, skills, and knowledge of the governmental process they gain from their experiences will last a lifetime and prove invaluable to them as they go about making their mark in this world.

Because of persons like them the future of our country is bright and its best days lie ahead. I wish them all well.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that such thoughtful committed young men and women can be found working in my office, those of my colleagues, and in every community in America. Their good works will keep America great, good, and forever young.

SENATE—*Monday, May 11, 2015*

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Sovereign Lord, You are our light and salvation so we will not fear. You are the strength of our lives so we will be unafraid. Lord, we are grateful for Your steadfast love and unchanging mercy. Each day You provide us with Your power and compassion.

Sustain our lawmakers today, strengthening them in their challenging work of striving to find creative ways to solve the problems of our time. Inspire them to trust You without wavering, acknowledging You in all they do. Lord, be gracious to them, guiding them with Your wisdom as You gladden their spirits with Your eternal presence.

Send down Heaven's peace into all our hearts.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

THE SENATE AT WORK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I took a trip up to Boston this weekend to address the Kennedy Institute. It was really a unique experience.

I was there in a full-scale representation of the Senate Chamber to discuss how the real Senate is beginning to get back to work. I explained how committees are working again so Senators can have more of a stake in the legislative process. I explained how we are allowing more open floor debate and more amendment opportunities so Senators can better represent the voices of their constituents. And I explained how we are getting the fundamentals back on track, such as passing a budget.

This doesn't mean we have ironed out all the Senate's challenges. It doesn't mean a new era of good feelings beckons just around the corner. And it doesn't mean an exertion of will won't be necessary every now and then. But it does mean that we are beginning to open the Senate back up, and in a way that will make shared achievement more likely.

Recall just last week, when we overwhelmingly passed a bill to give the American people more of a say in President Obama's negotiations with Iran. Although we weren't able to consider nearly the number of amendments I would have liked to have seen considered to strengthen the bill, the legislation did provide for congressional oversight of any comprehensive agreement.

The White House had been threatening to veto that bill, but it passed with the bipartisan support of 98 percent of Senators anyway.

Later this afternoon, we will take up another Iran-related measure that I hope we will pass with similar bipartisan enthusiasm.

The resolution of the junior Senator from Idaho is simple. It calls on the administration to use the tools it has in pursuit of what should be a bipartisan goal: securing the release of American citizens being held as hostages by the regime in Iran.

One of those Americans, Saeed Abedini, has reportedly been held prisoner for what would appear to be the supposed crime of attempting to build and operate an orphanage—the supposed crime of building and operating an orphanage.

Beaten, denied access to medical care, and locked away in solitary confinement—that is apparently how the Iranian regime deals with those who dare to show love and compassion to others. No American should find this acceptable, just as no American should find it acceptable to imprison unjustly a reporter or a grandson coming to see his grandmother.

I think we can all agree that, at the very least, the American people should not be rewarding Iran for its disgraceful human rights abuses and that we should not be granting Iran access to the funding it desires to further its nuclear weapons program and terrorist proxies while this exploitation continues.

So I call on every Senator to join us in standing up for human rights. Let's pass Senator RISCH's legislation later this afternoon.

I mentioned earlier that committees are beginning to get back to work in the new Senate. We have seen a lot of bipartisan committee action in recent weeks. One standout achievement was the Finance Committee's overwhelming passage of bipartisan trade legislation, 20 to 6. It is incredibly important for American workers that we pass this bill. Without it, foreign countries will continue to be able to discriminate against American products and American produce, while we have some of the lowest duties in the world.

We need strong and fair trade legislation that expands Congress's oversight over the administration and sets clear rules and standards for its trade negotiators. That is the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act in a nutshell.

Yet some talk about preventing the Senate from even debating the bill. I would tell you, I think this would be a big mistake. The Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act reported by the Finance Committee is already a strong bill, and we will have an amendment process on the floor that will allow Members the opportunity to advance their priorities. Voting to proceed to a bill is a vote that says this is worthy of debate—worthy of debate. Well, certainly this bill is indeed worthy of debate, supported by the President of the United States.

So I commend Senator HATCH, Senator WYDEN, and their colleagues on the Finance Committee for getting us this far. My hope is that we can continue this debate tomorrow.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

MOVING LEGISLATION AND REPUBLICAN PRIORITIES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I must comment on some of the statements that my friend the Republican leader has made.

We have been able to accomplish a few things during this work period, and the reason we have been able to do so is that we, the minority, have cooperated.

For 4 years, my Republican colleagues in the minority objected to everything we tried to do—everything. I don't mean most everything; I mean everything. That was a plan they had.

I have mentioned before and I will mention again that they decided they would make sure that Obama was not reelected. That failed. And, No. 2, they were going to oppose everything he tried to do, and they have done that overwhelmingly. So it was really hard for 4 years to get things done.

Now, my friend the majority leader can talk all he wants about how much we have gotten done. Look at what we have been able to accomplish. The majority of the measures we have done could have been done before, if Republicans had not objected to them and stopped us from moving to those matters.

So we are going to continue to do everything we can to move measures, in conjunction with my Republican friends, but we shouldn't be hearing a lot of speeches here about how great things are now, because every time that happens I am going to come and tell everybody what has happened for 4 years.

Government is all about priorities. What do we, as Senators, value the most? With only a few days before the Memorial Day recess, I am disturbed and distressed by the Republicans' priorities. For example, the majority leader knows that the Federal highway program expires this month—not next month, this month. He knows that the highway trust fund runs out of money a few weeks later. Why then are Republicans making no serious effort to pass a long-term reauthorization of the Federal highway program?

I can easily answer this question. They do not know how to pay for America's next jobs bill. So with no as the answer, they again do nothing. Another short-term extension—this is one of many—one of many. I think the last I remember, the last my staff brought me up to date—I think it has been 12 or 15 times that it has been extended for short periods of time. This is not good. This is such bad news for every State—every State—because the directors of the departments of transportation can't do anything long term. The only way to have a good program for construction is to be able to look ahead.

As the Senator from Vermont said the other day, Vermont's season to be able to do construction work is very short, and they can't do long-term planning when the money is only going to be available for a few months.

So this is really unfortunate and really too bad. I say again, this could be America's next jobs bill. So it is really too bad.

We also have the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, known as FISA. It expires on June 1. It must be extended and reformed. Last week, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the bulk collection program, as currently constructed, is not authorized under current law—meaning the law is illegal. It would be irresponsible for this Congress to merely reauthorize and not reform. How can we reauthorize something that is illegal? We can't. We shouldn't. Why would anyone agree to reauthorize a program which our circuit courts deem to be illegal?

My friend the majority leader keeps talking about extending the program for 5½ years. Extending an illegal program for 5½ years? That is not sensible. What should happen is that we should move forward and do something that is needed here; that is, do it all over again.

The House of Representatives is sending us on Wednesday a new FISA bill, one that has been vetted by those people concerned about the rights of our citizens. They have determined that what the House has done is good. They have passed it out of committee 25 to 2. Senator LEAHY has a bill over here that is almost identical to that bill. So I can't understand why we just don't wait until the House sends us that bill and we turn around immediately and give it to the President as passed by the House of Representatives. The President will sign it. He realizes the program has to be changed. We cannot reauthorize a program that is illegal.

So I hope we can move forward on what the House has done. To his credit, Senator LEAHY is not saying: We have to have my bill. He is saying: If we don't do my bill—Senator LEAHY's bill—pass the House bill. That would be good.

This is the only bipartisan, bicameral solution we have today that will end the illegal bulk collection program in its current form and reform and reauthorize key provisions of FISA. Otherwise, I am not the only one, Mr. President. I was told walking over here that the junior Senator from Kentucky is not going to let the extension of FISA take place.

So why don't we just go ahead and get it done now; that is, when the House sends us their bill, say we are going to pass that and send it to the White House for signature.

I hope the majority leader will reassess his priorities and instead choose to protect Americans' civil liberties.

What is the business of the day, Mr. President?

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to continue our efforts to honor the 198 North Dakotans who gave their lives while serving in the Vietnam war.

Together with Bismarck High School's 11th graders and their teachers, my office is reaching out to the families and friends of these fallen heroes to learn about their lives. I am humbled to learn the tidbits shared with us about each young man, and I wish I could dedicate a whole speech to each unique life.

Today, I also want to highlight the service and contributions to North Dakota and our country by my good friend Rick Maixner of Bismarck. Rick served as a Navy pilot during the Vietnam war, earning many distinguished medals for his aerial service. He then served the State of North Dakota as a State senator and member of the State house of representatives. In his forties, Rick earned his law degree. Throughout his career, he has always been a true public servant. I wish Rick a very happy 70th birthday.

Now I will share about the lives of some of the North Dakotans who did not come home from the Vietnam war.

JAMES FREIDT

James Freidt was from Grand Forks and was born May 5, 1947. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. James was 20 years old when he died on October 11, 1967.

James's father served our country during World War II and received a Purple Heart for his service.

James was one of 10 children and was one of three children in his family to die tragically.

His family and friends called him Jimmy and remember him as a very protective brother who was always smiling. The siblings have fond memories of playing games like kick the can together.

Shortly before beginning his tour of duty, James was able to attend one of his sisters' weddings. The family is grateful for that good memory of James. He was killed just over 1 month after arriving in Vietnam.

ROBERT ''BOBBY'' SCHMITZ

Robert ''Bobby'' Schmitz was from Martin and was born February 25, 1944. He served in the Army's 4th Infantry Division. Bobby was 25 years old when he died on September 16, 1969.

He was the oldest of six children. His father, Eugene, and a brother, Denny, also served our country in the Army. Growing up, Bobby helped his family with farming and their dairy cows. He and his brother, Denny, were both on

the wrestling team. Bobby graduated from NDSU with a degree in business administration before serving in Vietnam. He was engaged to be married and was looking forward to starting his life with his fiancee after he completed his service.

LOREN ''DOUG'' HAGEN

Loren ''Doug'' Hagen was born in Fargo on February 25, 1946. He served as a Green Beret in the Army Special Forces. On August 7, 1971, Doug died. He was 25 years old.

Doug was the eldest of three sons. He was an Eagle Scout and an honor student. After graduating from NDSU with a degree in engineering, Doug enlisted in the Army. His goal was to find his best friend from high school, who had gone missing in action 2 years prior.

Doug was killed 2 weeks into his second tour of duty, which was 1 week prior to his being promoted to captain.

Doug was awarded the Medal of Honor for extraordinary heroism for his actions trying to rescue his fellow soldiers on the day he died. His Medal of Honor was presented to his father by President Gerald Ford at the White House in 1974.

Last month, the American Legion Post 308 was created in West Fargo and was named the Loren ''Doug'' Hagen Post in his honor.

I am grateful to Jordan Haluzak, Jasmine Nice, Brady Bieber, and Alex Love of Bismarck High School for sharing with us about Doug and his family. Jordan is related to Doug and is learning more about his family tree through this project.

MICHAEL HIMMERICK

Michael Himmerick was from Valley City and was born November 28, 1947. He served as a Navy medic for a group of 100 marines. Michael died on April 6, 1967. He was 19 years old.

Michael was one of four boys, and two of his brothers also served in the Navy. His family called him Mickey, and the marines he served with called him Doc. His brother Jim says Michael was one heck of a ballplayer. He was scouted by four Major League Baseball teams when he was a sophomore in high school, but he threw his arm out the summer after his junior year.

Jim remembers Michael's plans to put his intelligence and military experience to good use to become a doctor after completing his service.

LARRY SIKORSKI

Larry Sikorski was from Fairmount and was born April 1, 1947. He served in the Marine Corps' Hotel Battery, 3rd Battalion, 12th Marines. Larry died on February 25, 1969. He was 21 years old.

He had two sisters, Yvonne and Arlene. He had four brothers, Chet, Richard, Daniel, and Orrin—all of whom served our country in the U.S. military.

Larry's nephew Dale was just 1 year younger than Larry. He cherishes his memories of building a raft together, just like Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer. They spent 3 days together building it, but, unfortunately, once sent into the river, the raft did not float.

Dale remembers Larry as being outgoing and very intelligent. Larry earned straight A's while studying predentistry at the University of North Dakota before enlisting in the Marines.

Before going to Vietnam, when Dale dropped Larry off at the airport, Larry told Dale he would never see him again.

RICHARD ''JIMMY'' GAFFNEY, JR.

Richard ''Jimmy'' Gaffney, Jr., was from Fargo. He was born October 23, 1948. He served in the Marine Corps' Echo Company, 2nd Battalion, 7th Marines. Jimmy died on July 13, 1968. He was 19 years old.

Jimmy enlisted in the Marine Corps shortly after he graduated from Fargo Central High School in 1966. During his first 13-month tour of duty in Vietnam, he was promoted to the rank of corporal.

In letters he mailed to his family, Jimmy wrote that he had made a lot of good friends in his fellow soldiers. When his first tour came to an end, Jimmy signed up for a second tour. Shortly after starting his second tour of duty, he was killed by a land mine.

RICHARD VOLK

Richard Volk was from Minot. He was born March 20, 1949. He served in the Marine Corps' Echo Battery, 2nd Battalion, 12th Marines. Richard died on March 19, 1969, the day before his 20th birthday.

Richard was one of 11 children. Three of the four sons in his family served our country in the military. At one point, Richard and his older brother, Stephen, were both serving in Vietnam at the same time.

Richard was a hard worker, working on the Soo Line Railroad and at his brother-in-law's restaurant, the Pantry Cafe. His brother Virgil remembers that Richard loved hunting and fishing. Virgil said Richard was the best looking in the family, and he knew it.

ROGER SVIR

Roger Svir was from Park River and was born December 1, 1950. He served in the Army's 1099th Transportation Company, called the River Rats. Roger died on September 26, 1971. He was 20 years old.

He was the oldest of four children. His father and seven uncles served our country in World War II and Korea.

During high school, Roger worked for a potato farmer and shared his earnings with his mother Virginia. His mother cherishes her memories of Roger and his cousin playing together along the river and of Roger fixing his car.

He had plans to buy a piece of land with his father and start their own farm. After Roger died, his father thought he was too old to start farming alone, and he gave up on the dream.

Roger was proud to hold the same position as an Army River Rat ship fitter that his father held during World War II.

WILLIS WEBER

Willis Weber was from Valley City and was born July 1, 1937. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. His regiment was called the Blue Spaders of the Big Red One. Willis was 28 years old when he died on November 11, 1965.

At College High School in Valley City, his friends called him Willie. He participated in journalism, printing, basketball, football, and intramural sports.

Prior to his Army service, Willis served in the Air Force and in the Valley City Police Department.

Three weeks after arriving in Vietnam, Willis was shot, and he died a few days after because of that injury. He was awarded six medals in recognition for his actions while serving in Vietnam.

The Valley City AMVETS Post 3 and the Auxiliary are named after Willis in honor of his service and sacrifice to his country.

I want to thank Woody Wendt, a charter member of the Willis Weber AMVETS Post, Sarah Lerud, and Wes Anderson—all of Valley City—for sharing these details of Willis' life.

EDWARD ALEC WERMAN

Edward Alec Werman was from Hansel and was born April 11, 1938. He served with the Green Berets in the Army's Special Forces. Edward was 33 years old when he died on June 1, 1971.

In addition to his parents and five siblings, he left behind his wife Nancy, his daughter Robin, and his son Alec.

His sister Linda remembers Edward as a hard worker who loved his children. His daughter Robin loved traveling as a child with her family to places such as Myrtle Beach and Washington, DC.

Edward became a captain in the Army after attending West Point. He served two tours of duty in Vietnam and died when the helicopter he was in crashed and burned.

STEVE ESCALLIER

Steve Escallier enlisted while living in Portal and was born February 13, 1950. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Steve died on October 31, 1969. He was 19 years old.

Steve's siblings remember him as an exceptional brother with good looks and long eyelashes. He held closely the Native American values of truth, life, family, and God. Steve was a firm believer in the United States and the obligation to help those who asked, so he chose to enlist. He had plans to become a teacher after completing his service.

Steve's sister Elyse believes the whole town where they lived in California mourned Steve's death. It took

the family years after his death to be able to say ''Vietnam'' and even longer to be able to say Steve's name.

STEVEN HANSON

Steven Hanson spent his early childhood in Aneta and was born October 27, 1949. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division. Steve died on September 24, 1971. He was 21 years old.

His family and friends called him Steve. While growing up, Steven's father Gordon served as a Lutheran pastor in the small town of Dazey, and the family traveled all over the world with his father's work as an Army chaplain.

Steven's younger brother by 10 years, David, tells of a letter the family received from a fellow soldier whose life Steven saved the day he died.

The letter described Steven as the pilot of his helicopter crew of four soldiers. Steven's helicopter was shot down, but he was able to guide it to a semicontrolled crash landing. A fellow pilot of Steven's also had survived a recent crash, and Steven was heard joking on the radio to tell so-and-so that he now has safely landed one, too.

One of his crew members was pinned under the helicopter and injured, so Steven helped to free him and called the evacuation helicopter. Later, a second chopper came and dropped down the cable to take Steven and his crewman to safety, but they were drawing fire, and the cable gave way. Steven fell 100 feet to his death.

In addition to his parents and siblings, Steven left behind a wife and son.

LEON COX

Leon Cox was from Jamestown and was born May 4, 1934. He enlisted in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. Leon was 35 years old when he died on May 17, 1969.

Leon, or ''Fuzzy,'' as he was affectionately called by his family, was the seventh of 12 children. Leon grew up in a family dedicated to serving our country. His father served in World War I; two brothers, John and Alex, served in World War II; and two other brothers, Donnie and Jim, served in Korea.

Leon made a career out of his military service. During his senior year of high school, he joined the National Guard and was deployed to Korea. After returning from his deployment, he joined the Army and was stationed in Germany, where he and his wife adopted a young girl named Nicolette.

Leon's family remembers him as a proud man who believed in his country.

GUNDER GUNDERSON

Gunder Gunderson was from Walhalla and was born on July 25, 1941. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Gunder was 24 years old when he died on November 23, 1965.

His fellow platoon soldier, Paul Guglietta, says that it was an honor to serve in the same platoon as Sergeant Gunderson. Paul remembers Gunder as being dedicated, hard-working, and very intelligent. He always drove himself to improve on everything he did. Paul was injured at the same time Gunder was killed and says that Gunder was a brave and courageous soldier.

ROY WAGNER

Roy Wagner was from Bismarck and was born February 23, 1947. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. Roy died October 2, 1967, at the age of 20.

When Roy's brother Toby was drafted, Roy decided to enlist. When the draft board met the brothers together, they decided that Toby should go home because he had a wife and kids. Roy was more than happy to take Toby's place.

While in Vietnam, Roy met a young Vietnamese boy whose parents had been killed in the conflict. It was Roy's intention to adopt the boy once he married his fiancee while on leave, but Roy was killed before he could marry his sweetheart or adopt the boy.

The day he died, Roy was in the field with five other soldiers. The group was led into a tunnel and ambushed. Three of the men were shot, and Roy knew that he needed to buy them some time. He stood at the front of the group shooting at the enemy until all of the other men got out. He took seven bullets, saved all five men, and lost his life that day. All five men later contacted the family to tell them of Roy's self-sacrifice.

The AMVETS post in Bismarck is named after Roy to honor his service and his sacrifice.

I wish to thank Bismarck High School students Kyra Wetzel and Hunter Lauer for sharing their research about Roy Wagner with us.

These are just a few of the brave men who served our country in Vietnam. As we are now experiencing the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam war, commemorated by an official proclamation by the President, I think it is important that we honor those who were killed in action and that we share their stories with the next generation of North Dakotans, the next generation of Americans, so they can truly appreciate the sacrifice of those who served us in the U.S. military and certainly the sacrifice which gave the last great measure of their lives.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREEDOM FOR BOB LEVINSON

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, at 5:30 p.m. today, we are going to vote on S. Con. Res. 16, which calls on the Government of Iran to release Americans who are being held. It also calls on the government to cooperate in finding, locating, and ultimately releasing Bob Levinson.

Robert Levinson, a retired FBI agent, while visiting the tourist Island of Kish in the Persian Gulf, which is a part of Iran, suddenly disappeared in 2007. It has been 8 years since his disappearance, which occurred on March 9, 2007. Since Bob is a part of this resolution, this is just another of a continuing conversation this Senator from Florida has had over the course of the last 8 years. It is unbelievable that it has been 8 years.

It wasn't until 2010—3½ years after his disappearance—that the Levinson family received a proof-of-life video. Then, 1 year later, they received photographs of Bob, in April of 2011. Since then, nothing.

Now, if the Government of Iran really wanted to help, they could. It may be that one part of the Iranian Government is keeping it from other parts. It could be the military—or the special part of the military, the Quds Force—knows, and it may be that the Foreign Minister and the President of Iran do not have the facts. But there is somebody in Iran who can produce the facts, if he wanted to, and that is the Supreme Leader.

Now, in this era of intense negotiations over preventing Iran from having a nuclear weapon and preventing them from the ability to develop a nuclear weapon any time in the next 10 years without us at least getting 1 year's advance notice so we can take countermeasures; in this time of intense discussions with Iran—of course, it is constantly brought up by our negotiating team, including Secretary of State Kerry, but it is rather inexcusable that the only answer Iran has is, We don't know anything about Bob Levinson.

This is, of course, personal to the FBI community because the hostage is one of their retired agents. It is personal to us in Florida as well. Bob left behind a wife, seven children, and four grandchildren. Christine Levinson lives in Florida. A number of the FBI agents who have tried to help her over the course of the years also live in Florida. We are hopefully and prayerfully expectant that if it is a successfully concluded negotiation to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon, that the Government of Iran will immediately release all Americans who are in jail whom we know about and likewise will make the effort to find Bob and bring him home to his wife and seven children. That is what humanity would absolutely require.

So at this particular time—8 years-plus into the process—we make this

plea for former FBI agent Bob Levinson.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, spring in Washington, DC, is one of the most beautiful times of the year, as it is in Connecticut and around the country. We have endured a tough winter in the Northeast—a lot of snow and a lot of cold. And now a lot of potholes are all around the country. Spring means potholes, which are endemic not only to the Northeast but to our roads all around America. Potholes are just the latest reminder of infrastructure challenges facing our Nation. That is one reason why this week is, in fact, Infrastructure Week, a time when we should be focusing on rail and roads, the decaying and aging infrastructure that bedevils and hobbles our Nation as we seek to compete globally. And our businesses in Connecticut seek to compete nationally as well as globally.

This time of year is also the beginning of the construction season, especially in the colder regions of the country, such as the Northeast and Iowa, Nebraska, and the Midwest.

In Connecticut, construction workers are ready to go, ready to take advantage of this chance to address our aging and decaying transportation assets.

I know that trade is on our agenda this week. I urge and implore that trade be set aside, that the trade bill be delayed—not forever, by any means. As the leader of our caucus has urged—our leader HARRY REID has implored that we focus on infrastructure. We face a deadline. May marks the last month of MAP–21, the law governing surface transportation funding. On May 31—just 20 days from now—the authorization governing our highway trust fund will expire. That is right. There is a highway cliff that we are just days away from going over. This Nation will go over that cliff unless we act, and now is the moment. Now is the time. Now is our opportunity, and it is an opportunity that will not excuse us from acting.

The bill covers more than just funding. It is crucial to keeping our roadways safe. Now, 2014 was a record year for auto recalls, auto problems, and issues. So part of what needs to be done in addressing the expiration of MAP–21 is to make safety a priority. But it cannot be achieved if we don't address the fundamental challenges of our aging infrastructure.

Fundamental reforms are needed at the NHTSA and other safety watchdogs to make sure our constituents are safe. So one would think now would be the time to discuss legislation that would fix our streets and stop potholes from imperiling our drivers and put construction workers back on the job, providing a lifeline to nearly 2 million Americans who have jobs directly tied to the transportation sector.

One would think we would want to cut down on our unemployment. In the construction sector, joblessness remains at a 10-percent level. You would think that now is the time to be advancing a multiyear, long-term bill that will provide certainty to States and municipalities so they can finalize planning for long-term projects. You would think that now is the time to take a hard look at our safety oversight agencies—NHTSA, the FRA, the Federal Highway Administration—and to make reforms and increase the tools that they have in fines and penalties they can exact to protect all who rely on our transportation network.

Unfortunately, the approach of this Congress is going to be, as engineers say, patch and pray. Patch the potholes, patch the roads, patch the railroads—even when the tracks are cracked, even when ballasts are failing. Patch the bridges. Patch and pray. We are about to become a nation of patch and pray when it comes to decaying, deficient roads, bridges, railroads, and all the vital nuts and bolts, literally, that transport our Nation.

How ironic it is at this moment—when it is spring, when the construction industry is about to rely on the opportunities it has to put people back to work, and when many of us in this Chamber and others at school commencements will be talking about the big ideas, the big challenges, the big dreams and hopes that our graduates have for the future—that we are thinking small. We are thinking about patching—patching our highway transit fund for months, maybe until the end of the year. A nation that patches and prays cannot be exceptional, cannot be a great nation when it comes to shortchanging investments in the vital facilities, in the nuts and bolts, in the roads and bridges that make it a national competitor.

This kind of short-term extension of a highway and transit system fails to match the challenges that our Nation faces. We spend less and invest less as a percentage of our gross domestic product than many other industrialized nations. Europe and China spend far more as a percentage of their gross domestic product than we do.

So I call on the leadership, my good friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to make infrastructure our priority for this week, as it should be for this decade. Within this decade, according to some projections, one in four of our bridges will be 65 years or older, making them even more prone to decay and disrepair.

The consequences are real and costly. Bridges collapse, such as the 50-year old Skagit River Bridge in Washington. The bridge collapsed sending cars into the river below. That wasn't a remote bridge. It was over Interstate 5, a major artery on the west coast. Of course, we all remember the 2007 bridge collapse in Minneapolis. We remember the Mianus River Bridge collapse in Connecticut, the Bridgeport derailment due to decaying and cracking tracks that were improperly repaired. We remember where lives were lost because of a derailment and the failure to invest in train communication and signaling that could have prevented that tragedy. We remember the railroad grade crossings where insufficient investment in modern technology causes deaths all around the country—hundreds of them every year—not to mention billions of dollars due to these collisions, derailments, crashes on the roads, costing lives and imperiling our Nation's future.

A short-term patch robs our States and municipalities of the certainty they need to contract what is essential to construction at the lowest possible cost in the most efficient way. The certainty and reliability in funding are essential to our municipalities, knowing what their resources will be not just this year but into the future and driving the bargaining with contractors and subcontractors.

It is not just because of our rebuilding needs that we need this investment. There are also many other significant related issues that we must address to keep our roads and bridges safe and reliable. We need to ensure that trucks on the road aren't too big, that truck drivers have enough rest, that our railroads are properly overseen, that constant train control is implemented, that testing for physical and emotional problems is done regularly and reliably. And the long list of NTSB regulations needs to be finally addressed and implemented.

We are in a time when we are talking to young men and women as they graduate from school about those big ideas and about their futures and dreams, when we invoke what is best and brightest about America, our foresight, our strength, our courage to take risks, to invest in ourselves and our future. It is the same spirit that led to the building of the Erie Canal, the transcontinental railroad, and the interstate highway system. Those initiatives were not partisan initiatives. The greatest generation came back from World War II and built the interstate highways under the leadership of President Dwight Eisenhower. He was committed to making America one Nation in its

roads, tying us and binding us together as a Nation through that investment. He had the courage—as we should today—to say that what is great about America is what we give back, what we are willing to invest—not only for today, but for tomorrow.

And we are in danger today in this Chamber, in this Nation, of being one of the first generations that left a lesser America for our children. Think of it—a lesser America at a time when the words ''exceptional'' and ''exceptionalism'' trip off the tongues of many of our colleagues here in the Chamber. We need to match that rhetoric with real action.

So today, let us resolve that we will debate and act on a long-term investment program to make sure that our roads and bridges, our railroads and airports, and the ports that could make our Nation the envy of the world are matching our rhetoric and our goals; that they truly make us competitive for businesses in Connecticut and around the Nation, competitive on the global scene, where competition has never been tougher and where our infrastructure needs to be better.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I am back on the floor again for ''Waste of the Week'' No. 10. As my colleagues know, I have been coming down every week talking about waste, fraud, and abuse, ways we can save taxpayer dollars. While we have not been able to address, unfortunately, tragically, the larger issue of the plunge into deficit spending and debt that our Nation has incurred over the past several years, in particular—every effort, every bipartisan effort, has been thwarted by the President's refusal to engage in that, and yet the debt clock keeps on ticking. We keep spending more money than we take in. We keep putting more and more of a burden on future generations as well as our own.

Our economy is not growing. One of the reasons is that we have not achieved fiscal responsibility in the Congress. So while we have not been able to address the larger issue, we can at least address some of those issues that have been documented as waste, fraud, and abuse, documented by nonpartisan agencies that are established for the sole purpose of weeding out some of the excess spending that is not essential to the functioning of government.

We have put up some pretty interesting numbers relative to what we have achieved. We are already over $50 billion of spending that has been documented as totally unnecessary. Some of it has been of the character of somewhat ridiculous. Some has been very, very substantial. We are going to continue to do this, pointing out to the American taxpayer and pointing out to government officials who run these agencies and make these decisions that we simply cannot afford to keep doing this.

So today's waste of the week will be addressed, hopefully by the Appropriations Committee, which will soon be working now that we have passed a budget, to distribute those funds that are necessary for the functioning of government.

I am urging them to use a system and means of identifying what is essential and what is not essential. Now, there may be some things we would like to do but cannot afford to do. They need to be put on hold until we can do them. But there are a lot of issues and a lot of spending that goes on that should not be done in the first place.

Significant savings can be made. Even though it is much smaller than what we need to do, we certainly can address issues that will save taxpayer dollars and better allocate spending for government. When our previous Governor in Indiana, Mitch Daniels, took over, he brought with him a resume as former Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Then-President George W. Bush gave him the name ''The Blade.'' ''The Blade'' looked at every small, little detail of spending and asked a lot of questions: Why are we doing this? How can we save? How can we make government more efficient? There are essential things government has to do. But when he became Governor, he transferred over some of that knowledge and expertise and started doing some simple things, asking some simple questions: Why are we spending money on this? Why are we spending money on that?

Let me give you just a couple of examples. He gathered some of his staff and said: I want you to go out and put pennies on the tires of our State-owned vehicles wherever they are housed. Wherever they are parked, put pennies on them. He waited several months then said: Now, go back and identify all of those vehicles where the pennies are still on the tire. In other words, they had not been moved. They had not even been shifted to another parking spot. They simply were just sitting there.

Well, interestingly enough, he found that many unused State vehicles still had the pennies on their tires. If they had been sitting there for months and nobody was using them, why are we paying for them? Why are we spending money on purchasing these? Let's sell them off, save some money for the State. They obviously are not necessary. It was one-third of the State's fleet of vehicles.

Another thing he did, he said: Let's look at our printing costs. The State had its own printing operation. He said: Let's shop around and see if the private sector can do this more effectively and efficiently. Of course, they did find a private vendor in Indiana that did it much more effectively.

You save a lot of money just going black and white, maybe not quite as pretty, maybe not quite as attractive as color, but another way to save money.

These are small things, but when you total them up for all the agencies that are in Washington—as was determined by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform—it adds up to a lot of money. This government is more vast than anyone can possibly imagine.

Well, the Commission found that Federal agencies could save at least $10 billion over 10 years by cutting out waste in federal travel, printing and vehicle expenses. So here again is a waste of the week that we are going to add to our ever-increasing gauge of the waste. All this now in red, these are what we have been adding, the 10 items that we have added. We are approaching now, looks like $60 billion, on our way to $100 billion. I think we will probably be having to add extensions to this because, folks, I mean, there is waste out there, there is fraud out there, there is abuse out there like you would not believe.

Should we be dealing with the larger question, the runaway entitlements, the lack of money to adequately fund NIH or scientific research or education but we cannot because our budget is totally out of control? Should we be doing this? Absolutely. That is what we are here for. We have talked about this for the last 5 years since I have been back here. Despite the many alternatives that have been presented to the White House, every one has been rejected.

So at least let's do those things where we have more control through the appropriations process and better manage government, make it more efficient and make it more effective. That is why we point out these and we will continue to point out these in the ''Waste of the Week'' No. 10. I cannot wait to get down here next week and do No. 11.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

STATING THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES REGARDING THE RELEASE OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN IRAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 16, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) stating the policy of the United States regarding the release of United States citizens in Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on adoption of S. Con. Res. 16.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I first want to thank Senator RISCH for his tireless dedication to the plight of the three American citizens unjustifiably detained in Iran, as well as his efforts to call upon the Iranian Government to cooperate in locating Robert Levinston, a missing fourth American, and also returning him to his family.

I also want to thank my colleagues from the States these Americans are from—Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER from California, Senators STABENOW and PETERS from Michigan, Senators NELSON and RUBIO from Florida, and Senators CRAPO and RISCH from Idaho—for their efforts in working with the families of these American citizens who have been held too long in Iran.

I call upon the government of Iran to do the right thing—do the right thing and immediately release these citizens and send them home to their families and communities as soon as possible. The resolution has a statement of policy that is absolutely unobjectionable in any way.

Let me point out one last thing, if I might. As the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I want to reassure the families of these Americans that I will continue to urge the U.S. Government to use every tool at its disposal to secure the release of these Americans, and I will continue to call upon the Iranian Government to immediately and unconditionally release these men and send them home to their families.

I am very pleased we will soon be voting on this resolution, which unequivocally says that America should use all the tools at its disposal for the return of these Americans.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the quorum call, the time be equally divided between the majority and the minority.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I commend Senator RISCH, and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this resolution, which is incredibly important to people in Michigan as well as across the country.

We have a very special man who unfortunately is being held as a hostage in Iran, and he needs to come home now. I have had the honor of getting to know the family of Amir Hekmati. He is a patriotic American from Flint, MI, who served his country honorably and bravely as a marine between 2001 to 2005 in Iraq and Afghanistan. He is an American citizen but also became a dual citizen with Iran in order to be able to visit his grandmother and other family members in Iran.

In August 2011, he was visiting his grandmother and was arrested by the Iranian authorities and charged with spying for the CIA, which was absolutely false, absolutely trumped-up charges. He was then deprived of a fair trial and jailed on those totally trumped-up charges.

Of those Americans confirmed as prisoners in Iran, none have been incarcerated longer than Amir Hekmati. He has been waiting the longest to come home. He has been tortured and is locked inside a prison notorious for its deplorable conditions. Meanwhile, Amir's father is battling terminal brain cancer.

I was very honored to have the opportunity to spend time with his family—his mom and dad, his sister and two brothers—who are passionately engaged in speaking out, coming to Washington, meeting with the State Department, and making sure we are laser-focused on their brother and their son. My heart went out to them.

Think about all of us who have children. Speaking to his mom and dad, it is frightening, it is deplorable, it is outrageous, and he needs to come home—now.

I can't say enough about the love and devotion of the Hekmati family. I have had a number of different opportunities to meet with them. Amir's sister and brother have frequently been here in Washington making sure we are not forgetting about this brave marine. They have fought so hard for his freedom.

I also commend Congressman DAN KILDEE, who represents the Hekmati family in Flint, MI, for being a great partner and such a strong advocate and a strong voice on behalf of Amir and his family.

This resolution is a clear message to the Iranian Government: If you want a seat at the table with the rest of the international community, free Amir Hekmati now, as well as all the other U.S. citizens who are being held as hostages.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to all of their families. I can tell this body that for us, in Michigan, we are laser-focused on making sure that Amir Hekmati's name is lifted up at every opportunity and that it is very clear that this brave, courageous marine who served our country so well has the full support of our government to bring him home immediately.

I congratulate and thank my colleague.

I am proud to be one of the cosponsors on this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator STABENOW for her work on this resolution and for her actions on behalf of her constituent who is being held in Iran. She has been extremely helpful in bringing this resolution forward.

I see Senator RISCH on the floor. I want to state one last time that because of Senator RISCH, we are on the floor tonight with a vote in the full Senate. I thank him for his tenacity and persistence on bringing this resolution forward so we can focus this on the four Americans being held by Iran and our desire to get them home as soon as possible and use every tool we have at our disposal on behalf of those Americans.

Mr. President, I thank Senator RISCH for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, in addition to thanking Senator RISCH for his tenacity and making sure we are at this point with this resolution, I must also go back to our vote last week and the incredible work of our two colleagues in a bipartisan way, as we saw Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN come together and lead us forward with a very thoughtful piece of legislation that makes clear the role of the Senate in a very important process right now in negotiations.

I thank Senator CARDIN as the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senators PORTMAN, ROBERTS, KIRK, BOOZMAN, SASSE, and ROUNDS as cosponsors to S. Con. Res. 16.

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

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for those kind words. I think ''tenacity'' is probably an appropriate description. I would like to have had a little more tenaciousness if it would have resulted in better and stronger language than we have. Nonetheless, we have what we have.

I congratulate Senator CARDIN and Senator CORKER for their hard work on the resolution that passed here last week, which went out of here with only one dissenting vote. It was a difficult process, to say the least. Obviously, it didn't rise to the level that a lot of us wanted to see where this—it could have and should have been handled like a treaty. Indeed, it is a treaty. No matter what else we call it, it is a treaty. Nonetheless, we are where we are. We are better off with these things than without. We are going to wait to see how this plays out as the summer unfolds. We have an important June 30 date. Once an agreement is reached, then, of course, we will be on the floor talking and discussing the appropriateness of the agreement.

There are a lot of us who have been critical of how this started and, for that matter, where we are today. In my judgment, this shouldn't have even started. They shouldn't have even sat down at the table until these people were released and/or accounted for. Nonetheless, we are where we are.

There are four people we are talking about in this resolution. Senator STABENOW already referred to one and gave an excellent description of where we are with that individual.

Next, I will talk about the gentleman from California who is also being held. His name is Jason Rezaian. He has been held on unspecified charges since July 2014, denied access to an attorney in violation of Iran's own laws and international norms, for that matter.

Robert Levinson of Florida is a retired FBI agent who was pursuing an investigation in Iran. He was abducted off Kish Island, off the coast of Iran, in March 2007. His whereabouts are unknown. The Iranian Government has repeatedly said they are not holding Levinson, but certainly they should cut loose the information they have, and this resolution requires them to do so.

Lastly, I want to talk about Saeed Abedini. Pastor Abedini is a constituent of mine from Idaho. He is an ordained Christian minister. He has family in Iran. At the time he was arrested, he was in Iran visiting family and in the process of setting up and running an orphanage. He is detained at the present time in Evin Prison, which is considered one of the worst prisons in Iran. He has been held in solitary confinement, physically beaten, denied access to necessary medical treatment as a result of abuse, and was denied access to his lawyer until just before trial.

He had a trial. He was convicted and sentenced to 8 years. And his offense—his offense—was being Christian and pursuing Christianity in a country where this is not permitted. I think it is shocking to most Americans that this could happen in today's age. This is barbarous conduct by a regime that knows no shame. This man should be released from prison and should be released forthwith. He has done absolutely nothing that is a threat to the Iranian people or, in fact, to the Iranian regime—those are two different things we are talking about here. He has done nothing to be a threat to those people, and he should be released.

Iran thinks it elevates its position in the world because it does these kinds of things. It does not. Certainly it shows toughness but a barbarian type of toughness that the world is not impressed with at all.

This is a country which pushes the envelope whenever it can. This country is at the heart of virtually every problem we have in that part of the world. Most importantly, it is one of if not the most prominent promoters of terrorism in the world. Some time ago, this was thought of as a good thing by some of these nations that do not rise to what they should be on the world stage as an important nation. Terrorism was thought of as a way that things could be done.

In recent years, most every country has had it with terrorism. It is no longer something people look at and say, well, yes, there is terrorism, but you need to understand the root causes. That is gone. That is absolutely gone. The other countries in this region have had it with terrorism. Everyone in the region now is going to feel that as we go forward.

There is hope for Iran. The demographics in that country show there is a real disconnect between the people of that country and the regime that operates that country. Most notably, as a downside for the present regime, is that the demographics show that the vast majority of people who are living in Iran are young people. They have a different view of the world than the regime does. They are a secular people who do not want to be ruled by religious fanatics, which is what they have today. In any event, the world is watching how this is going to unfold.

Now, we have a clear expression—and Senator CARDIN made mention of this. We ran this as a separate document, not as part of the resolution we passed last week. This is a separate document, where we are going to have a clear expression of the nature and the view of what the world thinks of this and the view that the U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress takes of the conduct that Iran is engaged in. It is a separate view, and I believe it will be very helpful to the notion that this regime in Iran cannot—cannot—continue down the road it is going down. The Iran regime purports to represent its people. What it is doing is not helpful to the Iranian people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I will yield back all remaining time, with the consent of my colleague from Maryland.

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

The question occurs on agreeing to S. Con. Res. 16.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Ernst	Menendez
Baldwin	Feinstein	Merkley
Barrasso	Fischer	Mikulski
Bennet	Flake	Moran
Blumenthal	Franken	Murkowski
Blunt	Gardner	Murphy
Boozman	Gillibrand	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nelson
Brown	Hatch	Paul
Burr	Heinrich	Perdue
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Peters
Capito	Heller	Portman
Cardin	Hirono	Reed
Carper	Hoeven	Reid
Casey	Inhofe	Risch
Cassidy	Isakson	Roberts
Coats	Johnson	Rounds
Cochran	Kaine	Sasse
Collins	King	Schatz
Coons	Klobuchar	Schumer
Corker	Lankford	Scott
Cornyn	Leahy	Sessions
Cotton	Lee	Shaheen
Crapo	Manchin	Shelby
Daines	Markey	Stabenow
Donnelly	McCain	Tester
Durbin	McCaskill	Tillis

Toomey	Warner	Whitehouse
Udall	Warren	Wicker

NOT VOTING—10

Booker	Rubio	Vitter
Cruz	Sanders	Wyden
Graham	Sullivan	
Kirk	Thune	

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 16

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON RELEASE OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Saeed Abedini of Idaho is a Christian pastor unjustly detained in Iran since 2012 and sentenced to eight years in prison on charges related to his religious beliefs.

(2) Amir Hekmati of Michigan is a former United States Marine unjustly detained in 2011 while visiting his Iranian relatives and sentenced to 10 years in prison for espionage.

(3) Jason Rezaian of California is a Washington Post journalist credentialed by the Government of Iran. He was unjustly detained in 2014 and has been held without a trial.

(4) Robert Levinson of Florida is a former Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) official who disappeared in 2007 in Iran. He is the longest held United States citizen in United States history.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that—

(1) the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran should immediately release Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, and Jason Rezaian, and cooperate with the United States Government to locate and return Robert Levinson; and

(2) the United States Government should undertake every effort using every diplomatic tool at its disposal to secure their immediate release.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING JOHN G. HEYBURN II

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on Friday, May 8, I had the honor of paying tribute to a dear friend, John Heyburn, who passed away on April 29 after a long illness.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I gave during the celebration of his life at St. Francis in the Fields Episcopal Church in Harrods Creek, KY, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[May 8, 2015]

LEADER MCCONNELL'S EULOGY OF JOHN HEYBURN

We lost John just a few days ago, but it's been a long goodbye.

And so Martha, as we celebrate John this morning, we honor you too.

Because through it all, you were his most faithful companion, his fiercest advocate, and a cherished lifeline to those of us who loved him dearly.

And we're grateful.

Scripture tells us that heaven is a city. And I like to think that even in life John would have appreciated the comparison. He loved this city and all that it meant to him—the connection it gave him to family and the father he so admired—the opportunity it gave him to help so many others over the years as a mentor, a friend, a neighbor, and as a wise and patient jurist.

John just loved being with people—and we loved being with him. He was a man who was full of life and vigor and a boundless curiosity about the world around him and the people who filled it.

Above all, though, he was good.

They say that politics is a contact sport, which is true. I confess I enjoy it. But it's also true that politics carries temptations for all us who are involved in it. Most of us struggle with those temptations, and some occasionally cross the line. Not John.

John Heyburn had as much integrity as anyone I have ever known. As a young man, he dreamed of being a politician. But what he really wanted, I think, was to play a part in shaping events—to leave a mark on his country, his city, his community . . . to live not just for himself but for others.

Like so many other great men, he found his heart's ambition in an unexpected place: in the courtroom he came to love, in his marriage with Martha, and in the sons he cherished. And in these last few years, he showed his greatness in another unexpected way. It was in his heroic struggle against a terrible illness that he inspired us most with his optimism and his athlete's spirit. He let us accompany him on the journey, and we we're the better for it.

To borrow the words of another U.S. Senator, John taught us how to live and he taught us how to die.

We will miss his hearty laugh, his kind eyes, his thoughtful presence. But as we say our final goodbye to this good man, we are comforted by the thought that he is now in the heavenly city, where we are told that every tear will be wiped away, full of vigor and new life.

And we are consoled to think that John Heyburn has finally heard those words he longed to hear: ''Well done, good and faithful servant, enter your master's joy.''

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act expires in a matter of weeks. Senator LEE and I have a bipartisan bill, the USA FREEDOM Act, that would end the use of section 215 to authorize the bulk collection of Americans' phone records and replace it with a more targeted program. It also would enact other important reforms to bring more accountability and transparency to government surveillance. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is bringing that same bill for a vote in the House on Wednesday.

Last week, some opponents came to the floor to voice their opposition. They claimed that ending this bulk collection program would somehow put our national security at risk and that a bulk collection program like this could somehow have prevented the September 11 attacks. But the facts are not on their side. According to the headline of a recent National Journal story, these opponents of reform have made ''dubious claims in defense of NSA surveillance.''

I agree these claims are dubious, and I want to set the record straight. I ask unanimous consent that the National Journal story dated May 8, 2015, and an analysis by the Center for Democracy and Technology of similar claims be printed in the RECORD.

One Senator stated on the Senate floor last week, ''If this program had existed before 9/11, it is quite possible we would have known that 9/11 hijacker Khalid Al Mihdhar was living in San Diego and was making phone calls to an Al Qaeda safe house in Yemen.''

Another seemed to suggest that the bulk collection program would ''have prevented 9/11.''

When I was chairman in the last Congress, the Senate Judiciary Committee held six hearings to examine revelations about government surveillance activities. At one of those hearings, I asked former counterterrorism official Richard Clarke, who was working in the Bush administration on September 11, whether the NSA bulk collection program would have prevented those attacks. He testified that the government had the information it needed to prevent the attacks but failed to properly share that information among Federal agencies.

Senator Bob Graham, who investigated the September 11th attacks as head of the Senate Intelligence Committee, likewise has said that ''there were plenty of opportunities without having to rely on this metadata system for the FBI and intelligence agencies to have located Mihdhar.''

The other claim that has been made repeatedly over the past few days is that, as one Senator put it, the bulk collection of Americans' phone records is ''very effective at keeping America safe.'' Another stated that the USA FREEDOM Act would ''eliminate the essential intelligence this program collects.''

But numerous national security experts also have concluded that the NSA's bulk collection program is not essential to national security. The President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technology, which included two former national security officials, stated:

> The information contributed to terrorist investigations by the use of section 215 telephony metadata was not essential to preventing attacks and could readily have been obtained in a timely manner using conventional section 215 orders.

Former Acting CIA Director Michael Morell testified to the Senate Judiciary Committee that the review group's

recommendation to end the government's collection of that data and instead allow the government to search phone records held by the telecommunications providers would not add a substantial burden to the government. That is precisely the approach of our bipartisan USA FREEDOM Act.

Last year, the Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General supported a prior version of the USA FREEDOM Act, which also ended bulk collection under section 215 and replaced it with a more targeted phone records program. The Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence said that our bill ''preserve[d] essential Intelligence Community capabilities.''

These individuals are not newcomers to the issue of national security. They understand the threats to our Nation. They do not have a political motive. They have the best interests of our Nation and its values in mind when they tell us that we can end the dragnet collection of innocent Americans' phone records and keep our country safe.

The USA FREEDOM Act does not just end NSA's bulk collection program under section 215. It also fills other gaps in our intelligence capabilities. It ensures that the government can quickly obtain business records—including phone records—in emergency situations. It ensures that if a foreign terrorist who poses a serious threat comes into the United States, the government does not have to stop its surveillance while it seeks emergency wiretap authorization from the Attorney General. It ensures that the government need not terminate FISA surveillance on a foreigner who temporarily travels outside the United States. And it ensures that the FBI has the tools it needs to investigate individuals who are facilitating the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction on behalf of a foreign government or terrorist organization. These provisions were requested by the FBI and by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. They were not part of the bill that was filibustered in the Senate in November.

As a final matter, it is notable that there has been not a single Senate committee hearing on surveillance reform or the expiring provisions in the 5 months of this new Congress under Republican leadership. There has been zero committee consideration on the bill that Senator MCCONNELL has now brought directly to the Senate calendar that would simply extend these expiring provisions. I recall the promises that under new leadership the committees would work through regular order, but that has not occurred even though it was apparent to all last year that we would need to grapple with long-overdue reforms. This lack of leadership or any committee process is also despite the fact that the leader and chairmen of the relevant committees would not even let us debate the USA FREEDOM Act last year, in part because it had not gone through committee. As the process moves forward this year, we should not be hearing complaints about lack of process from those who did not provide it.

There is no question that the USA FREEDOM Act contains far-reaching surveillance reforms. But the most high-ranking intelligence officials in the country have endorsed its approach because it is a responsible bill. It protects Americans' privacy and keeps them safe. The Senate should take up the bill once the House passes it this week.

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

[From National Journal, May 8, 2015]

REPUBLICANS MAKE DUBIOUS CLAIMS IN DEFENSE OF NSA SURVEILLANCE

MITCH MCCONNELL AND HIS COHORT OF SECURITY HAWKS ARE STOPPING AT NOTHING TO RENEW THE SPY AGENCY'S PHONE DRAGNET. BUT HOW FAIR IS THEIR DEFENSE?

(By Dustin Volz)

One by one, several powerful Republican senators took to the floor Thursday morning to offer one of the most full-throated defenses of the National Security Agency's bulk collection of billions of U.S. phone records since Edward Snowden exposed the program nearly two years ago.

The crux of their argument is unmistakable: The NSA's expansive surveillance powers need to remain intact and unchanged to keep Americans safe from potential terrorist threats—and if these powers existed before Sept. 11, 2001, they may have assisted in preventing the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

But some of the talking points used by Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell and his allies appear to rely heavily on assertions that are either dubious in their veracity or elide important contextual details.

Here is a review of some of their declarations:

Claim: ''Not only have these tools kept us safe, there has not been a single incident, not one, of intentional abuse of them.''—McConnell

McConnell may have been referring specifically to the phone records program here, but the NSA does not, as he implies, have a spotless record.

According to a 2013 inspector general report, NSA analysts intentionally misused foreign surveillance authorities at least a dozen times in the past decade, sometimes for the purpose of spying on their romantic interests. So-called ''loveint''—short for ''love intelligence''—was revealed by the inspector general in response to a letter sent from Republican Sen. Chuck Grassley, who this year renewed a call for the Justice Department to provide an update on how it was handling its investigation into the alleged willful abuses and to ''appropriate accountability for those few who violate the trust placed in them.''

Additionally, a 2012 internal audit obtained by The Washington Post found that the NSA has violated privacy restrictions set in place for its surveillance programs thousands of times each year since 2008. The audit found that most—though not all—infractions were unintended.

Claim: ''The compromise legislation rolls us back to the same thing we were doing pre-9/11.''—Senate Intelligence Chairman Richard Burr

The USA Freedom Act referenced by Burr would reauthorize three key surveillance provisions under the post-9/11 Patriot Act. It would usher in several reforms related to transparency and oversight, but it would keep those authorities intact. Section 215 of the law would no longer allow for the bulk collection of U.S. phone metadata by the NSA, but the authority—created after 9/11—would still exist.

Claim: ''The alternatives to the current program would not come close to offering the capabilities that now enable us to protect Americans.''—Sen. Tom Cotton

Cotton's claim does not align with the stance of Director of National Intelligence James Clapper and then-Attorney General Eric Holder, who sent a letter to lawmakers last year expressing their support for an earlier iteration of the Freedom Act. ''The intelligence community believes that your bill preserves essential intelligence-community capabilities; and the Department of Justice and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence support your bill and believe that it is a reasonable compromise that enhances privacy and civil liberties and increases transparency,'' the letter read. That version of the Freedom Act is widely considered more limiting of surveillance powers than the one being debated in Congress this year.

Claim: ''One alternative offered by opponents of this program is to have phone companies retain control of all call data and provide the NSA only the data responsive to searches phone companies would run on the NSA's behalf. This is not technologically feasible.''—Cotton

The reliance on phone companies to retain call data already occurs, as they are the ones who turn the records over to the government in bulk. Cotton, who voted for a pared down iteration of the Freedom Act last year when he served in the House, cites an 85-page study from the National Research Council to support this assertion. But the Arkansas freshman appears to be conflating its findings, which dealt with whether software could fully replace bulk collection, with what backers of the Freedom Act are attempting to do. ''Although no software can fully replace bulk with targeted information collection, software can be developed to more effectively target collection and to control the usage of collected data,'' the report concluded. Cotton's reservations—that the new system may take longer than the old—have more to do with process than technological capabilities.

Claim: ''Here's the truth. If this program had existed before 9/11, it is quite possible that we would have known that the 9/11 hijacker Khalid al-Mihdhar was living in San Diego and making phone calls to an al-Qaida safehouse in Yemen. There's no guarantee we would have known. Theres no way we can go back in time and prove it, but there is a probability that we would have known and there's a probability that American lives could have been saved.''—Sen. Marco Rubio.

Rubio hedges his language several times with this claim, but the statement still omits important context. As reported by a 2013 ProPublica investigation, ''U.S. intelligence agencies knew the identity of the hijacker in question, Saudi national Khalid al-Mihdhar, long before 9/11 and had the ability find him, but they failed to do so.'' Such missed opportunities to disrupt Midhar's activities, which were being monitored by at

least as early as 1999, reflect a failure of information sharing among intelligence agencies, ProPublica notes, and are described in detail in the 9/11 Commission report.

SENATORS' QUESTIONABLE CLAIMS ABOUT NSA BULK COLLECTION

CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY & TECHNOLOGY

On May 7th, 2015, the Second Circuit issued a ruling that declared the NSA's bulk collection of Americans' phone records was clearly unlawful under the Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. The ruling provided another boost to supporters of surveillance reform and the backers of the USA FREEDOM Act. Hours after the ruling came down, several U.S. Senators—Mitch McConnell, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Jeff Sessions, and Marco Rubio—took to the Senate Floor to forcefully defend the NSA's bulk collection program. The Senators made some statements that merit a second look, and serious skepticism.

Claim 1: The NSA's bulk collection of Americans' phone records is essential to national security. ''Under consideration in the House and proposed in the Senate is the socalled USA FREEDOM Act, which will eliminate the essential intelligence this program collects.''—Senator Tom Cotton

The weight of public evidence contradicts this claim, based on statements from experts with access to classified intelligence:

The Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence stated that the USA FREEDOM Act of 2014—which is in all ways identical to or less restrictive of surveillance than the 2014 bill—''preserves essential Intelligence Community capabilities'' though the bill ''bans bulk collection under a variety of authorities.''

The President's Review Group noted in 2014 that the bulk collection program yielded information that was ''not essential to preventing attacks and could readily have been obtained in a timely manner using conventional section 215 orders.''

The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board stated in 2014: ''Based on the information provided to the Board, including classified briefings and documentation, we have not identified a single instance involving a threat to the United States in which the program made a concrete difference in the outcome of a counterterrorism investigation. Moreover, we are aware of no instance in which the program directly contributed to the discovery of a previously unknown terrorist plot or the disruption of a terrorist attack.''

Senators Wyden, Heinrich, and Udall said in 2013 ''[We] have reviewed this surveillance extensively and have seen no evidence that the bulk collection of Americans' phone records has provided any intelligence of value that could not have been gathered through less intrusive means.''

It's important not to conflate the value of Sec. 215 overall with the effectiveness of the use of Section 215 for bulk collection. Sec. 215 can be used for targeted—not just bulk—data collection. The USA FREEDOM Act ends nationwide bulk collection under Sec. 215, but preserves the government's ability to use Sec. 215 for more targeted collection. What is at stake with USA FREEDOM is not Sec. 215 itself, but its continued use for bulk domestic surveillance.

Claim 2: The bulk collection program could have stopped 9/11. ''Here is the truth. If this program had existed before 9/11, it is quite possible we would have known that 9/11 hijacker Khalid Al Mihdhar was living in San Diego and was making phone calls to an Al Qaeda safe house in Yemen.''—Senator Marco Rubio

A bulk collection program was not necessary to find Al Mihdhar prior to 9/11. As the PCLOB report details, the NSA had already begun intercepting calls to and from the safe house in Yemen in the late 1990s. Since the government knew the number of the safe house, and Al Mihdhar was calling that number, it would only be necessary to collect the phone records of the safe house to discover Al Mihdhar in San Diego. This is, in fact, an example of how targeted surveillance would have been more effective than bulk collection. The 9/11 Commission Report and other sources note that the CIA was aware of Mihdhar well before the attack and missed multiple opportunities to deny him entry to the U.S. or intensify their surveillance of him.

Claim 3: Bulk collection of phone records is the same as a subpoena. ''This is the way the system works and has worked for the last 50 years—40 years at least. A crime occurs. A prosecutor or the DEA agent investigates. They issue a subpoena to the local phone company that has these telephone toll records—the same thing you get in the mail—and they send them in response to the subpoena.''—Senator Jeff Sessions

The Second Circuit opinion, which held that the bulk collection program is unlawful, included a lengthy comparison of subpoenas and the bulk collection program. The bulk collection program encompasses a vastly larger quantity of records than could be obtained with a subpoena. The Second Circuit notes that subpoenas typically seek records of particular individuals or entities during particular time periods, but the government claims Sec. 215 provides authority to collect records connected to everyone—on an ''ongoing daily basis''—for an indefinite period extending into the future.

Claim 4: The government is only analyzing a few phone records. ''The next time that any politician—Senator, Congressman—talking head, whoever it may be, stands up and says ''The U.S. Government is [. . .] going through your phone records,'' they are lying. It is not true, except for some very isolated instances—in the hundreds—of individuals for whom there is reasonable suspicion that they could have links to terrorism.''—Senator Marco Rubio

The NSA's telephony bulk collection program collects the phone records of millions of Americans with no connection to a crime or terrorism. These records are stored with the NSA and they are analyzed scores of times each year when the NSA queries the numbers' connection to the phone numbers of suspects. Moreover, until 2014, when the NSA suspected a phone number was connected to terrorism, the NSA analyzed the phone records ''three hops'' out—querying those who called those who called those who called the original suspect number. As a result, the PCLOB estimated, a single query could subject the full calling records of over 420,000 phone numbers to deeper scrutiny. In 2014, the President limited the query to ''two hops''—though this can still encompass the full call records of thousands of phone numbers. The USA FREEDOM Act (Sec. 101) would authorize the government to obtain ''two hops'' worth of call records from telecom companies.

Claim 5: The USA FREEDOM Act threatens privacy by leaving phone records with telecom companies. ''[T]he opponents of America's counterterror programs would rather trust telecommunication companies to hold this data and search it on behalf of our government. [. . .] In addition to making us less safe, the USA FREEDOM Act would make our privacy less secure.''—Senator Mitch McConnell

The telecom companies already have the phone records since the records are created in the normal course of their business. The USA FREEDOM Act does not shift control of data from NSA to telecoms; the bill limits the volume of what the government can collect from companies with a single 215 order. Keeping the records with the phone companies, as the USA FREEDOM Act would require, does not create a new privacy intrusion, or, according to the public record, pose new security risks. In contrast, it is highly intrusive for the government to demand companies provide a copy of the communication records of millions of Americans on a daily basis to a secretive military intelligence agency for data mining.

One last important point: The discussion on the Senate Floor centered exclusively on the bulk collection of phone records. However, the debate and the legislation before Congress are not just about one telephony metadata program. The debate is over whether the government should have the authority to collect a variety of records in bulk under the PATRIOT Act. The government has claimed that its bulk collection authority extends to any type of record that can reveal hidden relationships among individuals—which could include phone call, email, cell phone location, and financial transaction records. Framing the issue in terms of phone records makes the problem seem much smaller than it is, especially as our society moves into a technology-enabled future where each individual will create much more metadata and digital records than the present. The stakes are high.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President. Due to a commitment in my state, I was unable to be here for the votes on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. Had I been present, I would have voted in support of this bill.

HONORING THOSE WHO HAVE GIVEN THE ULTIMATE SACRIFICE SERVING IN U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, the mission of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, CBP, is broad and diverse. The more than 60,000 men and women of CBP protect our borders at and between our ports of entry. They protect Americans against terrorists and the instruments of terror. They enforce our laws and help boost our economic security and prosperity by facilitating trade and travel. While the roles they play each day may differ, the men and women of CBP share one common goal: to keep our country a safe, secure, and resilient place where the American way of life can thrive. They provide selfless service to our country, and they do so with honor and distinction under an ever-present and evolving threat.

Today I wish to pay tribute to the agents and officers who have given the ultimate sacrifice in the service of our

Nation. All told, 33 courageous men and women of CBP have died in the line of duty since the agency's inception in 2003. Today we commemorate these brave men and women, celebrate their lives, and offer their families and loved ones our continued support. They have earned the respect and appreciation of a grateful nation. I ask unanimous consent that a list of these agents and officers be printed in the RECORD.

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

James P. Epling, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Yuma, Arizona, End of Watch: December 16, 2003; Travis W. Attaway, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Harlingen, Texas, End of Watch: September 19, 2004; Jeremy M. Wilson, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Harlingen, Texas, End of Watch: September 19, 2004; George B. Debates, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Casa Grande, Arizona, End of Watch: December 19, 2004; Nicholas D. Greenig, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Tucson, Arizona, End of Watch: March 14, 2006; David N. Webb, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Ajo, Arizona, End of Watch: November 3, 2006.

Ramon Nevarez, Jr., Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Lordsburg, New Mexico, End of Watch: March 15, 2007; David J. Tourscher, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Lordsburg, New Mexico, End of Watch: March 16, 2007; Clinton B. Thrasher, Air Interdiction Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, McAllen, Texas, End of Watch: April 25, 2007; Richard Goldstein, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Indio, California, End of Watch: May 11, 2007; Robert F. Smith, Air Interdiction Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, El Paso, Texas, End of Watch: May 22, 2007; Eric N. Cabral, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Boulevard, California, End of Watch: July 26, 2007.

Julio E. Baray, Air Interdiction Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, El Paso, Texas, End of Watch: September 24, 2007; Luis A. Aguilar, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Yuma, Arizona, End of Watch: January 19, 2008; Jarod C. Dittman, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, San Diego, California, End of Watch: March 30, 2008; Nathaniel A. Afolayan, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Artesia, New Mexico, End of Watch: May 1, 2009; Cruz C. McGuire, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Del Rio, Texas, End of Watch: May 21, 2009; Robert W. Rosas, Jr., Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Campo, California, End of Watch: July 23, 2009.

Mark F. Van Doren, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Falfurrias, Texas, End of Watch: May 24, 2010; Charles F. Collins II, CBP Officer, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Anchorage, Alaska, End of Watch: August 15, 2010; Michael V. Gallagher, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Casa Grande, Arizona, End of Watch: September 2, 2010; John R. Zykas, CBP Officer, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, San Diego, California, End of Watch: September 8, 2010; Brian A. Terry, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Naco Cochise, Arizona, End of Watch: December 15, 2010; Hector R. Clark, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Yuma, Arizona, End of Watch: May 12, 2011; Eduardo Rojas, Jr., Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Yuma, Arizona, End of Watch: May 12, 2011.

Leopoldo Cavazos, Jr., Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Fort Hancock, Texas, End of Watch: July 6, 2012; James R. Dominguez, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Cline, Texas, End of Watch: July 19, 2012; Jeffrey Ramirez, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Laredo, Texas, End of Watch: September 15, 2012; Nicholas J. Ivie, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Bisbee, Arizona, End of Watch: October 2, 2012; David R. Delaney, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Big Bend National Park, Texas, End of Watch: November 2, 2012; Darrell J. Windhaus, CBP Officer, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Brownsville, Texas, End of Watch: December 29, 2013; Alexander I. Giannini, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Benson, Arizona, End of Watch: May 28, 2014; Tyler R. Robledo, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Carrizo Springs, Texas, End of Watch: September 12, 2014.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DEREGULATION

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks at the American Action Forum.

The remarks follow.

DEREGULATION

Thank you for what the American Action Forum does. I've had a burr under my saddle for a long time about too much federal regulation. You always in politics have a hot button. That's my hot button. I had it when I was governor. I had it when I was university president. I had it when I was Education Secretary. I probably contributed to it when I was Education Secretary, so I've been trying ever since to do something about it.

Overregulation is annoying. It wastes time and money. It interferes with prompt decision making. It superimposes someone else's judgment on what you are trying to do. It interferes with your freedom. It comes from Washington, D.C. It usually prescribes a one-size-fits-all solution that doesn't fit the world in which you live.

Washington, D.C., in my judgment, is populated by too many elected officials of both political parties who think that because they take a one-hour airplane ride from their hometown that they suddenly get smarter when they get here.

Nothing used to make me more mad as governor than to look up towards Washington and see some member of Congress coming up with a big idea, holding a press conference, passing a law, taking credit for some great leap forward and sending the bill to me as governor. Then the next thing I know, that congressman would be home in Tennessee at the Lincoln Day Dinner or the Jackson Day Dinner giving a big speech about local control.

So, I've had a burr under my saddle for a long time about too much federal regulation.

I'm going to talk about two subjects this morning: overregulation of higher education and regulatory guidance. What connects the two? Federal government overreach.

The case of higher education has been the piling up of well-intentioned regulations that strangle our 6,000 colleges and universities.

The case of regulatory guidance, is the inclination of our legislative bureaucrats to forget why we had an American Revolution, which was against a king.

The agencies appear to be using guidance, which is free of notice and comment requirements—that means that people don't have any say about it—to put binding requirements on American businesses and colleges and universities.

To solve the problem, we have to have a bipartisan desire in Congress to weed the garden of bad laws and bad regulations and keep the garden clear. It's always been very hard to pass a law in this country. It ought to be very hard also to create a new regulation.

The good news is I believe for the first time in a long time there is bipartisan interest in weeding that garden. I'd like to tell you a little bit more about it.

Let me begin with higher education regulations.

Sometimes it's best to approach an issue with examples, so let me use three.

More than a year ago, Vanderbilt University in Nashville hired the Boston Consulting Group to determine how much it costs the university to comply with federal rules and regulations on higher education.

The answer: $150 million in a single year—or 11% of the university's total non-hospital expenditures.

Chancellor Nick Zeppos of Vanderbilt says this adds about $11,000 in additional tuition per year for each of the university's 12,700 students.

The second example:

Each year, twenty million families fill out a complicated 108-question form called the FAFSA.

108 questions. Now, think about this: 20 million American families fill this out. If you want a federal grant or you want a federal loan, you fill this out first and you fill it out every year. Now, you can do it online. After you've done it a few times, you know, it gets easier. But, several of our experts in this country that came from all different directions testified before our education committee in Congress that we only really needed two questions. What's your family income? And what's the family size? That would give you 95% of what you needed to know for the government to give out the $100 billion of student loans and the $33 billion of Pell grants that it gives out every year.

So, Senator Michael Bennet and I and Cory Booker and Richard Burr and Johnny Isakson, six of us, Democrats and Republicans have a bill in to cut this FAFSA to the two-question short form.

Now, we may not get that far, but it'll be closer to this short form than the FAFSA when we get through.

And, the President has even said he thinks it is a good idea. In his budget, he said that he could think of thirty or forty questions that could come off this.

Now, these aren't evil people who are putting questions on here. They're just well-intentioned people who say now, I've got an idea. I'd like to know this. They don't think about the fact that 20 million people have to fill this out.

The problem with this is a couple of obvious things. One is it wastes time and money. But the other problem is it discourages people from going to college who we'd like to have go.

The President of Southwest Community College in Memphis said he thinks he loses 1,500 students each semester because of the complexity of the form.

Tennessee has become the first state to make community college tuition free for qualifying students, but first every applicant must fill out that FAFSA. Now that tuition is free, the principle obstacle to a Tennessee high school senior going to community college is a federal, complicated set of regulations.

The third example: Ten years ago and again three years ago, surveys by the National Academy of Sciences—not the Republican National Committee, the National Academy of Sciences—found that principle investigators spend 42 percent of their time associated with federal research projects on administrative tasks instead of research.

I then asked the head of the National Academies what a reasonable period of time would be for a researcher to spend on administrative tasks. He said, well, maybe about 10 percent.

Now, think about how many billions we could save.

We, taxpayers give NIH $30 billion a year, $24 billion to research and development at colleges and universities.

The President has asked for another billion for NIH research. The Republican House has said let's make it $2 billion more every year.

But, the average annual cost of NIH research projects is $480,000, and if we reduce spending on unnecessary red tape by $1 billion, we could potentially fund a thousand multi-year grants.

Twenty-four of the 30 billion dollars that goes to NIH goes to university-based research. At the moment, 42% of an investigator's time is spent on administrative tasks.

This piling up of regulations is one of the greatest obstacles to innovation and cost consciousness in higher education has become—and the reason is us, the federal government.

So if all of us created the mess, then it is up to all of us to fix it.

We've begun to do that.

Here's the good news: On the Senate education committee, which I chair, there is a bipartisan effort to examine these regulations—to identify which ones are the problems, and see if we can get rid of them or simplify them.

More than a year ago, four members of the committee—Senator Mikulski and Senator Bennet, two Democrats, and Senator Burr and I, two Republicans—asked a group of distinguished educators to examine the federal rules and regulations for colleges and universities. They returned to us a document with 59 specific recommendations—requirements and areas for Congress and the Department of Education to consider—including 10 that were especially problematic. They told us that the colleges and universities were operating, in their words, in a ''jungle of red tape.''

I had a letter from a university president in Missouri who said that in his forty years of being in higher education, he had never been so oppressed by regulations.

Most of these are common-sensical things; for example, in our proposal to fix the student aid form, we suggest that students apply for student aid in their junior year in high school instead of their senior year.

Now, why does that make so much difference?

Well, one is if you know in your junior year, you're going to get this much in a Pell grant and this much in a loan, you can shop around and know where you're going.

Right now, you don't know the amount of money you'll get until after you're already enrolled in the school. So, that doesn't make any sense. In addition, you're asked in your senior year, which is the current way they do it, to report what your tax returns showed. Well, you haven't filed your tax returns yet for that year.

So, there are all sorts of unnecessary confusion, which could be solved by just moving the application time from the senior year in high school to the junior year.

The other area is regulatory guidance. Now, this is the kind of subject that usually puts people right to sleep—unless you're a victim of it—but we see the ugly effects of government overreach.

It's very hard to pass a law in this country for good reason.

Our revolution was against a king. We chose to be represented by an elected Congress. They're the ones who are supposed to make the laws. Our Constitution makes it pretty hard to pass a law.

In some of our laws, Congress delegates some of the details of how to implement the laws to federal agencies—but it does it with specific requirements: Before those rules come out, the people who are governed have a chance to have a say. That's called notice and comment before you have a federal regulation.

Well, what's happening today is some of these agencies are using something called guidance to get around that requirement, to use the guidance as a non-binding way to tell the people. It's supposed to be a non-binding way of suggesting to people how to follow regulations that are properly in place, but what the agencies are doing is using the guidance to make new laws.

For example, I asked the assistant secretary for Civil Rights at the U.S. Department of Education last year, whether she expects our more than 6,000 colleges and universities to comply with her agency's guidance—these are issued without any sort of notice or comment.

She answered, ''We do.''

So her agency is writing detailed guidance governing 22 million students on 7,200 campuses and it could be some individual's whim or idea.

How frequent is this? The distinguished group of educators led by the Vanderbilt Chancellor and the University of Maryland Chancellor who recommended the 59 changes in regulations that I talked about said that every single work day, on average, there's a new guidance or rule from the U.S. Department of Education to a college and university.

So, here you are operating with federal grants and loans at a Catholic college out in the Midwest, and you know every single day something's going to change from Washington about what you're doing.

It's very important that Congress make the law. It's very important because Congress answers to the people. That's the way our government ought to work.

When Congress isn't doing its job, the people can throw the bums out. It is very hard for the voters to do that to an unelected bureaucrat, say in the Civil Rights office at the U.S. Department of Education.

So, I'm about to begin a project with one of our outstanding new senators, James Lankford of Oklahoma, to examine whether agencies are abusing guidance and how to solve that problem.

Thank you for inviting me here to speak to you today about this burr that's been in my saddle for a long, long time.

I think that what you are trying to achieve here today is one of the most important things we can do in Washington—because as hard as it is to pass a law, it is almost harder to end one.

Probably the most famous comment about that came from Ronald Reagan who said: ''No government ever voluntarily reduces itself in size. Government programs, once launched, never disappear. Actually, a government bureau is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this earth!''

Well, at least once or twice, I'd like to prove him wrong.

Thank you very much.●

RECOGNIZING REED BARRETT

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Reed Barrett for his hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Reed is a native of Cheyenne, WY, and is a graduate of Cheyenne East High School. He graduated from the University of Wyoming where he was a psychology major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Reed for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING BRIANA BLACK

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Briana Black for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Briana is a native of Casper, WY, and is a graduate of Kelly Walsh High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming where she is pursuing a degree in international studies. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Briana for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING BIRNEY BRAYTON

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Birney

Brayton for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Birney is a native of Sheridan, WY, and is a graduate of Sheridan High School. He is a student at the University of Wyoming where he pursuing a degree in political science. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Birney for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING ERIN JARNAGIN

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Erin Jarnagin for her hard work as an intern in my Republican Policy Committee office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Erin is a native of Green River, WY, and is a graduate of Green River High School. She graduated from the University of Wyoming where she was an international studies major, and from The University of Chicago where she received her master's degree. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Erin for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING CATHERINE MERCER

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Catherine Mercer for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC offices. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Catherine is a native of Cheyenne, WY, and is a graduate of Cheyenne East High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming where she is pursuing a degree in psychology. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Catherine for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING MICKALA SCHMIDT

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Mickala Schmidt, once again, for her hard work as an intern in my Casper, WY office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Mickala is a native of Casper, WY, where she graduated from Natrona County High School. She attends Casper College where she is pursuing a degree in international studies and education. She has again demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Mickala for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING TIM STANTON

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Tim Stanton for his hard work as an intern in my Republican Policy Committee office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Tim is a student at the Colby College in Waterville, ME, where he is pursuing a degree in government. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Tim for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING KRISTEN TROHKIMOINEN

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kristen Trohkimoinen for her hard work as an intern in my Indian Affairs Committee office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kristen is a native of Casper, WY, and is a graduate of Natrona County High School. She is a student at the University of Wyoming where she is pursuing a degree in political science and international studies. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Kristen for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING DIEGO ZEPEDA

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Diego Zepeda, once again, for his hard work as an intern in my Sheridan, WY office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Diego is from Gillette, WY, and a graduate of Campbell County High School. He currently attends Northern Wyoming Community College where he is studying business management. He has again demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts during his time in my office.

I want to thank Diego for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

OBSERVING INTERNATIONAL MIGRATORY BIRD DAY

● Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today, I rise to speak in celebration of International Migratory Bird Day. Every spring, waterfowl such as canvasback ducks, northern pintails and goldeneyes, raptors such as sharp shinned hawks, broad winged hawks and kestrels, warblers, buntings, and of course orioles like Maryland's State bird, the Baltimore oriole, return north for the summer to breed, raise hatchlings, and brighten the United States' wildlife spectrum during the months of spring and summer. It is an exciting time of year for birders and naturalists who enjoy witnessing the annual return of these species from the tropics and who contribute billions of dollars to the outdoor recreation economy on travel and gear to support their passion and interests in the very special bird species who return to the United States every year.

In support of conserving these important migratory bird species, in March I reintroduced legislation to reauthorize

the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act. This bill promotes international cooperation for long-term conservation, education, research, monitoring, and habitat protection for more than 350 species of neotropical migratory birds, such as the Baltimore oriole. Through its successful competitive, matching grant program, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service supports public-private partnerships in countries mostly in Latin America and the Caribbean. Up to one-quarter of the funds may be awarded for domestic projects.

More than half of the bird species found in the U.S. migrate across our borders, and many of these spend winter in Central and South America. This legislation aims to sustain healthy populations of migratory birds that are not only aesthetically beautiful but also help our farmers through consumption of billions of harmful insects and rodent pests each year, providing pollination services, and dispersing seeds. Migratory birds face threats from pesticide pollution, deforestation, sprawl, and invasive species that degrade their habitats in addition to the natural risks of their extended flights. As birds are excellent indicators of an ecosystem's health, it is troubling that—according to the National Audubon Society—half of all coastal migrating shorebirds, like the common tern and piping plover, are experiencing dramatic population declines.

The Baltimore oriole is a neotropical migratory bird whose song and bright orange and black plumage brightens all of the Northeastern and Midwestern United States each spring and summer. Sadly, Baltimore oriole populations have steadily declined despite legal protections under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and the State of Maryland's Nongame and Endangered Species Conservation Act. Likewise, the iconic red knot, whose legendary 9,000-mile migration centers on a stopover in the Mid-Atlantic States, is decreasing in population quickly. Threats to these beloved Maryland birds are mainly due to habitat destruction and deforestation, particularly in Central and South America, where the birds winter. In addition, international use of toxic pesticides ingested by insects, which are then eaten by the birds, is significantly contributing to their decline. Conservation efforts in our country is essential, but investment in programs throughout the migratory route of these and hundreds of other migratory bird species is critical.

The goal of International Migratory Bird Day is to raise awareness about the plight of these birds during this special time of year when these birds are returning to the United States, and my legislation is critical to the conservation of these species.

The Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act has a proven track record of reversing habitat loss and advancing conservation strategies for the broad range of neotropical birds that populate the United States and the rest of the Western hemisphere. Since 2002, more than $50.1 million in grants have been awarded, supporting 451 projects in 36 countries. Partners have contributed an additional $190.6 million, and more than 3.7 million acres of habitat have been affected. In 2014, the grants totaled $3.6 million, with $12 million in matching funds across 20 countries.

On International Migratory Bird Day 2015, I am working with the sponsors of the bipartisan sportsmen's package, S. 659, and the leadership of the Environment and Public Works Committee to incorporate the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act into this legislation as it moves through committee. While sportsmen do not hunt songbirds, the financial assistance this program provides for habitat conservation provides cobenefits for games domestic species like wild turkey, deer, pheasant, elk, and quail, and the international investments benefit the conservation of sandhill cranes and migratory waterfowl that are popular game species. The resources of this program also help conserve critical wetland habitat which is incredibly important coastal and freshwater fish species like bass, perch, and sturgeon, as well as both migratory and resident duck and geese species. Incorporation of the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act into the bipartisan sportsmen's package would add a new element of game species conservation that will help ensure the presence of important game and fish species for generations of hunters and anglers and outdoor enthusiasts alike.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple reauthorization of this cost-effective, budget-friendly program that has been highly successful.●

TRIBUTE TO GREGORY LEACH

● Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President. I wish to commend the courageous actions of Gregory Leach, a transportation security specialist-explosives at Lihue International Airport and a resident of Hawaii. Mr. Leach helped to rescue three swimmers who were in danger of drowning. His heroism and selflessness deserve to be recognized on the Senate floor today.

Mr. Leach moved to Hawaii from Arkansas earlier this year to work as a transportation security specialist-explosives at Lihue International Airport. As a transportation security specialist-explosives, he supports screening operations to protect our transportation system from explosive threats.

This past March, on the beach in Wailua, Kauai, Mr. Leach noticed three swimmers who were struggling to return to shore. He acted quickly and decisively, grabbing a rescue buoy and swimming out to the group. One of the swimmers was unconscious, and Mr. Leach brought the man back to shore. He returned to the water to help the remaining two swimmers, and once all the swimmers were safely on the beach, Mr. Leach conducted chest compressions on the unconscious man until rescue personnel arrived. Mr. Leach's selfless efforts ensured that two of the swimmers survived. Unfortunately, the unconscious man later passed away.

According to Mr. Leach's supervisor, lead transportation security specialist-explosives Duane Samiano:

Transportation Security Specialist-Explosives Leach did not hesitate to render aid in a life threatening situation to individuals he did not know. His actions speak greatly to his courage, selflessness and dedication to others. I am very proud to have him on my team. He is a great asset as a Transportation Security Specialist-Explosives and represents himself and this agency with excellence.

I commend Mr. Leach for his actions, and I hope that his courage serves as an example for others.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–1542. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Paleontological Resources Preservation'' (RIN0596–AC95) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1543. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Honey Packers and Importers Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Information Order; Assessment Rate Increase'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0045) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1544. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing

Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado and Imported Irish Potatoes; Relaxation of the Handling Regulation for Area No. 2 and Import Regulations'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–13–0073; FV13–3 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1545. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Avocados Grown in South Florida and Imported Avocados; Change in Maturity Requirements'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0051; FV14–915–1 FIR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1546. A communication from the Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of the Portland, ME, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area'' (RIN3206–AN11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1547. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Subpart J—Value Added Producer Grant Program'' (RIN0570–AA79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Bacillus thuringiensis Cry1A.105 Protein in Soybean; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9926–23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1549. A communication from the Census Bureau Federal Register Liaison Officer, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Foreign Trade Regulations (FTR): Reinstatement of Exemptions Related to Temporary Exports, Carnets, and Shipments Under a Temporary Import Bond'' (RIN0607–AA53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1550. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005–82; Small Entity Compliance Guide'' (FAC 2005–82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1551. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Enhancements to Past Performance Evaluation Systems'' ((RIN9000–AM79) (FAC 2005–82)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1552. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments'' (FAC 2005–82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1553. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005–82; Introduction'' (FAC 2005–82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1554. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Review and Justification of Pass-Through Contracts'' (FAC 2005–82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1555. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Equal Employment and Affirmative Action for Veterans and Individuals with Disabilities'' ((RIN9000–AM76) (FAC 2005–82)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1556. A communication from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Seventy-Third Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1557. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''ANC 6E Largely Compliant with Law''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1558. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1559. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Charles T. Cleveland, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1560. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, with respect to the blocking of property of certain persons and prohibition of exportation and re-exportation of certain goods to Syria; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1561. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Restrictions on Sale of Assets of a Failed Institution by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation'' (RIN3064–AE26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1562. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, with respect to Sudan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1563. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 40'' (RIN0648–BE47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1564. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pacific Island Fisheries; Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument Expansion'' (RIN0648–BE63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1565. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Management Measures'' (RIN0648–BE44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1566. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Grouper Recreational Management Measures'' (RIN0648–BE62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1567. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan'' (RIN0648–BE66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1568. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1569. A communication from the Associate Chief of the Auctions and Spectrum Access Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Auction of FM Broadcast Construction Permits Scheduled for July 23, 2015; Notice and Filing Requirements, Minimum Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other Procedures for Auction 98'' ((AU Docket No. 15–3) (DA 15–452)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1570. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of Alabama's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Birmingham, Alabama'' ((RIN2060–AS58) (FRL No. 9927–16–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1571. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permitting for Greenhouse Gases: Providing Option for Rescission of EPA–Issued Tailoring Rule Step 2 Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permits'' ((RIN2060–AS57) (FRL No. 9926–98–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1572. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances'' ((RIN2070–AB27) (FRL No. 9925–42)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1573. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Infrastructure Requirements for the Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9927–45–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1574. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9927–35–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1575. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare Program; Changes to the Requirements for Part D Prescribers'' ((RIN0938–AS60) (CMS–6107-IFC)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1576. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–019); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1577. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1578. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report relative to the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1579. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Second Quarter of Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1580. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a performance report relative to the Animal Drug User Fee Act for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 184. A bill to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act to require background checks before foster care placements are ordered in tribal court proceedings, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–37).

S. 230. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska (Rept. No. 114–38).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 246. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–39).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 321. A bill to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–40).

S. 501. A bill to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–41).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

S. 995. A bill to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 1267. An orginal bill to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

S. 1268. An original bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 1269. An original bill to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1264. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a renewable electricity standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1265. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to make certain certifications to Congress before retiring B–1, B–2, or B–52 bomber aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 1266. A bill to expand the HUBZone program for communities affected by base realignment and closure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1267. An original bill to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1268. An original bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1269. An original bill to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 1270. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1271. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations to prevent or minimize the venting and flaring of gas in oil and gas production operations in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1272. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the effects of forward capacity auctions and other capacity mechanisms; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 1273. A bill to establish the Strengthening America's Bridges Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1274. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to reauthorize Federal agencies to enter into long-term contracts for the acquisition of energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1275. A bill to establish a Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program in the Department of Energy to provide financial assistance to promote energy efficiency and onsite renewable technologies in manufacturing and industrial facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1276. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to increase energy exploration and production on the outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1277. A bill to improve energy savings by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1278. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the conduct of certain lease sales in the Alaska outer Continental Shelf region, to make certain modifications to the North Slope Science Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KAINE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1279. A bill to provide for revenue sharing of qualified revenues from leases in the South Atlantic planning area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1280. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish an annual production incentive fee with respect to Federal onshore and offshore land that is subject to a lease for production of oil or natural gas under which production is not occurring, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1281. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a standard home office deduction; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1282. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to consider the objective of improving the conversion, use, and storage of carbon dioxide produced from fossil fuels in carrying out research and development programs under that Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1283. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to repeal certain programs, to establish a coal technology program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING:

S. 1284. A bill to clarify the treatment of carbon emissions from forest biomass, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1285. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to enter into contracts to provide certain price stabilization support relating to electric generation units that use coal-based generation technology; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1286. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the backlog of appeals of decisions of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs by facilitating pro bono legal assistance for veterans before the United States Court of Veterans Appeals and the Board of Veterans' Appeals, to provide the Secretary with authority to address unreasonably delayed claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 176. A resolution designating September 2015 as ''National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COONS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KAINE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 177. A resolution designating the week of May 10 through May 16, 2015, as ''National Police Week''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 27

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 27, a bill to make wildlife trafficking a predicate offense under racketeering and money laundering statutes and the Travel Act, to provide for the use for conservation purposes of amounts from civil penalties, fines, forfeitures, and restitution under such statutes based on such violations, and for other purposes.

S. 141

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 141, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 257

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 373

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 609

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 609, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to strengthen the position of the United States as the world's

leading innovator by amending title 35, United States Code, to protect the property rights of the inventors that grow the country's economy.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 740, a bill to improve the coordination and use of geospatial data.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 883

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 883, a bill to facilitate the reestablishment of domestic, critical mineral designation, assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, workforce, education, and research capabilities in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 889

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 889, a bill to provide regulatory relief to alternative fuel producers and consumers, and for other purposes.

S. 911

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 911, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1002, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1032, a bill to expand the use of E-Verify, to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Academy of Sciences to study the vehicle handling requirements proposed by the Commission for recreational off-highway vehicles and to prohibit the adoption of any such requirements until the completion of the study, and for other purposes.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1135

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

S. 1136

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill relating to the modernization of C–130 aircraft to meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1243

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1243, a bill to facilitate modernizing the electric grid, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. CON. RES. 16

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 16, a concurrent resolution stating the policy of the United States regarding the release of United States citizens in Iran.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 168, a resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

S. RES. 174

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 174, a resolution recognizing May 2015 as ''Jewish American Heritage Month'' and honoring the contributions of Jewish Americans to the United States of America.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 1266. A bill to expand the HUBZone program for communities affected by base realignment and closure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation to better tailor the HUBZone program to meet the needs of communities affected by the closure of U.S. military installations through the Base Closure and Realignment, or BRAC, process. I am pleased to be joined by my colleague from Maine, Senator KING, in introducing this legislation, the HUBZone Expansion Act of 2015.

This issue hits close to home for both Senator KING and me. When Loring Air Force Base closed in 1994 through the BRAC process, my home of Aroostook County lost 15 percent of its population. Senator KING lives in Brunswick, ME, which also experienced a considerable drop in population when it lost a major naval air station in 2011.

Military bases are often the economic heart of the towns and cities in which they are located, and communities can struggle for years to overcome the closure of those facilities as

the redevelopment process is often lengthy and riddled with bureaucratic hurdles.

In recognition of these challenges, Congress passed legislation providing HUBZone status for 5 years to military facilities closed through the BRAC process. This status allows small businesses located on former military bases or in ''economically distressed communities'' with high rates of poverty or unemployment to obtain certain Federal contracting preferences.

According to the Small Business Administration, there are currently 107 BRAC-related HUBZones in the U.S. Unfortunately, for many of the communities surrounding closed military bases, HUBZone status has not always had the intended effect. One of the reasons is simple. The law defines the geographic boundaries of a BRAC-related HUBZone to be the same as the boundaries of the closed base. When combined with the requirement that 35 percent of the employees of a qualifying business live within the HUBZone, redevelopment efforts are slowed or stalled. Very few people actually live on these former bases, making it difficult, if not impossible, for businesses and job seekers alike to meet the HUBZone requirements.

We have seen this very situation play out following the closure of the former Brunswick Naval Air Station, which closed as a result of the 2005 BRAC round. When the Navy left, Brunswick and its neighbor, Topsham, lost more than 2,400 military and civilian personnel. These two towns have a combined population of just 22,000, so losing these jobs has taken a significant economic toll. Because so few people live within the actual boundaries of the former naval air station, its HUBZone designation does not provide the help these communities need.

To address this first concern, our legislation would permit prospective employees who live just outside of the boundaries of the closed base to count toward the 35 percent requirement. Employees who live in the census tracts touching the boundaries of the closed base, and in census tracts that touch those census tracts, would be included, providing a large enough pool of potential workers for qualifying businesses to locate within the HUBZone.

A second reason that businesses have difficulty benefiting from the HUBZone program is because closed bases are given HUBZone status for a limited time, only 5 years. Local economic development agencies working to attract new businesses to a former base cannot begin until a base is closed, and this process can take many years. Because HUBZone preferences only apply for 5 years from closure, businesses often lose years of program eligibility. In fact, the Association of Defense Communities reports that in the seven years following the 2005 BRAC round, only ⅓ of former base property has been transferred to local authorities for redevelopment. Our legislation would address this problem by extending the period of time for which a closed base is eligible for HUBZone status from 5 years after closure to 8 years.

Steve Levesque, the Executive Director of the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority, oversees the redevelopment of the former Brunswick Naval Air Station. Steve supports this legislation, explaining that BRAC facilities do not have adequate residential areas needed to support the 35 percent residency requirement and that businesses cannot ''realize the HUBZone benefits for BRAC'd installations as envisioned by Congress.''

Heather Blease is a Mainer who has explained the need for these changes as well. Heather is an entrepreneur who opened a small business at the former Brunswick Naval Air Station in 2013. She has described the HUBZone law as ''flawed,'' because the limited number of residences on the base make it nearly impossible to meet the 35 percent residency requirement. She says that this proposed legislation ''would make all the difference in the world'' for her business, and would create needed jobs for Mainers.

The Association of Defense Communities also supports our effort to tailor the HUBZone program to make it more usable by closed military bases.

I ask my colleagues to support the HUBZone Expansion Act of 2015 to help communities and the people most affected get back on their feet after the loss of a military installation, closed through the BRAC process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASSOCIATION OF DEFENSE COMMUNITIES,
May 5, 2015.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, United States Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JACK REED,
Ranking Member, Armed Services Committee, United States Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member, Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAIN, RANKING MEMBER REED, CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY AND RANKING MEMBER SMITH: On behalf of the Association of Defense Communities Board of Directors, I want to express my deep appreciation for your leadership to support defense communities across the country. As the leading organization serving communities with active, realigned or closed military installations, ADC represents more than 200 communities, states, regions and their partners.

Communities impacted by the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process continue to face severe, long-term economic distress. To assist in these communities' recovery, Congress authorized additional support in the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 1997, declaring that military bases closed by BRAC are eligible for designation as Historically Underutilized Business Zones (HUBZones). As you know, the HUBZone program allows small businesses in disadvantaged areas additional opportunities to compete for federal procurements. Eighteen years later, the HUBZone designation remains integral for attracting small businesses to these communities and is one of the few available federal tools supporting a community's economic transition.

While the intent of Congress was to provide the HUBZone designation to help closed military installations attract small businesses, one aspect of the HUBZone program actually works against these redevelopment areas. Under the current law, 35 percent of a business's employees also must live in a HUBZone area. Because a military installation's HUBZone area encompasses only the boundaries of the former base, many closed military installations do not have a substantial number of HUBZone-certified residential areas from which to draw a sufficient workforce for the businesses desiring to locate on those properties. It often is impossible, therefore, for a business looking to relocate to these communities to qualify for HUBZone status. Further, there traditionally are many delays in the multi-year process through which local redevelopment authorities assume control of former federal property, leaving little or no opportunity to recruit small businesses before the statutory five-year HUBZone designation has expired.

ADC is honored to endorse the current bipartisan legislative language offered by Senators King and Collins and Representatives Pingree and Poliquin, and support its inclusion in the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). The proposal would (1) allow small businesses in HUBZone areas to recruit personnel from a broader workforce and (2) extend from five years to eight years the period for which a BRAC-impacted community could be designated a HUBZone. If adopted, this language would be extremely helpful to communities across the country that have supported our nation's military missions but now are struggling to overcome distinct economic challenges. ADC is hopeful that your colleagues will support this provision and its inclusion in the FY 2016 NDAA as that important legislation moves forward.

Thank you again for your leadership on this and other important issues. We look forward to working with you and your colleagues to further strengthen America's defense communities.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL COOPER,
President.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 176—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2015 AS ''NATIONAL BRAIN ANEURYSM AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 176

Whereas a brain aneurysm is an abnormal saccular or fusiform bulging of an artery in the brain;

Whereas an estimated 1 out of every 50 people in the United States has a brain aneurysm;

Whereas brain aneurysms are most likely to occur in people between the ages of 35 and 60, and there are typically no warning signs;

Whereas brain aneurysms are more likely to occur in women than in men by a 3-to-2 ratio;

Whereas young and middle-aged African-Americans have a higher risk of brain aneurysm rupture compared to Caucasian Americans;

Whereas, based on a 2004 study, the most recent year with readily-available data, the combined lost wages of survivors of a brain aneurysm rupture and their caretakers for 1 year were $138,000,000;

Whereas various risk factors can contribute to the formation of a brain aneurysm, including smoking, hypertension, and a family history of brain aneurysms;

Whereas approximately 6,000,000 people in the United States have a brain aneurysm;

Whereas an unruptured brain aneurysm can lead to double vision, vision loss, loss of sensation, weakness, loss of balance, incoordination, and speech problems;

Whereas a brain aneurysm is often discovered when it ruptures and causes a subarachnoid hemorrhage;

Whereas a subarachnoid hemorrhage can lead to brain damage, hydrocephalus, stroke, and death;

Whereas, each year, more than 30,000 people in the United States suffer from ruptured brain aneurysms, 50 percent of whom die as a result;

Whereas, annually, between 3,000 and 4,500 people in the United States with ruptured brain aneurysms die before reaching the hospital;

Whereas a number of advancements have been made in recent years regarding the detection of aneurysms, including the computerized tomography scan, the magnetic resonance imaging test, and the cerebral arteriogram, and early detection can save lives;

Whereas various research studies are currently being conducted in the United States in order to better understand, prevent, and treat brain aneurysms;

Whereas the United States spends only $1.30 per person for research each year on the approximately 6,000,000 people of the United States who suffer from brain aneurysms; and

Whereas the month of September would be an appropriate month to designate as ''National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2015 as ''National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month''; and

(2) continues to support research to prevent, detect, and treat brain aneurysms.

SENATE RESOLUTION 177—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 10 THROUGH MAY 16, 2015, AS ''NATIONAL POLICE WEEK''

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COONS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KAINE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 177

Whereas, in 1962, John Fitzgerald Kennedy signed the Joint Resolution entitled ''Joint Resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week of each year during which such May 15 occurs as Police Week'' (36 U.S.C. 136);

Whereas law enforcement officers are charged with pursuing justice and protecting communities in the United States;

Whereas Federal, State, local, and tribal police officers, sheriffs, and other law enforcement officers across the United States serve with dignity and integrity;

Whereas, in 2015, on the 20th anniversary of the Oklahoma City Murrah Federal Building bombing, the Senate honors the memory of those who perished in the bombing and the role of law enforcement officers as both first responders to terrorist attacks and protectors of the homeland from foreign and domestic threats;

Whereas law enforcement officers selflessly serve their communities even at the risk of their own personal safety, including the abhorrent murders of New York Police Department Officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu;

Whereas Peace Officers Memorial Day honors all law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty;

Whereas Peace Officers Memorial Day, 2015, honors 127 law enforcement officers recently killed in the line of duty, including David T. Johnson, Terry B. Fisher, Clinton Jeffrey Holtz, Carlos A. Rivera-Vega, Thomas A. Smith, Jr., Kristian D. Willhight, Brian D. Beck, David M. Baldwin, Eddie Maurice Hamer, Carlos Papillion, Jr., Cory B. Wride, Percy Lee House III, Jonathan Scott Pine, Amanda B. Baker, Brian M. Law, Juan Jaime Gonzalez, John T. Hobbs, Nicholas Choung Lee, Derek Andrew Hansen, Joaquin Correa-Ortega, Jason M. Crisp, Marc Uland Kelley, Allen Ray Richardson, James P. Morrissy, Ricky Del Fiorentino, Robert G. German, Mark A. Mayo, Mark H. Larson, Alexander E. Thalmann, David W. Smith, Jr., Gregory T. Maloney, Ernest T. Franklin, Dennis Guerra, Christopher A. Cortijo, Douglas H. Mayville, Mareli A. Morales-Santiago, Dennis Oliver Simmonds, Michael J. Severseen, William Heath Kelley, Bryan Marshall Berger, Gabriel Rich, Patrick Scott Johnson, Roberto Carlos Sanchez, Chelsea Richard, Noel Lee Hawk, John Collum, Michael Alexander Petrina, Charles Dinwiddie, Stephen Arkell, Steven LaCruz Thomas, Chad Charles, Jair A. Cabrera, Alexander Giannini, Christopher Skinner, Frank McKnight, Brian W. Jones, Paul A. Buckles, Kevin Dorian Jordan, Daryl Giles, Igor Soldo, Alyn R. Beck, Scott M. Hewell, Lee Dixon, Allen Bares, Jr., Jacob Daniel Calvin, Perry W. Renn, Jeffrey Brady Westerfield, Frank Gregory Bordonaro, Melvin Santiago, Christopher M. Goodell, Scott Patrick, Mark A. Hecker, Patrick Libertone, Joseph James Dunn I, Michael Pimentel, Geniel Amaro-Fantauzzi, Cleveland Johnson, Jr., Paul Ferrara, Daryl R. Pierson, Nickolaus E. Schultz, Jason E. Harwood, Joseph J. Matuskovic, Tyler R. Robledo, Byron Keith Dickson II, Michael Norris, Reinaldo Arocha, Jr., Jessica Laura Hollis, Michael C. Williams, Jordan J. Corder, David Kedra, Michael Joe Naylor, Eddie Johnson, Jr., Danny Oliver, Michael David Davis, Jr., Kagan Dindar, John Timothy Williamson, Anthony Haase, Robert Blajszczak, Jeffrey W. Garrett, Yevhen Eugene Kostiuchenko, Jesse Valdez III, Shaun Richard Diamond, David Payne, Robert Parker White, Matthew Chism, Darrell Perritt, Holmes Nathaniel Smith, Jr., Ronald A. Leisure, Justin Winebrenner, Jeffrey Wayne Greene, Alejandro Martinez, Sr., Christopher Smith, James Hart, Edwin O. Roman-Acevedo, Ernest J. Montoya, Sr., Grant William Whitaker, Richard Anthony Champion, John Robert Street, Rafael Ramos, Wenjian Liu, Charles R. Kondek, Jr., Jamel Clagett, Tyler Jacob Stewart, Stephen Petruzzello, Thomas Choi, James E. Foster, Jr., and Timothy Mitchell; and

Whereas 44 law enforcement officers across the United States have made the ultimate sacrifice during the first 4 months of 2015: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 10 through May 16, 2015, as ''National Police Week'';

(2) expresses strong support for law enforcement officers across the United States for their efforts to build safer and more secure communities;

(3) recognizes the need to ensure that law enforcement officers have the equipment, training, and resources necessary to protect their health and safety while the law enforcement officers are protecting the public;

(4) recognizes the members of the law enforcement community for their selfless acts of bravery;

(5) acknowledges that police officers and other law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice should be remembered and honored; and

(6) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Police Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the vital role of law enforcement officers in building safer and more secure communities across the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2015, at 6 p.m., to conduct a classified hearing entitled ''Understanding the Commercial, Political, and Security Implications of the U.S.-China Civil Nuclear Agreement.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

GOLD STAR FATHERS ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 67, S. 136.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 136) to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 136) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 136

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Gold Star Fathers Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE TREATMENT FOR FATHERS OF CERTAIN PERMANENTLY DISABLED OR DECEASED VETERANS.

Section 2108(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraphs (F) and (G) and inserting the following:

''(F) the parent of an individual who lost his or her life under honorable conditions while serving in the armed forces during a period named by paragraph (1)(A) of this section, if—

''(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

''(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse;

''(G) the parent of a service-connected permanently and totally disabled veteran, if—

''(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

''(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse; and''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar Nos. 69 and 70, S. 179 and S. 994, en bloc.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bills be printed in the RECORD, all en bloc.

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

JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 179) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 179

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building''.

STAFF SERGEANT JOSEPH D'AUGUSTINE POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 994) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 994

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STAFF SERGEANT JOSEPH D'AUGUSTINE POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building''.

SISTER ANN KEEFE POST OFFICE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 71, H.R. 651.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 651) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office.''

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 651) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 177, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows.

A resolution (S. Res. 177) designating the week of May 10 through May 16, 2015, as ''National Police Week.''

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 177) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority and Democratic leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Section 301 of Public Law 104–1, as amended by Public Law 108–349, and as further amended by Public Law 114–6, announces the joint reappointment of the following individuals as members of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Barbara L. Camens of the District of Columbia and Roberta L. Holzwarth of Illinois.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 12; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks,

the Senate be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided in the usual form; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; further, that the time from 2:15 p.m. until the cloture vote be equally divided in the usual form; finally, that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived with respect to the cloture vote.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Senators should expect a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to TPA at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BROWN and Senator MENENDEZ.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, some in this body seem to be on the verge of approving the largest trade deal in our Nation's history with little debate, one rushed hearing, and barely any understanding of what we are signing on to. The last time Congress considered fast-track was 13 years ago; the Senate spent 3 weeks considering that bill.

But some would like to condense consideration of the biggest trade deal we have ever debated—ever debated—and have it done in advance of Memorial Day; the reason—they know that the more we talk about U.S. trade policy, the more the American public does not like it.

Trade promotion authority will give up Congress's authority to amend trade agreements. Not only will this affect the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement and so-called TTIP, the United States-European Union agreement, it will affect any trade deal until 2021. With TPP and TTIP, 60 percent of the world's GDP is at stake. Millions of American jobs are on the line. This is too important to rush through with little debate and little congressional input.

With the Memorial Day recess approaching, there simply is not enough time to consider fast-track in a manner that allows full debate and consideration of amendments. We do not even know if the Senate will vote on all four bills as a package that we considered in the Finance Committee or just vote on fast-track or some combination of the four. If we voted on fast-track alone, we would be giving new rights to corporations while turning our backs on critical trade enforcement measures and the workers who are left behind by unfair foreign trade. Imagine if just TPA—fast-track—gets to the President's desk; we will have done nothing on enforcement and we will have left out help for workers who have lost their jobs because of what this institution did. Fast-tracking fast-track will prevent us from having serious debates on issues from public health, to the auto industry, to international monetary policy.

During the Finance Committee's consideration of this bill, I filed 88 amendments to the package of four bills, 81 of those to fast-track alone. I offered a number during markup, and I will offer more on the floor. I know Senator MENENDEZ had a very important amendment—and he will be speaking in a moment—in the Finance Committee that was adopted. I know other colleagues have amendments that will be considered. We should debate these amendments to legislation as important as this.

Now the majority leader, who just spoke, wants us to rush this bill through, to fast-track fast-track in the last few days just to get it done, just so the public won't be able to find out what is in it. We owe it to the American people to not rush through something as important as our national trade policy. We owe it to the American people to spend the limited time available on the floor passing a job-creation bill, such as the highway bill, which is set to expire May 31, rather than a provably job-killing trade agreement, as NAFTA was, as PNTR was, as CAFTA was, as South Korea was.

We know the real answer, that this deal amounts to more empty promises. If it were really good for the American worker, why can't the American worker see it? More corporate handouts, more worker sellouts.

As many of my colleagues know, this trade agreement simply doesn't work for us. This is what is wrong with the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

First, with China, there is no guarantee it will not join later. There is no prohibition in this language—as far as we can see, with the limited access to the text—that China can't backdoor into this agreement without a vote of Congress, without any examination from the American public.

Second, what happens to competition? American workers are paid a living wage. In Vietnam, the average wage is $3 per day. How do we compete with that? With currency. We know China has gamed the currency system year after year after year. They don't play by the same rules as we do.

Corporations shift from democratically elected governments to corporations. We have seen it in tobacco, we have seen it in public health, and we have seen it with minimum wage, where corporations can sue foreign governments. Corporations in one country can sue a government, even if that government has passed a law democratically through a democratic process.

Our trade deals amount to corporate handouts and worker sellouts. People in my State know what has happened since NAFTA. They promised NAFTA would bring millions of jobs. Instead, we have lost 5 million manufacturing jobs in this country since 1994. It is only since the auto rescue in 2010 that we have begun to gain those jobs back.

We know our trade deals were for small business to compete with companies abroad that pay their workers pennies on the dollar. These foreign companies don't have to abide by the same American laws that we do.

With so much to do at home and so much at stake in this deal, we shouldn't be rushing the process of considering fast-track. We should be working on a living wage. We should be working on paid sick and family leave. We should be working on equal pay for equal work. We should be working on investment to infrastructure and innovation. Instead, the majority leader wants to fast-track, fast-track. He wants to put this trade agreement on the floor as quickly as possible.

This body should deliberate methodically and carefully before we agree to become a rubberstamp for the White House's trade policy. It has not worked for us in the past; it will not work for us in the future. This body should not be rushing to give up our authority on trade.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND TRADE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to draw attention to the international plight of human trafficking and its relationship to our Nation's trade agenda.

According to the State Department's Trafficking in Persons Report, ''Human trafficking'' is about recruiting, harboring, transporting, providing or obtaining a person for compelled labor or commercial sex acts through the use of force, fraud or coercion. It is an unacceptable global scourge that must end and cannot be rewarded by any trade agreement.

Sexual exploitation, forced labor, forced marriage, debt bondage, and the sale and exploitation of children around the world should be a global cry for justice. But as Benjamin Franklin once said: ''Justice will not be served until those who are unaffected are as outraged as those who are.''

Today, we are all outraged at the violence, the psychological terror, and the greed that drives human trafficking. We are outraged that there are 50 million refugees and displaced people around the world, the largest number since World War II, many of whom are targets of traffickers. We are outraged that 36 million women, children, and men around the world are subjected to involuntary labor or sexual exploitation. We are outraged when we hear that over 5 million of them are children, that forced labor generates about $150-plus billion in profits annually, the second largest income source for international criminals next to the drug trade.

For the victims of these crimes, the term ''modern slavery'' more starkly describes what is happening around the world, and it must end.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act requires that the State Department annually publish a Trafficking in Persons Report, known as the TIP Report, which ranks each country based upon the extent of government action to combat trafficking.

Tier 3 in that listing is the worst of these rankings. It indicates that a government does not comply with the Trafficking Victims Protection Act's minimum standards, and it is not making significant efforts to do so. Tier 3 countries are those that have not even taken the most basic steps to address their human trafficking problem and have not provided protection for trafficking victims.

In the most recent TIP Report published, the State Department ranked 23 countries as tier 3. Countries such as North Korea, Iran, and Cuba have flaunted international legal norms and threatened to upend global security.

I am most disappointed to say that Malaysia—a middle-income country by most standards, a party to the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations—has the resources and the wherewithal to address human trafficking within its borders but has for years failed to take sufficient action to warrant an upgrade on the TIP Report. So it is unfortunate that the scale of the human trafficking problem in Malaysia is vast, and it is in sectors that will directly benefit from increased trade when TPP trade agreement is concluded.

The State Department's 2014 Trafficking in Persons Report states:

> Many migrant workers on agricultural plantations, at construction sites, in textile factories, and in homes as domestic workers throughout Malaysia are exploited and subjected to practices indicative of forced labor, such as restrictions on movement, deceit and fraud in wages, passport confiscation, and imposition of significant debts by recruitment agents or employers.

Most disappointingly, the State Department wrote last year that the Malaysian Government was neglecting the problem. The 2014 TIP Report continues:

> Malaysian authorities continued to detain trafficking victims in government facilities for periods of time that sometimes exceeded a year; victims had limited freedom of movement and were not allowed to work outside the facilities. The government provided minimal basic services to those staying in its shelters; NGOs—with no financial support from the government—provided the majority of rehabilitation and counseling services. . . . The government identified 650 potential victims in 2013—significantly fewer than the 1,096 potential victims identified in 2012. It reported fewer investigations (89 compared to 190) and fewer convictions (nine compared to 21) compared to the previous year.

Furthermore, in January, 2013, the Malaysian Government implemented a policy that places the burden of paying immigration and employment authorization fees on foreign workers rather than on employers, increasing the risk of workers falling into debt bondage. And, while nearly a year has passed since the State Department issued its 2014 report—as recently as April 17, this past month—the U.S. Ambassador to Malaysia said the Malaysian Government needs to show greater political will in prosecuting human traffickers and protecting their victims if the country hopes to improve on its current lowest ranking in the TIP Report.

It is precisely to combat crimes such as these that Congress has taken action this year to fight modern slavery. Earlier this year, the Foreign Relations Committee, under the leadership of Chairman CORKER, held an important hearing on human trafficking on February 4. On April 22, Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey held a House subcommittee hearing examining the State Department's Trafficking in Persons Report, emphasizing the need to maintain the integrity of the tier ranking system.

On that same day, April 22, the Senate voted 99 to 0 for the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, authored by Senator CORNYN. Later that day, in the Committee on Finance, a bipartisan group of 16 Senators voted for my amendment to prohibit fast-track procedures from applying to any trade agreement with a country ranked as tier 3—the worst ranking.

Congress has never before approved a free-trade agreement, much less fast-tracked one, with any country while it was ranked tier 3, and I do not believe we should start now.

I want to be clear. The amendment I offered and which was adopted with a bipartisan vote in the Committee on Finance is not meant to single out Malaysia or any other country. My antitrafficking provision to the fast track bill is a simple bipartisan statement of our American values. Contrary to the administration's comments, my amendment is not a poison pill. I don't know when trying to fight human trafficking becomes a poison pill. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Senator CORNYN, perhaps the Senate's strongest advocate for victims of human trafficking, voted for my amendment. Senator PORTMAN, the former U.S. Trade Representative, voted for my amendment. Senator WYDEN, the ranking member of the Committee on Finance and coauthor of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act, also voted for my amendment.

In total, 10 members of the Committee on Finance who voted for my amendment also voted for the fast-track bill. I cannot believe we would have seen such a strong bipartisan vote from so many Senators who support fast track if this amendment were truly a poison pill.

Now, the administration has recently said this amendment would remove our ability to use our trade dialogue to encourage countries to take action on human trafficking. But I want the record to reflect the fact that trade negotiations with the United States have not improved most countries' human trafficking performance. It is clear that years of engagement with Malaysia on this issue, even with the carrot of the TPP negotiations hanging before it, have not been enough to generate action from the Malaysian government.

Of the 17 countries the United States has entered into trade agreements with since 2001—the first year of the Trafficking in Persons Report—eight have not improved their trafficking in persons rankings since their trade deals entered into force. So for almost a decade and a half, eight have not improved their rankings since the trade deals entered into force, and three countries have actually had their trafficking in persons rankings downgraded after their trade deals entered into force.

The facts are abundantly clear. Free trade negotiations have never been a successful tool in encouraging other countries to improve their performance on combating human trafficking.

Now, I understand the administration's concerns over the effect of my amendment on the current TPP negotiations. But I hope that as the State Department finalizes the 2015 report, there is no undue influence to move countries around in order to benefit the administration's trade agenda. The integrity of the TIP report is at stake. And rest assured the Congress will provide the appropriate oversight to ensure that integrity. After all, in the State Department's own words, the TIP Report ''is the U.S. Government's principal tool to engage foreign governments on human trafficking.''

Furthermore, I now understand the administration is reaching out to human rights groups, seeking compromise language that would address the concerns about human trafficking in our trade partners that I and others have spoken of. So I am pleased the administration recognizes the validity of my position as adopted by the Committee on Finance and agrees that it is

appropriate to address human trafficking in this trade bill.

Let me close by saying I want to remind my colleagues that the fast track negotiating authority is precisely the point at which Congress lays down the rules, the conditions, and the principles by which the administration is granted our constitutional prerogative to negotiate international trade deals. Any suggestion that the bipartisan statement of negotiating principles of the Senate Committee on Finance is an interference with the administration's prerogatives gets that constitutional relationship backwards. We set the terms. The administration follows those terms in their negotiations. It is not our job to trim our principles to match the deal they have already negotiated.

This goes to the very heart of our congressional duties and to the heart of our constitutional power over international trade, and I believe it goes to the heart of the debate over fast-track authority itself that we began in the Committee on Finance and will soon engage on here on the Senate Floor as early as tomorrow. Do we set the terms by which our trade powers are delegated to the administration or do they dictate the terms they will accept?

That brings me to the question of the trade bill we may be considering as early as tomorrow. We do not know whether the hard-fought product of the Committee on Finance will be respected. We do not know if a major trade preference package or long-awaited trade enforcement reforms will be included. When we are asked to vote on cloture tomorrow, at least at this point, will we be voting for a blank piece of paper? How can any Member in their right mind vote to move forward when they do not even know what they are moving forward on?

I have asked to see the text, because I want to see, among other things, whether the amendment that was adopted by the Committee on Finance on human trafficking is in there. I am told we don't have it. It is nearly 7 o'clock the evening before we will vote at 2:30 tomorrow. How do Members of the Senate vote in blank on the most significant trade bill we have had in well over a decade? That is not good enough for me, and it should not be good enough for the Senate.

So I hope as we move forward to consider a fast-track bill, my colleagues will bear in mind the importance of protecting the process of the Senate Committee on Finance, just as we have protected the process of every committee that has a bill brought to the Senate Floor. That is why I am asking my colleagues to keep this amendment in the bill and help fight the scourge of modern slavery in the countries we trade with.

The bill reported by the Committee on Finance puts a strong emphasis on our need to match the actions we take on human trafficking at home to those we take in the international arena. And while we may not agree with the specifics of our trade policy, I hope when the fast-track bill comes to the floor, the Senate will stand together, reaffirming our commitment to holding our trading partners accountable for their lack of action on combating human trafficking.

With that, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:53 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 12, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JULIUS LLOYD HORWICH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE GABRIELLA CECILIA GOMEZ.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

GREGORY GUY NADEAU, OF MAINE, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, VICE VICTOR M. MENDEZ, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ANN CALVARESI BARR, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE DONALD A. GAMBATESA, RESIGNED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5148:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES W. CRAWFORD III

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on May 11, 2015 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

KATHERINE SIMONDS DHANANI, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF SOMALIA, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 25, 2015.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 12, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 13

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2016 for the Bureau of Land Management.
SD–124

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine protecting the constitutional right to counsel for indigents charged with misdemeanors.
SD–226

2 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine securing the border, focusing on fencing, infrastructure, and technology force multipliers.
SD–342

2:15 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine safeguarding American interests in the East and South China Seas.
SD–419

Committee on Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider S. 986, to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Indian Education, focusing on organizational challenges in transforming educational opportunities for Indian children.
SD–628

3 p.m.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine pending benefits legislation.
SR–418

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine regulatory issues impacting end-users and market liquidity.
SD–106

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the National Labor Relations Board.
SD–124

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 411, to authorize the approval of natural gas pipelines and establish deadlines and expedite permits for certain natural gas gathering lines on Federal land and Indian land, S. 485, to prohibit the use of eminent domain in carrying out certain projects, S. 1017, to amend the Federal Power Act to improve the siting of interstate electric transmission facilities, S. 1037, to expand the provisions for termination of mandatory purchase requirements under the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, S. 1196, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-ways on Federal land, S. 1201, to advance the integration of clean distributed energy into electric grids, S. 1202, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to assist States in adopting updated interconnection procedures and tariff schedules and standards for supplemental, backup, and standby power fees for projects for combined heat and power technology and waste heat to power technology, S. 1207, to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a grant program under which the Secretary shall make grants to eligible partnerships to provide for the transformation of the electric grid by the year 2030, S. 1210, to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to oil and gas production and distribution, S. 1213, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 and the Federal Power Act to facilitate the free market for distributed energy resources, S. 1217, to establish an Interagency Rapid Response Team for Transmission, to establish an Office of Transmission Ombudsperson, S. 1219, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to provide for the safe and reliable interconnection of distributed resources and to provide for the examination of the effects of net metering, S. 1220, to improve the distribution of energy in the United States, S. 1225, to improve Federal land management, resource conservation, environmental protection, and use of Federal real property, by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to develop a multipurpose cadastre of Federal real property and identifying inaccurate, duplicate, and out-of-date Federal land inventories, S. 1227, to require the Secretary of Energy to develop an implementation strategy to promote the development of hybrid micro-grid systems for isolated communities, S. 1228, to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, S. 1231, to require congressional notification for certain Strategic Petroleum Reserve operations and to determine options available for the continued operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, S. 1232, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to modify provisions relating to smart grid modernization, S. 1233, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to expand the electric rate-setting authority of States, S. 1237, to amend the Natural Gas Act to limit the authority of the Secretary of Energy to approve certain proposals relating to export activities of liquefied natural gas terminals, S. 1242, to amend the Natural Gas Act to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to consider regional constraints in natural gas supply and whether a proposed LNG terminal would benefit regional consumers of natural gas before approving or disapproving an application for the LNG terminal, and S. 1243, to facilitate modernizing the electric grid.
SD–366

Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine a pathway to improving care for Medicare patients with chronic conditions.
SD–215

Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy
To hold hearings to examine cybersecurity, focusing on setting the rules for responsible global cyber behavior.
SD–419

Committee on the Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.
SR–222

MAY 19

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 562, to promote exploration for geothermal resources, S. 822, to expand geothermal production, S. 1026, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to repeal a provision prohibiting Federal agencies from procuring alternative fuels, S. 1057, to promote geothermal energy, S. 1058, to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, S. 1103, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Clark Canyon Dam, S. 1104, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam, S. 1199, to authorize Federal agencies to provide alternative fuel to Federal employees on a reimbursable basis, S. 1215, to amend the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000 to provide for the development of methane hydrate as a commercially viable source of energy, S. 1222, to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for reports relating to electric capacity resources of transmission organizations and the amendment of certain tariffs to address the procurement of electric capacity resources, S. 1224, to reconcile differing Federal approaches to condensate, S. 1226, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands to promote a greater domestic helium supply, to establish a Federal helium leasing program for public land, and to secure a helium supply for national defense and Federal researchers, and S. 1236, to amend the Federal Power Act to modify certain requirements relating to trial-type hearings with respect to certain license applications before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
SD–366

MAY 20

2:15 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine addressing the needs of Native communities through Indian Water Rights Settlements.
SD–628

MAY 21

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, ''The Financial Regulatory Improvement Act of 2015''.
SD–538

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold hearings to examine S. 160, and H.R. 373, to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, S. 365, to improve rangeland conditions and restore grazing levels within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Utah, S. 472, to promote conservation, improve public land, and provide for sensible development in Douglas County, Nevada, S. 583, to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, S. 814, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, S. 815, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and S. 1240, to designate the Cerro del Yuta and Rio San Antonio Wilderness Areas in the State of New Mexico.
SD–366

JUNE 4

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 454, to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, S. 784, to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish microlabs to improve regional engagement with national laboratories, S. 1033, to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to replace the current requirement for a biennial energy policy plan with a Quadrennial Energy Review, S. 1054, to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small-and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, S. 1068, to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system from cyber security threats, S. 1181, to expand the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program to include commercial trucks and United States flagged vessels, to return unspent funds and loan proceeds to the United States Treasury to reduce the national debt, S. 1187, to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, S. 1216, to amend the Natural Gas Act to modify a provision relating to civil penalties, S. 1218, to establish an interagency coordination committee or subcommittee with the leadership of the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, focused on the nexus between energy and water production, use, and efficiency, S. 1221, to amend the Federal Power Act to require periodic reports on electricity reliability and reliability impact statements for rules affecting the reliable operation of the bulk-power system, S. 1223, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to improve the loan guarantee program for innovative technologies, S. 1229, to require the Secretary of Energy to submit a plan to implement recommendations to improve interactions between the Department of Energy and National Laboratories, S. 1230, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program under which the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall enter into memoranda of understanding with States providing for State oversight of oil and gas productions activities, and S. 1241, to provide for the modernization, security, and resiliency of the electric grid, to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs for research, development, demonstration, and information-sharing for cybersecurity for the energy sector.
SD–366

SENATE—*Tuesday, May 12, 2015*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord, preserve us in our pilgrimage through this life, using us as Your light to a dark world. Free us from hindrances that keep us from accomplishing Your purposes on Earth.

Today, abide with our Senators. Give light to guide them, faith to inspire them, courage to motivate them, and compassion to unite them now and evermore. Lord, help them in the making of laws to execute justice and to set the captives free. Protect them in their work and keep them from those things that lead to ruin. Give them faith to see beyond today, to sow the seeds and cultivate the soil that will bring our Nation a bountiful harvest.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate will have the opportunity this afternoon to open the legislative process for a broad 21st century American trade agenda.

Let me remind Senators that the vote we are taking today is not a vote to approve or disapprove of trade promotion authority. In fact, the bill we will be voting to proceed to is simply a placeholder that will allow us to open a broad debate on trade that our country very much needs. Voting yes to open debate on a 21st century American trade agenda offers every Member of this body the chance to stand up for American workers, American farmers, American entrepreneurs, and American manufacturers. It is a chance to stand with Americans for economic growth, opportunity, and good jobs.

Selling products stamped ''Made in America'' to the many customers who live beyond our borders is key. That is true across our entire country. It is true in my home State of Kentucky. We know that Kentucky already boasts more than half a million jobs related to trade. We know that nearly a quarter of Kentucky's manufacturing workers depend on exports for their jobs. And we know that manufacturing jobs tied to exports pay about 18 percent more than non-export related jobs.

So there is every reason to knock down more unfair international trade barriers and bring more benefits back to Americans, right here at home. According to one estimate, Kentucky alone could see thousands more jobs and millions more in economic investment if we enact smart agreements with countries in Europe and the Pacific.

We also know how important these types of agreements are to our national security—especially in the Pacific region. Just last week, seven former Defense Secretaries from both political parties wrote to express their ''strongest possible support'' for the bill before us today. ''The stakes are clear,'' they wrote. ''There are tremendous strategic benefits. . . . [and] America's prestige, influence, and leadership are on the line.''

If we care about preserving and extending American leadership in the 21st century, then we cannot cede the most dynamic region in the world to China. It is true from a national security perspective, and it is true from an economic perspective.

But first, we need fair and enforceable trade legislation that expands congressional oversight over the administration and sets clear rules and procedures for our trade negotiators. We have all those things in the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act, a bill that passed out of the Finance Committee 20 to 6 with strong support from both parties.

We should start the process of building on that bipartisan momentum right now. I know the opportunity to consider complex legislation via regular order became too uncommon in recent years, but that is changing now. The Senate may still be a little rusty, though, so I want to be clear about what today's vote is. This is a vote to begin a process. This is a vote to begin a debate on a broad trade agenda. Yes, TPA will be part of that debate. But trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, will be also.

Now, there are many Members on my side of the aisle who have real reservations about TAA. I do as well. But I expect that at the end of this process, after the Senate works its will, TAA—trade adjustment assistance—will be part of the package the Senate sends to the House.

The top Democrat on the Finance Committee made it clear at the markup of these trade bills that TAA needed to run alongside TPA. I know that the chairman of the committee, Senator HATCH, has also been working toward that end.

Now, the Finance Committee didn't just markup TPA and TAA. It also marked up the African Growth and Opportunity Act and passed the generalized system of preferences bill by voice vote. It reported a customs and enforcement bill by voice vote, too.

So while TPA is clearly the centerpiece of the trade agenda before us, there is also bipartisan support for other bills reported by the Finance Committee.

Now, I know we have heard some concern that these bills might get left behind. I don't think that was anybody's intent. I expect to have a robust amendment process that will allow trade-related amendments to be offered and considered, including on the subject matters that the committee dealt with. The underlying substitute will be a compromise between the two parties, marrying TAA and TPA.

But let me repeat so there is no misunderstanding: The measure before us will be open for amendment, and I expect that other trade policies considered by the committee—and possibly even more—will be debated on the floor. I also expect that Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN will be working hard to get as much done as they can on all of these proposals.

I know that Chairman HATCH wants to find a path forward on all of these bills. I know that Senator WYDEN and Chairman RYAN spent a lot of time working through TAA, and, despite the objections of many on our side, it is likely to be included in any trade bill that passes the Senate.

I am confident that an enduring agreement can be found if the Senate is allowed to work its will and debate openly. That is what we intend to have happen on this bill. So I repeat: All we are voting on today is whether to have that debate at all.

If there are Senators with concerns about particular details of the trade agenda before us, that is all the more reason to vote to debate it. Let's have these conversations in an open and transparent way. Let's give the American people a full-throated debate on an important issue.

But we can't debate any of the provisions Senators want to consider if they

vote to filibuster even getting on the bill. So I am calling on colleagues to prove they are serious—prove they are serious about wanting to pass this legislation—rather than simply looking for new and creative ways to defeat it. Voting to proceed is the way we have an opportunity to prove we want to pass trade promotion authority.

All the good committee work I mentioned demonstrates a real hunger to process bipartisan trade legislation. So let's vote to build on that today. Let's vote to open debate on a 21st century American trade agenda. Let's not slam the door on even the opportunity of having that debate.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

WASHINGTON, DC, NFL TEAM NAME CHANGE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday the National Football League punished one of its most recognizable players for allegedly having tampered with game balls. I find it stunning that the National Football League is more concerned about how much air is in a football than with a racist franchise name that denigrates Native Americans across the country. The Redskins name is a racist name. So I wish the commissioner would act as swiftly and decisively in changing the name of the Washington, DC, team as he did about not enough air in a football.

TRADE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we know that later today the Senate will vote on whether to move forward with consideration of trade legislation. What we do not know, other than what the leader just said, is what is going to be in the matter before us. It seems to me he said that there will be TPA and TAA in the bill, and that dealing with Africa and these other provisions dealing with customs won't be in the bill. That is unfortunate.

In April, the Senate Finance Committee reported four bills out of the committee. Each of these four bills addressed different trade issues. Several of these bills contain amendments that the Senate spent months and years working to pass.

As I stand here today, Senate Democrats still don't know for sure the procedure of the Republican leader. And I would say to my friend the Republican leader, and to everyone who hears me say this, that using the logic of the Republican leader, he should move to these four bills. If he wants a robust amendment process, which he talks about all the time, why doesn't he put this legislation before this body and we will have a robust amendment process.

The ranking member of the Finance Committee is here. He is an experienced legislator and he knows—he was here before the Republicans put skids on doing any legislation for 4 years. He knows what the process was before then. He knows what the process is today, and he knows that the reason a few things are being accomplished this work period—and I mean a few—is because we have cooperated with Republicans. We still want to do that.

But if the Republican leader is concerned about a robust amendment process, then, put everything the committee reported out. That is why we have been led by the good senior Senator from Oregon the way we have been.

I have been very clear. I am not a fan of fast track. But it is important to remember that the Senate's ongoing debate about trade is not limited to legislation granting President Obama fast-track trade authority.

One of the bills reported out of the committee provides worker assistance for American workers who lose their jobs because of trade—important. Trade adjustment helps American workers to be trained, to look for new jobs, and to reenter the workplace. It is a program that has worked well.

The second bill helps developing countries export their products to the United States.

The third bill started out as a customs bill and now includes bipartisan provisions fighting currency manipulation and includes provisions on the importation of goods made with forced labor. It also ensures that American manufacturers can enforce trade laws against foreign companies that refuse to play by the rules.

Simply put, these three other bills include many provisions to make sure that trade is fair for American workers and the American economy.

My views on trade—I repeat—are well known. I don't support these trade provisions. But if the Senate is going to talk about trade, we must consider its impact on the American workers and the middle class, and that is what the customs provision does. That is why I support combining these four bills into one piece of legislation—so no American will be left behind by the Senate Republicans.

It is essential that if we move to fast-track, we consider these other bills as part of the process. In past years, Democrats and Republicans joined together to pass other important trade legislation with fast-track. For example, in 2002, when that passed, Congress adopted in that trade adjustment assistance, customs and trade enforcement and an extension of our preference programs. If we did it in 2002, why can't we do it today?

My friend the majority leader talks about the motion to proceed as a way to move forward. There is also a way to move forward that would be less disruptive, and it would work a lot better; that is, have the majority leader put all these four bills together and then begin—his words—a ''robust amendment process.''

The absence of assurance that these four bills are together is a signal that some will be left behind, and the people left behind, of course, are the American middle class. I urge the majority leader to take the necessary steps to merge these four bills reported out of the Finance Committee into one piece of legislation; otherwise, we risk hurting every American whom we talk about protecting so much here; namely, the middle class.

Again, logically, if you use the statements of the Republican leader, we should put all four of them together. We would move forward on this legislation. We could have a process—again, using his words, a ''robust amendment process.'' Last time those words came out—''robust amendment process''—we had two amendments. That was the Iran bill, two amendments. That is robust? That is not very robust, in my estimation.

I wish my friend the ranking member of the Finance Committee the very best in this legislation. It is a huge responsibility for his caucus. We, at this stage, support these four bills being moved forward at the same time and then the process can begin of legislating. If we do not—if he does not do that, then it is going to be very difficult to get to the guts of the bills that are reported out of committee.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Oregon.

TRADE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the remarks of the Senate majority leader, and I believe the majority leader's statement provides potential—potential—to find the bipartisan common ground on trade that we found in the Senate Finance Committee. In the Senate Finance Committee, we passed the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 by a 20-to-6 vote and the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 2015 by a 17-to-9 vote. We passed a robust trade enforcement measure and package of trade preferences by voice vote.

Respectfully, I hope that the majority leader would take this morning to work with those on my side of the aisle

who are supportive of trade to find a similar bipartisan approach to ensure that all four of the measures I have described are actually enacted.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I appreciate the leadership of Senator WYDEN on this, because if you leave out certain bills that help workers, then what you are left with, essentially, is a package that ignores their needs.

I do want to say that I hope we will not proceed to this debate on this free-trade agreement. I stand here as someone who comes from California, where I had voted for half of the trade agreements and I voted against half. I think I am a fair voice for what we should be doing.

If there is one unifying principle about the economics of today, it is this: the middle class is having a very hard time in America today, perhaps the worst time in modern history.

A new University of California study released last week makes it clear how our middle class is being hollowed out. In my State, we have a dynamic workforce. We have dynamic entrepreneurs. We are doing very well. But this study found that the lowest paid 20 percent of California workers have seen their real wages decline by 12 percent since 1979.

Think about that. This is a great country. We always say we have to be optimistic about tomorrow. You do everything right, you play by the rules, and your income for your family, in real terms, goes down by 12 percent. There is something wrong with this. I think everyone will say they want to do more for the middle class, and there is a straightforward agenda we could turn to, to do just that. But instead what do we turn to: a trade agreement that threatens the middle class—that threatens the middle class. What should we be doing here? Not confabbing in a corner over there about how to push a trade bill on this floor that doesn't help working America, we should pass a highway bill. The highway bill is critical—good-paying jobs, businesses that thrive in all of our communities. More than 60,000 of our bridges are structurally deficient, more than 50 percent of our roads are not in good condition. But, oh, no, even though the highway bill expires—we have no more authority to expend money out of that fund come the end of May—they are bringing forward a trade bill that is a threat to the middle class.

Why don't we increase the minimum wage? The minimum wage needs to be raised. Oh, no, they do not want to do that. They have not done it in years. The States are doing it. Oh, no, let's keep people working full time in poverty. So instead of confabbing over there on how to push a trade bill onto this floor, we ought to be raising the minimum wage.

What else should we be doing? We should make college more affordable. We have people here on Social Security in this country who are still paying off their student loans. That is a shame upon America. They cannot even refinance their student loans.

Instead of confabbing in the corner about how to bring a trade bill to this floor, why don't we fix the student loan problem? Why don't we raise the minimum wage? Why don't we pass a highway bill that is funded to help middle-class people?

It is all a matter of perspective, my friends. We still have not done equal pay for equal work, so women are not making what they should. That hurts our women when they retire. They have lost more than $400,000 in income.

Instead of standing in the corner and figuring out how to bring a trade bill to the floor, they ought to be fixing equal pay for equal work. They ought to be fixing student loans for our students. They ought to be passing a highway bill. They ought to be increasing the minimum wage. They ought to deal with currency fairness because our trading partners play with their currency in order to push forward their products. But oh, no, that is not on the agenda.

We could have an agenda for a vibrant middle class. But instead of that, we are moving toward a trade bill.

I know there are some who disagree with me and who come down to this floor and say: We are going to create jobs with this trade bill; it is going to be great. Let them explain how we are not going to see some of the 12 million jobs that are manufacturing jobs in America not move to countries that pay 56 cents an hour; another country, $1.19 an hour.

I know they will disagree with me. They are making all of these promises. The more I hear it, the more I hear the echoes of the NAFTA debate. That was a long time ago, and I was here then. In 1988, I voted for fast-track authority to allow the administration to negotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement. Then, 5 years later, I saw the deal. It was a bad deal, and I voted no, but it was too late—because when I saw the deal, I knew I could not fix it because that is what fast-track is.

What this majority today is saying to us is vote for fast-track and give up your right, Senator BOXER, to amend this trade agreement. They say: Well, it is very transparent. Go down and look at it.

Let me tell you what you have to do to read this agreement. Follow this: You can only take a few of your staffers who have to have a security clearance—because, God knows why, this is secure, this is classified. It has nothing to do with defense. It has nothing to do with going after ISIS. It has nothing to do with any of that, but it is classified.

I go down with my staff whom I can get to go with me, and as soon as I get there, the guard says to me: Hand over your electronics.

OK. I give over my electronics.

Then the guard says: You cannot take notes.

I said: I cannot take notes?

Well, you can take notes, but you have to give them back to me, and I will put them in a file.

I said: Wait a minute. I am going to take notes, then you are going to take my notes away from me, then you are going to have them in a file and you can read my notes—not on your life.

So instead of standing in a corner trying to figure out a way to bring a trade bill to the floor that does not do anything for the middle class, that is held so secretively that you need to go down there and hand over your electronics and give up your right to take notes and bring them back to your office, they ought to come over here and figure out how to help the middle class, how to extend the highway bill, how to raise the minimum wage, how to move toward clean energy, how to fix our currency manipulation that we see abroad.

Anyway, I take you back to 1988. I voted for fast-track for NAFTA. Instead of the millions of new jobs that were promised, by 2010 the United States had lost 700,000 jobs.

Instead of standing in a corner figuring out how we are going to lose more jobs, we ought to do something that works for the middle class.

Let me tell you what happened with NAFTA. Instead of improved pay for our workers, which was promised, NAFTA pushed down American wages. It empowered employers to say to their workers: Either accept lower wages and benefits or we are moving to Mexico. Instead of strengthening our economy, it increased our trade deficit to Mexico, which now this year hit $50 billion. Before NAFTA we had a trade surplus with Mexico. Now we have a trade deficit.

So instead of standing in the corner and figuring out how to have more trade deficits with countries, we ought to do something to help the middle class.

I want to talk about something that happened in California—in Santa Ana—right after NAFTA. The city had worked hard to keep a Mitsubishi plant that assembled big-screen TVs, securing tax credits to help the plant stay competitive. Even after NAFTA passed, company officials promised they would keep the plant in Santa Ana. But guess what, folks. Three years later, Mitsubishi closed the plant. Company officials said they had to cut costs, especially labor costs, so they were moving their operations to Mexico.

We lost 400 good-paying, middle-class jobs, even though everyone promised

NAFTA would never do that. This is going to be wonderful. I got suckered into voting yes on fast-track. I fear we see this pattern again.

The definition of ''insanity'' is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome. We have 12.3 million manufacturing jobs in this country. We are looking at a transpacific partnership deal, the largest trade deal in history, covering 40 percent of the world's economy. Tell me, what chance do our people who work in manufacturing have against countries that pay less than $1 an hour? In one case, I think it is 70 cents an hour.

Of the 12 countries in the TPP, 3 have minimum wages that are higher than ours, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, but most of the countries have far lower wages, including Chile, with a minimum wage of $2.14; Peru, with a minimum wage of $1.38; and Vietnam, with a minimum wage of 70 cents. Brunei and Singapore don't even have a minimum wage.

I think I have laid out the argument as to why all of these promises about better wages and more jobs fall flat on their face when we look at that last free trade deal—and this one involves more countries.

Then there is the investor-state dispute settlement, or ISDS, which will allow polluters to sue for unlimited money damages. For example, they could use it to try to undo the incredible work in California on climate change by claiming that they were put at a disadvantage by having to live with California's laws.

Polluters could seek to undermine the President's Clean Power Plan or the toxic mercury pollution under the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards or they could sue because they had to spend a little money to make sure they didn't dump toxins into our waterways—drinking water.

We have seen this happen before. SD Myers, Lone Pine Resources, and the Renco Group sued. They notified Peru in 2010 and intended to launch an $800 million investor-state claim against the government because they said the fair-trade agreement was violated because it said they did not really have to install all of these antipollution devices. Yet Peru forced them to do it, and what happened was that ''polluters pay'' turned into ''polluters get paid.''

So we have a trade agreement that threatens 12 million manufacturing jobs. We have a trade agreement that is pushing all of the things we need to do for our middle class off the floor. We have a trade agreement that sets up this extrajudicial board that can overcome America's laws.

As former Labor Secretary Robert Reich has warned, the consequences could be disastrous. He calls the TPP ''a Trojan horse in a global race to the bottom, giving big corporations and Wall Street a way to eliminate any and all laws and regulations that get in the way of their profits.''

We should set this aside and not go to this today. Let's work together as Democrats and Republicans for a true middle-class agenda, for a robust investment in our roads, bridges, and highways, and to fix our immigration system.

I see Senator LEAHY is on the floor. He put together a comprehensive immigration reform bill that was amazing, but it was stopped and never happened. We have workers in the dark who are afraid to come out into the sunlight, and that puts a downward pressure on wages. Let's pass that. Let's make college more affordable, ensure equal pay for equal work, and fight for currency fairness. We can do it.

TOXIC REFORM

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I will take about 3 minutes to talk about my last issue today, and that is the toxic reform bill that passed out of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

Mr. President, I have some great news about the toxic bill. The original Vitter-Udall bill was slain and is gone and in its place is a better bill. That is the great news. The bad news is it is still not a really good bill. We have to do better, and we can do better.

What we did in this bill is to understand that we had to negotiate certain items out of it, and one of the items we had to negotiate was how far the original bill went in preempting State laws, which we have now addressed. Credit goes to 450 organizations that—although they still oppose this bill—pushed hard for those changes. Credit also goes to Senators WHITEHOUSE, MERKLEY, and BOOKER, who told me they wanted to try to negotiate some changes. I blessed them, and they went and did it. For that I have to thank a Senator who is no longer with us, Ted Kennedy. He taught me that, as a chairman, you need to understand that sometimes you have to turn to your colleagues and let them move forward. And I was happy to do that.

The changes that came back included a part-way fix on preemption, a full fix on preempting air and water laws when it comes to toxics. And coenforcement has been fixed. So we are very, very pleased.

What is not really fixed, however, is that we want to make sure States have even more latitude to move if they see a danger. If there is a cancer cluster among kids or adults around this country, we want to make sure that the Federal Government will move to help them. We want to make sure that asbestos is addressed directly in this bill because 10,000 people a year die from asbestos exposure. If there is a chemical stored near a drinking water supply, we want to make sure that it, in fact, will receive priority attention.

What chemical is in there? We saw it happen in West Virginia. Senator MANCHIN wrote a really good bill with me. We should address that, and I was happy to see that we had some bipartisan votes on those last two fixes.

We have to fix this bill, and I just don't agree with anyone who comes to the floor and says it is perfect. But what I think is not important. What is important is what 450 groups think, and they think the bill has to be fixed.

Let's be clear. The people who say we have to fix the bill with perfecting amendments include the American Public Health Association and its Public Health Nursing Section, the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, the Consumers Union, the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, the National Disease Clusters Alliance, the National Hispanic Medical Association, the Birth Defect Research for Children, Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Maryland Nurses Association, the Massachusetts Nurses Association, the National Association of Hispanic Nurses, the Association of Women's Health, Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses, the Breast Cancer Action, the Breast Cancer Fund, Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition, Kids v Cancer, and the Lung Cancer Alliance. It goes on and on. A full list of the organizations can be found at saferchemicals.org/coalition.

I say to my colleagues that the Vitter-Udall bill is much better now than when it was introduced, and these 450 groups did everything in their power to help us fix the bill. We are halfway there. I hope we can negotiate some more fixes—and maybe we can do that.

If we can pass four or five of these amendments, we are on our way. But if we cannot fix the bill and it does come here, there will be a lot of talking about how to fix it. There will be a lot of talking, a lot of standing on our feet, and a lot of rallies with 450 groups. That is the choice the Senate faces, and in the end, we will deal with this.

I took to the floor today to thank my colleagues who helped negotiate this from a bill that was a disaster to a better bill, and I also want to make sure that these 450 organizations, including NRDC—what they did by standing up and calling for Safer Chemicals Healthy Families—was so fantastic. They never allowed people to talk them down or bully them out of the room. I stand with them 100 percent. The Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization was incredible.

We have some hope here. All we have to do is keep on fixing this bill, and it could come to a good place.

I so appreciate the patience of my colleagues. I talked long about two bills which are very important. I hope we will not get on this trade bill. I hope we will move to an agenda for the middle class.

As I said, the original toxic chemicals bill, S. 697, that according to a prize-winning reporter was written on the computer of the American Chemistry Council, was deeply flawed. That bill is gone. Thanks to the public health organizations, environmental organizations such as the Environmental Working Group, Safer Chemicals, the Breast Cancer Fund, Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, NRDC, nurses, physicians, the media, and individuals such as Deirdre Imus, Linda Reinstein, and Trevor Schaefer. Those individuals and organizations put S. 697, the original bill, front and center and, despite its beautiful name, saw it for what it was.

The amended version that was reported out of the EPW Committee last month included fixes to preemption of State air and water laws, co-enforcement of chemical restrictions by States, and removal of a harmful provision that would have undermined EPA's ability to restrict the import of dangerous chemicals from foreign countries.

However, there are still critical changes that must be made in order for this bill to do what has been advertised and protect public health.

Leading public health, labor, and environmental groups, including the Safer Chemicals, Healthy Families Coalition, which represents 450 environmental, labor, and public health groups; the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization; AFL–CIO; Environmental Working Group, the Breast Cancer Fund, and the Center for Environmental Health, and others have made clear that they do not support the bill reported from the EPW Committee because key improvements are needed if we are to achieve real TSCA reform.

Our common goal is real TSCA reform. We should fix the dangerous loopholes that could undo the good intentions of so many who have worked on this effort.

As Lisa Heinzerling, a professor at Georgetown University Law Center and former senior EPA official pointed out in a recent blog titled, ''Toxic Ambiguity: the Dangerous Mixed Messages of the Udall-Vitter Bill to Reform TSCA,'' these are serious loopholes that must be addressed.

I believe the needed fixes are achievable. Some of these changes, which I offered in the EPW Committee, received bipartisan support. As we move forward, I ask my colleagues to join me to keep making this bill better.

We need to address clusters of cancer, birth defects and other diseases, especially when children are affected. Communities should have the tools they need to determine whether there is a connection between these clusters and contaminants in the surrounding environment. Senator CRAPO was a cosponsor of this common-sense provision and voted for it in the EPW Committee.

We must ensure the chemicals that could contaminate drinking water supplies, such as the spill that occurred in West Virginia last year, are prioritized. Senator CAPITO from West Virginia supported this amendment in the EPW Committee.

We must ensure States can continue to act. The bill reported from the EPW Committee could still shut the States out for years from the ability to protect their citizens from toxic hazards. The process for State action is complicated and confusing and likely to end up in the courthouse. If the intention is to allow the States to act if the Federal Government has not done so, the bill needs to be amended to make that clear.

Asbestos has been a poster child for this bill and it is one of the most dangerous substances known to humankind—it takes 10,000 lives a year. We need to ensure that EPA can expeditiously review and take action to ban asbestos within 3 or less years.

The legal standard of review in this bill is the same as the original TSCA. We must ensure that there are no opportunities for the fatal flaws of current TSCA to be retained in the new law.

These are the kind of fixes I believe we can accomplish.

I think my colleagues and I can agree that there are safeguards that still need to be put in place. Now it is time to ensure that these safeguards become a reality.

We need to get it right this time. The stakes are high.

I look forward to working with colleagues to make this chemical safety bill do the job that our families and children deserve.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

TRADE

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I wish to harken back about 6 months, if I could, to the election of last November. For me there were at least three takeaways from that election. No. 1, the voters of this country want us to work together and across party lines. No. 2, they want us to get things done. Among the things they want us to get done is to find a way to strengthen the economic recovery that has been underway now for several years.

Senator BOXER has referred to a couple of things that would be on that to-do list—a robust 6-year transportation bill that rebuilds our roads, highways, bridges, transit systems and will put a lot of people to work and helps to strengthen our economic recovery by making a more efficient and effective transportation network to move products and goods all over this country and outside of this country.

We need to strengthen our cyber security. We need to address data breach and all of the attacks that are going on throughout this country to businesses, colleges, and universities—you name it.

We need tax reform that actually provides some predictability in the tax system and makes our Tax Code on the business side more competitive with the rest of the world.

We also need to acknowledge, as the President has done, that 95 percent of the world's market lies outside of our borders—95 percent. The fastest growing part of that market around the world is Asia. The President has suggested and strongly supported a trade agreement that would involve 12 nations, including about a half dozen here in this hemisphere and the other half over in Asia. All together it encompasses about 40 percent of the world trade market.

The President is not suggesting that we just open up our markets so that other countries can sell more of their stuff here. They already do that for the most part. The goal of this trade agreement is to open up these other markets in other countries so we can sell our goods, our products, and our services there. This is a top priority for this administration and this should be a top priority for Democrats and Republicans. This is a priority that should be hammered out and worked on in a way that will be fair to workers and middle-class families.

The majority leader has come here today to suggest a path forward. I hope we will not reject it. What he suggested is we allow, through a vote on the cloture, to move to the floor and begin debate on four different pieces of legislation that are part of the transportation agreement. We have seen this movie before. In fact, we have seen it any number of times before because I believe we have given trade promotion authority to every President since World War II except Richard Nixon. The reason why is because it is almost impossible for 535 of us in the Congress to negotiate a trade deal. Whether it is 3 nations or 11 other nations, it is pretty much impossible, and that is why we have trade promotion authority.

The majority leader suggested that we move to these four goals and let's begin the debate. We should realize, as Democrats, that we already realized a great victory here. In the past, the Republicans have rejected our efforts almost every time to include trade assistance adjustment, so that when folks are displaced from their jobs, they can actually get help on their health care, job training, and have an opportunity to put their lives back together.

This legislation today, the trade promotion authority, actually expresses what our views and our priorities are as a Congress through the trade negotiator and to our negotiating partners overseas, and I think that is in our interest. The other thing that we get out

of moving TPA with TAA together is that we get the assurance upfront that we are going to look after workers who are displaced. It is the best trade adjustment assistance we have ever had, at least in terms of the way it treats workers and displaced workers. It even helps those who are maybe not even affected by this agreement but are affected by other calamities in our economy—not just in the manufacturing sector but also in the service sector as well.

I suggest this to my colleagues: Let's spend the time between now and 2:30 p.m. trying to figure out how we can establish some confidence, faith, and trust here, so that if we move to this bill, it will not be just to consider trade promotion authority and trade adjustment assistance, we will have an opportunity to consider the other two pieces of legislation as well.

There is a lot riding on this. The economic recovery of our country does not rise and fall simply on the passage of this legislation and the conclusion of these negotiations, but it sure would help. It would sure help bolster a stronger economic recovery, just as would the passage of a 6-year transportation bill, just as would cyber security legislation, data breach legislation, and on and on.

I will close with this thought about the debate we have had in recent months with respect to the negotiations between the five permanent members of the Security Council, the Germans, and the Iranians in our efforts to make sure the Iranians don't develop a nuclear weapon. We have said again and again—we reworked the old Reagan slogan ''trust but verify,'' except with the Iranians, we have not said ''trust but verify, we have said ''mistrust but verify.''

I would suggest to my colleagues, especially on this side of the aisle, let's take that approach here. Maybe we don't trust the Republicans that they are going to do what they say they are going to do, but we have an opportunity to verify. The verifying comes with a vote later on. We go to the bill; we actually move to the bill, debate the amendments, and so forth.

If at the end of the day we are not happy with what has happened, if we feel as though we have been given a raw deal, that workers in this country have been given a raw deal, middle-class families have been given a raw deal, we have a chance to verify and we vote not to move the bill off the floor. We would not provide cloture to end debate. That is where we have our final vote. I hope we keep that in mind.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy for up to 30 minutes.

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

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I am here to speak in support of the USA FREEDOM Act, a bill that would restrain the power of government to collect data on phone calls made by average, everyday, ordinary, law-abiding American citizens—300 million-plus Americans—without any suspicion that any one of them is engaged in any kind of criminal activity, any kind of activity involving the collection of foreign intelligence.

I appreciate the support I have received for this bill, and I appreciate the opportunity to work with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont. Senator LEAHY and I feel passionate about this issue. Although Senator LEAHY and I come from different ends of what some would perceive as the political spectrum and although we don't agree on every issue, there are many issues on which we do agree. There are many issues, such as this one, on which we can say that these issues are neither Republican nor Democratic, they are neither liberal nor conservative, they are simply American issues, constitutional issues. They are issues that relate to the proper order of government. They are issues that relate to the rule of law itself.

The Constitution of the United States protects the American people against unreasonable searches. It does so against a long historical backdrop of government abuse. Over time, our Founding Fathers came to an understanding that the immense power of government needs to be constrained because those in power will tend to accumulate more power and, in time, they will tend to abuse that power unless that power is carefully constrained.

America's Founding Fathers were informed in many respects by what they learned from our previous national government, our London-based national government. They were informed, in part, by the story of John Wilkes.

John Wilkes—not to be confused with John Wilkes Booth, the assassin of Abraham Lincoln—John Wilkes was a member of the English Parliament. He was a member of Parliament who in 1763 found himself at the receiving end of King George III's justice.

In 1763, John Wilkes had published a document known as the North Briton No. 45. The North Briton was a weekly circular, a type of news magazine in England—one that, unlike most of the other weeklies in England at the time, was not dedicated to fawning praise of King George III and his ministers. No. This weekly would from time to time criticize the actions of King George III and his ministers.

At the time John Wilkes published the North Briton No. 45, he became the enemy of the King because he had criticized certain remarks delivered by the King in his address to Parliament. While not openly directly critical of the King himself, he criticized the King's minister who had prepared the remarks.

For King George III, this was simply too much; this simply could not stand. So, before long, on Easter Sunday 1763, John Wilkes found himself arrested, and he found himself subject to an invasive search—a search performed pursuant to a general warrant and one that didn't specify the names of the individuals to be searched, the particular places to be searched, or the particular items subject to that invasive search. It said, basically, in essence: Go and find the people responsible for this horrendous publication, the North Briton No. 45, and go after them. Search through their papers and get everything you want, everything you need.

John Wilkes decided that his rights as an Englishman prevented this type of action—or should have, under the law, prevented this type of action—so he chose to fight this action in court. It took time. John Wilkes spent some time in jail, but he eventually won his freedom. He was subsequently re-elected to multiple terms in Parliament. Because he fought this battle against the administration of King George III, he became something of a folk hero across England.

In fact, the number 45, with its association with the North Briton No. 45—the publication that had gotten him in trouble in the first place—the number 45 became synonymous not only with John Wilkes but also with the cause of freedom itself. The number 45 was a symbol of liberty not only in England but also in America. People would celebrate by ordering 45 drinks for their 45 closest friends. People would recognize this symbol by writing the number 45 on the walls of taverns and saloons. The number 45 came to represent the triumph of the common citizen against the all-powerful force of an overbearing national government.

With the example of John Wilkes in mind, the Founding Fathers were rightly wary of allowing government access to private activities and the communications of citizens. They feared not only that the government could seize their property but that it could gain access to details about their private lives. It was exactly for this reason that when James Madison began writing what would become the Fourth Amendment in 1789, he used language to make sure that general warrants would not be the norm and, in fact, would not be acceptable in our new Republic.

Ultimately, Congress proposed and the States ratified the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which provides in pertinent part that any search warrants would have to be warrants ''particularly describing the

place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.''

General warrants are not the norm in America. General warrants are not acceptable in America. They are not compatible with our constitutional system. Yet, today, we see a disturbing trend, one that bears some eerie similarities to general warrants in the sense that we have the NSA collecting information—data—on every phone call that is made in America. If a person owns a telephone, if a person uses a telephone, the NSA has records going back 5 years of every number a person has called and every number from which a person has received a call. It knows when the call was placed. It knows how long the call lasted.

While any one of these data points might themselves not inform the government too much about a person, researchers using similar data have proven that the government could, if it wanted to, use that same data set, that same database to discern an awful lot of private information about a person. The government could discern private information, including a person's religious affiliation; political affiliation; level of activity politically, religiously, and otherwise; the condition of a person's health; a person's hobbies and interests. These metadata points, while themselves perhaps not revealing much in the aggregate, when put into a large database, can reveal a lot about the American people.

This database is collected for the purpose of allowing the NSA to check against possible abuses by those who would do us harm, by agents, foreign intelligence agents, spies. But the problem here is that the NSA isn't collecting data solely on numbers that are involved in foreign intelligence activity, nor is it collecting data solely on phone numbers contacted by those numbers suspected to be involved in some type of foreign intelligence activity. They are just collecting all of the data from all of the phone providers. They are putting it in one database and then allowing that database to be searched.

This issue was recently challenged in court. It was challenged and was recently the subject of a ruling issued by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit based in New York. Just a few days ago, this last Thursday, the Second Circuit concluded that Congress, in enacting the PATRIOT Act, in enacting section 215 of the PATRIOT Act—the provision in the PATRIOT Act that claims to justify this bulk data collection program—the Second Circuit concluded that section 215 of the PATRIOT Act does not authorize bulk collection. It does not authorize the NSA to simply issue orders to telephone service providers saying: Send us all of your data. The language in the PATRIOT Act permitted the government to access the records that were ''relevant to an authorized investigation.'' That is the language from section 215 that is at issue.

The government argued in that case that the term ''relevant'' in the context of the NSA's work meant and necessarily included every record regarding every telephone number used by every American. By interpreting it this way, they tried to basically strip all meaning from the word ''relevant.'' If Congress had meant every record, Congress could have said every record. It did not. That is not to say it would have been appropriate for Congress to do so, and had Congress legislated in such broad terms, I suspect there would have been significant concern raised, if not in court then at least within this Chamber and within the House of Representatives. But, importantly, Congress did not adopt that statutory language. Congress instead authorized NSA to collect records that are ''relevant to an authorized investigation.''

The Second Circuit agreed that this is a problem, holding last week that the bulk collection program exceeded the language of the statute—specifically, the word ''relevant.'' While ''relevant'' is a broad standard, it is intended to be a limiting term whose bounds were read out of the statute by a government willing to overreach its bounds.

The proper American response to government overreach involves setting clear limits—limits that will allow the people to hold the government accountable. We must not permit this type of collection to continue.

While it is true that a single call record reveals relatively little information about a person, again, the important thing to remember is that when we aggregate all of this data together, the government can tell a lot about a person. I have every confidence that and I am willing to assume for purposes of this discussion that the hard-working, brave men and women who work at the NSA have our best interests at heart. I am willing to assume for purposes of this discussion that they are not abusing this database as it stands right now.

Some would disagree with me in that assumption, but let's proceed under that assumption, that they are law-abiding individuals who are not abusing their access to this database. Who is to say the NSA will always be inhabited only by such people? Who is to say what the state of affairs might be 1 year from now or 2 years or 5 years or 10 or 15 years? We know that in time people tend to abuse these types of government programs.

We know from the Church report back in the 1970s that every administration from FDR through Nixon used our Nation's intelligence-gathering activities to engage in espionage. It is not a question of if such tools will be abused; it is a question of when they will be abused. It is our job as Senators to help protect the American people against excessive risk of this type of abuse. That is why Senator LEAHY and I have introduced the USA FREEDOM Act. It directly addresses the bulk data collection issue while preserving essential intelligence community capabilities.

Rather than relying on the government's interpretation of the word ''relevant,'' our bill requires that the NSA include a specific selection term—a term meant to identify a specific target—and that the NSA then use the term to limit to the greatest extent reasonably practicable the scope of its request.

We give the government the tools to make targeted requests in a manner that parallels the current practice at the NSA—in many respects, a practice that is currently limited only by Presidential preferences.

This bill would enable the court to invite precleared privacy experts to help decide how to address novel questions of law, if the court wanted input.

The bill also would increase our security in several ways, including by providing emergency authority when a target of surveillance enters the United States to cause serious bodily harm or death and instituting the changes necessary to come in line with the Bush era nuclear treaties.

This bill was negotiated in consultation with the House Judiciary Committee, the House Intelligence Committee, and the intelligence community at large. It is supported by the chairman and ranking members of the House Judiciary Committee, the House Intelligence Committee, and the Director of National Intelligence. It enjoys broad support from industry and from privacy groups.

This is a compromise—an important compromise that will enable us to protect Americans' privacy while giving the government the tools it needs to keep us safe. This is a compromise that is expected to pass the House overwhelmingly, and it is a bill I think we should take up and pass as soon as they have voted.

So I would ask my friend, my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, about his insights. My friend from Vermont has served his country well, having served a significant amount of time in the U.S. Senate. Prior to that time, he served as a prosecutor—a prosecutor who had to follow and was subject to the Fourth Amendment.

I would ask Senator LEAHY, in his experience as a prosecutor and as a Senator, what he sees as the major benefits to this legislation and the major pitfalls to the NSA's current practice of bulk data collection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Utah has laid out very well the reasons for the changes proposed in the House and proposed by his and my bill. He also said something we should all think about. A couple of minutes ago, he said: Assuming everybody is following the rules today, are they going to follow the rules tomorrow or next year or the year after?

When he mentioned that, he also mentioned my years as a prosecutor. Let me tell a short story. I became one of the officers of the National District Attorneys Association and eventually vice president. A number of us had occasion to meet the then-Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover. I thought back to some of the frightening things he said about investigating people because of their political beliefs. You could tell Communists because they were all ''hippies driving Volkswagens'' was one of the things he said; secondly, that the New York Times was getting too leftist in some of its editorials and was coming very close to being a Communist paper, and he was making plans to investigate it as such. Think about that for a moment. The New York Times had criticized him editorially, and he was thinking he should investigate it as a Communist paper.

Not long thereafter, he died. We found out more and more about the secret files he had on everybody, from Presidents to Members of Congress. What if a J. Edgar Hoover had the kinds of tools that are available today? That would be my response to the Senator from Utah, and that is why I totally agree with him that we have to think about not just today but what might happen in the future.

For years, Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act has been used by the NSA to justify the bulk collection of innocent Americans' phone records. Americans were appropriately outraged when they learned about this massive intrusion into their privacy.

Look at what happened last week. The highly respected Federal Second Circuit Court of Appeals confirmed what we have known for some time: The NSA's bulk collection of Americans' phone records is unlawful, it is not essential, and it must end. That basically says it all. It is unlawful, it is not essential, and it should end.

Under the government's interpretation of Section 215, the NSA or FBI can obtain any tangible thing so long as it is ''relevant'' to an authorized investigation. Think for a moment back to J. Edgar Hoover—and I do not by any means equate the current Director of the FBI or his predecessors with what happened back then, but if you have somebody with that mindset.

In the name of fighting terrorism, the government convinced a secret court that it needed to collect billions of phone records of innocent Americans—not because those phone records were relevant to any specific counterterrorism investigation but, rather, because the NSA wanted to sift through them in the future. This is an extraordinarily broad reading of the statute—one that I can say, as someone who was here at the time, that Congress never intended—and the Second Circuit rightfully held that such an expansive concept of ''relevance'' is ''unprecedented and unwarranted.'' Such an interpretation of ''relevance'' has no logical limits.

This debate is not just about phone records. If we accept that the government can collect all of our phone records because it may want to sift through them someday to look for some possible connection to terrorists, where will it end?

We know that for years the NSA collected metadata about billions of emails sent by innocent Americans using the same justification. Should we allow the government to sweep up all of our credit card records, all of our banking or medical records, our firearms or ammunition purchases? Or how about anything we have ever posted on Facebook or anything we have ever searched for on Google or any other search engine? Who wants to tell their constituents that they support putting all this information into government databases?

I say enough is enough. I do not accept that the government will be careful in safeguarding this secret data—so careful that they allowed a private contractor named Edward Snowden to walk away with all this material. What is to stop anybody else from doing exactly the same thing?

During one of the six Judiciary Committee hearings that I convened on these issues last Congress, I asked the then-Deputy Attorney General whether there was any limit to this interpretation of Section 215. I did not get a satisfactory answer—that is, until the Second Circuit ruled last week and correctly laid out the implication of this theory. They said that if the government's interpretation of Section 215 is correct, the government could use Section 215 to collect and store in bulk ''any other existing metadata available anywhere in the private sector, including metadata associated with financial records, medical records, and electronic communications (including e-mail and social media information) relating to all Americans.'' I don't think you are going to find many Americans anywhere in the political spectrum who want to give this government or any other government that kind of power because nothing under the government's interpretation would stop it from collecting and storing in bulk any of this information.

The potential significance of this interpretation is staggering. It is no wonder that groups as disparate as the ACLU and the National Rifle Association have joined together to file a lawsuit in the Second Circuit to stop this bulk collection program.

Congress finally has the opportunity to make real reforms not only to Section 215 but to other parts of FISA that can be used to conduct bulk collection. Tomorrow, the House will consider the bipartisan USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. Senator LEE and I have introduced an identical bill in the Senate. If enacted, our bill will be the most significant reform to government surveillance authorities since the USA PATRIOT Act was passed nearly 14 years ago. Our bill will end the NSA's bulk collection program under Section 215. It also guarantees unprecedented transparency about government surveillance programs, allows the FISA Court to appoint an amicus to assist it in significant cases, and strengthens judicial review of the gag orders imposed on recipients of national security letters.

The USA FREEDOM Act is actually a very commonsense bill. That is why Senator LEE and I were able to join together on it. He is right—we come from different political philosophies, different parts of the country, and obviously we don't agree on all things, but we agreed on this because it makes common sense and it is something that should bring together Republicans and Democrats. It was crafted with significant input from privacy and civil liberties groups, the intelligence community, and the technology industry. It has support from Members of Congress and groups from across the political spectrum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the Washington Times, the Washington Post, USA TODAY, and the Los Angeles Times in support of the USA FREEDOM Act.

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

[From the Washington Times, May 7, 2015]

BIG BROTHER TAKES A HIT

THE COURTS GIVE AN ASSIST TO REPEALING INTRUSIONS INTO THE PRIVACY OF EVERYONE

Sen. Mitch McConnell, the Republican majority leader, has made it clear to his colleagues that he wants the USA Patriot Act, including the controversial parts of the legislation scheduled to expire at the end of June, fully extended. He's seems ready to do whatever he can to get his way.

The USA Patriot Act was enacted in the days following Sept. 11, when the nation trembled on the verge of panic, with little debate and little opposition in Congress. The Patriot Act has been recognized since on both left and right as unfortunate legislation that granted too much power to the government to snoop into the lives, calls and emails of everyone in the name of national security.

Mr. McConnell thought he could force the Senate to either let the law lapse, to panic everyone again, or get an extension without modification until the year 2020. Even as Mr. McConnell praised the National Security Agency's reliance on the act to justify the

collection of telephonic ''metadata'' from millions of Americans, the 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals was writing the decision, released Thursday, declaring the government program, first revealed by Edward Snowden, illegal because the language of the act cannot be read to justify such sweeping government action.

The lawsuit was brought by the American Civil Liberties Union and joined by groups, including the National Rifle Association, and welcomed by civil libertarians across the land. To continue the program, the Obama administration would presumably have to persuade Congress to adopt language specifically authorizing the NSA to collect and hold such data. That attempt might be forthcoming.

The court's decision gives a boost to the advocates for the USA Freedom Act, which would modify the Patriot Act. The Freedom Act is expected to pass in the House and Mr. McConnell's strategy to kill it in the Senate may not work now, given the appeals court's decision.

Sen. Patrick Leahy, the ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee, read the 97-page opinion and said, ''Congress should take up and pass the bipartisan USA Freedom Act, which would ban bulk collection under Section 215 and enact other meaningful surveillance reforms.''

The opinion of the liberal senator from Vermont is shared by the conservative Rep. James Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin, an author of the Patriot Act who has since regretted its excess. He joined the ACLU lawsuit as ''a friend of the court,'' and said Thursday that ''it's time for Congress to pass the USA Freedom Act in order to protect both civil liberties and national security with legally authorized surveillance.''

When the chips are down, blind partisanship, with genuine cooperation, can still be put aside.

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 2015]

NEW RULES FOR THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

For months, Congress has debated the National Security Agency's telephone metadata collection program, without legislative result. Now two factors have combined to make that frustrating situation even less sustainable. The legislative authority that first the George W. Bush administration and then the Obama administration cited for the program, Section 215 of the Patriot Act, is expiring on June 1. And, on Thursday, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit ruled that their interpretation of Section 215 was wrong anyway.

Congress needs to respond, and the sooner the better. To be sure, the court's ruling has no immediate practical impact, since the three-judge panel considered it superfluous to stop the program less than a month before Section 215 expires. The court's reasoning, though, could, and should, influence the debate. Judge Gerard E. Lynch's opinion noted that the NSA's mass storage of data, basically just in case it should be needed for a subsequent inquiry, stretched the statute's permission of information-gathering ''relevant to an authorized investigation'' beyond ''any accepted understanding of the term.''

Intelligence and law enforcement must be able to gather and analyze telephone metadata, but that requirement of national security can, and must, be balanced by robust protections of privacy and civil liberties. Under the current system, those protections consist of the NSA's own internal limitations on access to the database, subject to supervision by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC)—which operates in secret and considers arguments only from the government. A democratic society requires more explicit, transparent protections.

There is, fortunately, a promising reform proposal readily available: the USA Freedom bill, which enjoys bipartisan support in both chambers as well as broad endorsement from President Obama—and the affected private industries as well. In a nutshell, it would abandon the bulk collection of the NSA's metadata, and warrantless searches of it, in favor of a system under which telecommunications firms retained the information, subject to specific requests from the government. Those queries, in turn, would have to be approved by the FISC. Along with the bill's provisions mandating greater disclosure about the FISC's proceedings, the legislation would go a long way toward enhancing public confidence in the NSA's operations, at only modest cost, if any, to public safety.

The measure has passed the House Judiciary Committee by a vote of 25 to 2. In the Senate, it failed to muster 60 votes last year when Democrats were in the majority, and its prospects appear even dimmer now that the Republicans are in control; their leader, Sen. Mitch McConnell (Ky.) favors reauthorizing Section 215 as-is.

Mr. McConnell's view—that the statute does, indeed, authorize bulk metadata collection—was legally tenable, barely, before the 2nd Circuit's opinion. Now he should revise it. If the Senate renews Section 215 at all, it should only be a short-term extension to buy time for intensive legislating after June 1—with a view toward enacting reform promptly. If the anti-terrorism effort is to be sustainable, Congress must give the intelligence agencies, and the public, a fresh, clear and, above all, sustainable set of instructions.

[From USA Today, May 10, 2015]

PATRIOT ACT CALLS FOR COMPROMISE IN CONGRESS

PROPOSAL ON NSA AND PHONE RECORDS WOULD GO A LONG WAY TOWARD REBALANCING SECURITY AND LIBERTY

In the years since the USA Patriot Act was approved in the frantic days following 9/11, it has become steadily more apparent that the law and the way it was applied were an overreaction to those horrific events.

The most flagrant abuse is the government's collection of staggering amounts of phone ''metadata'' on virtually every American. That program—which collects the number you call, when you call and how long you talk—was secret until Edward Snowden's leaks confirmed it in 2013.

Last Thursday, a federal appeals court—the highest to rule on the issue—found that the program is illegal. You'd think the unambiguous ruling from a unanimous three-judge panel would finally force changes to the bulk collection program.

But that's not necessarily going to happen, even though a compromise has emerged in Congress that would go a long way toward rebalancing security and liberty.

Under the compromise, the data would remain with the phone companies instead of the government. Requests to access the database would have to be far more limited, and each would require approval from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

The new procedure would eliminate some of the phone collection program's most intrusive features, while keeping the security it offers at a time when the terrorist group Islamic State brings new threats. The measure has support from Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, and a long list of civil liberties and privacy groups.

It would also satisfy the court, which didn't dispute Congress' right to create such a program, just the executive branch's right to do so without Congress' assent.

Yet instead of embracing the compromise, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, Republican presidential hopeful Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida, and others are working to sabotage it. They want the Senate to ensure that the program will continue just as it is after parts of the Patriot Act expire at the end of this month.

While the phone program's benefits are dubious, its costs are clear. Several major tech companies have said that privacy intrusions have hurt U.S. companies. Meanwhile, innocent Americans suffer an assault to their privacy each day the government collects data on their calls. And if this sort of collection goes on, history demonstrates the government is likely to abuse it.

As the appeals court ruling warned, if the government's interpretation were correct in stretching the law to collect phone data, it could use the same interpretation to ''collect and store in bulk any other existing metadata available anywhere,'' including financial records, medical records, email and social media.

Choosing between privacy and security in these dangerous times is difficult. But, despite what supporters of bulk collection insist, lawmakers don't have to choose.

A carefully built compromise allows access to phone records, but with genuine privacy safeguards. The nation would be no less secure. And the civil liberties on which the nation was built would be better protected.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 6, 2015]

THE USA FREEDOM ACT: A SMALLER BIG BROTHER

Last fall, Congress was on the verge of doing away with the most troubling invasion of privacy revealed by Edward Snowden: the National Security Agency's indiscriminate collection of the telephone records of millions of Americans. But then opponents cited the emergence of Islamic State as a reason for preserving the status quo. The Senate failed to muster the 60 votes needed to proceed with the so-called USA Freedom Act.

But the legislation has staged a comeback. Last week the House Judiciary Committee approved a bill of the same name that would end bulk collection—leaving phone records in the possession of telecommunications providers. The government could search telephone records only by convincing a court that there was ''reasonable, articulable suspicion'' that a specific search term—such as a telephone number—was associated with international terrorism. And rules would be tightened so that investigators couldn't search records from, say, an entire state, city or ZIP Code.

Americans were understandably alarmed in 2013 when Snowden revealed that information about the sources, destination and duration of their phone calls was being vacuumed up by the NSA and stored by the government, which could then ''query'' the database without court approval for numbers connected to suspected terrorists. After initially defending the program, President Obama modified it a bit, but he left it to Congress to make the fundamental change of ending bulk collection.

We had hoped that Congress would take a fresh look at whether this program is necessary at all, given a presidential task

force's conclusion that it was ''not essential to preventing attacks.'' But if Congress is determined to continue the program, it must establish safeguards. The bill does this, though there is room for improvement. For example, unlike last year's Senate bill, this measure doesn't require the government to destroy information it obtains about individuals who aren't the target of an investigation or suspected agents of a foreign government or terrorist organization.

Approval is likely in the House, but prospects in the Senate are more doubtful. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R–Ky.) has said that ending bulk collection of phone records would amount to ''tying our hands behind our backs.''

That was, and is, a specious objection. Under this legislation, the government can continue to search telephone records when there is a reasonable suspicion of a connection to terrorism. But it will no longer be able to warehouse those records, and it will have to satisfy a court that it isn't on a fishing expedition. Those are eminently reasonable restrictions—unless you believe that the war against Islamic State and similar groups means that Americans must sacrifice their right to privacy in perpetuity.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, additionally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the major technology industry companies and trade associations in support of the USA FREEDOM Act.

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

MAY 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: We, the undersigned technology associations and groups, write to express our strong support for H.R. 2048, the USA Freedom Act, as reported by the House Judiciary Committee on April 30th by a vote of 25 to two.

Public trust in the technology sector is critical, and that trust has declined measurably among both U.S. citizens and citizens of our foreign allies since the revelations regarding the U.S. surveillance programs began 2 years ago. As a result of increasing concern about the level of access the U.S. government has to user-generated data held by technology companies, many domestic and foreign users have turned to foreign technology providers while, simultaneously, foreign jurisdictions have implemented reactionary policies that threaten the fabric of the borderless internet.

The USA Freedom Act as introduced in the House and Senate on April 28th offers an effective balance that both protects privacy and provides the necessary tools for national security, and we congratulate those who participated in the bipartisan, bicameral effort that produced the legislative text. Critically, the bill ends the indiscriminate collection of bulk data, avoids data retention mandates, and creates a strong transparency framework for both government and private companies to report national security requests.

Meaningful surveillance reform is vital to rebuilding the essential element of trust not only in the technology sector but also in the U.S. government. With 21 days remaining until the sunset of certain national security authorities, we urge you to swiftly move to consider and pass the USA Freedom Act without harmful amendments.

Mr. LEAHY. Some would argue that no reforms are needed. Unfortunately, they do not go into the facts, as the Second Circuit did; they invoke fearmongering and dubious claims about the utility of the bulk collection programs to defend the status quo. These are the same arguments we heard last November when we were not even allowed to debate an earlier version of the USA FREEDOM Act because of a filibuster.

Last week, some Senators came to the floor to argue that the NSA's bulk collection of phone records might have prevented 9/11. Now, this specter is always raised, that it might have prevented 9/11 and is vital to national security. We also heard that if we enact the USA FREEDOM Act, that will somehow return the intelligence community to a pre-9/11 posture. None of these claims can withstand the light of day.

I will go back to some of the facts—not just hypotheses. Richard Clarke was working in the Bush administration on September 11, 2001. I asked him whether the NSA program would have prevented those attacks. He testified that the government already had the information that could have prevented the attacks, but failed to properly share that information among Federal agencies. Likewise, Senator Bob Graham, who investigated the September 11 attacks as part of the Senate Intelligence Committee, also debunked the notion that this bulk collection program would somehow have prevented the 9/11 attacks.

The NSA's bulk collection of phone records simply has not been vital to thwarting terrorist attacks. When the NSA was embarrassed by the theft of all of their information and the news about the NSA's phone metadata program first broke, they defended the program by saying it had helped thwart 54 terrorist attacks. Well, I convened public hearings on this and under public scrutiny, that figure of 54 initially shrunk to: Well, maybe a dozen. We scrutinized that further. They said: Well, maybe it was two. Everybody realized that the government had to tell the truth in these open hearings. And then they said: Maybe it was one. That sole example was not a ''terrorist attack'' that was thwarted. It was a material support conviction involving $8,000 not a terrorist plot.

Numerous independent experts also have concluded that the NSA's bulk collection program is not essential to national security. I mention these things, because as soon as you come down and say: We are all going to face another 9/11, we are all going to face ISIS, we are all going to face these terrible attacks if we do not have this program—yet we can show that it has not stopped any attacks.

The President's Review Group, which included former national security officials, stated: The bulk collection of American's phone records was not essential to preventing attacks, and could readily have been obtained in a timely manner using conventional Section 215 orders.

So we can go with hysteria and overstatements or we can go with facts. In my State of Vermont, we like facts. We should not be swayed by fearmongering. Congress cannot simply reauthorize the expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act without enacting real reforms.

When the House passes the USA FREEDOM Act tomorrow and sends it to the Senate, we should take it up immediately, pass that bill. The American people are counting on us to take action. They did not elect us to just kick the can down the road or blindly rubber stamp intelligence activities that now have been found by the court to be illegal. Congress should pass the USA FREEDOM Act this week.

I thank my good friend from Utah for yielding to me. I totally agree with his position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the colloquy for a period of an additional 15 minutes to allow a couple of other Members to participate in the colloquy.

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

Mr. LEE. I would like to now hear from my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada, Mr. HELLER, and hear his thoughts on how people in his State—how people he knows across the country feel about this program and what we ought to do about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I rise to join this bipartisan group calling for support of the USA FREEDOM Act. I want to begin by thanking my friend and colleague from Utah for his hard work and effort on behalf of the American people on this, my friend from Vermont for his actions also, and other Members of this Chamber.

Together, what we are trying to do is bring transparency, accountability, and, most importantly, freedom to the American people—freedom from an unnecessary and what has now been declared an illegal invasion of American's privacy. I am talking specifically about section 215 under the PATRIOT Act. Just last week, a Federal appeals court ruled that this National Security Agency program that collects Americans' calls—these records are now illegal.

Our national security and protection of our freedom as Americans are not mutually exclusive. Allowing the Federal Government to conduct vast domestic surveillance operations under section 215 provides the government with too much authority. This court's

ruling only reaffirms that the NSA is out of control.

Under section 215, the FBI can seek a court order directing a business to turn over certain records when they have reasonable grounds to believe the information asked for is ''relevant to an authorized investigation of international terrorism.'' However, the NSA has wrongly interpreted this to mean that all—all—telephone records are relevant.

So they are collecting and storing large amounts of data in an attempt to find a small amount of information that might be relevant. If we reauthorize these laws without significant reforms, we are allowing millions of lawabiding U.S. citizens' call records to be held by the Federal Government. I see this as nothing but an egregious intrusion of Americans' privacy.

So what does the NSA know? They know someone from my State in Elko, NV, got a call from the NRA and then called their Senator. So what does the NSA know? They know someone from Las Vegas called the suicide hotline for 20 minutes and then called a hospital right after. So what does the NSA know? They know you called your church or received a phone call from political action committees.

So does the previous administration, does this administration or perhaps the next administration care about your party affiliation? Do they care about your religious beliefs? Do they care about your health concerns? How about your activities in nonprofit tax-exempt entities? Maybe not today, as the Senator from Utah said, but what about 5 years from now, what about 10 years from now and even 15 years from now?

That is why I have been working with my colleagues since the last Congress to pass the USA FREEDOM Act, and I am proud to join as an original cosponsor of this bill in this new Congress. Those reforms are not just a pipeline dream that will die in the Senate. This is a substantive bill that carefully balances the privacy rights of Americans and the needs of the intelligence community as they work to keep us safe.

That is why the House Judiciary Committee has passed this bill on a bipartisan basis and the full House of Representatives is expected to pass it later this week. Let me be clear. We are not here to strip the intelligence community of the tools needed to fight terrorism. To my colleagues who feel that the USA FREEDOM Act will do this, I would ask them to read this letter from our intelligence community.

In my hand, I have a letter signed by the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence that was sent to Senator LEAHY last year. I would like to read a portion of this. ''The intelligence community believes that your bill preserves essential intelligence community capabilities; and the Department of Justice and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence support your bill and believe that it is a reasonable compromise that enhances privacy and civil liberties and increases transparency.''

We are not here to harm the operational capabilities of the intelligence community who safeguard us every day. What we are here to do is provide the American people the certainty that the Federal Government is working without violating their constitutional rights. That is why I have also consistently opposed and voted against the PATRIOT Act during my time in Congress.

I will do everything I can to end the PATRIOT Act, but if I cannot do that, I will work to gut the PATRIOT Act of the most egregious sections that infringe upon American citizens' privacy and their civil liberties. That is what the reforms of the USA FREEDOM Act begin to achieve. This legislation, among other things, will rein in the dragnet collection of data by the National Security Agency. It will stop the bulk collection of American communication records by ending the specific authorization under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

We are reaching a critical deadline as several Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act provisions expire at the end of May. I want to be clear that I expect reforms to our surveillance programs, and I will not consent to a straight reauthorization of the illegal activities that occur under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

It is time for our Nation to right this wrong, make significant changes necessary to restore America's faith in the Federal Government, and restore the civil liberties that make our Nation worth protecting. I want to again thank the Senator from Utah and my colleague from the State of Vermont for their hard work and effort on behalf of all Americans in protecting their privacies and their civil liberties. I will turn my time back over to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we would like to hear next from my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Montana, on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Utah, my good friend, for his leadership on the USA FREEDOM Act. I recently returned from an official trip to the Middle East with leader MCCONNELL and several of my fellow first-term Senators. We met with leaders in Israel, Jordan, Iraq, Kuwait, and Afghanistan to discuss the political and security issues facing Middle Eastern nations.

We also met with a number of American servicemembers who are bravely securing our country in these crisis-stricken regions and working every day to keep our Nation safe from the extreme forces that wish to destroy us. These meetings painted a very clear picture; that terror imposed by extreme forces such as ISIS and the threats facing our allies in the Middle East are real and they are growing every single day.

But the growing presence of ISIS in the Middle East is not just affecting the long-term security of nations such as Iraq and Syria, it is no longer a risk isolated geographically to the Middle East.

These extreme Islamic forces are working every day to harm the American people within our borders and on our soil. It is critical our law enforcement officials and our intelligence agencies have the tools they need to find terrorists in the United States and abroad, identify potential terror attacks, and eradicate these risks. ISIS is not just working to inflict physical damage upon our country and our people, this extreme group and other like-minded terrorists are intent on destroying our very way of life, our Nation's foundation of freedom and justice for all.

But as we strengthen our intelligence capabilities, we must, with equal vigor and determination, protect our Constitution, our civil liberties, the very foundation of this country. If the forces of evil successfully propel leaders in Washington to erode our core constitutional values, we will grant these terrorists a satisfying victory. We must never allow this. We must uphold the Constitution. We must work to protect the balance between protecting our Nation's security while also maintaining our civil liberties and our constitutional rights.

That is why I, similar to so many Montanans, am deeply concerned about the NSA's bulk metadata collection program and its impact on our constitutional rights. This program allows the NSA to have uninhibited access to America's phone records. I firmly believe this is a violation of America's constitutional rights and it must come to an end. Montanans have also long been concerned that the NSA has overreached its legal authority when implementing its bulk data collection program.

The recent ruling from the New York-based Second Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals confirmed it. The court ruled unanimously that section 215 of the PATRIOT Act does not authorize the NSA's bulk collection of Americans' phone metadata, but this is not the first time the legality of NSA's bulk data practices have been questioned.

A 2015 report from the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, which is a nonpartisan, independent privacy board, found that section 215 does not provide authority for the NSA's collection program. The report raised serious concerns that the NSA's program violated the rights guaranteed under the

First and Fourth Amendments. The report states:

Under the section 215 bulk records program, the NSA acquires a massive number of calling records from telephone companies every day, potentially including the records of every call made across the Nation. Yet Section 215 does not authorize the NSA to acquire anything at all.

The report concludes:

The program lacks a viable legal foundation under section 215. It implicates Constitutional concerns of the first and fourth amendments, raises serious threats to privacy and civil liberties as a policy matter, and has shown only limited value. For these reasons the government should end the program.

I strongly agree. In addition, the independent Commission found that the bulk collection program contributed only minimal value in combatting terrorism beyond what the government already achieves through other alternative means. So claims that this program provides unique value to our security were not validated, and, in fact, were refused by the Commission.

As Montana's Senator, I took an oath to protect and defend the Constitution. It is a responsibility and a promise I take very seriously. That is why I have joined Senators LEE, LEAHY, and others to introduce the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. This bipartisan legislation will end the NSA's bulk data collection program, while also implementing greater oversight, transparency, and accountability in the government's surveillance activities.

The USA FREEDOM Act strikes the right balance between protecting our security and protecting our privacy. It still allows necessary access to information specific to an investigation, with an appropriate court order, and provides the flexibility to be able to move quickly in response to emergencies, but it stops the indiscriminate government collection of data on innocent Americans once and for all.

I have long fought to defend Montanans' civil liberties, protecting privacy and constitutional rights from Big Government overreach. After spending 12 years in the technology sector, I know firsthand the power that data holds and the threats to American civil liberties that come with mass collection.

As Montana's loan representative in the U.S. House, I cosponsored the original USA FREEDOM ACT that would have ended the NSA's abuses and overreach. I also supported efforts led by Congressman JUSTIN AMASH to amend the 2014 Defense appropriations bill and end the NSA's blanket collection of Americans' telephone records.

We made significant ground last year in raising awareness of this overreach, but the fight to protect America's civil liberties and constitutional freedoms is far from over. That is why I am proud to stand today as a cosponsor of the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 and a strong advocate and defender of America's right to privacy. As risks facing our homeland and our interests overseas remain ever present, it is critical that our law enforcement has the tools they need to protect our national security from extremists who would destroy our Nation and our very way of life.

The USA FREEDOM Act provides these tools, but we must also remain vigilant to ensure that American civil liberties aren't needlessly abandoned in the process. We need to protect and defend the homeland. We need to protect and defend the Constitution.

I stand today with the full confidence that the USA FREEDOM Act achieves both, and I urge the Senate to pass it.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the colloquy by an additional 5 minutes so we can hear from my friend and colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENTHAL.

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

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Utah, my friend and very distinguished colleague, as well as our friend from the State of Vermont for their leadership this morning and throughout the drafting and formulating of this very well-balanced compromise—a balance between security, which we must be able to preserve and defend, and our privacy and other essential constitutional rights, which we need to protect just as zealously, because the reason for fighting to preserve our security is so we maintain and preserve our great constitutional rights.

That balance can be struck. It is feasible, achievable, and this measure of the USA FREEDOM Act is a strong step in the right direction.

I wish to talk today about one of its great virtues, which is an American virtue, the virtue of due process having an effective adversarial process, one that is transparent and provides for effective appellate view. The lack of an adversarial process, as well as transparency and effective appellate review, is one of the reasons the USA FREEDOM Act is absolutely necessary.

We know bulk collection of megadata is unnecessary. The President's own review group made that fact clear. We also know bulk metadata collection is, essentially, un-American. This country was founded by people who, rightly, abhorred the so-called general warrant that permitted the King's officials to rummage through their homes and documents. No general warrant in our history has swept up as much information about innocent Americans as orders allowing bulk collection.

Last week, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals told us something more; that we now know bulk collection is unauthorized. It is illegal. It is unauthorized by statute and has been so for the last 9 years that the government has collected bulk data of this kind.

The question is, How did it happen? How did we arrive at a point where the Government of the United States has been collecting data illegally for 9 years? We know that in May of 2006, the FISA Court—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court—first was asked whether the Federal Government could collect the phone records of potentially every single American, and it said yes.

It failed the most crucial test of any court, which is to uphold our liberties against any legal onslaught. It got it wrong because the government's argument hinged on a single word, the word ''relevance.'' The court ruled that relevance means all information. In other words, the court had to decide whether relevant information means all information, and it said yes.

That judgment was just plain wrong, and it did not strike the Second Circuit as a difficult question. It doesn't strike us—now in retrospect—as a difficult question. The Second Circuit held that the Federal Government's interpretation is ''unprecedented and unwarranted.'' Never before, in the history of the Nation, has this kind of bizarre overreaching been successfully entertained.

Now, the court—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court—didn't even issue an opinion. There was no way for anyone to know that this bulk metadata collection had been authorized because the court never told anyone, never explained itself. One can hope the Court knew what it was thinking at the time, but we don't know what it was thinking.

Now, I don't mean any disrespect to the FISA Court, which is composed of judges who have been confirmed by this body, article 3 judges who serve because they have been appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

The reason the court got this issue so fundamentally wrong, I think, is because it heard only one side of the argument. It heard only the government's side. It heard only the advocates seeking to collect in this sweeping way that was contrary to statute and, in my view, also contrary to fundamental rights and principles.

The USA FREEDOM Act corrects that systemic problem. It not only enables, but it requires the court to hear both sides.

We know from our life's experience that people make better decisions when they hear both sides of an argument. Judges on the courts know they want to hear both sides of the argument before they make a decision. Often they will appoint someone to make the other side of the argument, if there isn't anyone to do so effectively. They

want effective representation in the courtroom.

That is why I have advocated from the very start and proposed—and the President affirmed—that there needs to be advocacy for our constitutional rights before the court. The other side of the government's argument needs to be represented.

We need a FISA Court we can trust to get it right because this proposal for an adversarial proceeding in no way contemplates an abridgement of secrecy or unnecessary delay. Warrants could proceed without delay. They could proceed without violation of confidentiality and secrecy, but the systemic problem would be fixed so the FISA Court would hear from both sides.

This act also is important because it would bring more transparency to FISA Court decisions, requiring opinions to be released, unless there is good reason not to do so. It would require some form of effective appellate review so mistakes could be corrected.

These kinds of changes in the law are, in fact, basic due process. They are the rule of law throughout the United States in article 3 courts, and these changes will make the FISA Court look like the courts Americans are accustomed to seeing in their everyday experience. When they walk into a courtroom in any town in the State of Connecticut or the State of Utah or the State of Montana, what they are accustomed to seeing is two sides arguing before a judge, and that is what the FISA Court would look like—rather than one side making one argument, whether it is for bulk collection of metadata or any other intrusion on civil rights and civil liberties, there would be an advocate on the other side to make the case that it is overreaching, that it is unnecessary, that it is unauthorized. In fact, that is what the Second Circuit said the government was doing by this incredibly overextended overreach in bulk collection of metadata.

Unless and until this essential reform is enacted, along with other critical reforms that are contained in the USA FREEDOM Act, I will oppose reauthorization of section 215, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I thank my colleagues from Utah and Vermont for their leadership and all who have joined in this morning's discussion. The colloquy today, I think, illustrates some important points of why the USA FREEDOM Act is important at this point in our Nation's history.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the patience of Senator HATCH and his willingness to wait while we finished this exercise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

TRADE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, later today, the Senate will vote on whether to begin debate on the future of the U.S. trade policy. It is a debate that has been a long time coming. In fact, we haven't had a real trade debate in this Chamber since at least 2002. That was 13 years ago.

Think about that. Let's keep in mind that 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of the United States and that if we want our farmers, our ranchers, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs to be able to compete in the world marketplace, we need to be actively working to break down barriers for American exports. This is how we can grow our economy and create good, high-paying jobs for American workers.

While the chatter in the media and behind the scenes surrounding today's vote has been nearly deafening, no one should make today's vote more than it is. It is, once again, quite simply, a vote to begin debate on these important issues.

Now, I know some around here are unwilling to even consider having a debate if they can't dictate the terms in advance, but that is not how the Senate works and, thankfully, that is not the path we are going to take.

I have been in Congress for a long time, so I think I can speak with some authority about how this Chamber is—under normal conditions and regular order—supposed to operate. Of course, before this year, it had been a while before this body had worked the way it was supposed to. Hopefully, today's vote can serve as a reminder, and we can go to regular order on these bills and do it in a way that brings dignity to this Chamber again.

Once again, today's vote will decide only whether we will begin a debate on trade policy. It will not in any way decide the outcome of that debate. Indeed, the question for today is not how this debate will proceed but whether it will proceed at all.

Right now, everyone's focus seems to be on whether we will renew trade promotion authority—or TPA—and that will, of course, be part of the trade debate. TPA is a vital element of U.S. trade policy. Indeed, it is the best way to ensure that Congress sets the objectives for our trade negotiators and provides assurances to our trading partners that if a trade agreement is signed, the United States can deliver on the deal.

As you know, the Finance Committee reported a strong bipartisan TPA bill on April 22. The committee vote was 20 to 6 in favor of the bill. It was a bipartisan vote. That was a historic day. Before that day, the last time the Finance Committee reported a TPA bill was in 1988, almost three decades ago.

But that is not all we did on that day. In addition to our TPA bill, we reported a bill to reauthorize trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, a bill to reauthorize expired trade preference programs, and a customs and trade enforcement bill.

These are all important bills—each one of them. They all have bipartisan support. I was a principal author of three of these four bills, and I don't intend to see any of them left by the wayside. However, that looks like it is becoming increasingly what might really happen here if we don't get together.

Everyone here knows that I am anxious to get TPA across the finish line. And though it pains me a little to say it, TAA is part of that effort. We know our colleagues on the left have to have that. While I oppose TAA, I have recognized—and I have from the beginning—that the program is important to many of my colleagues, some of whom are on this side of the aisle as well, and it is a necessary component to win their support for TPA.

On a number of occasions, including at the Finance Committee markup, I have committed to helping make sure that TPA and TAA move on parallel tracks, and I intend to honor that commitment. Toward that end, if we get cloture on the motion to proceed later today, I plan to combine TPA and TAA into basically a single package that can be split by the House, and move them as a substitute amendment to the trade vehicle. And, I have to say, Congressman RYAN, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, understands that TAA has to pass over there as well.

In other words, no one should be concerned about a path forward for TPA and TAA. That was the big debate throughout the whole procedural process. And even though it raises concerns for a number of Republicans, including myself, these two bills will move together.

The question ultimately becomes this: What about the preferences and customs bills? There are two other bills here. I have committed in the past to work on getting all four of these bills across the finish line or at least to a vote on the floor, and I will reaffirm that commitment here on the floor today. I will work in good faith with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both the House and Senate to get this done.

Regarding preferences, the House and Senate have introduced very similar bills, and, in the past, these preference programs—programs such as the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the generalized system of preferences—have enjoyed broad bipartisan support. My guess is that support will continue and that there is a path forward on moving that legislation in short order.

Admittedly, the customs bill is a bit more complicated. However, I am a principal author of most of the provisions in the customs bill. Indeed, many

of my own enforcement positions and priorities are in that bill. Put simply, I have a vested interest in seeing the customs bill become law, and I will do all I can to make sure that happens. I will work with Senator WYDEN and the rest of my colleagues to find a path forward on these bills. I don't want any of them to be left behind.

But we all know that the customs bill has language in there that cannot be passed in the House. I don't know what to do about that. All I can say is that we can provide a vote here in this body, and who knows what that vote will be. I am quite certain that if we are allowed to proceed today, these bills—not to mention any others—will be offered as amendments. But in the end, we can't do any of that—we can't pass a single one of these bills—if we don't even begin the trade debate.

If Senators are concerned about the substance of the legislation we are debating, the best way to address these problems is to come to the floor, offer some amendments, and take some votes. That is how the Senate is supposed to operate, and we are prepared to operate it that way.

I might add, though, we have to get the bill up. And if there is a cloture vote and cloture fails, Katy bar the door.

I know there are some deeply held convictions on all sides of these issues and that not everyone in the Senate agrees with me. That is all the more reason to let this debate move forward and let's see where it goes. Let's talk about our positions. Let's make all of our voices heard. I am ready and willing to defend my support for free trade and TPA here on the Senate floor. I will happily stand here and make the case for open markets and expanded access for U.S. exporters and refute any arguments made to the contrary. And I am quite certain there are a number of my colleagues who would relish the opportunity to tell me why they think I am wrong. They should have that right. None of that happens if people vote today to prevent the debate from even taking place.

We need to keep in mind that we are talking about bipartisan legislation here. All of these bills are supported by Senators on both sides of the aisle. This isn't some partisan gambit to force a Republican bill through the Senate. And, of course, let's not forget that, with TPA, we are talking about President Obama's top legislative priority and one of the most important bills in this President's service as President of the United States of America.

This is a debate we need to have. I am prepared to have it. The American people deserve to see us talk about these issues on the floor instead of hiding behind procedural excuses.

I urge all of my colleagues, regardless of where they stand substantively on these issues, to vote to begin this important and, hopefully, historic debate on U.S. trade policy.

Let me say, I am basically shocked that after all we have done—the large vote in the committee, the importance of these two bills in particular but all four of them, and the importance of trade promotion authority and trade adjustment assistance to the President—that we now have a bunch of procedural mechanisms that could make this all impossible. It is hard for me to believe that this could take place. We had an agreement—the two sides—and I am concerned about that agreement being broken at this late date, when we were so happy to get these bills out of the committee and get them the opportunity of being on the floor.

I have to say, as a Republican and as a conservative, I have been willing to carry the water for the President on this because he is absolutely right that TPA and TAA should pass, especially TPA. On TAA, I have questions on it and I wish we didn't have to pass it, but I have agreed to see that it is on the Senate floor as part of passing TPA.

The bill deserves to pass. However, we know that the President does not like the language that was put into the customs bill and neither do I, at this point, because I think it could foul up the whole process, the way I am hearing from the other side. We understood we were going to have votes on TPA and TAA, without getting into the currency problem that will still be alive on the customs bill. I am very concerned about this because we have come this far, and we should follow through and get this done. The President will be better off, the country will be better off, and all of us will be better off. And we can walk away from this, I believe, in the end feeling that we have done the right thing. This is the best thing that could be done for our country. We have to be part of the free-trade movement in this country and in this world. There are 400 trade agreements out there. We have only agreed to 20 of them.

These trade agreements generally bring jobs that are much better paid than other jobs in our society, between 13 and 18 percent more. For the life of me, I will never understand why the unions are so opposed to it and, thus, so many Democrats are opposed to it. I can't understand it, because this will create jobs, and generally the better jobs—the jobs that unions can then fight to unionize if they want to, which they have a right to do under our laws. Yet every time these matters come up, they are a principal impediment to getting free-trade agreements passed.

Look, I think Ambassador Froman has done a very good job up to now, but his hands are tied. If we don't pass TPA, he is going to have a very difficult time, ever, bringing about the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TTIP, which is 28 European countries plus ours. TPP is 11 countries plus ours, mainly in Asia—not the least of which is Japan, which our Trade Representative believes he can get to sign a trade agreement with us. I believe he can. But I don't believe he can do it without TPA. We have already been told by the Ambassador from New Zealand that they are not going to sign without TPA.

So to hamper the passage of TPA because of some desire to do otherwise is not only a mistake, but it flies in the face of the support this President needs and should have on this particular bill.

Now, I understand there are folks on the other side who just aren't for free trade and they are not for trade bills. And they have a right to feel that way. I don't have a problem with that. What I have a problem with is making it impossible to pass these bills and get them through the Senate, which is the path we are on right now. If the votes are against cloture, I suspect our path to getting this done—to improving our trade throughout the world, to allowing us to compete worldwide the way we should—is going to be severely hampered, if not completely hurt.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrat side has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, most people who are following this debate may be a little bit put off by some of the initials that we use around here—TPP, TPA, TAA. What is it all about?

It is about a trade agreement. It involves a dozen countries, including the United States. Most of them are in Asia. We are preparing to discuss and debate it, and that trade agreement is known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP. I think that is what that stands for. I will correct the record if I am wrong on that.

But before we get to the trade agreement, we have to decide how we are going to consider it, and that is known as TPA, trade promotion authority, or fast track. The question is whether the Senate will agree that we cannot amend the trade agreement—no amendments—and that it is a simple majority vote. That is what is known as fast track. Virtually every President in modern time has had that authority. It has expired, and now it has to be recreated by a vote on the floor.

What we are anticipating this afternoon is whether we go to the arguments about these various issues, and the uncertainty is what leads my friend from Utah, Senator HATCH, to come to the floor.

The uncertainty from our side is this: How are we going to consider this?

Four bills came out of the Finance Committee related to trade. How are they going to be brought to the floor? Are they going to be part of one package? Are they separate votes? Which one will come out of the Senate? Will more than one come out of the Senate? These are unanswered questions, and because these questions are unanswered, the vote at 2:30 or so is in doubt.

Senator HATCH is upset. He believed that there was an agreement. I wasn't a party to it. I don't know. But this much I do know: Trade is a controversial issue. It is important to America's economy. But when you take it home and meet with the people you represent, there are strong mixed feelings about trade.

Some who work for the Caterpillar tractor company in Illinois want to promote trade, sell more of those big yellow tractors, and put more Americans to work to build them.

But many look at trade and say: I could be a casualty. I could be a victim. They could ship my job overseas, Senator. So what are you going to do to make sure I am protected in this?

That is why trade isn't an easy issue. It is a controversial issue.

TAA, which Senator HATCH referred to, is trade adjustment assistance. What it says is that if you lost your job because of a trade agreement, we will help pay for your training for a new job. Senator HATCH said he opposed that. I fully support it.

I just visited a high school in downstate Illinois. There was a man there teaching high school students—good, gifted high school students—how to repair computers. I said: How did you get into this business? He said: It is a funny thing. I lost my job in a factory years ago because of a trade agreement. But because of trade adjustment assistance, I was able to go back to college, got a degree, and now I am a teacher.

Do I support trade adjustment assistance? You bet I do—for that teacher and for many others who want to transition into a new job if they lose their job because of trade. So including trade adjustment assistance in any part of a trade agreement is important to many of us. We want to make sure it is included on the floor of the Senate.

Equally so, we want to make sure that trade agreements are enforceable. It wasn't that long ago that we had thriving steel production companies in America that were victimized by many foreign countries that started dumping steel in the United States.

What does it mean to dump steel? These countries—Brazil, Japan, and Russia—were selling steel in the United States at prices lower than the cost of production. Why? They knew they could run the Americans out of business—and they did. By the time we filed an unfair trade grievance, went through the hearings and won our case, the American companies disappeared. Enforcement is an important part of any conversation about trade. We want to know from Senator HATCH and the Republicans who bring this to the floor, if we are going to enforce the trade agreements so Americans are treated fairly.

I think that is a pretty legitimate question. Until it is answered, there is uncertainty. Maybe the vote at 2:30 will reflect it. I hope we can get an answer before 2:30, but if not, then soon after, on how Senator MCCONNELL wants to bring this issue to the floor.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, May 31—today is May 12. On May 31, the Federal highway trust fund authorization expires. What it means is at that point in time, the Federal Government will stop sending Federal dollars back to our States to build highways and bridges and support buses and mass transit—May 31.

What are we going to do about it? We have 19 days to do something about it. Sadly, we know what we are going to do about it. The Republicans who control the House and the Senate have failed to come up with any means of extending the highway trust fund. What they are going to do probably is ask us for a short-term extension—1 month, 2 months.

The reason we think this will happen is that in the past 6 years, there have been 32 extensions of the highway trust fund. We used to pass highway trust fund bills to last 6 years, for obvious reasons. You cannot build highways a month at a time. You have to know you have money that is going to be there for years to build a highway, to repair a bridge, to make certain you have new mass transit modernization. But the Republicans have been unable to reauthorize the highway trust fund for any period of time. They want to extend it 30 days at a time, 60 days at a time.

There are some realities that we need to accept. We cannot patch our way to prosperity in America. You cannot fill enough potholes to build a highway. If we are going to accept our responsibility to be a great nation and a great leader in the world economy, we need an infrastructure to support it.

The Republican failure to extend the highway trust fund for 5 or 6 years, sadly, is going to cost us jobs in America—not just good-paying construction jobs but jobs in businesses that count on infrastructure. I have them all over Illinois. There are thousands of workers in Illinois who depend on them. But because the Republicans have failed to come up with an extension of the highway trust fund, we are going to limp along here and, sadly, not meet our national obligation to create an infrastructure to support our economy.

I am hoping that cooler heads will prevail and leadership will prevail, and that the Republican leadership in the House and the Senate—they are in the majority in both Chambers—will step forward with a plan to create a highway trust fund for 6 years. The President has; he put it on the table. Republicans rejected it. They have no alternative—none.

Let's get down to business. Let's put America back to work. Let's create the infrastructure we need to build our economy.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats have 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to make a statement on Syria and humanitarian concerns in Syria, but it will take longer than that. I know my colleague from Vermont is here, and I would like to yield the remaining 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me say this, if I might. If I can get unanimous consent to speak after Senator THUNE, that would be fine, and I would yield back to the Senator.

How is that?

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator wants to make that unanimous consent request——

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes after Senator THUNE speaks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I believe the previous Presiding Officer suggested I had 5 minutes remaining of Democratic time at this point.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN SYRIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to say, very briefly, a word about the situation in Syria. On May 13, 1994, a Senator from Illinois named Paul Simon was then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa. His ranking Republican was Senator Jim Jeffords of Vermont. Senators Jim Jeffords and Paul Simon had been told that there was a looming genocide about to occur in Rwanda. They went on the phone together and spoke to U.N. General Romeo Dallaire in Kigali, Rwanda, in May of 1994. They asked: What can we do to stop the killing in Rwanda? General Dallaire said: If you would send 5,000 uniformed troops, I could stop this genocide.

Senators Simon and Jeffords wrote to the Clinton White House immediately at that time and asked for the administration to call on the United Nations to act.

Their letter said in part: ''Obviously there are risks involved but we cannot continue to sit idly by while this tragedy continues to unfold.''

The Senators received no reply from the White House. In less than 8 weeks, 800,000 Rwandans were massacred. Today, President William Clinton acknowledges that he should have done more—we should have done more. What happened in Rwanda was a classic genocide. Today, what is happening in Syria may not meet the classic definition of a genocide, but it certainly meets every standard and every definition as the looming humanitarian crisis of our time. The question before us and the United States is this: What will we do?

I think it has reached the point where we must act. That is why I have joined three of my colleagues—fellow Democrat TIM KAINE of Virginia and Republicans LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina and JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona—and we have written to President Obama, urging him to call together world leaders and to establish a humanitarian zone—a safe zone, a no-fly zone—in Syria, where modern medical treatment can be provided and displaced persons can escape. We think it should be done under the auspices—I do—of the United Nations and that the United States can join other countries in providing a defensive security force.

We need to turn to our NATO allies, such as Turkey. We need to reach out to Saudi Arabia, even Iran, and try to find an international consensus to spare the suffering and death which has been occurring now for years. We do not know the exact number of casualties. We estimate that some 400,000 may have died in Syria. Millions have been displaced.

This is a picture of just one of the refugee camps to which the people of Syria have fled. I have visited camps such as this in Turkey. They are in Lebanon and Jordan. They cannot accommodate all of the people who are evacuating that country.

Once every few months a friend of mine comes to visit in Chicago. He is an extraordinary man. His name is Dr. Sahloul. He heads up a group of Syrian Americans who travel to Syria on a regular basis. They have to sneak into the country—this war-torn country. As doctors, they are providing basic medical care to the victims of the violence that is taking place in Syria.

Dr. Sahloul brings heartbreaking photographs to show me. The last photographs were of children who had been victims of barrel bombs, which Bashar al-Assad, the leader of Syria, drops on his own people. These are literally garbage cans filled with munitions and explosives that explode, killing civilian populations. The photos showed children who had been maimed, lost their limbs, and some had been killed by these barrel bombs that continue. Now Assad has decided to up the ante. He is including chlorine gas in the barrel bombs as well.

These doctors try to save these children and save these victims. Many times they are operating on tables in abandoned schools. They are begging for medicines, which are at a high premium. Many times they are not successful. What will we do? What can the United States do?

I hope that we can be part of an effort—an international effort—to provide safe zones for medical treatment and for the displaced persons in Syria. I hope to join with others on a bipartisan basis in urging that alternative.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, later today the Senate will vote on whether to proceed to a bill that was reported out of the Senate Finance Committee, on which I serve, the trade promotion authority legislation. What is so remarkable about this is that we are on the cusp here in the Senate of passing a major piece of legislation—bipartisan legislation on which a Republican majority in the Senate is working with a Democratic President to give him trade promotion authority—something that would be very good for our economy. If the Democrats in the Senate do not blow it, this could be a major hallmark achievement of this Congress. But my understanding is there is an effort on the other side now to prevent us from even getting on the bill to debate it. I hope that as Democrats contemplate that move, they will think long and hard about what they will be doing. Not only will they be undermining their own President, who is very much for this, but they will be hurting the American economy. Almost every President, literally back to FDR, has had trade promotion authority in which he has the ability to negotiate trade agreements with our trading partners in a way that Congress ultimately has to approve but in a way that expedites and gives the maximum amount of leverage to get the best trade agreement possible.

We are taking up that legislation, hopefully, later today. But it is all going to depend on Senate Democrats and whether they want to proceed to this bill or not. I certainly hope, as I said, that they will come to the conclusion that it is in the best interests of our country, of our economy, and certainly, I think, in the best interests of creating a bipartisan achievement here in which they are working with their own President and with Republicans here in the Senate.

With 96 percent of the world's consumers outside the borders of the United States, trade is essential to growing our economy and opening new markets for products marked ''Made in the USA.''

Over the past few years, exports have been a bright spot in our economy, supporting an increasing number of American jobs each and every year. In fact, in 2014 exports supported 11.7 million U.S. jobs and made up 13 percent of our Nation's economy.

In my home State of South Dakota alone, exports support more than 15,000 jobs in industries that range from farming and ranching to machinery and electronics. We need to continue to open markets around the globe to American goods and services. The best way to do that is through new trade agreements. Countries with which we have free and fair trade agreements purchase substantially more from us than other countries.

In fact, in 2013, free-trade agreement countries purchased 12 times more goods and services per capita from the United States than non-free-trade agreement countries. Let me restate that. In 2013, those countries with which we have a free-trade agreement purchased 12 times more goods per capita from the United States than those countries with which we do not have a free-trade agreement.

It is not just American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers who benefit from trade agreements. American consumers benefit as well. Trade agreements give American families access to a greater variety of goods at lower prices.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimates that trade increases American families' purchasing power by $10,000 annually. For American workers, increased trade means more opportunity and increased access to high-paying jobs. Manufacturing jobs tied to exports pay on average 13 to 18 percent more than wages in other areas of our economy.

Unfortunately, while trade agreements were proliferated around the globe over the past several years, the United States has not signed a new trade agreement in 5 years. Altogether, the United States has just 14 trade agreements currently in effect. That is a lot of lost opportunity for American workers and businesses, since trade agreements have proved to be the best way to increase demand for American products and services.

A big reason for the lack of trade agreements in recent years is the fact that trade promotion authority expired in 2007. As I said earlier, since 1934—you have to go back to the administration of FDR—almost all of the United States' free-trade agreements have been negotiated using trade promotion authority or a similar streamlined process. Trade promotion authority is designed to put the United States in the strongest possible position when it comes to negotiating trade agreements.

Under TPA, Congress sets guidelines for trade negotiations and outlines the priorities the administration has to follow. In return, Congress promises a

simple up-or-down vote on the resulting trade agreement, instead of a long amendment process that could leave the final deal looking nothing like what was negotiated. That simple up-or-down vote is the key. It lets our negotiating partners know that Congress and trade negotiators are on the same page, which gives other countries the confidence they need to put their best offers on the table, and that in turn allows for a successful and timely conclusion to negotiations.

Currently, the administration is negotiating two major trade agreements that have the potential to vastly expand the market for American goods and services in the European Union and in the Pacific.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is being negotiated with a number of Asia-Pacific nations, including Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, and Vietnam.

If this agreement is done right, there could be huge benefits for American agriculture, among other industries. Currently, American agricultural products face heavy tariffs in many Trans-Pacific Partnership countries. Poultry tariffs in TPP countries, for example, can reach a staggering 240 percent. Reducing the barriers to American agricultural products in these countries would have enormous benefits for American farmers and ranchers.

Agricultural producers in my State of South Dakota have contacted me to tell me how trade benefits their industries and to urge support for trade promotion authority as the most effective way to secure trade agreements that will benefit South Dakota farmers and ranchers.

The leader of the South Dakota Dairy Producers Association wrote to me about the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, which could have significant benefits for South Dakota dairy farmers, and urged me to vote in favor of trade promotion authority. He said the Trans-Pacific Partnership talks ''have the potential to be positive for our dairy industry, but only if the U.S. insists on settling for nothing less than a balanced deal that delivers net trade benefits for the dairy industry. Passing TPA is a key part of getting there.'' That is from a dairy producer in my State of South Dakota.

Mr. President, passing TPA is a key part of getting there. Neither the Trans-Pacific Partnership nor the United States-European Union trade agreement is likely to be completed in a timely fashion without trade promotion authority. If we want to make sure that trade negotiations achieve the goals of American farmers and manufacturers, trade promotion authority is essential.

The bipartisan bill we are considering on the Senate floor this week reauthorizes trade promotion authority, and it includes a number of important updates, such as provisions to strengthen the transparency of the negotiating process and ensure that the American people stay informed.

It also contains provisions that I pushed for to require negotiators to ensure that trade agreements promote digital trade as well as trade in physical goods and services. Given the increasing importance of digitally enabled commerce in the 21st-century economy, it is essential that our trade agreements include new rules that keep digital trade free from unnecessary government interference.

This trade promotion authority bill will help ensure that any trade deals the United States enters into will be favorable to American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers, and it will hold other countries accountable for their unfair practices. Passing this bill is essential to prevent American workers and businesses from being left behind in the global economy.

Since Republicans took control of the Senate in January, Democrats and Republicans have come together on a number of issues to pass legislation to address challenges that are facing our country. I hope this bill will be our next bipartisan achievement.

The President has made it clear that he supports this bill, and key Democratic Senators are working to make sure it passes. I hope the rest of the Democratic Party here in the Senate will come together with the President and Republicans to get this done.

As President Obama said the other day, ''We have to make sure that America writes the rules of the global economy. . . . Because if we don't write the rules for trade around the world—guess what—China will. And they'll write those rules in a way that gives Chinese workers and Chinese businesses the upper hand, and locks American-made goods out.'' Again, that is a quote from President Obama.

To put it another way, if America fails to lead on trade, other nations will step in to fill the void, and those nations will not have the best interests of American workers and American families in mind.

It is time to pass trade promotion authority so we can secure favorable new trade deals and ensure that American goods and services can compete on a level playing field around the globe and that American workers and American consumers receive the benefits that come along with that. I hope that will be the outcome of the vote today, and I hope it will be a major achievement for this Senate—a bipartisan achievement where both sides work together for the good of our economy, for the good of jobs, for the good of higher wage levels for American workers, and for the good of a more competitive economy in which our consumers benefit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

TRADE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, at 2:30 this afternoon, the Senate will vote on a motion to proceed to the fast-track bill which was recently approved by the Finance Committee. I will be strongly opposing that legislation.

In a nutshell, here is the reality of the American economy today: While we are certainly better off than we were 6½ years ago, the truth is that for the last 40 years the American middle class has been disappearing. The truth is that today we have some 45 million Americans living in poverty, and that is almost at the highest rate in the modern history of America.

While the middle class continues to shrink, we are seeing more income and wealth inequality than at any time in our country since 1929, and it is worse in America than any other major country on Earth. Today, 99 percent of all new income is going to the top 1 percent. Today, the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. In the last 2 years, the 14 wealthiest people in this country have seen an increase in their wealth of $157 billion, and that $157 billion is more wealth than is owned by the bottom 130 million Americans.

How is that happening? Why is it happening? We have seen a huge increase in technology, productivity is way up, and the reality is that most working people should be seeing an increase in their income. Yet, median family income has gone down by almost $5,000 since 1999. How does that happen? Why is it that the richest country in the history of the world has almost all of its new wealth in the hands of the few, while the vast majority of the American people are working longer hours for lower wages? How does that happen? Well, there are a lot of factors, but I will tell everyone that our disastrous trade agreements, such as NAFTA, CAFTA, and permanent normal trade relations with China, are certainly one of the major reasons why the middle class is in decline and why more and more income and wealth goes to a handful of people on the top.

The sad truth is that many of the new jobs created in this country today are part-time and low-paying jobs. Thirty or forty years ago, people who maybe had a high school degree could go out and get a job in a factory. They never got rich and it wasn't a glamorous job, but they had enough wages and benefits to make it into the middle class.

Since 2001, we have lost almost 60,000 factories in America. When young people graduate from high school today, they don't have the opportunity to work in a factory and have a union job and make middle-class wages; their options are Walmart and McDonald's,

where there are low wages and minimal benefits. Those are companies which are vehemently anti-union.

The sad truth is that we are in a race to the bottom. Not only have our trade agreements cost us millions of decent-paying jobs, they have depressed wages in this country because companies—virtually every major multinational corporation in this country has outsourced jobs and shed millions of American jobs. What they say to workers is: If you don't like the cuts in health care and wages, we will go to China. We can hire people there for $1 an hour.

Sadly, the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement follows in the footsteps of the other disastrous free-trade agreements that have forced American workers to compete against desperate and low-wage workers around the world.

Over and over again—and I have heard this so many times, including on the floor this morning—supporters of fast-track have told us that unfettered free trade will increase American jobs and wages and will be just wonderful for the American economy. Sadly, however, these folks have been proven wrong and wrong and wrong time after time after time. I hear the same language, and what they say proves not to be true every time.

I will mention some quotes from the supporters of NAFTA. These are people who were telling us how great the NAFTA free-trade agreement would be.

President Bill Clinton was pushing NAFTA in the same way that President Obama is pushing TPP today. On September 19, 1993, President Clinton said:

> I believe NAFTA will create 200,000 American jobs in the first two years of its effect. . . . I believe that NAFTA will create a million jobs in the first five years of its impact.

It wasn't just liberals, such as Bill Clinton, who supported NAFTA. I have a quote from the very conservative Heritage Foundation in 1993: ''Virtually all economists agree that NAFTA will produce a net increase of U.S. jobs over the next decade.''

In 1993, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, our majority leader MITCH MCCONNELL, said: ''American firms will not move to Mexico just for lower wages.''

Were President Clinton, the Heritage Foundation, and MITCH MCCONNELL correct? Well, of course they were not. In fact, what happened was exactly the opposite of what they said.

According to the well-respected economists at the Economic Policy Institute, NAFTA has led to the loss of more than 680,000 jobs. In 1993, the year before NAFTA was implemented, the United States had a trade surplus with Mexico of more than $1.6 billion. Last year, the trade deficit with Mexico was $53 billion. So all of the verbiage we heard about NAFTA being so good for American workers turned out to be dead wrong.

What about China? We were told: Oh my God, China will open up the Chinese market, and there are billions of people. What an opportunity to create good-paying jobs in America.

Here is what President Clinton, one of the proponents of permanent normal trade relations with China, had to say in 1999:

> In opening the economy of China, the agreement will create unprecedented opportunities for American farmers, workers and companies to compete successfully in China's market . . . This is a hundred-to-nothing deal for America when it comes to the economic consequences.

In 1999, conservative economists at the Cato Institute said:

> The silliest argument against PNTR is that Chinese imports would overwhelm U.S. industry. In fact, American workers are far more productive than their Chinese counterparts . . . PNTR would create far more export opportunities for America than the Chinese.

Wow, were they wrong.

The Economic Policy Institute has estimated that PNTR with China has led to the net loss of over 2.7 million Americans jobs.

Go to any department store in America and walk in the door. Where are the products made? China, China, China. They are made in Vietnam and in other low-wage countries. In fact, it is harder and harder to buy a product not made in China.

So all of those people who told us what a great deal PNTR with China would be turned out to be dead wrong. In fact, our trade agreement with China has cost us almost 3 million jobs.

In 2001, the trade deficit with China was $83 billion. Today, it is $342 billion. In 2011, on another trade agreement, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—a big proponent of unfettered free trade—strongly supported TPP. The Chamber of Commerce told us we had to pass a free-trade agreement with South Korea because it would create some 280,000 jobs in America. That is a lot of jobs. It turns out they were wrong again. In reality, the Economic Policy Institute recently found that the Korea Free Trade Agreement has led to the loss of some 75,000 jobs.

Now, the Obama administration says, trust us. Forget what they said about NAFTA. Forget what they said about Korea. Forget what they said about China. This one is different. Really, really, cross our fingers, hope to die, this one is really, really different. Yes, it may be true that every corporation in America—corporations that have shut down factories in this country and moved to China—they are supporting this agreement. Yes, it is true Wall Street, whose greed and recklessness have almost destroyed the American economy, is supporting this agreement. Yes, it is true the pharmaceutical industry, which charges us the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, is supporting this agreement—but not to worry, we should trust these guys. They really are thinking of the American middle class and working families. Trust us when they tell us a trade agreement will be good for working people. Yes, we should really trust them. Meanwhile, every trade union in America and the vast majority of environmental groups in this country are saying be careful about TPP; vote no on fast-track.

Here is the reality of the American economy. Since 2001, we have lost 60,000 factories in this country and we have lost over 4.7 million manufacturing jobs. In 1970, 25 percent of all the jobs in this country were in manufacturing. Today, that figure is down to 9 percent.

The point is that, by and large, especially if there were unions, those manufacturing jobs paid working people a living wage, not a Walmart wage, not a McDonald's wage.

Our demand must be to corporate America—which tells us every night on TV to buy this product, to buy this pair of sneakers, to buy this television, to buy whatever it is—that maybe, just maybe, they might want to start manufacturing those products here in the United States of America and pay our workers a decent wage, rather than looking all over the world for the lowest possible wages in which they can exploit workers who are desperate.

I was very disappointed that President Obama chose the headquarters of Nike to tout the so-called benefits of the TPP. Nike epitomizes why disastrous, unfettered free-trade policies during the past four decades have failed American workers. Nike does not employ a single manufacturing worker who makes shoes in the United States of America—not one worker. One hundred percent of the shoes sold by Nike are made overseas in low-wage countries. That is the transformation of the American economy, and it is not just Nike.

When Nike was founded in 1964, just 4 percent of U.S. footwear was imported. In other words, we manufactured the vast majority of the shoes and the sneakers we wore. Today, nearly all of the shoes that are bought in the United States are manufactured overseas. Today, over 330,000 workers manufacture Nike's products in Vietnam, where the minimum wage is 56 cents an hour.

I hear President Obama and other proponents of TPP talking about a level playing field. We have to compete on a level playing field. Does anybody think competing against desperate people who make 56 cents an hour is a level playing field, is fair to American workers? Of course, we want the poor people all over the world to see an increase in their standard of living, and we have to play an important role in that, but we don't have to destroy the American middle class to help low-income workers around the world.

In Vietnam, not only is the minimum wage 56 cents an hour, independent

labor unions are banned, and people are thrown in jail for expressing their political beliefs. Is that the level playing field President Obama and other proponents of unfettered free trade are talking about?

Back in 1988, Phil Knight—Phil Knight is the founder and the owner of Nike—said Nike had ''become synonymous with slave wages, forced overtime, and arbitrary abuse.'' Phil Knight was right. In fact, factories in Vietnam where Nike shoes are manufactured have been cited by the Worker Rights Consortium for excessive overtime, wage theft, and physical mistreatment of workers. Today, Mr. Knight is one of the wealthiest people on this planet, worth more than $22 billion. While Mr. Knight's net worth has more than tripled since 1999, the average Vietnamese worker who makes Nike shoes earns pennies an hour. That is pretty much synonymous with what unfettered free trade is about. A handful of people such as Phil Knight become multi-multi-multibillionaires and poor people all over the world are exploited and paid pennies an hour.

It is not just Nike and it is not just Vietnam. Another country that is part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership is Malaysia. Today, there are nearly 200 electronics factories in Malaysia where high-tech products from Apple, Dell, Intel, Motorola, and Texas Instruments are manufactured and brought back to the United States. If the TPP is approved, that number will go up substantially. What is wrong with that? It turns out that many of the workers at the electronics plants in Malaysia are being forced to work there under horrible working conditions. According to Verite, which conducted a 2-year investigation into labor abuses in Malaysia—an investigation which was commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor—32 percent of the industry's nearly 200,000 migrant workers in Malaysia were employed in forced situations because their passports had been taken away or because they were straining to pay back illegally high recruitment fees. In other words, American workers are going to be forced to compete against people in Malaysia—immigrant workers there whose passports have been taken away and who can't leave the country and who are working under forced labor situations.

So let me conclude by saying this: All of us understand trade is good. It is a good thing. But I think most of us now have caught on to the fact that the trade agreements pushed by corporate America, pushed by Wall Street, pushed by the pharmaceutical industry are very, very good if you are the CEO of a major corporation, but they are a disaster if you are an American worker.

It is my view that we have to rebuild manufacturing in America. It is my view that we have to create millions of decent-paying jobs in America. It is my view that we need to fundamentally rewrite our trade agreements so our largest export does not become decent-paying American jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the fast-track agreement. Let us sit down and work on trade agreements that work for the American middle class, that work for our working people and not just for the CEOs of the largest corporations in this country.

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. President.

In just a few minutes, we will be holding a vote on whether to invoke cloture to cut off debate and move to the trade promotion authority bill, granting trade promotion authority to the President—a very important conversation this country needs to have in terms of what we are going to do to expand our opportunities in a region of the world that represents 50 percent of the population of this world and that represents 40 percent of our trade opportunities. It is a great opportunity for this Congress, this Senate, to show how serious we are about truly rebalancing our efforts with Asian nations.

In Colorado alone, we exported nearly $8.4 billion in goods in 2014. In Colorado, 48 percent of all goods were exported in 2014.

Over 260,000 jobs are derived from trade with nations represented by the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiating group. The TPP represents an opportunity for Colorado to create nearly 4,000 new jobs, and that is just a start.

So today's conversation is not just a vote on whether we will have more delay on an important bill; this is about something that represents far greater opportunity than that. The fact is, over the past several years we have focused our time on the Middle East, and rightfully so, but as our day-to-day attention gets grabbed by the Middle East, our long-term interests lie in Asia and the Trans-Pacific Partnership region.

So I hope today that Members will put aside tendencies to decide they want to play politics with the trade promotion authority and instead, indeed, pursue policies that will give us a chance to grow our economy, to make more products representative with the symbol and the label ''Made in America.'' That is the chance we have today—to give our workers a competitive advantage, to create an opportunity for increased trade in an area of the world where we face increasing competition and regional threats, to show that the United States will indeed be a part of a region in the world that represents so much opportunity.

As we have seen increases in Colorado and beyond in trade and trade opportunities, this bill represents a chance for us to continue improving our ability to grow Colorado's economy and Colorado trade.

So to our colleagues across the Senate, I indeed hope that we will invoke cloture today, that we will move forward on debate, and that we will have an opportunity to continue our work to support trade and to move toward passage of the final TPP.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

The trade package we are considering today is missing important provisions that support American companies and American workers. We cannot have trade promotion without trade enforcement. Even supporters of fast-track and TPP—those cheerleaders, the most outspoken cheerleaders for free trade—even those supporters acknowledge there will be winners and losers from this agreement.

Past deals show how widespread the losses will be. Travel the State the Presiding Officer and I represent in the Senate and look at what NAFTA has done, look at what PNTR with China has done, look at what the Central America Free Trade Agreement has done, and look at what the South Korea trade agreement has done to us.

It would be a tragedy if the Senate acted and failed to help the American companies and the American workers and the communities that we acknowledge will be hurt by TPP. In other words, we take an action in this body, working with the administration, and there are losers and winners from this action. The losers are those who lose their jobs, the small businesses that go out of business, and the communities that get hurt by this. Those are the

losers. How do you ignore them when it comes to these trade agreements?

By excluding two of the four bills from the initial trade package, we are excluding critical bipartisan provisions that protect workers and ensure strong trade enforcement.

We need to make sure that our steel manufacturers and other companies in our country are protected from unfair dumping. That is why I introduced—along with my colleagues, Senators PORTMAN, CASEY, BURR, BENNET, and COATS—the Leveling the Playing Field Act. We included it in the Customs and Border Protection reauthorization with bipartisan support. It would strengthen enforcement of trade laws. It would increase the ability of industries—such as the steel industry, which is so important in my State—to fight back against unfair trade practices. It passed the Senate Finance Committee, but in the majority leader's package and Senator HATCH's package, it is nowhere to be found on the floor today.

We need to make sure strong currency provisions are included. The Finance Committee overwhelmingly supported my amendment 18 to 8. We had the support of Republican colleagues: Senators PORTMAN, GRASSLEY, CRAPO, ROBERTS, BURR, ISAKSON—who is sitting in the Chamber—and SCOTT. Again, this provision, which passed the Finance Committee overwhelmingly, ensures a level playing field for American businesses. It is nowhere to be found in the majority leader's package on the floor today.

Finally, any trade package needs to ensure we are not importing products made with child labor. That is why the Finance Committee passed an amendment with overwhelming bipartisan support to close a 75-year-old loophole that allowed products made with forced labor and child labor into this country. For 75 years, that loophole stood. We passed that amendment 21 to 5. We had the support of Republican colleagues: Senators GRASSLEY, CRAPO, ROBERTS, CORNYN, THUNE, TOOMEY, PORTMAN, COATS, and HELLER. But, again, this bipartisan provision is nowhere to be found in the majority leader's package.

That is why I call on my Republican colleagues—many of whom I have named; almost every one on them on the Finance Committee—who have voted for either the currency amendment or the level the playing field amendment or the prohibition on child labor amendment. Some Republican members of the Finance Committee voted for all three of those amendments, but they are not in the package.

I am hopeful my Republican colleagues will join Democratic colleagues to vote no on cloture so we can bring a package to the floor that does trade promotion authority, that takes cares of workers, and also takes care of enforcing trade rules.

The trade package which passed out of the Finance Committee is far from perfect. I still have grave concerns about fast-track. I know what bad trade rules have done to my State. There is a reason these provisions were included in the trade package. The Senate should consider all four of them. Majority Leader MCCONNELL says he wants to respect committee work on legislation. Well, here is his chance.

The only way to get these important provisions to the President's desk is to combine all four into one. We have done it in the past. Keep in mind, every time Congress does major trade laws—2002 fast-track included provisions on enforcement, and it included provisions to help workers through trade adjustment assistance; the same thing in 1988 in the trade package; the same thing in 1974 in the trade package. Why would we bifurcate this? Why would we take out enforcement when that is a very important part of trade?

We should not move forward with any trade package that does not include all four bills. I ask my colleagues in both parties, those who supported our enforcement efforts in both parties in Finance, to join us and vote no on cloture when we take the vote in the next few minutes.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be charged evenly to both parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, a few moments ago, we heard an argument that this envisioned trade agreement will increase the number of products that are stamped ''Made in America,'' ''Made in the United States of America.'' Certainly that is the argument that has been put forward for trade agreement after trade agreement after trade agreement.

The first step in the process is to say: Look at those markets. Wouldn't it be wonderful in that nation if we had direct access, improved access?

Particularly, we have done a series of agreements with very low-wage, low-environmental standards, low-enforcement nations. Well, that is the first stage.

Then the second stage becomes: Now that we have this broader connection, we are competing with products made in that country, so we better make sure we open a factory there as well. And then suddenly, instead of those products coming from the United States to a foreign nation, in fact, those products are being made in that foreign nation.

Then comes stage three: Oh, now that we are making those products overseas at a much lower price because of the lower wages and lower environmental standards and lower enforcement, it does not make sense to make those products in the United States anymore.

So that is how we lost 5 million manufacturing jobs in America. That is how we lost 50,000 factories in America. So for those who want to put forward the chimera, the illusion, the mirage that somehow this is going to increase American production, American citizens should know, in fact, that is a false promise—a false promise that has been put out time after time after time and shown to be wrong again and again and again.

Let's think about this: Why would you pave a path to put the workers in your State directly in competition with workers earning 60 cents an hour? Tell me that is advantageous to making things in your nation, and I will tell you, you are wrong.

So let's not go down a path in which we pave a highway to essentially destroy American manufacturing, to disrupt American manufacturing, to decrease the competitiveness of living wages here in the United States of America. Let's enhance and strengthen our position in the world, not undermine it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the remaining 2½ minutes we have, I want to take a few seconds of it.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion to proceed. All this does is get us on the bill. We need to have a robust debate about the trade agenda, and I am willing to do that. Of course, the centerpiece is TPA—no question about it. I know our staffs have been working together to find a path forward on Enforce Customs.

This is an important bill, and we need to get it through the Senate, but to do that, we need to begin debate today.

Trade promotion authority is the key to our economic future. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will stand with me and President Obama and vote yes so we may update and modernize our trade laws, including TPA, and help lay the groundwork for a healthy economy for our children and our grandchildren.

Ninety-five percent of the world's trade is outside of our country. Trade produces better salaries—13 to 18 percent. We have worked through all the problems in the committee. We have had plenty of amendments, lots of debate, and we put this on the floor with the understanding that it would be voted on.

Mr. BROWN. Would the Finance chair yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. My time is just about gone, but go ahead.

Mr. BROWN. I would just ask, the four bills that we passed in committee—African growth and opportunity, trade adjustment assistance, trade promotion authority, and the Customs bill—all passed out of committee by strong bipartisan majorities,

right, and we hoped at the time they would come together in the motion to proceed to a vote.

Mr. HATCH. I understand the question. They passed out with an understanding between the vice chairman of the committee and me that we would vote on them separately but would move TPA and TAA—which most Republicans hate—we would move them together, and then we would move the third one, and then we would move the fourth one. It was supposed to be done that way because everybody knew that putting the Schumer amendment on the one bill would not be acceptable in the House and would not be acceptable to the President, and that is the problem here. We all are prepared to have a vote on that bill, but the agreement was that we would vote individually on all four bills. Finally, we agreed to do TPA and TAA because your side was concerned about whether this side would allow TAA to go through. There never had been a question that we were willing to do that even though most of us hate that bill.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ISAKSON. I object.

Mr. BURR. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HATCH. If we could get a minute, too, I would be happy to have that. OK.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Joni Ernst, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, Thad Cochran, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, John McCain, James Lankford, Patrick J. Toomey, Roy Blunt, Ron Johnson, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, David Vitter, Ben Sasse.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 176 Leg.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Graham	Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 45.

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

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 1314.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, well, what we just saw here is pretty shocking. There are always limits to what can be accomplished when the American people choose divided government, but of course it does not mean Washington should not work toward bipartisan solutions that make sense for our country. Trade offers a perfect opportunity to do just that. We on this side believe strongly in lifting up the middle class and knocking down unfair barriers that discriminate against American workers and American products in the 21st century.

On this issue, the President agrees. So we worked in good faith all year—all year long—to formulate a package that both parties could support. The top Republican on the Finance Committee, Senator HATCH, engaged in months of good-faith negotiations with the top Democrat on the committee, Senator WYDEN. They consulted closely with colleagues over in the House such as Chairman RYAN. They consulted closely with President Obama, with Democrats, with Republicans.

The issues they had to work through were tough. Difficult concessions had to be made. Many believed an agreement would never emerge, but in the end a strong bipartisan trade package came together that was able to pass through the committee by an overwhelming margin of 20 to 6—20 to 6. It was a significant win for the people we represent. It was a win for the Americans who look to us to secure economic growth and good jobs for them, not give in to the special interests who, apparently, would rather see those jobs end up in countries like China.

It was a win for the security of our country and for our leadership around the world. The Secretary of Defense, for example, was at lunch with Republicans today talking about the importance to our repositioning to the Pacific, from a defense and foreign policy point of view, to get TPP. He was accompanied by seven—not at our lunch, but seven former Defense Secretaries of both parties said this just last week, ''The stakes are clear and America's prestige, influence and leadership are on the line.''

So the rationale for voting yes today, a vote that would have simply allowed the Senate to debate the issue, was overwhelming. It was supported by the facts, and yet voices in the President's party who rail against the future won out today. I do not routinely quote President Obama, but today is no ordinary day. So when the President said,

''The hard left is just making stuff up,'' when the President said their increasingly bizarre arguments didn't ''stand the test of fact and scrutiny,'' it was hard to argue with him.

''You don't make change through slogans,'' the President reminded his adversaries on this issue. ''You don't make change through ignoring realities.''

I think that is something worth reflecting on.

Now this doesn't have to be the end of the story. Trade has traditionally been a bipartisan issue that cuts across the partisan divide. I suspect we have colleagues on the other side who aren't that comfortable filibustering economic benefits for their constituents or a President who leads their party.

What we have just witnessed is that the Democratic Senate shut down the opportunity to debate the top economic priority of the Democratic President of the United States.

I suspect some may be parking their vote, rather than buying the outlandish rhetoric we have heard from the left. Certainly, that is my hope.

But to get the best outcome for the country, we have to be realistic. For instance, the idea that any Senator can make a guarantee that a particular bill will be enacted into law is simply impossible.

I assure you that we would have had a different outcome on today's cloture motion if Senators actually wielded the power to force things through by sheer will alone. Obviously, we don't. What we can guarantee is that Senators receive a fair shake once we proceed to the debate our country deserves on a 21st century American trade agenda.

We will have an open and fair amendment process. How many times have I said that this year? That is what we intend to do when we get on TPA. For my part, I can restate my commitment to processing TPA, TAA, and other policies that Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN can agree to.

The Senate has historically been a place where our country debates and considers big issues. This is an issue worthy of our consideration. Yet today we have voted to not even consider it. It doesn't mean we can predetermine outcomes. It doesn't mean we can even guarantee the successful passage of legislation once we proceed to debate it. We can't make those kinds of guarantees that the other side was saying are preconditions to even considering the President's No. 1 domestic priority.

But blocking the Senate from even having a debate of such an important issue is not the answer. Senators who do so are choosing to stand with special interests and against the American jobs that knocking down more unfair trade barriers could support.

So I sure hope that some of our colleagues across the aisle will heed the words of President Obama and rethink their choice. I hope they will vote with us to open debate on this issue.

Let me reiterate. We will continue to engage with both sides. We will continue to engage with both sides. We will have an open amendment process. We will continue to cooperate in the same spirit that got us through so many impossible hurdles already in getting this bill to the floor.

This was no small accomplishment to get it as far as it has come, given the various points of view on the Finance Committee. Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN deserve a lot of credit for that. But they didn't go through all of that to stall out on the floor before we have the chance to do something important for the American people.

So I hope that folks on the other side who are preventing this debate will seriously consider the implications. Other countries are taking a look at us. They are wondering whether we can deliver. We hear TPP is close to being finalized, and here is the headline they see—that every single one—with one exception, I believe—of the President's own party in the Senate prevented the mechanism for having trade considered, prevented it from even coming to the Senate floor. That is not the kind of headline that we want to send around the world—that America cannot be depended upon, that America cannot deliver trade agreements. To our allies in the Pacific that are apprehensive about the Chinese—and who thought this was not only good for their commerce but good for their security—what kind of message does that send?

So I moved to reconsider. Hopefully, it will be an opportunity for people to think this over, and we will be able to come together and go forward on a bipartisan basis to achieve an important accomplishment for the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend, the majority leader, has one person to blame for our not being on the floor now debating this important piece of legislation, and that person is the majority leader. The next time he looks in the mirror, he can understand who is responsible for not having debate, as he said, with robust amendments. It is he.

The reason for this situation we are in today is very simple. The Finance Committee reported four bills out by a large, bipartisan vote of the Finance Committee. The majority leader decided, on his own, that he would consider two of those and that the others would have to figure out some other way to get done.

As the Republican leader said this morning in his opening statement, let's move to those two bills, and then we will start the amendment process. Do all four and start the amendment process. It is very logical.

It is illogical what he is saying. Why should we only do two of the four reported out of the Finance Committee? It doesn't make sense.

Now, my friend the Republican leader is very aware of motions to proceed. During the last 4 years, because of the Republicans' cynical approach to government, they basically defeated everything we tried to do while not allowing us to proceed on legislation. However, we are saying we are willing to work with you on this legislation. We don't want to stop moving forward on this bill. We think, though, the bill should be what was reported out of the Finance Committee. That seems the fair thing to do.

That is all we ask—a path forward, a realistic path for all of us to proceed on this legislation. If we are stuck here, it is too bad. We shouldn't be.

I say to my friend the Republican leader, I am always available to speak with him—here, telephone, my office, his office—to figure a way forward on this legislation.

I have stated the last week or so that the way we should go forward is to have all four of the measures that came out of the Finance Committee lumped together and start legislating on those—to have, in the words of the Republican leader, a robust amendment process on those bills as lumped together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, obviously the most sensitive political issue surrounding this is the currency issue. I want to make sure everybody has a clear understanding of where we are on that.

A Senator from the committee stated: I explicitly did not offer the currency amendment to the TPA bill. We were told that it would not be a part—if it were a part of TPA, we all know it would kill it, the President wouldn't sign the bill. So my goal is not to use currency to kill the TPA bill and not to kill the TPA bill, it is to get currency passed. That is why we offered it to the Customs bill, a separate bill, on the strong view that no one disputed in committee—no one disputed this in committee—that we would get a vote separately—separately, I repeat—on the Customs bill on the floor and that it would come to the floor just like the other bills.

As for currency, in the committee they agreed they would deal with it on the Customs bill and not on TPA. And now our friends on the other side are trying to bunch it all together.

But look, we need to be clear. The currency issue on TPA is a killer. The President would veto the bill. It would defeat the bill. That is why in committee they sensibly reached the conclusion to deal with currency on the Customs bill. So I want to be clear about that. So when we get on the bill,

everybody will understand the significance of that issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one word before my friend from Oregon is recognized—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, that is exactly what Senator SCHUMER said in committee, what I just read. That was what Senator SCHUMER said in committee. It was not clear from my notes who said it, but that is exactly what Senator SCHUMER said in committee:

And, explicitly I did not offer the currency amendment to the TPA bill. We were told that it would not be part—if it were part of TPA it might kill it.

Senator SCHUMER:

My goal is not to use currency to kill the TPA bill and not to kill the TPA bill, it's to get currency passed.

Senator SCHUMER, further:

And that's why we offered it to the customs bill, on the view, strong view, that no one disputed in committee that we'd get a vote separately on the customs bill on the floor, that it would come to the floor just like the other bills.

That is Senator SCHUMER in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator SCHUMER has been involved in the currency issue from basically the time he came to the Senate. It has been an important issue for him, and he can speak for himself.

I am not an expert on the bill, and I don't intend to debate anyone here on the merits of the bill. People know how I feel about the legislation generally, but I am kind of an expert on the procedural aspect of what goes on around here.

I suggest the best way to move forward is to come up with a program to have all of these bills discussed at the same time, and that is why we have felt the way we did and we indicated that in the vote we just took. So I think everybody should just take a deep breath, and I think there are probably ways we can move forward with this without disparaging either side.

I think the vote was important, procedurally. We, as a minority—as the Republican leader certainly can understand, having been in the minority for a number of years—I think we would be better off with the minority having a say in what goes on in this body.

That is the way we spoke today. We believe that, and we look forward to continuing the process of moving forward on this bill. We cannot be debating the merits of this legislation unless we figure out some way to move forward, and right now that process is not looking very good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the Senator briefly yield for a unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the bill manager, the ranking member of the Finance Committee is recognized to speak, that I be recognized to speak, and that following me, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee be recognized to speak.

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

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the majority leader has entered a motion to reconsider the trade legislation. I want to be clear, both for the majority leader and all our colleagues here, that I am very interested in working with the majority leader and our colleague from the other side of the aisle to find a bipartisan path to get back to the trade legislation at the earliest possible time.

This morning, 14 protrade Democrats met, and I can assure all the Senators here that these are Senators who are committed—strongly committed—to ensuring that this bill passes.

Now, with respect to just another brief description about where we are, all the hard work that the majority leader correctly described as going on in connection with this legislation has been about four bills: the trade promotion act, Customs—which is really trade enforcement to help displaced workers—and then trade preferences for developing countries.

Just briefly, I want to describe why it was so important for Senators on a bipartisan basis in the Finance Committee to tackle these issues.

The first, trade promotion authority, helps strip the secrecy out of trade policy. The second is the support system for American workers. This is known as trade adjustment assistance, which has been expanded. The third finally puts our trade enforcement policies into high gear so America can crack down on the trade cheats. The fourth renews trade programs that are crucial to American manufacturers. Together, these bills would form a legislative package that throws out the 1990s NAFTA playbook on trade. It is an opportunity to enact fresh, middle-class trade policies that will create high-skill, high-wage jobs in Oregon and across our land. That opportunity is lost if this package of four bills gets winnowed down to two.

In particular, dropping the enforcement bill in my view is legislative malpractice. The calculation is quite simple. The Finance Committee gave the Senate a bipartisan trade enforcement bill that will protect American jobs and promote American exports, which are two propositions that I believe every Member of this body supports. The enforcement legislation closes a shameful loophole that allows for products made with forced and child labor to be sold in our country. This is 2015, and there is absolutely no room for a loophole that allows slavery in American trade policies. If the decision is made to drop this bipartisan legislation, that shameful loophole would live on.

Now, any Senator who goes home and speaks, as I do, about the virtues of job-creating trade policies has, in my view, a special obligation to ensure that American trade enforcement is tough, effective, and built on American values. That is what the Finance Committee's bipartisan enforcement bill is all about. Without proper enforcement, no trade deal can ever live up to the hype. This enforcement bill is a jobs bill, plain and simple, and it needs to get to the President's desk.

Some elements of this package represent priorities that have traditionally belonged to Republicans. Other elements are traditionally Democratic. But taken as a whole, this is a bipartisan package that both sides of the Finance Committee supported strongly, with the understanding that its component parts would be linked together. You can't make this stool stand up with just two legs.

The Senate should not begin debate until there is a clear path forward for each of these four bills, and I use that word specifically because I have talked with colleagues about it. We are going to work together in a bipartisan fashion. That is what Chairman HATCH and I have done since he became chairman, and I have been grateful to him because that is the way he sought to carry out his responsibilities when I was chairman. We are going to work together, but the challenge has always been to find a clear path forward for each of these four bills.

So I urge my colleagues to continue down the Finance Committee's bipartisan route and find a path that moves all four of these bills forward.

In closing, I want to reiterate that with the majority leader having entered into a motion to have the trade bill reconsidered, I want to express to my colleagues—and I see several Finance members here, Chairman HATCH and Senator CORNYN, a senior member of the committee, a member of the leadership—that I am very interested in working closely with both of them to find a bipartisan path and get back to this legislation just as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Finance Committee be recognized and then I be recognized following his remarks.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his kindness in doing that.

I listened to the debate, and I have to say I am very disappointed.

Everybody knew that Senator SCHUMER accommodated us—the ranking member and myself—in putting the language on the Customs bill. In fact, here is what Senator SCHUMER said:

And, explicitly I did not offer the currency amendment to the TPA bill. We were told that it would not be part—if it were part of TPA it might kill it. My goal is not to use currency to kill the TPA bill and not to kill the TPA bill, it's to get currency passed. And that's why we offered it to the customs bill, on the view, strong view, that no one disputed in committee that we'd get a vote separately on the customs bill on the floor, that it would come to the floor just like the other bills.

That was the agreement. The distinguished Senator from Oregon knows that was the agreement; that we were going to lump the two together, the TPA and TAA—although I would have preferred to have those voted on separately, but we agreed to do that because there was a concern on the Democratic side that maybe we wouldn't put TAA out. That was a ridiculous concern because we know TPA can't pass unless you give the unions what they want on TAA. So we grit our teeth and we were willing to do that. We put them together so we could accommodate again. And it was completely understood that the AGOA bill, the next two bills, would be voted on separately. Senator SCHUMER knew, and said so; that he realized it would give the House a very, very bad stomachache because they probably couldn't put this bill through with that language on it.

I even agreed with Senator SCHUMER that we could have hearings later. He could bring up a bill. We would have hearings. We would have a markup on the currency matters because there are a lot of people who would like to see something done on currency—but not to destroy the TPA bill or, should I say, all of the negotiations that this administration has been conducting with regard to TPP—the Trans-Pacific Partnership—with 11 nations, including Japan, which has always been difficult to get to the table because they have very great concerns there, but they were willing to come to the table. And it might ruin TTIP, which is 28 nations in Europe.

Forty to sixty percent of all trade in the world would come through these two agreements that would be done by the Trade Representative, subject to the review by Congress provided in TPA, which happens to be the procedural mechanism pursuant to which we can assert congressional control over these foreign policy agreements, these trade agreements.

So there was no agreement to bring these up all at one time. The first time I heard that was, I think, yesterday or the day before, and I was flabbergasted. To have our colleagues vote against cloture on a bill the President wants more than any other bill, after he talked to them, is astounding to me.

So I am going to take a moment to talk about what transpired this afternoon because I think it warrants further discussion.

As I stated this morning, with today's vote, we were trying to do something good for the American people, to advance our Nation's trade agenda and to provide good jobs for American workers, all of which would happen should we get this through both Houses of Congress and the President signs it into law.

Now, to do that, we can't have killer amendments put on bills that everybody knows will kill it and that the President can't sign. I know people disagree with us on how we intended to get there. That much was clear from the outset. Sadly, these colleagues—who have always been against TPA—were unwilling to have a discussion about their disagreements in a fair and open debate, and, I have to say, that was all of them on the other side today. Instead, they voted this afternoon to prevent any such debate from taking place.

We are willing to debate, we are willing to have amendments, but I am also only willing to abide by the agreement we have with Senator SCHUMER with regard to the Customs bill. That was the agreement, and I compliment Senator SCHUMER for being willing to put it on there because he knew it would kill TPA.

Needless to say, I am disappointed by this outcome.

While we are talking about trade policy at large, the bill receiving the most attention was, of course, the TPA bill, which is bipartisan. I made sure it was bipartisan—that we could work together, that we could come together, that we could all basically feel good about it—and it passed 20 to 6, which is astounding to even me. I didn't know we would get seven Democrats on the bill, and I compliment the distinguished ranking member for working hard to get seven Democrats on the bill. But still, that doesn't take away the fact that the minority leader and others don't want any bill at all.

While we are talking about trade policy at large, I would just say the bill receiving the most attention was, of course, the TPA bill, which is bipartisan, supported by Republicans and Democrats in both the House and the Senate, by the way, not to mention the President of the United States and his administration.

On April 22, the bill was voted out of the Senate Finance Committee by a historic vote of 20 to 6, with seven Democrats on the committee voting to report the bill. The bill which was President Obama's top legislative priority, by the way, was riding a wave of amendments headed to the floor. Yet, today, the mere thought of even debating this bill was apparently too much for my Democratic colleagues to bear. Nothing changed. It is the same bill we reported out of committee. I can remember the happy time we had talking about how wonderful it was to finally get this bill out of the committee, after going to 10 p.m. one night and actually beyond that for staff.

This is the same bill we have been talking about for months. The only thing that was different today than just a few days ago was the strategy being employed by the opposition.

As we all know, the TPA bill wasn't the only trade bill reported out of the Finance Committee in April. We also reported a bill to reauthorize Trade Adjustment Assistance, a bill to reauthorize some trade preference programs and a Customs and Enforcement bill.

A few days before we were to begin the floor debate on trade policy, we heard rumblings from our colleagues on the other side, and we started hearing statements from some Senators, including some who had generally been supportive of TPA, that they would only support the pending motion to proceed if they had assurances that all four bills—TPA, TAA, preferences, and Customs—would be debated and passed at the same time. That never was the agreement, and everybody understood that. These new demands brought forward at the eleventh hour were problematic for a number of reasons, most notably because, as reported out of the Finance Committee, the Customs bill faces a number of problems both with the White House and the House of Representatives, and my friends on the other side realized that in this bipartisan effort that we were making together. They recognized that there were problems for both the White House and House of Representatives that would prevent it from being enacted into law any time soon. I will not detail all the problems, but I think most of my colleagues know what they are. But I will say that those problems existed from the beginning and we knew about them at the outset. We had people on the committee who were totally opposed to this bill. I made sure they had a right to bring up their amendments. I respect them. I don't agree with them. I can't even agree on how they ever reached the positions that they do. But the fact is they have a right to do that, and we protected that right.

Now, I might say these problems existed from the beginning. We knew about them from the onset. That is why the ranking member of the Finance Committee and I agreed at our markup to move our four trade bills separately.

As one of the principal authors of three of the four trade bills, I want to be very clear because there has apparently been some confusion on this point. There was never a plan to move all four of these bills together or as part of TPA.

While we agreed that TPA and TAA would have to move on parallel tracks—we did agree to that—there was no such agreement with regard to the other bills, only a commitment that we would do our best to try to get all four enacted into law, with no guarantees that they would be but to do our very best.

The agreement with TPA and TAA was honored. Both the majority leader and I made clear today that if cloture was invoked on the motion to proceed, we would file a substitute amendment that included both of these bills—TPA and TAA.

We also made commitments—commitments I had already made—to work with our colleagues to find a path forward on the Customs and the preferences legislation. But that was not enough, apparently. We have had numerous discussions regarding alternative paths for other trade bills. That was not enough, either. The only thing they would accept was full inclusion of all the trade bills at the outset of the debate. We could not agree to that, and they knew it.

Of course, to be fair, some of the Democrats were not necessarily insisting that the four bills be part of the same package. Instead, they just wanted guarantees that all of them would be enacted into law. That is not the way it works around here.

I do not even know how to comment on that. It is, to put it bluntly, simply absurd to think that a Senate leader can guarantee any bill will become law before a debate even begins. Yet those were the demands we faced over the last few days. Although they were obviously impossible, we worked in good faith to try to reach an accommodation with those who—in my opinion—were not working in good faith. And I am willing to forgive that. Even then, there was no path to yes.

Of course, as we all know that the idea for demanding a ''four bills or no bills'' strategy did not originate in the Finance Committee. This demand materialized last week and came directly from the Senate Democratic leadership, virtually all of whom oppose TPA and their President on this bill, outright. Sadly, it seems they were able to sell this idea to other Members of their caucus, including more than a few who should know better.

We were never talking about reaching an agreement with people who wanted a path forward on good trade legislation. We have been talking about an idea devised for the sole purpose of stopping progress on TPA. At least for today, it appears they have been successful.

Once again, I am disappointed. A lot of work has gone into this effort in both the Senate and the House of Representatives—not to mention the administration. I, personally, have been at this from the very moment I took over as the lead Republican on the Senate Finance Committee in January 2011.

In January 2014—more than a year ago—I introduced legislation with the former chairmen, Max Baucus and Dave Camp, that formed the basis of the bill that we had hoped to start debating this week. Both Baucus and Camp were committed to this effort. Sadly, Chairman Camp retired and Chairman Baucus was sent off to China.

When Senator WYDEN took over the committee, I worked with him to address his concerns about the bill, and that work continued after I took over as chairman this year. Even though I thought some of his proposals were unworkable, I bent over backwards to accommodate his desires, because in the end, I thought it would broaden support for TPA, and I wanted to please him, as my partner on the committee.

Chairman RYAN joined us in this effort, and we did all we could to put together a bill and a path forward that both parties could support. We met with Chairman RYAN regularly. Until the last few days and the advent of these new demands materializing out of whole cloth, I thought we had been successful. Even after these new demands came up, I did my best to find an agreement, working right up to the vote to find a reasonable path forward. But, apparently, something reasonable was not in the cards.

Everyone here knows I am an optimist. I still believe we can get something done, that we can work something out. I have told the President the same. I am still willing to do what it takes to pass these bills. I hope my colleagues will see the light here and come to the table with some realistic alternatives for a path forward. Until that happens, the President is going to have to wait on these trade agreements, as will all the farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and other job creators in our country who desperately need market access and a level international playing field in order to compete.

In the future, if we see a sharp decline in U.S. agriculture and manufacturing and if the United States retreats from the world, ceding the Asia-Pacific region, in particular, to China's overwhelming economic influence, people may very well look back at today's events and wonder why we could not get our act together. I am already thinking that. Why couldn't we get our act together?

I certainly hope that does not happen—that these other nations—particularly China—take advantage of our not getting our act together. Perhaps, in my frustration, I am being a little dramatic. Still, I have no doubt that some will come to regret what went on here today—one way or another.

As for me, I have no regrets. I have done all I can to get these important bills across the finish line. I am going to continue to do all I can in the future to get these bills across the finish line.

Unfortunately, after today, it is very unclear how many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to do the same. I believe there are honest, good people on that side of the aisle who want to make this right, who want to make up for what happened here today. I feel confident that is so. I am going to proceed on the basis that that is so. I sure hope it is so because, my gosh, to put this Nation's foreign policy—especially in the Asia-Pacific region, in particular—on hold when we could be building relationships in these countries as never before and at the same time spurring on international trade as never before is a matter of grave concern to me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Finance Committee, who I know has labored long and hard to get this bill where it is today. I know how disappointed he is at the filibuster by our friends across the aisle on the President's No. 1 domestic priority.

I have heard it said that the U.S. economy is just one or two steps away—a few policy choices away—from awakening that slumbering giant known as the U.S. economy and growing it for the benefit of all Americans. Unfortunately, the filibuster that occurred today is a backwards step.

I know there are some people that say to Republicans: Why would you want to work with President Obama? The truth of the matter is that is what we are here for, if we agree on the principle. We are not here to agree with him just to agree with him. As a matter of fact, sometimes it is easier to go back home and say: Well, I disagreed with the President.

But this is one area where the President of the United States is absolutely correct. We are here not to do what he wants us to do, but we are here to do what our constituents—what the American people—want us to do. What they want is the better jobs, the improved wages, the sort of robust economic growth that comes along with trade agreements.

It has been said numerous times, but I will say it again: 95 percent of the world lies out beyond our borders; 80 percent of the purchasing power in the world lies beyond the borders of the United States. Why in the world would we not want to open markets to the things that we grow, that our ranchers

raise, and that our manufacturers make? Why in the world would we not want to do it?

You will have to ask our colleagues across the aisle, who today, with the exception of one Democrat, chose to filibuster this bill. I am intrigued to hear the numbers that were mentioned earlier: 14 protrade Democrats—14. I guess that means there are at least 32 antitrade Democrats. But I must say, on this side of the aisle, we are by and large a protrade party—for the very reasons that I mentioned earlier. We would like to work with anybody—including the President of the United States—to try to get our economy growing again, to open markets to the things that we make and grow and manufacture here in the United States, because it benefits the entire country, including hard-working families.

The irony is that last week the Senate overwhelmingly voted on a bill that would guarantee Congress the time and opportunity to review a potential agreement between President Obama and Iran. That bill passed 98 to 1 and will prevent implementation by the President until the American people, through their elected representatives, are given the chance to scrutinize, study, and debate that particular agreement and vote on it up or down. So far, the so-called deal or framework has been incredibly vague, and I think it is important that we understand what is in it.

You can imagine that if we voted 98 to 1 to require the President to lay before the American people this important negotiation with Iran, why it is so strange that our Democratic friends do not want us to participate in the same process by which to vote up or down on trade agreements.

Trade promotion authority, historically, has had bipartisan support here in the Chamber. By the way, this is not just something that will be extended for the next 20 months of President Obama's administration. This will be extended 6 years into the Presidency of the next President of the United States.

The Chairman mentioned that this legislation sailed through the Finance Committee by a wide margin of 20 to 6. And, of course, as I said—and I will say it again—it is supported by the administration, by President Obama's administration.

It is very strange to see Democrats blocking a bill supported by the leader of their political party, the President of the United States. The excuses they gave here today are that all of a sudden they woke up and decided that the deal that Senator WYDEN and Senator HATCH agreed to—which is to combine trade promotion authority with trade adjustment assistance—was not good enough and they wanted to renegotiate the deal.

I think, from my perspective, there are really two types of folks in the camp across the aisle. There are those who, perhaps, would like to get to yes, and that means that you can have a negotiation and try to find a way to get to yes. But I can only gather from what was said earlier that there are probably 32 Senators on that side of the aisle who are antitrade. They are not interested in getting to yes. What they do is they throw up phony barriers, such as this attempt to renegotiate the package that was brought here to the floor. This is sort of typical obstructionism.

We saw this happen in the antitrafficking legislation as well, when a piece of legislation passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously and came to the floor. And then all of a sudden, someone woke up and said: Well, we did not read the bill, and now we object.

This trade tool will give Congress the opportunity to examine any upcoming deal that the President is trying to cut and make sure—we make sure; we do not take the President's word for it. We make sure the American people get a fair shake.

Many of the provisions in trade promotion authority are common sense and they are nonpartisan. For example, if passed, TPA would give Congress the authority to read the full text of the trade agreement. It is hard to argue that this is a bad thing. It is hard to get more straightforward than that, but we have no guarantee without this provision.

Trade promotion authority would promote greater transparency and accountability in the negotiations process. Some, understandably, have complained that up to this point the Obama administration has relayed very little information about this unfolding trade agreement—known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership—or the affected industries—that it has relayed very little information about the negotiations taking place with countries along the Pacific Rim and in Europe.

This bill prioritizes transparency and accountability front and center and will require the administration to brief Members of Congress regularly on the progress of the negotiations. It will actually allow Members of Congress to attend the negotiations. How more transparent can you get than that? That way Congress can work directly with those who are finalizing this agreement to ensure, again, that the American people are getting a good deal.

So through the trade promotion authority, the bill that has been filibustered today, Congress would have been able to get to know important details regarding the actual implementation of the trade deal.

I am disappointed our Democratic colleagues were not able to see how important this legislation is, not to us, not to the President but to the people they represent and to the economy and wages we need to see grow.

Well, as we heard from Secretary Ash Carter today at lunch, this is important for national security reasons as well. It is important America thoroughly engage in Asia with our trading partners because there is a strange but simple phenomenon that occurs when two countries trade with each other. They are sure a lot less likely to go to war with each other if they are doing business and talking to each other.

From a national security perspective, we want to make sure we make the rules with regard to trading in Asia and that we don't default and let China fill the void, which they will be happy if we don't take care of our business.

Trade is important to my State, and as I said, it is important to the United States. In the 20th century all we needed back in Texas were farm-to-market roads to find customers for our goods. But in the 21st century, our customers are not just in the next town over, they are all around the world. As I said, 95 percent of our potential customers live outside of the United States.

This legislation would help connect American farmers, ranchers, and small businesses to the markets around the world which would help our economy. As the country's largest exporter, we in Texas know the value of trade firsthand because we depend on it. I know a lot of people think, well, Texas is just about oil and gas. Well, that is not actually true. We have a very diversified economy. But part of what we have done, which has set us apart from the rest of the country in terms of economic growth and job creation, is trade.

Last year, Texas reported $289 billion of exported goods, with some 41,000 businesses exporting goods from Texas to outside the country. Now, this type of trade has helped our economy grow and keep people employed, able to provide food for their families and other necessities of life. We have prospered, relatively speaking, during a time when much of the American economy has been relatively stagnant and trade has been an important part of that.

Opening up our country to greater trade through the trade promotion authority would help American businesses send their goods to even more markets. The United States is the leading exporter of agricultural products. Last year alone, America's farmers and ranchers who could benefit tremendously from this legislation exported more than $152 billion in agricultural commodities and products to customers around the world.

In Texas, for example, in the agriculture sector, we lead the Nation in exports of beef and cotton. By opening up more international opportunities for these products, our economy would grow and our Texas commodities, such as beef and cotton, would become staples in fast-growing markets like Asia.

We also know, as I suggested earlier, that trade is not just about selling

products, it is about the jobs that are necessary to make and grow the products we sell. According to a report released last month by the International Trade Administration, as of 2014, more than 1 million jobs in Texas alone are supported by exporting, and in the entire country that figure is 11 million. So with 11 million jobs dependent on exports, why in the world wouldn't we want to improve our ability to export more abroad to other markets around the world and to create more jobs in the process?

Well, TPA is important because it would allow Congress to also have clear oversight over the pending trade agreements. I know there is a lot of skepticism about the kind of deal that is being cut behind closed doors. We would open those doors and bring it out into the open and allow all Americans to examine it. And we, as their representatives, will exam it as well and ask the hard questions, such as why is this in the best interest of the American farmer, rancher, and manufacturer.

We know that TPP—the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is the big Asia trade agreement—alone makes up about 40 percent of the world's economy.

I admit I am a little disappointed that the Democrats, with the exception of one Senator, would choose to block this important piece of legislation. With so much of the world's purchasing power located beyond our borders, one would think that on a bipartisan basis we would all support opening up new access to consumers and markets for America's farmers, ranchers, and manufactured goods, and that should be a top priority.

Unfortunately, our colleagues across the aisle did not see our Nation's businesses and our economy as their main priority today. I hope that after today's failure of this particular legislation, we will engage in serious negotiations.

I agree with the majority leader, that after November 4, the American people gave the U.S. Senate new management. They were dissatisfied with the management of last year and previous years because all they saw was dysfunction. Well, now the U.S. Senate is starting to function again. We are starting to produce important pieces of legislation, such as the first budget since 2009. This is a great opportunity for us on a bipartisan basis—on a nonpartisan basis—to do something really good.

I hope, after making the mistake of blocking this legislation, that our colleagues—the 14 so-called progrowth Democrats out of the 46 across the aisle—will see fit to work with us to try and move this legislation forward.

ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 4 p.m., the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:59 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 5:29 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. AYOTTE).

MORNING BUSINESS

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, yesterday I missed the vote on S. Con. Res. 16, which states U.S. policy on the release of American citizens in Iran, because I was touring tornado damage in Delmont, in my home State of South Dakota. Had I been able to be here, I would have voted in support of this concurrent resolution. Iran's treatment of these detained Americans is reprehensible, and I believe we should be using every diplomatic tool at our disposal to obtain their release.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I was necessarily absent during the Senate's consideration of S. Con. Res. 16, which states that Iran should immediately release Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, and Jason Rezaian, and cooperate with the U.S. Government to locate and return Robert Levinson. The resolution also states that the U.S. Government should use every diplomatic tool at its disposal to secure their immediate release. Had I been present, I would have voted in support of S. Con. Res. 16.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mrs. STABENOW. Madam President, I wish to reflect on this year's Memorial Day and the importance of this holiday in American life.

As I attend Memorial Day parades and commemorations, I am struck by our spirit of national unity. I know that across Michigan—and across our Nation—our fellow Americans are taking part in similar gatherings where we stop and reflect on our history and the sacrifice made by so many in order to bring our Nation to where we are today.

Memorial Day is unique among American holidays. On Memorial Day, we do not honor a particular date or event, a battle or the end of a war. On Memorial Day, we do not honor an individual leader—a President or a general.

On Memorial Day, we pay homage to the thousands and thousands of individual acts of bravery and sacrifice that stretch back to the battlefields of our Revolution and to those taking place today in conflicts across our world.

Last month, I was reminded of the significance of this day when I welcomed 76 Michigan World War II and Korean war veterans to Washington from Michigan's Upper Peninsula as part of the Honor Flight Network.

These veterans visited the World War II and Korean war memorials, and at the end of the day, received personalized notes thanking them for their service. The mission of the Honor Flight Network is a fitting tribute to our ''greatest generation.''

This Memorial Day we not only honor past generations, but our current generation of young men and women who are serving or have come home. In April, 350 airmen and 12 A–10 Thunderbolt II planes from our Selfridge Air National Guard Base deployed to the Middle East to fight the terrorist group ISIL as part of Operation Inherent Resolve.

This Memorial Day is a reminder of our obligation to honor our commitment to all our generations of veterans by making sure they have the support they need and the benefits they deserve.

As we observe this holiday, let us remember the centuries of sacrifice by the many men and women that this day represents. And let us make sure that all who served with honor are honored in return.

REMEMBERING CORPORAL BRYON K. DICKSON

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I wish to honor Corporal Bryon K. Dickson, a Pennsylvania State trooper who was killed in the line of duty on September 12, 2014. Corporal Dickson was a resident of Dunmore, PA, who served our Commonwealth and our Nation with honor, valor and distinction.

Corporal Dickson spent the majority of his life in service to others. A graduate of Wyoming Area High School, he entered the Marines after high school

and served with honor for 4 years. Following his discharge, Corporal Dickson went on to study at the Pennsylvania State University, where he earned a degree in the administration of justice before entering the Pennsylvania State Police Academy.

As a member of the Pennsylvania State Police, Corporal Dickson distinguished himself as a passionate and dedicated officer. He became a certified drug recognition expert and devoted himself to removing impaired drivers from Pennsylvania's roads. In recognition of his efforts, Corporal Dickson received several awards from the Pennsylvania DUI Association, and numerous State police commendations. At the time of his death, he was a 7-year veteran of the force, serving as the patrol unit supervisor for Troop R at the Blooming Grove Barracks.

Corporal Dickson represented the very best of law enforcement in Pennsylvania and around the country. He wanted to help his community, so he put himself at risk every day to keep us safe. He ultimately gave, as Abraham Lincoln once said, ''the last full measure of devotion'' to his Commonwealth and his country. We owe him a debt of gratitude for that sacrifice.

As he was laid to rest, thousands of police officers from around the country, some from as far away as Alaska, lined the streets of Scranton, PA to pay their final respects to Corporal Dickson. He was eulogized by police commissioner Frank Noonan as a ''steadfast soldier of the law.'' But Corporal Dickson was more than just a brave public servant. In addition to being an honored marine, and distinguished State trooper, he was a devoted family man who ''took perfect care of his wife'' and handcrafted flawless wood toys for his two young sons. He was, most importantly, a loving husband, father, son, brother, uncle, and friend; and that is how he will be most dearly remembered.

My thoughts and prayers will remain with his wife Tiffany, his two children Bryon III and Adam, and all those who knew and loved Corporal Dickson. May he rest in peace. And may his sacrifice never be forgotten.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE LOUISIANA VETERANS FESTIVAL

● Mr. VITTER. Madam President, today, I recognize the Second Annual Louisiana Veterans Festival taking place on May 16, at the Northshore Harbor Center in Slidell, LA. The event is hosted by the East St. Tammany Habitat for Humanity, which constructs homes for low-income families in Louisiana, including veterans. The event offers an opportunity for families of military personnel and members of the community to celebrate and thank veterans for their service to our Nation.

Habitat for Humanity's efforts are incredibly important, especially for our veterans. When we send our American citizens to war, we make a promise to protect them and a commitment to support them when they return home. Habitat for Humanity's work ensures that many will have a home when they return.

Throughout America's history, our military has bravely defended our Nation—especially our beliefs and values—from the threat of tyranny and oppression. Our service men and women have defended us in all corners of the Earth, and they continue to defend us today. It is through the service and devotion of the military members and our veterans that our Nation has remained the strong America we know today. For their sacrifices, we owe them a debt of gratitude that can never be repaid.

Through my work in the United States Congress, I have had the privilege of meeting with veterans throughout the State of Louisiana, from World War II veterans to recent veterans from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. I am humbled by the stories of heroism and selflessness. May we never forget those who have made the ultimate sacrifice to protect our freedoms.

It is our responsibility to remember their courage, not only in ceremonies such as the Veterans Festival in Slidell, but also every day. Louisiana is blessed to have such a successful organization with so many dedicated workers and volunteers building a better future for our veterans and their families. We honor those who have served for us and have given so much, and I am pleased to recognize the Second Annual Louisiana Veterans Festival and the East St. Tammany Habitat for Humanity for its role in building homes for veterans.●

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance:

Report to accompany S. 995, A bill to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–42).

Report to accompany S. 1267, An original bill to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–43).

Report to accompany S. 1268, An original bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–44).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1287. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for viral hepatitis surveillance, education, and testing in order to prevent deaths from chronic liver disease and liver cancer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1288. A bill to require States to implement a cash withdrawal daily limit for recipients of cash assistance under the temporary assistance for needy families program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1289. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain contractor personnel in matters on the defense acquisition workforce in the annual strategic workforce plan of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1290. A bill to ensure the ability of covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program to access care under a health plan under such program in each TRICARE program region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 1291. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 1292. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to treat certain qualified disaster areas as HUBZones and to extend the period for HUBZone treatment for certain base closure areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1293. A bill to establish the Department of Energy as the lead agency for coordinating all requirements under Federal law with respect to eligible clean coal and advanced coal technology generating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1294. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate in promoting the development of efficient, economical, and environmentally sustainable thermally led wood energy systems; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1295. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 1296. A bill to establish the American Infrastructure Bank to offer States the option for more flexibility in financing and funding infrastructure projects; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1297. A bill to update the Commercial Space Launch Act by amending title 51, United States Code, to promote competitiveness of the U.S. commercial space sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1298. A bill to provide nationally consistent measures of performance of the Nation's ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REID):

S. 1299. A bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1300. A bill to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa fees in certain situations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1301. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1302. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1303. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the enrollment of veterans in certain courses of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1304. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a pilot competitive grant program for the development of a skilled energy workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 1305. A bill to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1306. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to use existing funding available to further projects that would improve energy efficiency and reduce emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1307. A bill to amend section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, to require that the annual budget submissions of the Presidents include the total dollar amount requested for intelligence or intelligence related activities of each element of the Government engaged in such activities; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1308. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1309. A bill to provide for the removal of default information from a borrower's credit report with respect to certain rehabilitated education loans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1310. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing new oil or natural gas production leases in the Gulf of Mexico under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to a person that does not renegotiate its existing leases in order to require royalty payments if oil and natural gas prices are greater than or equal to specified price thresholds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1311. A bill to amend the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to modify certain penalties to deter oil spills; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1312. A bill to modernize Federal policies regarding the supply and distribution of energy in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. Res. 178. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week from May 6, 2015, through May 12, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 36

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

S. 122

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 122, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the personal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 370

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 389

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 389, a bill to amend section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that annual State report cards reflect the same race groups as the decennial census of population.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 677

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 677, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 713

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 713, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength or when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation places a lien against an insurance company's assets, and for other purposes.

S. 806

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 806, a bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for preemployment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers and for other purposes.

S. 824

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 824, a bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 860, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 911

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 911, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1013

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1013, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1049

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to allow the financing by United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1133

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1133, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 1141

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1141, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small businesses.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1199

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1199, a bill to authorize Federal agencies to provide alternative fuel to Federal employees on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes.

S. 1236

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1236, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to modify certain requirements relating to trial-type hearings with respect to certain license applications before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 1253

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1253, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of certain disposable medical technologies under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1282

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1282, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to consider the objective of improving the conversion, use, and storage of carbon dioxide produced from fossil fuels in carrying out research and development programs under that Act.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 174

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 174, a resolution recognizing May 2015 as ''Jewish American Heritage Month'' and honoring the contributions of Jewish Americans to the United States of America.

S. RES. 177

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 177, a resolution designating the week of May 10 through May 16, 2015, as ''National Police Week''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1294. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate in promoting the development of efficient, economical, and environmentally sustainable thermally led wood energy systems; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Bioenergy Act of 2015.

Managed in an environmentally responsible way, woody biomass presents a carbon-neutral alternative to fossil

fuels for heating and powering homes, schools and businesses. Much of the woody biomass in the U.S. that could be used for energy production is either waste from the forest products industry, or small trees that contribute to the overcrowding of forests and wildfires. In 2013, wildfires burned 4.3 million acres of American forests and rangeland, and the Federal Government spent $1.7 billion to fight them. Additionally, about 2 billion metric tons, or 30 percent, of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions came from fossil fuel use in space heating, water heating or electricity generation for American homes and businesses. Using woody biomass for heat and power can help fund wildfire risk reduction and forest restoration, all while creating low-carbon energy and a stable source of jobs in rural economies across the country.

Despite this potential, the U.S. Department of Energy, DOE, has not invested in biomass heat, bioheat, and power, biopower, projects and research. This bill introduces modest steps to develop this resource, learn more about its full potential, and improve interagency coordination between DOE and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, Forest Service on this topic.

Specifically, the bill will establish a competitive cost-share grant program at the Department of Energy to improve technologies for processing woody biomass and bringing down transportation costs, as well as innovative technologies for using biomass for heat and power—from new power plant designs, to neighborhood heating systems called ''district energy'' systems.

The bill also creates a cost-share grant program through the U.S. Forest Service to support proven biomass technologies, like combined heat and power, CHP. To assist with financing, the bill expands a loan program run by the USDA Rural Utilities Service to include bioheat and biopower, and establishes a new loan program for projects that are not located in a rural utility service territory. Finally, the bill would support continued research into the environmental sustainability and economics of using biomass for heat and power, and would establish a collaborative platform for directing this research across the Departments of Energy and Agriculture.

This bill is good for the environment, good for rural jobs, and good for stopping wildfires before they start. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1294

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Bioenergy Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BIOHEAT.—The term ''bioheat'' means the use of woody biomass to generate heat.

(2) BIOPOWER.—The term ''biopower'' means the use of woody biomass to generate electricity.

(3) INITIATIVE.—The term ''Initiative'' means the Bioheat and Biopower Initiative established under section 3(a).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

(5) STATE WOOD ENERGY TEAM.—The term ''State Wood Energy Team'' means a collaborative group of stakeholders that—

(A) carry out activities within a State to identify sustainable energy applications for woody biomass; and

(B) has been designated by the State and Private Forestry organization of the Forest Service as a State Wood Energy Team.

SEC. 3. BIOHEAT AND BIOPOWER INITIATIVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, acting jointly with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall establish a collaborative working group, to be known as the ''Bioheat and Biopower Initiative'', to carry out the duties described in subsection (c).

(b) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Initiative shall be led by a Board of Directors.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board of Directors shall consist of—

(A) representatives of the Department of Energy and the Department of Agriculture, who shall serve as cochairpersons of the Board;

(B) a senior officer or employee, each of whom shall have a rank that is equivalent to the departmental rank of a representative described in subparagraph (A), of each of—

(i) the Department of the Interior;

(ii) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(iii) the National Science Foundation; and

(iv) the Office of Science and Technology Policy; and

(C) at the election of the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, such other members as may be appointed by the Secretaries, in consultation with the Board.

(3) MEETINGS.—The Board of Directors shall meet not less frequently than once each quarter.

(c) DUTIES.—The Initiative shall—

(1) coordinate research and development activities relating to biopower and bioheat projects—

(A) between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Energy; and

(B) with other Federal departments and agencies;

(2) provide recommendations to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Energy concerning the administration of this Act; and

(3) ensure that—

(A) solicitations are open and competitive with respect to applicable annual grant awards; and

(B) objectives and evaluation criteria of solicitations for those awards are clearly stated and minimally prescriptive, with no areas of special interest.

SEC. 4. GRANT PROGRAMS.

(a) DEMONSTRATION GRANTS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish, within the Bioenergy Technologies Office, a program under which the Secretary shall provide grants to relevant projects to support innovation and market development in bioheat and biopower.

(2) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, the owner or operator of a relevant project shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(3) ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall allocate—

(A) $15,000,000 to projects that develop innovative techniques for preprocessing biomass for heat and electricity generation, with the goals of—

(i) lowering the costs of—

(I) distributed preprocessing technologies, including technologies designed to promote densification, torrefaction, and the broader commoditization of bioenergy feedstocks; and

(II) transportation and logistics costs; and

(ii) developing technologies and procedures that maximize environmental integrity, such as reducing greenhouse gas emissions and local air pollutants and bolstering the health of forest ecosystems and watersheds; and

(B) $15,000,000 to innovative bioheat and biopower demonstration projects, including—

(i) district energy projects;

(ii) innovation in transportation and logistics; and

(iii) innovative projects addressing the challenges of retrofitting existing coal-fired electricity generation facilities to use biomass.

(4) REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION.—In selecting projects to receive grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, diverse geographical distribution among the projects.

(5) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project carried out using a grant under this subsection shall be 50 percent.

(6) DUTIES OF RECIPIENTS.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, the owner or operator of a project shall—

(A) participate in the applicable working group under paragraph (7);

(B) submit to the Secretary a report that includes—

(i) a description of the project and any relevant findings; and

(ii) such other information as the Secretary determines to be necessary to complete the report of the Secretary under paragraph (8); and

(C) carry out such other activities as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(7) WORKING GROUPS.—The Secretary shall establish 2 working groups to share best practices and collaborate in project implementation, of which—

(A) 1 shall be comprised of representatives of feedstock projects that receive grants under paragraph (3)(A); and

(B) 1 shall comprised of representatives of demand and logistics projects that receive grants under paragraph (3)(B).

(8) REPORTS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing—

(A) each project for which a grant has been provided under this subsection;

(B) any findings as a result of those projects; and

(C) the state of market and technology development, including market barriers and opportunities.

(b) THERMALLY LED WOOD ENERGY GRANTS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, shall establish a program under which the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide grants to support commercially demonstrated thermally led wood energy

technologies, with priority given to projects proposed by State Wood Energy Teams.

(2) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, the owner or operator of a relevant project shall submit to the Secretary of Agriculture an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary of Agriculture may require.

(3) ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall allocate $10,000,000 for feasibility assessments, engineering designs, and construction of thermally led wood energy systems, including pellet boilers, district energy systems, combined heat and power installations, and other technologies.

(4) REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION.—In selecting projects to receive grants under this subsection, the Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, diverse geographical distribution among the projects.

(5) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project carried out using a grant under this subsection shall be 50 percent.

[(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—]

[(1) $30,000,000 to the Secretary to provide grants under subsection (a); and]

[(2) $10,000,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture to provide grants under subsection (b).]

SEC. 5. LOAN PROGRAMS; STRATEGIC ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH.

(a) LOW-INTEREST LOANS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish, within the Rural Development Office, a low-interest loan program to support construction of thermally led residential, commercial or institutional, and industrial wood energy systems.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The program under this subsection shall be carried out in accordance with such requirements as the Secretary of Agriculture may establish, by regulation, in taking into consideration best practices.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this subsection $50,000,000.

(b) ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND CONSERVATION LOAN PROGRAM.—In addition to loans under subsection (a), thermally led residential, commercial or institutional, and industrial wood energy systems shall be eligible to receive loans under the energy efficiency and conservation loan program of the Department of Agriculture under section 2 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 902).

(c) STRATEGIC ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting jointly with the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service), shall establish a bioheat and biopower research program—

(A) the costs of which shall be divided equally between the Department of Energy and the Department of Agriculture;

(B) to be overseen by the Board of Directors of the Initiative; and

(C) to carry out projects and activities—

(i)(I) to advance research and analysis on the environmental, social, and economic costs and benefits of the United States biopower and bioheat industries, including associated lifecycle analysis of greenhouse gas emissions and net energy analysis; and

(II) to provide recommendations for policy and investment in those areas;

(ii) to identify and assess, through a joint effort between the Chief of the Forest Service and the regional combined heat and power groups of the Department of Energy, the feasibility of thermally led district wood energy opportunities in all regions of the Forest Service regions, including by conducting broad regional assessments, feasibility studies, and preliminary engineering assessments at individual facilities; and

(iii)(I) to offer to communities technical assistance to explore thermally led wood energy opportunities; and

(II) to provide enhanced services to smaller communities that have limited resources and capacity to pursue new thermally led wood energy opportunities.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture—

(A) $2,000,000 to carry out paragraph (1)(C)(i);

(B) $1,000,000 to carry out paragraph (1)(C)(ii); and

(C) $1,000,000 to carry out paragraph (1)(C)(iii).

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REID):

S. 1299. A bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senators MURKOWSKI, UDALL, DURBIN, COONS, WARREN, SCHATZ, HEINRICH, DONNELLY, AYOTTE, KLOBUCHAR, BLUMENTHAL, STABENOW, TESTER, HIRONO, MERKLEY, SANDERS, GRASSLEY, COLLINS, and REID in the introduction of the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act Reauthorization.

This legislation is named for the son of our former colleague, Senator Gordon Smith, who took his own life at the young age of 22. After this tragedy, Senator Smith worked to gain the support of members across the aisle and in both chambers to prevent other children from doing the same with passage of the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act in 2004.

Although great strides have been made over the last decade, suicide remains the third-leading cause of death for adolescents and young adults between the ages of 10 and 24. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, youth suicide results in approximately 4,600 lives lost each year. Additionally, the CDC reports that 157,000 young adults in this age group are treated for self-inflicted injuries annually, often as the result of a failed suicide attempt.

More work must be done to address the mental and behavioral health of children and young adults before they hurt themselves and others. Parents also need help in identifying early warning signs of mental illness and accessing the appropriate treatment before it is too late.

The Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act authorizes critical resources for schools—elementary schools through college where children and young adults spend most of their time—to be able to reach at-risk youth. Since 2005, this law has supported 370 youth suicide prevention grants in all 50 States, 46 tribes or tribal organizations, and 175 institutions of higher education.

The bill my colleagues and I are introducing today, with the support of over 40 member organizations of the Mental Health Liaison Group, would increase the authorized grant level to States, tribes, and college campuses for the implementation of proven programs and initiatives designed to address mental illness and reduce youth suicide. It will enable more schools to offer critical services to students and provide greater flexibility in the use of funds, particularly on college campuses. This change to the Campus Suicide Prevention Program comes at a vital time.

Over the last decade, we have seen an increasing trend in the number of students seeking help for mental health issues on college campuses. Of these students seeking services for mental health issues, over 30 percent report that they have seriously considered attempting suicide at some point in their lives. With more students seeking mental health services, we must work to ensure that college and university counseling centers are equipped with the necessary tools to meet this demand.

We can play a role in helping these children and their families. Indeed, passing the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act Reauthorization is one way we can better address the mental health needs of this population. I urge our colleagues to work with us to pass this legislation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1300. A bill to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa fees in certain situations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Adoptive Family Relief Act, which would provide support and relief to American families seeking to bring their adoptive children from the Democratic Republic of Congo home to the U.S. It would also provide relief to similarly situated adoptive families should barriers arise in other countries in the future. I

thank my colleagues, Senators RON JOHNSON, CHUCK GRASSLEY, MITCH MCCONNELL, AMY KLOBUCHAR, BARBARA BOXER, and BOB CORKER for joining me as original cosponsors.

Within the past few years, over 350 American families have successfully adopted children from the Democratic Republic of Congo. However, since September 25, 2013, they have not been able to bring their adoptive children home to the United States because the Democratic Republic of Congo suspended the issuance of ''exit permits'' for these children until its parliament passes new laws regarding international adoption. These exit permits are necessary for adopted children to leave the Democratic Republic of Congo and be united with their American families in the U.S. As the permit suspension drags on, however, American families are repeatedly paying visa renewal and related fees, while also continuing to be separated from their adopted kids.

The Adoptive Families Relief Act would grant flexibility to the United States Department of State to waive immigrant visa renewal fees for adoptive American parents in extraordinary circumstances like this, where the cause of delay is due to factors not in the control of the child or parents. The Department of State is fully supportive of this legislation and is eager to provide some relief to the many families who are affected.

Under current law, adopted children from abroad must secure U.S. immigrant visas in order to travel to the United States to unite with their adoptive parents. However, these visas expire after 6 months. Ordinarily, such visas are used within the allotted 6 months. However, in rare circumstances, such as the suspension of exit permits in the Democratic Republic of Congo, adopted children are prohibited from leaving their country of birth and cannot use their U.S.-issued visas within the prescribed timeframe.

Adoptive parents consequently pay $325 in visa renewal fees every 6 months if they want to preserve the validity of their adopted child's visa to travel to the U.S. To renew the visa, the child must also complete another medical exam, which costs the child's adoptive family approximately $200. Many families from across the country have already paid for at least three visas, which amounts to $975 per child, plus costs for medical exams. Additionally, many families are also paying monthly childcare or foster care fees, and some families have adopted more than one child. So, in addition to the emotional stress of being separated from their adoptive children, American parents face a financial burden while the situation goes unresolved.

This bill would not change any of the substantive requirements for issuance of a renewed visa, such as necessary medical exams and background checks. It simply allows the Department of State to waive the visa renewal fee to alleviate the financial burden imposed on American families to renew their child's visa, and reimburses those who have already renewed their child's visa since the exit permit suspension.

The Department of State does not anticipate this waiver authority to be used broadly based on its past experiences and its other adoption programs abroad. The bill would not be a financial burden on the United States. According to the State Department, once the initial visa, which the parents must pay for, is issued, the subsequent work for consular officers involved with renewing a visa is relatively quick and simple. The work involved to renew the visa therefore does not amount to the full cost of the visa renewal fee, so the State Department maintains it would not impact its consular resources.

This legislation builds on the efforts of other members who have tried to resolve the Democratic Republic of Congo's exit permit suspension in various ways. Last April, 171 Members of Congress sent a letter to Democratic Republic of Congo President Joseph Kabila asking for his intervention. In June of 2014, 167 Members of Congress also sent a letter to President Obama requesting his outreach to President Kabila to resolve this situation. Members of Congress sent a letter to the Democratic Republic of Congo Parliament offering technical assistance on October 28, 2014, and the Senate passed S. Res. 502 in the 113th Congress, concerning the Democratic Republic of Congo's suspension of exit permits for Congolese adopted children. This year, the Senate passed an amendment to promote the return of legally adopted children from the Democratic Republic of Congo. My Senate colleagues and our staff have met with our constituents directly affected by the Democratic Republic of Congo's exit permit suspension, and heard their call for help. Furthermore, I, and other Senators, have also had individual meetings with Congolese Ambassador to the U.S., Faida Mitifu.

However, since the exit permit suspension continues despite these efforts, it is imperative to bring some relief to our American adoptive parents. While we continue to urge the Democratic Republic of Congo to lift its exit permit suspension, I urge my colleagues to pass the Adoptive Family Relief Act to provide some relief to American families caught powerless in this difficult situation. Should other adoptive parents face similar obstacles in the future with their adoption process in other countries, this bill will also serve as a source of relief to them.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 178—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL NURSES WEEK FROM MAY 6, 2015, THROUGH MAY 12, 2015

Mr. MERKLEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 178

Whereas, since 1991, National Nurses Week is celebrated annually from May 6, also known as National Recognition Day for Nurses, through May 12, the birthday of Florence Nightingale, the founder of modern nursing;

Whereas National Nurses Week is a time of year to reflect on the important contributions that nurses make to provide safe, high-quality health care;

Whereas nurses are known to be patient advocates, acting fearlessly to protect the lives of those under the care of nurses;

Whereas nurses represent the largest single component of the health care profession, with an estimated population of 3,100,000 registered nurses in the United States;

Whereas nurses are leading in the delivery of quality care in a transformed health care system that improves patient outcomes and safety;

Whereas the Future of Nursing report of the Institute of Medicine has called for the nursing profession to meet the call for leadership in a team-based delivery model;

Whereas, when nurse staffing levels increase, the risk of patient complications and lengthy hospital stays decreases, resulting in cost savings;

Whereas nurses are experienced researchers, and the work of nurses encompasses a wide scope of scientific inquiry, including clinical research, health systems and outcomes research, and nursing education research;

Whereas nurses provide culturally and ethnically competent care and are educated to be sensitive to the regional and community customs of persons needing care;

Whereas nurses are well-positioned to provide leadership to eliminate health care disparities that exist in the United States;

Whereas nurses are the cornerstone of the public health infrastructure, promoting healthy lifestyles and educating communities on disease prevention and health promotion;

Whereas nurses are strong allies to Congress as they help inform, educate, and work closely with legislators to improve the education, retention, recruitment, and practice of all nurses and, more importantly, the health and safety of the patients for whom they care;

Whereas increased Federal and State investment is needed to support programs such as the Nursing Workforce Development Programs (authorized under title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296 et seq.)), which bolster the nursing workforce at all levels, to increase the number of doctorally prepared faculty members, and to educate more nurse research scientists who can discover new nursing care models to improve the health status of the diverse population of the United States;

Whereas nurses touch the lives of the people of the United States from birth to the end of life; and

Whereas nursing has been voted as the most honest and ethical profession in the United States for the past 13 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week, as founded by the American Nurses Association;

(2) recognizes the significant contributions of nurses to the health care system of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Nurses Week with appropriate recognition, ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of nurses to the everyday lives of patients.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1221. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1221. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Trade Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

SEC. 102. TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

(a) OVERALL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—The overall trade negotiating objectives of the United States for agreements subject to the provisions of section 103 are—

(1) to obtain more open, equitable, and reciprocal market access;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and investment and that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement;

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, enhance the competitiveness of the United States, promote full employment in the United States, and enhance the global economy;

(5) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and enhance the international means of doing so, while optimizing the use of the world's resources;

(6) to promote respect for worker rights and the rights of children consistent with core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7)) and an understanding of the relationship between trade and worker rights;

(7) to seek provisions in trade agreements under which parties to those agreements ensure that they do not weaken or reduce the protections afforded in domestic environmental and labor laws as an encouragement for trade;

(8) to ensure that trade agreements afford small businesses equal access to international markets, equitable trade benefits, and expanded export market opportunities, and provide for the reduction or elimination of trade and investment barriers that disproportionately impact small businesses;

(9) to promote universal ratification and full compliance with ILO Convention No. 182 Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor;

(10) to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multi-sectoral nature of trade and investment activity;

(11) to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce; and

(12) to take into account other legitimate United States domestic objectives, including, but not limited to, the protection of legitimate health or safety, essential security, and consumer interests and the law and regulations related thereto.

(b) PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—

(1) TRADE IN GOODS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade in goods are—

(A) to expand competitive market opportunities for exports of goods from the United States and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through the utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating tariff and nontariff barriers and policies and practices of foreign governments directly related to trade that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade; and

(B) to obtain reciprocal tariff and nontariff barrier elimination agreements, including with respect to those tariff categories covered in section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(2) TRADE IN SERVICES.—(A) The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding trade in services is to expand competitive market opportunities for United States services and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating barriers to international trade in services, such as regulatory and other barriers that deny national treatment and market access or unreasonably restrict the establishment or operations of service suppliers.

(B) Recognizing that expansion of trade in services generates benefits for all sectors of the economy and facilitates trade, the objective described in subparagraph (A) should be pursued through all means, including through a plurilateral agreement with those countries willing and able to undertake high standard services commitments for both existing and new services.

(3) TRADE IN AGRICULTURE.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to agriculture is to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of agricultural commodities in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in bulk, specialty crop, and value added commodities by—

(A) securing more open and equitable market access through robust rules on sanitary and phytosanitary measures that—

(i) encourage the adoption of international standards and require a science-based justification be provided for a sanitary or phytosanitary measure if the measure is more restrictive than the applicable international standard;

(ii) improve regulatory coherence, promote the use of systems-based approaches, and appropriately recognize the equivalence of health and safety protection systems of exporting countries;

(iii) require that measures are transparently developed and implemented, are based on risk assessments that take into account relevant international guidelines and scientific data, and are not more restrictive on trade than necessary to meet the intended purpose; and

(iv) improve import check processes, including testing methodologies and procedures, and certification requirements,

while recognizing that countries may put in place measures to protect human, animal, or plant life or health in a manner consistent with their international obligations, including the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (referred to in section 101(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(3)));

(B) reducing or eliminating, by a date certain, tariffs or other charges that decrease market opportunities for United States exports—

(i) giving priority to those products that are subject to significantly higher tariffs or subsidy regimes of major producing countries; and

(ii) providing reasonable adjustment periods for United States import sensitive products, in close consultation with Congress on such products before initiating tariff reduction negotiations;

(C) reducing tariffs to levels that are the same as or lower than those in the United States;

(D) reducing or eliminating subsidies that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or unfairly distort agriculture markets to the detriment of the United States;

(E) allowing the preservation of programs that support family farms and rural communities but do not distort trade;

(F) developing disciplines for domestic support programs, so that production that is in excess of domestic food security needs is sold at world prices;

(G) eliminating government policies that create price depressing surpluses;

(H) eliminating state trading enterprises whenever possible;

(I) developing, strengthening, and clarifying rules to eliminate practices that unfairly decrease United States market access opportunities or distort agricultural markets to the detriment of the United States, and ensuring that such rules are subject to efficient, timely, and effective dispute settlement, including—

(i) unfair or trade distorting activities of state trading enterprises and other administrative mechanisms, with emphasis on requiring price transparency in the operation of state trading enterprises and such other mechanisms in order to end cross subsidization, price discrimination, and price undercutting;

(ii) unjustified trade restrictions or commercial requirements, such as labeling, that affect new technologies, including biotechnology;

(iii) unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including restrictions not based on scientific principles in contravention of obligations in the Uruguay Round Agreements or bilateral or regional trade agreements;

(iv) other unjustified technical barriers to trade; and

(v) restrictive rules in the administration of tariff rate quotas;

(J) eliminating practices that adversely affect trade in perishable or cyclical products, while improving import relief mechanisms to recognize the unique characteristics of perishable and cyclical agriculture;

(K) ensuring that import relief mechanisms for perishable and cyclical agriculture are as accessible and timely to growers in the United States as those mechanisms that are used by other countries;

(L) taking into account whether a party to the negotiations has failed to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or has circumvented obligations under those agreements;

(M) taking into account whether a product is subject to market distortions by reason of a failure of a major producing country to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or by the circumvention by that country of its obligations under those agreements;

(N) otherwise ensuring that countries that accede to the World Trade Organization have made meaningful market liberalization commitments in agriculture;

(O) taking into account the impact that agreements covering agriculture to which the United States is a party have on the United States agricultural industry;

(P) maintaining bona fide food assistance programs, market development programs, and export credit programs;

(Q) seeking to secure the broadest market access possible in multilateral, regional, and bilateral negotiations, recognizing the effect that simultaneous sets of negotiations may have on United States import sensitive commodities (including those subject to tariff rate quotas);

(R) seeking to develop an international consensus on the treatment of seasonal or perishable agricultural products in investigations relating to dumping and safeguards and in any other relevant area;

(S) seeking to establish the common base year for calculating the Aggregated Measurement of Support (as defined in the Agreement on Agriculture) as the end of each country's Uruguay Round implementation period, as reported in each country's Uruguay Round market access schedule;

(T) ensuring transparency in the administration of tariff rate quotas through multilateral, plurilateral, and bilateral negotiations; and

(U) eliminating and preventing the undermining of market access for United States products through improper use of a country's system for protecting or recognizing geographical indications, including failing to ensure transparency and procedural fairness and protecting generic terms.

(4) FOREIGN INVESTMENT.—Recognizing that United States law on the whole provides a high level of protection for investment, consistent with or greater than the level required by international law, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding foreign investment are to reduce or eliminate artificial or trade distorting barriers to foreign investment, while ensuring that foreign investors in the United States are not accorded greater substantive rights with respect to investment protections than United States investors in the United States, and to secure for investors important rights comparable to those that would be available under United States legal principles and practice, by—

(A) reducing or eliminating exceptions to the principle of national treatment;

(B) freeing the transfer of funds relating to investments;

(C) reducing or eliminating performance requirements, forced technology transfers, and other unreasonable barriers to the establishment and operation of investments;

(D) seeking to establish standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation, consistent with United States legal principles and practice;

(E) seeking to establish standards for fair and equitable treatment, consistent with United States legal principles and practice, including the principle of due process;

(F) providing meaningful procedures for resolving investment disputes;

(G) seeking to improve mechanisms used to resolve disputes between an investor and a government through—

(i) mechanisms to eliminate frivolous claims and to deter the filing of frivolous claims;

(ii) procedures to ensure the efficient selection of arbitrators and the expeditious disposition of claims;

(iii) procedures to enhance opportunities for public input into the formulation of government positions; and

(iv) providing for an appellate body or similar mechanism to provide coherence to the interpretations of investment provisions in trade agreements; and

(H) ensuring the fullest measure of transparency in the dispute settlement mechanism, to the extent consistent with the need to protect information that is classified or business confidential, by—

(i) ensuring that all requests for dispute settlement are promptly made public;

(ii) ensuring that—

(I) all proceedings, submissions, findings, and decisions are promptly made public; and

(II) all hearings are open to the public; and

(iii) establishing a mechanism for acceptance of amicus curiae submissions from businesses, unions, and nongovernmental organizations.

(5) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade-related intellectual property are—

(A) to further promote adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights, including through—

(i)(I) ensuring accelerated and full implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(15)), particularly with respect to meeting enforcement obligations under that agreement; and

(II) ensuring that the provisions of any trade agreement governing intellectual property rights that is entered into by the United States reflect a standard of protection similar to that found in United States law;

(ii) providing strong protection for new and emerging technologies and new methods of transmitting and distributing products embodying intellectual property, including in a manner that facilitates legitimate digital trade;

(iii) preventing or eliminating discrimination with respect to matters affecting the availability, acquisition, scope, maintenance, use, and enforcement of intellectual property rights;

(iv) ensuring that standards of protection and enforcement keep pace with technological developments, and in particular ensuring that rightholders have the legal and technological means to control the use of their works through the Internet and other global communication media, and to prevent the unauthorized use of their works;

(v) providing strong enforcement of intellectual property rights, including through accessible, expeditious, and effective civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement mechanisms; and

(vi) preventing or eliminating government involvement in the violation of intellectual property rights, including cyber theft and piracy;

(B) to secure fair, equitable, and nondiscriminatory market access opportunities for United States persons that rely upon intellectual property protection; and

(C) to respect the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted by the World Trade Organization at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar on November 14, 2001, and to ensure that trade agreements foster innovation and promote access to medicines.

(6) DIGITAL TRADE IN GOODS AND SERVICES AND CROSS-BORDER DATA FLOWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United

States with respect to digital trade in goods and services, as well as cross-border data flows, are—

(A) to ensure that current obligations, rules, disciplines, and commitments under the World Trade Organization and bilateral and regional trade agreements apply to digital trade in goods and services and to cross-border data flows;

(B) to ensure that—

(i) electronically delivered goods and services receive no less favorable treatment under trade rules and commitments than like products delivered in physical form; and

(ii) the classification of such goods and services ensures the most liberal trade treatment possible, fully encompassing both existing and new trade;

(C) to ensure that governments refrain from implementing trade-related measures that impede digital trade in goods and services, restrict cross-border data flows, or require local storage or processing of data;

(D) with respect to subparagraphs (A) through (C), where legitimate policy objectives require domestic regulations that affect digital trade in goods and services or cross-border data flows, to obtain commitments that any such regulations are the least restrictive on trade, nondiscriminatory, and transparent, and promote an open market environment; and

(E) to extend the moratorium of the World Trade Organization on duties on electronic transmissions.

(7) REGULATORY PRACTICES.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the use of government regulation or other practices to reduce market access for United States goods, services, and investments are—

(A) to achieve increased transparency and opportunity for the participation of affected parties in the development of regulations;

(B) to require that proposed regulations be based on sound science, cost benefit analysis, risk assessment, or other objective evidence;

(C) to establish consultative mechanisms and seek other commitments, as appropriate, to improve regulatory practices and promote increased regulatory coherence, including through—

(i) transparency in developing guidelines, rules, regulations, and laws for government procurement and other regulatory regimes;

(ii) the elimination of redundancies in testing and certification;

(iii) early consultations on significant regulations;

(iv) the use of impact assessments;

(v) the periodic review of existing regulatory measures; and

(vi) the application of good regulatory practices;

(D) to seek greater openness, transparency, and convergence of standards development processes, and enhance cooperation on standards issues globally;

(E) to promote regulatory compatibility through harmonization, equivalence, or mutual recognition of different regulations and standards and to encourage the use of international and interoperable standards, as appropriate;

(F) to achieve the elimination of government measures such as price controls and reference pricing which deny full market access for United States products;

(G) to ensure that government regulatory reimbursement regimes are transparent, provide procedural fairness, are nondiscriminatory, and provide full market access for United States products; and

(H) to ensure that foreign governments—

(i) demonstrate that the collection of undisclosed proprietary information is limited to that necessary to satisfy a legitimate and justifiable regulatory interest; and

(ii) protect such information against disclosure, except in exceptional circumstances to protect the public, or where such information is effectively protected against unfair competition.

(8) STATE-OWNED AND STATE-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding competition by state-owned and state-controlled enterprises is to seek commitments that—

(A) eliminate or prevent trade distortions and unfair competition favoring state-owned and state-controlled enterprises to the extent of their engagement in commercial activity, and

(B) ensure that such engagement is based solely on commercial considerations,

in particular through disciplines that eliminate or prevent discrimination and market-distorting subsidies and that promote transparency.

(9) LOCALIZATION BARRIERS TO TRADE.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to localization barriers is to eliminate and prevent measures that require United States producers and service providers to locate facilities, intellectual property, or other assets in a country as a market access or investment condition, including indigenous innovation measures.

(10) LABOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to labor and the environment are—

(A) to ensure that a party to a trade agreement with the United States—

(i) adopts and maintains measures implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)) and its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)),

(ii) does not waive or otherwise derogate from, or offer to waive or otherwise derogate from—

(I) its statutes or regulations implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)), in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, where the waiver or derogation would be inconsistent with one or more such standards, or

(II) its environmental laws in a manner that weakens or reduces the protections afforded in those laws and in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, except as provided in its law and provided not inconsistent with its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)) or other provisions of the trade agreement specifically agreed upon, and

(iii) does not fail to effectively enforce its environmental or labor laws, through a sustained or recurring course of action or inaction,

in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party after entry into force of a trade agreement between those countries;

(B) to recognize that—

(i) with respect to environment, parties to a trade agreement retain the right to exercise prosecutorial discretion and to make decisions regarding the allocation of enforcement resources with respect to other environmental laws determined to have higher priorities, and a party is effectively enforcing its laws if a course of action or inaction reflects a reasonable, bona fide exercise of such discretion, or results from a reasonable, bona fide decision regarding the allocation of resources; and

(ii) with respect to labor, decisions regarding the distribution of enforcement resources are not a reason for not complying with a party's labor obligations; a party to a trade agreement retains the right to reasonable exercise of discretion and to make bona fide decisions regarding the allocation of resources between labor enforcement activities among core labor standards, provided the exercise of such discretion and such decisions are not inconsistent with its obligations;

(C) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to promote respect for core labor standards (as defined in section 111(7));

(D) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to protect the environment through the promotion of sustainable development;

(E) to reduce or eliminate government practices or policies that unduly threaten sustainable development;

(F) to seek market access, through the elimination of tariffs and nontariff barriers, for United States environmental technologies, goods, and services;

(G) to ensure that labor, environmental, health, or safety policies and practices of the parties to trade agreements with the United States do not arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate against United States exports or serve as disguised barriers to trade;

(H) to ensure that enforceable labor and environment obligations are subject to the same dispute settlement and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement; and

(I) to ensure that a trade agreement is not construed to empower a party's authorities to undertake labor or environmental law enforcement activities in the territory of the United States.

(11) CURRENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to currency practices is that parties to a trade agreement with the United States avoid manipulating exchange rates in order to prevent effective balance of payments adjustment or to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other parties to the agreement, such as through cooperative mechanisms, enforceable rules, reporting, monitoring, transparency, or other means, as appropriate.

(12) WTO AND MULTILATERAL TRADE AGREEMENTS.—Recognizing that the World Trade Organization is the foundation of the global trading system, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the World Trade Organization, the Uruguay Round Agreements, and other multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements are—

(A) to achieve full implementation and extend the coverage of the World Trade Organization and multilateral and plurilateral agreements to products, sectors, and conditions of trade not adequately covered;

(B) to expand country participation in and enhancement of the Information Technology Agreement, the Government Procurement Agreement, and other plurilateral trade agreements of the World Trade Organization;

(C) to expand competitive market opportunities for United States exports and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, through the negotiation of new WTO multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements, such as an agreement on trade facilitation;

(D) to ensure that regional trade agreements to which the United States is not a party fully achieve the high standards of, and comply with, WTO disciplines, including Article XXIV of GATT 1994, Article V and V bis of the General Agreement on Trade in Services, and the Enabling Clause, including through meaningful WTO review of such regional trade agreements;

(E) to enhance compliance by WTO members with their obligations as WTO members through active participation in the bodies of the World Trade Organization by the United States and all other WTO members, including in the trade policy review mechanism and the committee system of the World Trade Organization, and by working to increase the effectiveness of such bodies; and

(F) to encourage greater cooperation between the World Trade Organization and other international organizations.

(13) TRADE INSTITUTION TRANSPARENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to transparency is to obtain wider and broader application of the principle of transparency in the World Trade Organization, entities established under bilateral and regional trade agreements, and other international trade fora through seeking—

(A) timely public access to information regarding trade issues and the activities of such institutions;

(B) openness by ensuring public access to appropriate meetings, proceedings, and submissions, including with regard to trade and investment dispute settlement; and

(C) public access to all notifications and supporting documentation submitted by WTO members.

(14) ANTI-CORRUPTION.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the use of money or other things of value to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any improper advantage in a manner affecting trade are—

(A) to obtain high standards and effective domestic enforcement mechanisms applicable to persons from all countries participating in the applicable trade agreement that prohibit such attempts to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any such improper advantage;

(B) to ensure that such standards level the playing field for United States persons in international trade and investment; and

(C) to seek commitments to work jointly to encourage and support anti-corruption and anti-bribery initiatives in international trade fora, including through the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, done at Paris December 17, 1997 (commonly known as the ''OECD Anti-Bribery Convention'').

(15) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to dispute settlement and enforcement of trade agreements are—

(A) to seek provisions in trade agreements providing for resolution of disputes between governments under those trade agreements in an effective, timely, transparent, equitable, and reasoned manner, requiring determinations based on facts and the principles of the agreements, with the goal of increasing compliance with the agreements;

(B) to seek to strengthen the capacity of the Trade Policy Review Mechanism of the World Trade Organization to review compliance with commitments;

(C) to seek adherence by panels convened under the Dispute Settlement Understanding and by the Appellate Body to—

(i) the mandate of those panels and the Appellate Body to apply the WTO Agreement as written, without adding to or diminishing rights and obligations under the Agreement; and

(ii) the standard of review applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreement involved in the dispute, including greater deference, where appropriate, to the fact finding and technical expertise of national investigating authorities;

(D) to seek provisions encouraging the early identification and settlement of disputes through consultation;

(E) to seek provisions to encourage the provision of trade-expanding compensation if a party to a dispute under the agreement does not come into compliance with its obligations under the agreement;

(F) to seek provisions to impose a penalty upon a party to a dispute under the agreement that—

(i) encourages compliance with the obligations of the agreement;

(ii) is appropriate to the parties, nature, subject matter, and scope of the violation; and

(iii) has the aim of not adversely affecting parties or interests not party to the dispute while maintaining the effectiveness of the enforcement mechanism; and

(G) to seek provisions that treat United States principal negotiating objectives equally with respect to—

(i) the ability to resort to dispute settlement under the applicable agreement;

(ii) the availability of equivalent dispute settlement procedures; and

(iii) the availability of equivalent remedies.

(16) TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws are—

(A) to preserve the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade laws, including the antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws, and avoid agreements that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies, or that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

(B) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market access barriers.

(17) BORDER TAXES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding border taxes is to obtain a revision of the rules of the World Trade Organization with respect to the treatment of border adjustments for internal taxes to redress the disadvantage to countries relying primarily on direct taxes for revenue rather than indirect taxes.

(18) TEXTILE NEGOTIATIONS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in textiles and apparel articles are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of textiles and apparel in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in textiles and apparel.

(19) COMMERCIAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an agreement that is proposed to be entered into with the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership countries and to which section 103(b) will apply, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding commercial partnerships are the following:

(i) To discourage actions by potential trading partners that directly or indirectly prejudice or otherwise discourage commercial activity solely between the United States and Israel.

(ii) To discourage politically motivated actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel and to seek the elimination of politically motivated nontariff barriers on Israeli goods, services, or other commerce imposed on the State of Israel.

(iii) To seek the elimination of state-sponsored unsanctioned foreign boycotts against Israel or compliance with the Arab League Boycott of Israel by prospective trading partners.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ''actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel'' means actions by states, non-member states of the United Nations, international organizations, or affiliated agencies of international organizations that are politically motivated and are intended to penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli-controlled territories.

(20) GOOD GOVERNANCE, TRANSPARENCY, THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF LEGAL REGIMES, AND THE RULE OF LAW OF TRADING PARTNERS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to ensuring implementation of trade commitments and obligations by strengthening good governance, transparency, the effective operation of legal regimes and the rule of law of trading partners of the United States is through capacity building and other appropriate means, which are important parts of the broader effort to create more open democratic societies and to promote respect for internationally recognized human rights.

(c) CAPACITY BUILDING AND OTHER PRIORITIES.—In order to address and maintain United States competitiveness in the global economy, the President shall—

(1) direct the heads of relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to work to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to carry out obligations under trade agreements by consulting with any country seeking a trade agreement with the United States concerning that country's laws relating to customs and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment; and

(B) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(2) seek to establish consultative mechanisms among parties to trade agreements to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environment and human health based on sound science;

(3) promote consideration of multilateral environmental agreements and consult with parties to such agreements regarding the consistency of any such agreement that includes trade measures with existing environmental exceptions under Article XX of GATT 1994; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate an annual report on capacity-building activities

undertaken in connection with trade agreements negotiated or being negotiated pursuant to this title.

SEC. 103. TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY.

(a) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the President determines that one or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President—

(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c); and

(B) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), proclaim—

(i) such modification or continuance of any existing duty,

(ii) such continuance of existing duty free or excise treatment, or

(iii) such additional duties,

as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement.

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall notify Congress of the President's intention to enter into an agreement under this subsection.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) reduces any rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad valorem on the date of the enactment of this Act) to a rate of duty which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) reduces the rate of duty below that applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreements or a successor agreement, on any import sensitive agricultural product; or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that applied on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—

(A) AGGREGATE REDUCTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of 1/10 of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—No staging is required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a duty reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States. The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under this subparagraph.

(5) ROUNDING.—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of reductions under paragraph (4), the President may round an annual reduction by an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this paragraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B) ½ of 1 percent ad valorem.

(6) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—A rate of duty reduction that may not be proclaimed by reason of paragraph (3) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 106 and that bill is enacted into law.

(7) OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B), (3)(A), (3)(C), and (4) through (6), and subject to the consultation and layover requirements of section 115 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3524), the President may proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX, as defined in section 2(5) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(5)), if the United States agrees to such modification or staged rate reduction in a negotiation for the reciprocal elimination or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the World Trade Organization.

(8) AUTHORITY UNDER URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority provided to the President under section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(b) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF AND NONTARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Whenever the President determines that—

(i) 1 or more existing duties or any other import restriction of any foreign country or the United States or any other barrier to, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States or adversely affects the United States economy, or

(ii) the imposition of any such barrier or distortion is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or effect,

and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President may enter into a trade agreement described in subparagraph (B) during the period described in subparagraph (C).

(B) The President may enter into a trade agreement under subparagraph (A) with foreign countries providing for—

(i) the reduction or elimination of a duty, restriction, barrier, or other distortion described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the prohibition of, or limitation on the imposition of, such barrier or other distortion.

(C) The President may enter into a trade agreement under this paragraph before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c).

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) CONDITIONS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(3) BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this title referred to as ''trade authorities procedures'') apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this title be referred to as an ''implementing bill''.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(c) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL PROCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 106(b)—

(A) the trade authorities procedures apply to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) before July 1, 2018; and

(B) the trade authorities procedures shall be extended to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) after June 30, 2018, and before July 1, 2021, if (and only if)—

(i) the President requests such extension under paragraph (2); and

(ii) neither House of Congress adopts an extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (5) before July 1, 2018.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.—If the President is of the opinion that the trade authorities procedures should be extended to implementing bills described in paragraph (1)(B), the President shall submit to Congress, not later than April 1, 2018, a written report that contains a request for such extension, together with—

(A) a description of all trade agreements that have been negotiated under subsection (b) and the anticipated schedule for submitting such agreements to Congress for approval;

(B) a description of the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title, and a statement that such progress justifies the continuation of negotiations; and

(C) a statement of the reasons why the extension is needed to complete the negotiations.

(3) OTHER REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The President shall promptly inform the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The Advisory Committee shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains—

(i) its views regarding the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension requested under paragraph (2) should be approved or disapproved.

(B) REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The President shall promptly inform the United States International Trade Commission of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The International Trade Commission shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains a review and analysis of the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements implemented between the date of the enactment of this Act and the date on which the President decides to seek an extension requested under paragraph (2).

(4) STATUS OF REPORTS.—The reports submitted to Congress under paragraphs (2) and (3), or any portion of such reports, may be classified to the extent the President determines appropriate.

(5) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTIONS.—(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ''extension disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 103(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.'', with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(B) Extension disapproval resolutions—

(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House; and

(ii) shall be referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules.

(C) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to extension disapproval resolutions.

(D) It is not in order for—

(i) the House of Representatives to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules;

(ii) the Senate to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance; or

(iii) either House of Congress to consider an extension disapproval resolution after June 30, 2018.

(d) COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—In order to contribute to the continued economic expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102.

SEC. 104. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) CONSULTATIONS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—

(1) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement;

(B) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(E) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(2) CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO FORCE.—Prior to exchanging notes providing for the entry into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(3) ENHANCED COORDINATION WITH CONGRESS.—

(A) WRITTEN GUIDELINES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with Congress, including coordination with designated congressional advisers under subsection (b), regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall enhance coordination with Congress through procedures to ensure—

(i) timely briefings upon request of any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress conducted under this title, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement; and

(ii) the sharing of detailed and timely information with Members of Congress, and their staff with proper security clearances as appropriate, regarding those negotiations and pertinent documents related to those negotiations (including classified information), and with committee staff with proper security clearances as would be appropriate in the light of the responsibilities of that committee over the trade agreements programs affected by those negotiations.

(C) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(b) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—

(A) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In each Congress, any Member of the House of Representatives may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consulting with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(B) SENATE.—In each Congress, any Member of the Senate may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(2) CONSULTATIONS WITH DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations designated under paragraph (1).

(3) ACCREDITATION.—Each Member of Congress designated as a congressional adviser under paragraph (1) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiating sessions relating to trade agreements.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY GROUPS ON NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—By not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 30 days after the convening of each Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall convene the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall convene the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations (in this subsection referred to collectively as the ''congressional advisory groups'').

(2) MEMBERS AND FUNCTIONS.—

(A) MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the House of Representatives:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the House of Representatives that would have, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(B) MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the Senate:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the Senate that would have, under the Rules of the Senate, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(C) ACCREDITATION.—Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in negotiations for any trade agreement to which this title applies. Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in the negotiations by reason of which the member is in one of the congressional advisory groups.

(D) CONSULTATION AND ADVICE.—The congressional advisory groups shall consult with and provide advice to the Trade Representative regarding the formulation of specific objectives, negotiating strategies and positions, the development of the applicable trade agreement, and compliance and enforcement of the negotiated commitments under the trade agreement.

(E) CHAIR.—The House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(F) COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES.—Members of any committee represented on one of the congressional advisory groups may submit comments to the member of the appropriate congressional advisory group from that committee regarding any matter related to a negotiation for any trade agreement to which this title applies.

(3) GUIDELINES.—

(A) PURPOSE AND REVISION.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall provide for, among other things—

(i) detailed briefings on a fixed timetable to be specified in the guidelines of the congressional advisory groups regarding negotiating objectives and positions and the status of the applicable negotiations, beginning as soon as practicable after the congressional advisory groups are convened, with more frequent briefings as trade negotiations enter the final stage;

(ii) access by members of the congressional advisory groups, and staff with proper security clearances, to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(iii) the closest practicable coordination between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups at all critical periods during the negotiations, including at negotiation sites;

(iv) after the applicable trade agreement is concluded, consultation regarding ongoing compliance and enforcement of negotiated commitments under the trade agreement; and

(v) the timeframe for submitting the report required under section 105(d)(3).

(4) REQUEST FOR MEETING.—Upon the request of a majority of either of the congressional advisory groups, the President shall meet with that congressional advisory group before initiating negotiations with respect to a trade agreement, or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

(d) CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) PURPOSES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) facilitate transparency;

(B) encourage public participation; and

(C) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include procedures that—

(A) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(B) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(4) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(e) CONSULTATIONS WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with advisory committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall enhance coordination with advisory committees described in that paragraph through procedures to ensure—

(A) timely briefings of advisory committees and regular opportunities for advisory committees to provide input throughout the negotiation process on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by those committees; and

(B) the sharing of detailed and timely information with each member of an advisory committee regarding negotiations and pertinent documents related to the negotiation (including classified information) on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas the member represents, and with a designee with proper security clearances of each such member as appropriate.

(3) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF TRANSPARENCY OFFICER IN THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) There shall be in the Office one Chief Transparency Officer. The Chief Transparency Officer shall consult with Congress on transparency policy, coordinate transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.''.

SEC. 105. NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS BEFORE NEGOTIATION.—

(1) NOTICE.—The President, with respect to any agreement that is subject to the provisions of section 103(b), shall—

(A) provide, at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, written notice to Congress of the President's intention to enter into the negotiations with that country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President intends to initiate those negotiations, the specific United States objectives for the negotiations with that country, and whether the President intends to seek an agreement, or changes to an existing agreement;

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consult regarding the negotiations with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, such other committees of the House and Senate as the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c);

(C) upon the request of a majority of the members of either the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c), meet with the requesting congressional advisory group before initiating the negotiations or at any other time concerning the negotiations; and

(D) after consulting with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance, and at least 30 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and regularly update thereafter, a detailed and comprehensive summary of the specific objectives with respect to the negotiations, and a description of how the agreement, if successfully concluded, will further those objectives and benefit the United States.

(2) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURE.—

(A) ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to the subject matter under section 102(b)(3)(B) with any country, the President shall—

(i) assess whether United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country;

(ii) consider whether the tariff levels bound and applied throughout the world with respect to imports from the United States are higher than United States tariffs and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(iii) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(B) SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS ON IMPORT SENSITIVE PRODUCTS.—(i) Before initiating negotiations with regard to agriculture and, with respect to agreements described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 107(a), as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(I) identify those agricultural products subject to tariff rate quotas on the date of enactment of this Act, and agricultural products subject to tariff reductions by the United States as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, for which the rate of duty was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate which was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994;

(II) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning—

(aa) whether any further tariff reductions on the products identified under subclause (I) should be appropriate, taking into account the impact of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned;

(bb) whether the products so identified face unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including those not based on scientific principles in contravention of the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(cc) whether the countries participating in the negotiations maintain export subsidies or other programs, policies, or practices that distort world trade in such products and the impact of such programs, policies, and practices on United States producers of the products;

(III) request that the International Trade Commission prepare an assessment of the probable economic effects of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned and on the United States economy as a whole; and

(IV) upon complying with subclauses (I), (II), and (III), notify the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of those products identified under subclause (I) for which the Trade Representative intends to seek tariff liberalization in the negotiations and the reasons for seeking such tariff liberalization.

(ii) If, after negotiations described in clause (i) are commenced—

(I) the United States Trade Representative identifies any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) for tariff reductions which were not the subject of a notification under clause (i)(IV), or

(II) any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) is the subject of a request for tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations,

the Trade Representative shall, as soon as practicable, notify the committees referred to in clause (i)(IV) of those products and the reasons for seeking such tariff reductions.

(3) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE FISHING INDUSTRY.—Before initiating, or continuing, negotiations that directly relate to fish or shellfish trade with any country, the President shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and shall keep the Committees apprised of the negotiations on an ongoing and timely basis.

(4) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING TEXTILES.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to textiles and apparel products with any country, the President shall—

(A) assess whether United States tariffs on textile and apparel products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(B) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(5) ADHERENCE TO EXISTING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT AGREEMENT OBLIGATIONS.—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the President shall take into account the extent to which that country has implemented, or has accelerated the implementation of, its international trade and investment commitments to the United States, including pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE ENTRY INTO AGREEMENT.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Before entering into any trade agreement under section 103(b), the President shall consult with—

(A) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(B) each other committee of the House and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters which would be affected by the trade agreement; and

(C) the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

(2) SCOPE.—The consultation described in paragraph (1) shall include consultation with respect to—

(A) the nature of the agreement;

(B) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(C) the implementation of the agreement under section 106, including the general effect of the agreement on existing laws.

(3) REPORT REGARDING UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—

(A) CHANGES IN CERTAIN TRADE LAWS.—The President, not less than 180 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

(i) the range of proposals advanced in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could require amendments to title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(ii) how these proposals relate to the objectives described in section 102(b)(16).

(B) RESOLUTIONS.—(i) At any time after the transmission of the report under subparagraph (A), if a resolution is introduced with respect to that report in either House of Congress, the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) shall apply to that resolution if—

(I) no other resolution with respect to that report has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to those procedures; and

(II) no procedural disapproval resolution under section 106(b) introduced with respect to a trade agreement entered into pursuant to the negotiations to which the report under subparagraph (A) relates has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be.

(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ''resolution'' means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ finds that the proposed changes to United States trade remedy laws contained in the report of the President transmitted to Congress on _____ under section 105(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 with respect to _____, are inconsistent with the negotiating objectives described in section 102(b)(16) of that Act.'', with the first blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress, the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date of the report, and the third blank space being filled with the name of the country or countries involved.

(iii) Resolutions in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee.

(iv) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(v) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(vi) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(vii) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) shall apply to resolutions.

(4) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS.—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(e)(1)) regarding any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 shall be provided to the President, Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 103(a)(2) or 106(a)(1)(A) of the intention of the President to enter into the agreement.

(c) INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION ASSESSMENT.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO COMMISSION.—The President, not later than 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall provide the International Trade Commission (referred to in this subsection as the ''Commission'') with the details of the agreement as it exists at that time and request the Commission to prepare and submit an assessment of the agreement as described in paragraph (2). Between the time the President makes the request under this paragraph and the time the Commission submits the assessment, the President shall keep the Commission current with respect to the details of the agreement.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 105 calendar days after the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report assessing the likely impact of the agreement on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors, including the impact the agreement will have on the gross domestic product, exports and imports, aggregate employment and employment opportunities, the production, employment, and competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the agreement, and the interests of United States consumers.

(3) REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE.—In preparing the assessment under paragraph (2), the Commission shall review available economic assessments regarding the agreement, including literature regarding any substantially equivalent proposed agreement, and shall provide in its assessment a description of the analyses used and conclusions drawn in such literature, and a discussion of areas of consensus and divergence between the various analyses and conclusions, including those of the Commission regarding the agreement.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make each assessment under paragraph (2) available to the public.

(d) REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES WITH AGREEMENT.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) conduct environmental reviews of future trade and investment agreements, consistent with Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169), dated November 16, 1999, and its relevant guidelines; and

(B) submit a report on those reviews and on the content and operation of consultative mechanisms established pursuant to section 102(c) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(2) EMPLOYMENT IMPACT REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169) to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria; and

(B) submit a report on such reviews to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(3) REPORT ON LABOR RIGHTS.—The President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on a timeframe determined in accordance with section 104(c)(3)(B)(v)—

(A) a meaningful labor rights report of the country, or countries, with respect to which the President is negotiating; and

(B) a description of any provisions that would require changes to the labor laws and labor practices of the United States.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make all reports required under this subsection available to the public.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E), the President shall also submit to Congress a plan for implementing and enforcing the agreement.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The implementation and enforcement plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) BORDER PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required at border entry points, including a list of additional customs and agricultural inspectors.

(B) AGENCY STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required by Federal agencies responsible for monitoring and implementing the trade agreement, including personnel required by the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture (including additional personnel required to implement sanitary and phytosanitary measures in order to obtain market access for United States exports), the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Treasury, and such other agencies as may be necessary.

(C) CUSTOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS.—A description of the additional equipment and facilities needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(D) IMPACT ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—A description of the impact the trade agreement will have on State and local governments as a result of increases in trade.

(E) COST ANALYSIS.—An analysis of the costs associated with each of the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) BUDGET SUBMISSION.—The President shall include a request for the resources necessary to support the plan required by paragraph (1) in the first budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, after the date of the submission of the plan.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the plan required under this subsection available to the public.

(f) OTHER REPORTS.—

(1) REPORT ON PENALTIES.—Not later than one year after the imposition by the United States of a penalty or remedy permitted by a trade agreement to which this title applies, the President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the penalty or remedy applied under United States law in enforcing United States rights under the trade agreement, which shall address whether the penalty or remedy was effective in changing the behavior of the targeted party and whether the penalty or remedy had any adverse impact on parties or interests not party to the dispute.

(2) REPORT ON IMPACT OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 5 years thereafter, the United States International Trade Commission shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements with respect to which Congress has enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures since January 1, 1984.

(3) ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS AND REPORTS.—(A) The United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate after acceptance of a petition for review or taking an enforcement action in regard to an obligation under a trade agreement, including a labor or environmental obligation. During such consultations, the United States Trade Representative shall describe the matter, including the basis for such action and the application of any relevant legal obligations.

(B) As part of the report required pursuant to section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213), the President shall report annually to Congress on enforcement actions taken pursuant to a trade agreement to which the United States is a party, as well as on any public reports issued by Federal agencies on enforcement matters relating to a trade agreement.

(g) ADDITIONAL COORDINATION WITH MEMBERS.—Any Member of the House of Representatives may submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and any Member of the Senate may submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate the views of that Member on any matter relevant to a proposed trade agreement, and the relevant Committee shall receive those views for consideration.

SEC. 106. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.—Any agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(A) the President, at least 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into the trade agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the

President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(B) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the agreement, publishes the text of the agreement on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(C) within 60 days after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement;

(D) the President, at least 30 days before submitting to Congress the materials under subparagraph (E), submits to Congress—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement;

(E) after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft of an implementing bill described in section 103(b)(3);

(ii) a statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the trade agreement; and

(iii) the supporting information described in paragraph (2)(A);

(F) the implementing bill is enacted into law; and

(G) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the agreement enters into force with respect to a party to the agreement, submits written notice to Congress that the President has determined that the party has taken measures necessary to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date on which the agreement enters into force.

(2) SUPPORTING INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The supporting information required under paragraph (1)(E)(iii) consists of—

(i) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement—

(I) asserting that the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(II) setting forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(aa) how and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, and objectives referred to in subclause (I);

(bb) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(cc) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(dd) how the implementing bill meets the standards set forth in section 103(b)(3).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the supporting information described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(3) RECIPROCAL BENEFITS.—In order to ensure that a foreign country that is not a party to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) does not receive benefits under the agreement unless the country is also subject to the obligations under the agreement, the implementing bill submitted with respect to the agreement shall provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement apply only to the parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement. The implementing bill may also provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement do not apply uniformly to all parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(4) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or other understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacts an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress,

shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) FOR LACK OF NOTICE OR CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if during the 60-day period beginning on the date that one House of Congress agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution for lack of notice or consultations with respect to such trade agreement or agreements, the other House separately agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.

(B) PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.—(i) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''procedural disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.'', with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements with respect to which the President is considered to have failed or refused to notify or consult.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i) and paragraphs (3)(C) and (4)(C), the President has ''failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015'' on negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements if—

(I) the President has failed or refused to consult (as the case may be) in accordance with sections 104 and 105 and this section with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(II) guidelines under section 104 have not been developed or met with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(III) the President has not met with the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations pursuant to a request made under section 104(c)(4) with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements; or

(IV) the agreement or agreements fail to make progress in achieving the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title.

(2) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTIONS.—(A) Procedural disapproval resolutions—

(i) in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee; and

(ii) in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(B) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to a procedural disapproval resolution introduced with respect to a trade agreement if no other procedural disapproval resolution with respect to that trade agreement has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, and if no resolution described in clause (ii) of section 105(b)(3)(B) with respect to that trade agreement has been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) of such section.

(C) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(D) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(3) CONSIDERATION IN SENATE OF CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION TO REMOVE TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(A) REPORTING OF RESOLUTION.—If, when the Committee on Finance of the Senate meets on whether to report an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b), the committee fails to favorably report the bill, the committee shall report a resolution described in subparagraph (C).

(B) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A) if the Committee on Finance reports a resolution described in subparagraph (C) and such resolution is agreed to by the Senate.

(C) RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A resolution described in this subparagraph is a resolution of the Senate originating from the Committee on Finance the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.'', with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A).

(D) PROCEDURES.—If the Senate does not agree to a motion to invoke cloture on the

motion to proceed to a resolution described in subparagraph (C), the resolution shall be committed to the Committee on Finance.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF A CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION.—

(A) QUALIFICATIONS FOR REPORTING RESOLUTION.—If—

(i) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives reports an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b) with other than a favorable recommendation; and

(ii) a Member of the House of Representatives has introduced a consultation and compliance resolution on the legislative day following the filing of a report to accompany the implementing bill with other than a favorable recommendation,

then the Committee on Ways and Means shall consider a consultation and compliance resolution pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF A QUALIFYING RESOLUTION.—(i) Not later than the fourth legislative day after the date of introduction of the resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means shall meet to consider a resolution meeting the qualifications set forth in subparagraph (A).

(ii) After consideration of one such resolution by the Committee on Ways and Means, this subparagraph shall not apply to any other such resolution.

(iii) If the Committee on Ways and Means has not reported the resolution by the sixth legislative day after the date of its introduction, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(C) CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A consultation and compliance resolution—

(i) is a resolution of the House of Representatives, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.'', with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

(D) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements which are the object of a consultation and compliance resolution if such resolution is adopted by the House.

(5) FOR FAILURE TO MEET OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the United States Trade Representative, shall transmit to Congress a report setting forth the strategy of the executive branch to address concerns of Congress regarding whether dispute settlement panels and the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization have added to obligations, or diminished rights, of the United States, as described in section 102(b)(15)(C). Trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill with respect to an agreement negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organization unless the Secretary of Commerce has issued such report by the deadline specified in this paragraph.

(6) LIMITATIONS ON PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country to which the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking are applicable and the government of which does not fully comply with such standards and is not making significant efforts to bring the country into compliance (commonly referred to as a ''tier 3'' country), as determined in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons submitted under section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)).

(B) MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ''minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking'' means the standards set forth in section 108 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106).

(c) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (b) of this section, section 103(c), and section 105(b)(3) are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with the full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.

SEC. 107. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS FOR WHICH NEGOTIATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEGUN.

(a) CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding the prenegotiation notification and consultation requirement described in section 105(a), if an agreement to which section 103(b) applies—

(1) is entered into under the auspices of the World Trade Organization,

(2) is entered into with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries with respect to which notifications have been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

(3) is entered into with the European Union,

(4) is an agreement with respect to international trade in services entered into with WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(5) is an agreement with respect to environmental goods entered into with WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

and results from negotiations that were commenced before the date of the enactment of this Act, subsection (b) shall apply.

(b) TREATMENT OF AGREEMENTS.—In the case of any agreement to which subsection (a) applies, the applicability of the trade authorities procedures to implementing bills shall be determined without regard to the requirements of section 105(a) (relating only to notice prior to initiating negotiations), and any resolution under paragraph (1)(B), (3)(C), or (4)(C) of section 106(b) shall not be in order on the basis of a failure or refusal to comply with the provisions of section 105(a), if (and only if) the President, as soon as feasible after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) notifies Congress of the negotiations described in subsection (a), the specific United States objectives in the negotiations, and whether the President is seeking a new agreement or changes to an existing agreement; and

(2) before and after submission of the notice, consults regarding the negotiations with the committees referred to in section 105(a)(1)(B) and the House and Senate Advisory Groups on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

SEC. 108. SOVEREIGNTY.

(a) UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN EVENT OF CONFLICT.—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b), nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States shall have effect.

(b) AMENDMENTS OR MODIFICATIONS OF UNITED STATES LAW.—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall prevent the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States from amending or modifying any law of the United States, that State, or that locality (as the case may be).

(c) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS.—Reports, including findings and recommendations, issued by dispute settlement panels convened pursuant to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall have no binding effect on the law of the United States, the Government of the United States, or the law or government of any State or locality of the United States.

SEC. 109. INTERESTS OF SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Trade Representative should facilitate participation by small businesses in the trade negotiation process; and

(2) the functions of the Office of the United States Trade Representative relating to small businesses should continue to be reflected in the title of the Assistant United States Trade Representative assigned the responsibility for small businesses.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS INTERESTS.—The Assistant United States Trade Representative for Small Business, Market Access, and Industrial Competitiveness shall be responsible for ensuring that the interests of small businesses are considered in all trade negotiations in accordance with the objective described in section 102(a)(8).

SEC. 110. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS; APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ADVICE FROM UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—Section 131 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2151) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''section 2103(a) or (b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 2103(b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion

Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''section 2103(a)(3)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103(a)(4)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(2) HEARINGS.—Section 132 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2152) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(3) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—Section 133(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2153(a)) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(4) PREREQUISITES FOR OFFERS.—Section 134 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2154) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(5) INFORMATION AND ADVICE FROM PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS.—Section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(II) by striking ''not later than the date on which the President notifies the Congress under section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''not later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 106(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 2102 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 102 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(6) PROCEDURES RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING BILLS.—Section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(7) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 162(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2212(a)) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(b) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—For purposes of applying sections 125, 126, and 127 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2135, 2136, and 2137)—

(1) any trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as an agreement entered into under section 101 or 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2111 or 2112), as appropriate; and

(2) any proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as a proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112).

SEC. 111. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE.—The term ''Agreement on Agriculture'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(2) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(2)).

(2) AGREEMENT ON SAFEGUARDS.—The term ''Agreement on Safeguards'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(13) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(13)).

(3) AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES.—The term ''Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(12)).

(4) ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT.—The term ''Antidumping Agreement'' means the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 referred to in section 101(d)(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(7)).

(5) APPELLATE BODY.—The term ''Appellate Body'' means the Appellate Body established under Article 17.1 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(6) COMMON MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''common multilateral environmental agreement'' means any agreement specified in subparagraph (B) or included under subparagraph (C) to which both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations are full parties, including any current or future mutually agreed upon protocols, amendments, annexes, or adjustments to such an agreement.

(B) AGREEMENTS SPECIFIED.—The agreements specified in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, done at Washington March 3, 1973 (27 UST 1087; TIAS 8249).

(ii) The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, done at Montreal September 16, 1987.

(iii) The Protocol of 1978 Relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, done at London February 17, 1978.

(iv) The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, done at Ramsar February 2, 1971 (TIAS 11084).

(v) The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, done at Canberra May 20, 1980 (33 UST 3476).

(vi) The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, done at Washington December 2, 1946 (62 Stat. 1716).

(vii) The Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, done at Washington May 31, 1949 (1 UST 230).

(C) ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS.—Both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations may agree to include any other multilateral environmental or conservation agreement to which they are full parties as a common multilateral environmental agreement under this paragraph.

(7) CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term ''core labor standards'' means—

(A) freedom of association;

(B) the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;

(C) the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor;

(D) the effective abolition of child labor and a prohibition on the worst forms of child labor; and

(E) the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

(8) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UNDERSTANDING.—The term ''Dispute Settlement Understanding'' means the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16)).

(9) ENABLING CLAUSE.—The term ''Enabling Clause'' means the Decision on Differential and More Favourable Treatment, Reciprocity and Fuller Participation of Developing Countries (L/4903), adopted November 28, 1979, under GATT 1947 (as defined in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501)).

(10) ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—The term ''environmental laws'', with respect to the laws of the United States, means environmental statutes and regulations enforceable by action of the Federal Government.

(11) GATT 1994.—The term ''GATT 1994'' has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

(12) GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TRADE IN SERVICES.—The term ''General Agreement on Trade in Services'' means the General Agreement on Trade in Services (referred to in section 101(d)(14) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(14))).

(13) GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT AGREEMENT.—The term ''Government Procurement Agreement'' means the Agreement on Government Procurement referred to in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(17)).

(14) ILO.—The term ''ILO'' means the International Labor Organization.

(15) IMPORT SENSITIVE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT.—The term ''import sensitive agricultural product'' means an agricultural product—

(A) with respect to which, as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, the rate of duty was the subject of tariff reductions by the United States and, pursuant to such Agreements, was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate that was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994; or

(B) which was subject to a tariff rate quota on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(16) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGREEMENT.—The term ''Information Technology Agreement'' means the Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products of the World Trade Organization, agreed to at Singapore December 13, 1996.

(17) INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term ''internationally recognized core labor standards'' means the core labor standards only as stated in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-Up (1998).

(18) LABOR LAWS.—The term ''labor laws'' means the statutes and regulations, or provisions thereof, of a party to the negotiations that are directly related to core labor standards as well as other labor protections for children and minors and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health, and for the United States, includes Federal statutes and regulations addressing those standards, protections, or conditions, but does not include State or local labor laws.

(19) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of the United States; and

(C) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of a foreign country and is controlled by entities described in subparagraph (B) or United States citizens, or both.

(20) URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS.—The term ''Uruguay Round Agreements'' has the meaning given that term in section 2(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(7)).

(21) WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION; WTO.—The terms ''World Trade Organization'' and ''WTO'' mean the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(22) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term ''WTO Agreement'' means the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

(23) WTO MEMBER.—The term ''WTO member'' has the meaning given that term in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(10)).

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

SEC. 202. APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) REPEAL OF SNAPBACK.—Section 233 of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–40; 125 Stat. 416) is repealed.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, the provisions of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on December 31, 2013, and as amended by this title, shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to petitions for certification filed under chapter 2, 3, or 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after such date of enactment.

(c) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of any such chapter, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF TERMINATION PROVISIONS.—Section 285 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''June 30, 2021''.

(b) TRAINING FUNDS.—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''shall not exceed'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021.''.

(c) REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 246(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''June 30, 2021''.

(d) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—Section 245(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317(a)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''June 30, 2021''.

(2) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—Section 255(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2345(a)) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2012 and 2013'' and all that follows through ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015 through 2021''.

(3) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.—Section 298(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401g(a)) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2012 and 2013'' and all that follows through ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015 through 2021''.

SEC. 204. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND REPORTING.

(a) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—Section 239(j) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2311(j)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''DATA REPORTING'' and inserting ''PERFORMANCE MEASURES'';

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''a quarterly'' and inserting ''an annual''; and

(ii) by striking ''data'' and inserting ''measures'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''core'' and inserting ''primary''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''that promote efficiency and effectiveness'' after ''assistance program'';

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''CORE INDICATORS DESCRIBED'' and inserting ''INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) PRIMARY INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE DESCRIBED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The primary indicators of performance referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall consist of—

''(I) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who are in unsubsidized employment during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program;

''(II) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program and who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth calendar quarter after exit from the program;

''(III) the median earnings of workers described in subclause (I);

''(IV) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, subject to clause (ii), obtain a recognized postsecondary credential or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, during participation in the program or within one year after exit from the program; and

''(V) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, during a year while receiving such benefits, are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential or employment and who are achieving measurable gains in skills toward such a credential or employment.

''(ii) INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.—For purposes of clause (i)(IV), a worker who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who obtained a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted for purposes of that clause only if the worker, in addition to obtaining such a diploma or its recognized equivalent, has obtained or retained employment or is in an education or training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential within one year after exit from the program.'';

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''DATA'' and inserting ''MEASURES'';

(B) by striking ''quarterly'' and inserting ''annual''; and

(C) by striking ''data'' and inserting ''measures''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) ACCESSIBILITY OF STATE PERFORMANCE REPORTS.—The Secretary shall, on an annual basis, make available (including by electronic means), in an easily understandable format, the reports of cooperating States or cooperating State agencies required by paragraph (1) and the information contained in those reports.''.

(b) COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF DATA.—Section 249B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''enrolled in'' and inserting ''who received'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''complete'' and inserting ''exited''; and

(II) by striking ''who were enrolled in'' and inserting '', including who received'';

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''complete'' and inserting ''exited'';

(iv) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''complete'' and inserting ''exit''; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) The average cost per worker of receiving training approved under section 236.

''(H) The percentage of workers who received training approved under section 236 and obtained unsubsidized employment in a field related to that training.''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking ''quarterly'' each place it appears and inserting ''annual''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) The median earnings of workers described in section 239(j)(2)(A)(i)(III) during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program, expressed as a percentage of the median earnings of such workers before the calendar quarter in which such workers began receiving benefits under this chapter.''; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) the reports required under section 239(j);''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''a quarterly'' and inserting ''an annual''.

(c) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL DEFINED.—Section 247 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(19) The term 'recognized postsecondary credential' means a credential consisting of an industry-recognized certificate or certification, a certificate of completion of an apprenticeship, a license recognized by a State or the Federal Government, or an associate or baccalaureate degree.''.

SEC. 205. APPLICABILITY OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—

(1) PETITIONS FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014, AND BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CERTIFICATIONS OF WORKERS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(i) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIALS OF CERTIFICATIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall—

(I) reconsider that determination; and

(II) if the group of workers meets the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(iii) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this clause is a petition for a certification of eligibility for a group of workers filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be eligible, on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to receive benefits only under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) COMPUTATION OF MAXIMUM BENEFITS.—Benefits received by a worker described in clause (i) under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be included in any determination of the maximum benefits for which the worker is eligible under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) PETITIONS FILED BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014.—A worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or before December 31, 2013, shall continue to be eligible to apply for and receive benefits under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

(3) QUALIFYING SEPARATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PETITIONS FILED WITHIN 90 DAYS OF DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Section 223(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be applied and administered by substituting ''before January 1, 2014'' for ''more than one year before the date of the petition on which such certification was granted'' for purposes of determining whether a worker is eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and on or before the date that is 90 days after such date of enactment.

(b) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

(1) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(B) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF CERTAIN PETITIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall—

(i) reconsider that determination; and

(ii) if the firm meets the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(C) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this subparagraph is a petition for a certification of eligibility filed by a firm or its representative under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS THAT DID NOT SUBMIT PETITIONS BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 2014, AND DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall certify a firm described in subparagraph (B) as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, if the firm or its representative files a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 not later than 90 days after such date of enactment.

(B) FIRM DESCRIBED.—A firm described in this subparagraph is a firm that the Secretary determines would have been certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance if—

(i) the firm or its representative had filed a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on a date during the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the provisions of chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, had been in effect on that date during the period described in clause (i).

SEC. 206. SUNSET PROVISIONS.

(a) APPLICATION OF PRIOR LAW.—Subject to subsection (b), beginning on July 1, 2021, the provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.), as in effect on January 1, 2014, shall be in effect and apply, except that in applying and administering such chapters—

(1) paragraph (1) of section 231(c) of that Act shall be applied and administered as if subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of that paragraph were not in effect;

(2) section 233 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by substituting ''104-week period'' for ''104-week period'' and all that follows through ''130-week period)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by substituting ''65'' for ''52''; and

(II) by substituting ''78-week period'' for ''52-week period'' each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (g) as if it read as follows:

''(g) PAYMENT OF TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES TO COMPLETE TRAINING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in order to assist an adversely affected worker to complete training approved for the worker under section 236 that leads to the completion of a degree or industry-recognized credential, payments may be made as trade readjustment allowances for not more than 13 weeks within such period of eligibility as the Secretary may prescribe to account for a break in training or for justifiable cause that follows the last week for which the worker is otherwise entitled to a trade readjustment allowance under this chapter if—

''(1) payment of the trade readjustment allowance for not more than 13 weeks is necessary for the worker to complete the training;

''(2) the worker participates in training in each such week; and

''(3) the worker—

''(A) has substantially met the performance benchmarks established as part of the training approved for the worker;

''(B) is expected to continue to make progress toward the completion of the training; and

''(C) will complete the training during that period of eligibility.'';

(3) section 245(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''June 30, 2022'' for ''December 31, 2007'';

(4) section 246(b)(1) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''June 30, 2022'' for ''the date that is 5 years'' and all that follows through ''State'';

(5) section 256(b) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021'' for ''each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and $4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning on October 1, 2007'';

(6) section 298(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021'' for ''each of the fiscal years'' and all that follows through ''October 1, 2007''; and

(7) section 285 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a), by substituting ''June 30, 2022'' for ''December 31, 2007'' each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (b) as if it read as follows:

''(b) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 3 after June 30, 2022.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved

under chapter 3 pursuant to a petition filed under section 251 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

''(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

''(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.

''(2) FARMERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 6 after June 30, 2022.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 6 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

''(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

''(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.''.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply on and after July 1, 2021, with respect to—

(1) workers certified as eligible for trade adjustment assistance benefits under chapter 2 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 221 of that Act before July 1, 2021;

(2) firms certified as eligible for technical assistance or grants under chapter 3 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 251 of that Act before July 1, 2021; and

(3) agricultural commodity producers certified as eligible for technical or financial assistance under chapter 6 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 292 of that Act before July 1, 2021.

SEC. 207. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF HEALTH COVERAGE TAX CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subparagraph (B) of section 35(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''before January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''before January 1, 2020''.

(b) COORDINATION WITH CREDIT FOR COVERAGE UNDER A QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN.—Subsection (g) of section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (13), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraphs:

''(11) ELECTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any taxpayer for any eligible coverage month unless such taxpayer elects the application of this section for such month.

''(B) TIMING AND APPLICABILITY OF ELECTION.—Except as the Secretary may provide—

''(i) an election to have this section apply for any eligible coverage month in a taxable year shall be made not later than the due date (including extensions) for the return of tax for the taxable year, and

''(ii) any election for this section to apply for an eligible coverage month shall apply for all subsequent eligible coverage months in the taxable year and, once made, shall be irrevocable with respect to such months.

''(12) COORDINATION WITH PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible coverage month to which the election under paragraph (11) applies shall not be treated as a coverage month (as defined in section 36B(c)(2)) for purposes of section 36B with respect to the taxpayer.

''(B) COORDINATION WITH ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—In the case of a taxpayer who makes the election under paragraph (11) with respect to any eligible coverage month in a taxable year or on behalf of whom any advance payment is made under section 7527 with respect to any month in such taxable year—

''(i) the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year shall be increased by the excess, if any, of—

''(I) the sum of any advance payments made on behalf of the taxpayer under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and section 7527 for months during such taxable year, over

''(II) the sum of the credits allowed under this section (determined without regard to paragraph (1)) and section 36B (determined without regard to subsection (f)(1) thereof) for such taxable year, and

''(ii) section 36B(f)(2) shall not apply with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable year, except that if such taxpayer received any advance payments under section 7527 for any month in such taxable year and is later allowed a credit under section 36B for such taxable year, then section 36B(f)(2)(B) shall be applied by substituting the amount determined under clause (i) for the amount determined under section 36B(f)(2)(A).''.

(c) EXTENSION OF ADVANCE PAYMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 7527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''August 1, 2003'' and inserting ''the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 7527(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''occurring'' and all that follows and inserting ''occurring—

''(A) after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015, and

''(B) prior to the first month for which an advance payment is made on behalf of such individual under subsection (a).''.

(d) INDIVIDUAL INSURANCE TREATED AS QUALIFIED HEALTH INSURANCE WITHOUT REGARD TO ENROLLMENT DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''insurance if the eligible individual'' and all that follows through ''For purposes of'' and inserting ''insurance. For purposes of''.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of such Code, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by striking ''insurance.'' and inserting ''insurance (other than coverage enrolled in through an Exchange established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (m) of section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting '', 35(g)(11)'' after ''30D(e)(4)''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) PLANS AVAILABLE ON INDIVIDUAL MARKET FOR USE OF TAX CREDIT.—The amendment made by subsection (d)(2) shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(3) TRANSITION RULE.—Notwithstanding section 35(g)(11)(B)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this title), an election to apply section 35 of such Code to an eligible coverage month (as defined in section 35(b) of such Code) (and not to claim the credit under section 36B of such Code with respect to such month) in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2013, and before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) may be made at any time on or after such date of enactment and before the expiration of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 6511(a) with respect to such taxable year; and

(B) may be made on an amended return.

(g) AGENCY OUTREACH.—As soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Health and Human Services, and Labor (or such Secretaries' delegates) and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (or the Director's delegate) shall carry out programs of public outreach, including on the Internet, to inform potential eligible individuals (as defined in section 35(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the extension of the credit under section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the availability of the election to claim such credit retroactively for coverage months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 208. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''September 30, 2024'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 29, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025.''.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) FURTHER ADDITIONAL PERIOD.—For the period beginning on July 15, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

''(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting '0.3464' for '0.21'; and

''(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting '0.3464' for '0.21'.''.

SEC. 209. CHILD TAX CREDIT NOT REFUNDABLE FOR TAXPAYERS ELECTING TO EXCLUDE FOREIGN EARNED INCOME FROM TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYERS EXCLUDING FOREIGN EARNED INCOME.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer elects to exclude any amount from gross income under section 911 for such taxable year.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 210. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than $1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 2.75 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 211. COVERAGE AND PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(s)(2)(F) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)(F)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including such renal dialysis services furnished on or after January 1, 2017, by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under section 1881(b)(14) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in section 1834(r)(2))''.

(b) PAYMENT.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(r) PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.—

''(1) PAYMENT RATE.—In the case of renal dialysis services (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1881(b)(14)) furnished under this part by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under such section during a year (beginning with 2017) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in paragraph (2)), the amount of payment under this part for such services shall be the base rate for renal dialysis services determined for such year under such section, as adjusted by any applicable geographic adjustment factor applied under subparagraph (D)(iv)(II) of such section and may be adjusted by the Secretary (on a budget neutral basis for payments under this paragraph) by any other adjustment factor under subparagraph (D) of such section.

''(2) INDIVIDUAL WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'individual with acute kidney injury' means an individual who has acute loss of renal function and does not receive renal dialysis services for which payment is made under section 1881(b)(14).''.

SEC. 212. MODIFICATION OF THE MEDICARE SEQUESTER FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

Section 251A(6)(D)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(6)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking ''0.0 percent'' and inserting ''0.25 percent''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 12, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 12, 2015, at 2:15 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''The Civil Nuclear Agreement with China: Balancing the Potential Risks and Rewards.''

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 12, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR–418, of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Exploring the Implementation and Future of the Veterans Choice Program.''

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 12, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 12, 2015, at 3:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 12, 2015, at 5:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 12, 2015, at 2 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 12, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 12, 2015, at 11 a.m.

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

RAUL HECTOR CASTRO PORT OF ENTRY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1075 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1075) to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the ''Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry.''

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 1075) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning, Wednesday, May 13; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the time be equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the second half; finally, that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:44 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 13, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, May 12, 2015*

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 12, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

GROWING U.S. NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week, while we were in recess, I traveled through my district and had the opportunity to appear on local television and to speak at civic clubs. Every time I mentioned that we have an $18 trillion debt, eastern North Carolinians were astounded and could not believe it.

To put the debt into perspective, on January 20, 2009, the total Federal debt stood at $10.6 trillion. As of last Friday, May 8, 2015, it has risen to $18—an increase of $7.5 trillion. Our debt now stands at over $200,000 for every full-time private sector worker. I agree with my constituents that it is time Congress stopped passing legislation that is not paid for.

Republicans have control of both Chambers of Congress now because voters want us to cut the debt and deficit and stop passing legislation that is not paid for.

In an April article for Forbes Magazine, Stan Collender wrote:

If you haven't noticed that Congress is about to increase the Federal deficit substantially, you haven't been watching carefully . . . or at all. Virtually every policy change that has already or soon will be considered seriously in the House and Senate will make the deficit higher rather than lower.

He further writes:

Based on what Congress is now considering, the deficit could be $100 billion or more next year than it otherwise would be if you just put Washington on autopilot; that is, if you made no changes to existing tax and spending policies. That would be an almost 21 percent increase.

It is obvious that our current fiscal policies are unsustainable.

Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking for months and even years about the waste of money in Afghanistan. It is sad to me that we have been pouring money down a rat hole known as Afghanistan.

We have spent over $685 billion in Afghanistan in the last 14 years, and President Obama just entered into a bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan late last year that ties us—our Nation—to a failed policy for another 9 years.

What have we gained there, with over 2,000 American troops killed, over 20,000 wounded, and billions of dollars spent? My answer to my own question is: nothing. Absolutely nothing.

A couple of weeks ago, I visited Walter Reed Army Medical Center to meet some of our veterans who had been wounded and are trying to heal. Some have wounds that will never truly heal.

Congress owes it to them—and all of our men and women who serve—and the American taxpayer to have a serious debate about our future in Afghanistan. I think it is high time to leave Afghanistan. Nine more years is absolutely fruitless.

Mr. Speaker, out of fairness to American taxpayers and future generations, we can no longer delay the need to pay down our debt and work toward sound economic policies. And out of fairness to our veterans and the men and women who serve in the military, we need to have a serious debate about spending more money and time in Afghanistan, when it has been proven and is well known by historians to be the graveyard of empires. Is it worth it, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

May God continue to bless our men and women in uniform and may God continue to bless America.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as I rise on the floor of the House, the Senate is about to begin debate on trade promotion authority, which is Congress ceding all authority to the President to negotiate agreements secretly, bring them before these bodies, and to say take it or leave it, an ''up-or-down'' vote, no amendments—ceding our constitutional authority. I hope the Senate turns him down.

Now, the President went to Oregon last week, to Nike, who originated the idea of chasing cheap labor around the world and outsourcing U.S. production. He gave a speech. I wasn't invited. That was fine with me. He went there to make fun of people like me who have fought these trade agreements for more than 20 years and have been more right than wrong about the impacts of these trade agreements.

He talked about labor, saying: Don't worry. This is going to put enforceable labor provisions on Vietnam, where you can't have a union, where you have child labor, prison labor, and you get paid 60 cents an hour. He says: We are going to fix all that.

Well, I have read that chapter. I can't talk about it. It is classified. But I can say this. It will be as effective in dealing with the abuses—and, Brunei is even worse than Vietnam—in Brunei or Vietnam, in terms of their labor and working conditions, as the recent U.S. Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Guess what? In Colombia, they still kill people who try and form unions, and we have no recourse against them. So it is not going to fix that problem.

He says: Well, I was in law school when NAFTA passed, and these people are just living in the past. Well, unfortunately, you are bringing the past to the future.

This agreement has been vetted by 500 corporations in real time. They can put it on a big screen in their boardroom, bring in all their lawyers and staff, and say: Let's change these words. Let's make it look like the labor stuff is enforceable, but then we put this here, and it isn't.

I can read it, too. I can go to the basement of this building and I can read it in secret, and I can't talk about it.

So this is an agreement that is for labor, for the environment, for consumers, when it is being written in corporate boardrooms and then submitted to the Special Trade Representative who then puts that text into a special agreement we can't see? No, the President is very, very wrong about that.

He says we are wrong because we are making things up about undermining regulation, food safety, worker safety, and even financial regulations. Well, we are not. This has something called investor-state dispute resolution, which means anyone can challenge any U.S. law. Any foreign corporation, Japanese corporation, or Bruneian corporation can challenge a U.S. law in a secret tribunal staffed by lawyers who have no conflict of interest, no legal body underlying their decisions, and who one day represents corporations and the next day sit as judges.

And he is right, they can't make us repeal our laws. He is absolutely right. But they can make us pay to keep them. We had to pay hundreds of millions of dollars to Brazil to keep subsidizing cotton in this country.

Now, I wasn't into subsidizing the cotton, but it really irks me that we were subsidizing it here, and because of the power of the farm lobby, we paid Brazil hundreds of millions of dollars to keep that subsidy.

The Japanese were killing dolphins to catch tuna, and we passed a law to just label dolphin-safe tuna so consumers could decide, too. We had a big campaign with friendly dolphins.

The Mexicans won in the same process. They won a judgment against the United States of America—that it was an unfair trade barrier—and we had to pay the Mexicans to not fish for dolphins. And then they appealed yet to another place and actually made us eliminate dolphin-safe altogether.

Yes, it can undermine our labor laws, it can undermine our environmental laws, and it can undermine our consumer protection laws when they are challenged by a foreign corporation. So the President is yet wrong again. We are not making stuff up.

Currency manipulation, the Japanese wall—every U.S. auto manufacturer knows about this. They manipulate currency. Therefore, their vehicles are $8,000 cheaper than they would be if their currency was fairly traded—$8,000—and we are going to compete on a level playing field?

This agreement gives them full access, with no tariffs, to our pickup truck market, which means the end of pickup truck manufacturing in America. The iconic Fords and Chevys, forget about it. They are gone with an $8,000 advance.

We couldn't put currency manipulation into this and say that is not fair, because the Japanese didn't want it. But they are giving us a big concession. They are going to buy some American rice. Well, isn't that great? We are trading tens of thousands of auto jobs for a few jobs working in the rice fields in California. And that will only last until the Japanese challenge the rice farmers. Because they get subsidized Federal water, they will ultimately be barred from the Japanese market because they will lose in a secret tribunal under this ISDS provision.

Finally, I have just got to wonder what the President is talking about when he says we are speculating and it is made up.

Oh, Mexican trucks. I predicted when we had the agreement with Mexico that they would force us to let Mexican trucks drive freely in America. Guess what? We lost that, and they put tariffs on our goods because they couldn't drive their trucks all around our country.

There is great precedence here. He hasn't fixed a darned thing. He probably hasn't even read the agreement.

WOMEN'S HEALTH WEEK AND NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Women's Health Week and National Nurses Week.

Yes, this week is Women's Health Week—a time to raise awareness about manageable steps women can take to improve their health.

Currently, one in five women is in fair or poor health, and almost 40 percent report struggling with mental health issues. Women are less likely than men to be employed full time, meaning they are less likely to be eligible for employer-based health benefits.

Difficulty finding and maintaining employer-based coverage is especially pronounced for older women, who are more likely to develop conditions like breast cancer. But thanks to ObamaCare, women's health took a monumental step forward.

Before ObamaCare, insurance companies could discriminate against women, denying coverage to women—of course, to all people—due to preexisting conditions, such as cancer and even previous pregnancies. Today, being a woman or becoming pregnant is no longer a preexisting condition.

The National Women's Law Center estimates that insurers' practice of gender rating cost women about a billion dollars a year before ObamaCare. ObamaCare ends gender rating. It requires health plans to cover women's preventive services, like contraceptive care and OB/GYN visits, without cost sharing.

Accessible contraceptive coverage is particularly important. Prior to ObamaCare, more than half of all women between the ages of 18 and 34 struggled to afford it.

In addition, every health insurance plan is now required to offer maternity care. Prior to the passage of ObamaCare, the National Women's Law Center found that only 12 percent of private plans included maternity services.

And even without those major improvements, health care accessibility remains a challenge. Almost one out of three women reports not visiting a doctor due to the cost.

Women are still less likely to be insured than men. And even when they have insurance, women face increasingly high deductibles, copayments, and other cost sharing requirements, forcing major sacrifices just in order to make ends meet.

A recent study found that over 40 percent of women have unmet medical needs due to the cost of medical care. This problem is particularly acute in States that have not expanded Medicaid. Currently, 3 million uninsured women live in States that have not expanded Medicaid coverage.

So we have come so far in increasing access to affordable and adequate health care for women, but we still have a long way to go.

This week is also National Nurses Week, and I can't pass up the chance to recognize the important contributions that nurses make—improving women's and men's health care every day. After all, we might not have ObamaCare if it weren't for the support and advocacy for nurses all across the country.

This year's National Nurses Week 2015 theme is: ''Ethical Practice. Quality Care.'' It recognizes the importance of ethics in nursing and acknowledges the strong commitment, compassion, and care nurses display in the practice of their profession.

Registered Nurses, or RNs, are the largest segment of the health care workforce, with 3.1 million RNs, and that number is growing. RNs meet Americans' health care needs on every level. They provide preventive care, such as screenings and immunizations; they diagnose, treat, and help to manage chronic illnesses; and they help patients make critical health decisions every day. But most importantly, nurses take the time to care for each patient during a difficult time in their or their family's lives.

□ 1215

We have plenty of evidence that hiring more nurses leads directly to improved quality care and patient outcomes.

We have seen study after study showing this connection, including a recent analysis showing that one out of every four unanticipated events that leads to death or injury are related to nurse understaffing; yet we continue to see nurses understaffed at medical facilities.

Nurses around the country have identified understaffing as the single most important barrier they face in providing quality care to their patients. It is also a barrier to quality improvement and efforts to reduce preventable readmissions.

I have introduced legislation called the Safe Nurse Staffing for Patient Safety and Quality Care Act, which would help solve this serious problem by establishing a Federal minimum standard in all hospitals for direct care registered nurse to patient staffing ratios.

This problem is not confined to hospitals. Nursing homes are currently required to only have a direct care nurse on staff 8 hours a day. This simply makes no sense. Patients are in these facilities 24 hours a day and need access to round-the-clock nursing care. That is why I have introduced the Put a Registered Nurse in the Nursing Home Act.

We should be thanking nurses, who are considered the most ethical of our healthcare system, and I applaud them.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

As the gavel sounds and a new day of business begins, we pause to acknowledge the eternal, creative, redemptive spirit of life that unites all people, transcending political persuasion, personal bias, or cultural creed.

We come seeking the wisdom of the ages that points us away from easy choices of rigid certitude that divide and separate but, rather, guides us toward challenging compromises of flexible possibility that connect and unite.

May we seek a common good where all people know freedom, equality, justice, and mercy; a common good grounded in compassion, gratitude, and generosity. May we remember we are one human family in which the pain of one is the pain of all and the joy of one is the joy of all.

May we find this common good in the conversations, deliberations, and achievements of this day and in the countless opportunities that come our way each and every day.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

EASTERN EUROPE PROMOTES PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week, I was grateful to participate in a congressional delegation with congressional colleagues MADELEINE BORDALLO and REID RIBBLE, coordinated ably by Army Majors Bobby Cox and Jimmy Crook, to visit dynamic Eastern European allies.

In the Czech Republic, it was heartwarming to see the affection for America at Pilsen upon the 70th anniversary of their liberation by the U.S. Army.

M.K. Air Base in Romania is a symbol of growing Romanian-U.S. defense cooperation. The heroic and courageous leaders at Kiev, Ukraine, were unified in facing Putin's aggression where 7,000 civilians have been killed.

Georgia's proven partnership with NATO is confirmed with extraordinary service by their military for freedom and democracy. The Novo Selo training base in Bulgaria is world class, with young Bulgarians and Americans working side by side to promote peace through strength.

In each country, we were welcomed by dedicated U.S. Ambassadors, with talented Embassy personnel, promoting warm relationships with the new emerging democracies for the mutual benefit of all citizens.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President by his actions should never forget September the 11th in the global war on terror.

LET'S PASS THE HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT TRUST FUND BILL

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, once again, House Republican leadership's culture of governing crisis to crisis is endangering hundreds of thousands of American jobs and thousands of critical construction projects across the country.

There are only 7 legislative days left until the highway and transit trust fund expires on May 31, but there is no plan yet to act. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 660,000 good-paying construction jobs are hanging in the balance; 6,000 critical construction projects across the country are also being threatened.

For too long, we have been stuck in these short-term patches that fail to meet the challenges of our Nation's crumbling roads and bridges as other nations, our competitors, advance their infrastructure and pass us by leaps and bounds.

We have got to get to work to fixing America's crumbling roads and bridges. It is the job of the Congress to do this. We need to do our job.

We continue to wait, as Democrats, for a plan that we can work together on to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. It is up to the Republican leadership to act, and I am calling upon them to do just that.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Police Week, when we remember the sacrifice of our Nation's law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty.

This year's commemoration falls during a time of heightened tension between our officers and the civilians they have sworn to protect, and it serves as a solemn reminder to all of us the importance of communication, duty, and mutual respect.

Today and every day, we honor the lives of our fallen, including Officer Tommy Decker, of Cold Spring, Minnesota, who was killed in the line of duty in 2012 while doing a welfare check.

May they have eternal rest; may their legacy of service to their communities live on, and may those they left behind find comfort and peace.

Blessed are the peacemakers.

THE BAD HABIT OF PATCH FUNDING

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, we are getting a bad habit of patch funding in 6-month increments what traditionally has been a 6-year surface transportation bill. Virtually no major projects are underway in the Nation as a result. Six-month patch funding has produced patch roadwork.

Worse, road and bridge funding, in turn, is delaying billions of dollars in

development that can't get started without new roads.

The Washington Post showcased our example featuring overhaul of Union Station, which cannot proceed without a new bridge.

Transportation funding delay is stopping a lot more than transportation infrastructure. Our districts need long-term reauthorization.

COMMUNICATION FROM VETERANS ADVOCATE OF THE OFFICE OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Veterans Advocate of the Office of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL GILMORE,
Veterans Advocate (IL–18).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 12, 2015 at 9:38 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 651.

That the Senate passed S. 179.

That the Senate passed S. 136.

That the Senate passed S. 994.

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 16.

Appointments:

Board of Directors of Office of Compliance.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

MELANOMA AND SKIN CANCER DETECTION AND PREVENTION MONTH

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, May is Melanoma and Skin Cancer Detection and Prevention Month.

One person dies of melanoma every hour. There will be over 73,000 new cases of invasive melanoma in the United States this year. Early detection is crucial to prevention.

I would like to highlight a very brave constituent of mine, McKenna Fitzpatrick. She is in the fourth grade at Seven Oaks Elementary School and bravely faced skin cancer.

Despite being so young, she detected her skin cancer early, had a biopsy, dealt with her diagnosis, and overcame the challenges. McKenna's experience is a testament to the virtue of early detection.

Take care of yourself when you are outside or any other time you may be exposed to UV light. This is extremely important for residents of Florida and people across the Nation. This summer, enjoy the beach safely and responsibly.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS HAPPENING

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, a new global record was set last week, but this is not a good record. The atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide surpassed 400 parts per million for an entire month. This is the first time we have reached these levels in over 800,000 years. This is a serious and a potent reminder that we have not yet acted on climate change.

The last time CO_2 concentrations were this high, the world was a hotter place. There were forests in the Arctic, and sea levels were meters higher than they are today.

Our planet is telling us that climate change is happening. We owe it to our constituents to put aside partisan differences and to begin to work on solutions to this global problem.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHIEF FLOYD SIMPSON

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to honor a friend who recently died in a motorcycle accident. On May 3, in my hometown of Corpus Christi, our police chief, Floyd Simpson, died.

Originally from Chicago, Chief Simpson felt drawn to Texas. As a 25-year veteran of the Dallas Police Department before moving to Corpus Christi, Chief Simpson established a reputation as a ''legend in the department,'' and according to his peers, he was an outstanding ''human being, husband, and father.''

He was a great communicator, regularly appearing on the radio and at community events throughout the Coastal Bend. In his interview for the job of chief of police, Corpus Christi City Manager Ron Olson asked him to describe his values. Chief Simpson replied that faith comes first, family second, and everything else comes after that.

In the wake of Chief Simpson's passing, State and local officials are coming together to make State Highway 361 safer. Even in death, he will continue to help keep others safe.

My heart and prayers go out to Tanya, Chief Simpson's wife of 27 years, and his children.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

REPORT ON H.R. 2250, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–110) on the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1732.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1732.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1602

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. YOUNG of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act.

The Federal-State partnership Congress created under the Clean Water Act has led to significantly improved water quality over the past four decades. This is because Congress recognized that States should have the primary responsibility of regulating waters within their own boundaries and that not all waters need to be subjected to Federal jurisdiction. These limits on Federal power have also been reaffirmed by the Supreme Court not once, but twice.

However, last year, the EPA and the Corps of Engineers proposed a new rule that discards these limits. This purposefully vague rule will only increase confusion, increase uncertainty, increase lawsuits, and open up just about any water or wet area to Federal regulation.

Don't just take my word for it. At least 32 States, including Pennsylvania, are objecting to the rule as proposed. More than 1 million comments have been filed on this proposed rule, with approximately 70 percent of the substantive comments asking for the rule to be withdrawn or significantly modified.

Mr. Chair, 370 individual counties and the National Association of Counties oppose the rule. The National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of Towns and Townships all oppose this rule.

The majority of the regulated community opposes the rule, including the American Farm Bureau, the National Association of Home Builders, the Associated General Contractors of America, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Edison Electric Institute, the National Mining Association, and the American Road and Transportation Builders Association.

This list of those opposed to this rule goes on and on and on. Not only do all these groups oppose the rule, but they all support H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act.

I will insert the list of supporters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT FOR H.R. 1732

AgriMark, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Public Works Association, American Road and Transportation Builders Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated General Contractors of America, Association of American Railroads, Family Farm Alliance, International Council of Shopping Centers.

National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Association of Counties, National Association of Homebuilders, National Association of Realtors, National Association of Regional Councils, National Association of Wheat Growers, National League of Cities, National Multifamily Housing Council, National Water Resources Association.

Northeast Dairy Farmers Cooperatives, Oregon Dairy Farmers Association, Portland Cement Association, Select Milk Producers Inc., Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, The American Sugarbeet Growers Association, The United States Conference of Mayors, Virginia Poultry Federation, Waters Advocacy Coalition.

National Association of Manufacturers.

LIST OF SUPPORTERS FOR H.R. 1732

Agricultural Retailers Association, American Exploration & Mining Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Forest & Paper Association, American Gas Association, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Petroleum Institute, American Public Power Association, American Road & Transportation Builders Association, American Society of Golf Course Architects.

Associated Builders and Contractors, The Associated General Contractors of America, Association of American Railroads, Association of Oil Pipe Lines, Club Managers Association of America, Corn Refiners Association, CropLife America, Edison Electric Institute, Federal Forest Resources Coalition, The Fertilizer Institute.

Florida Sugar Cane League, Foundation for Environmental and Economic Progress (FEEP), Golf Course Builders Association of America, Golf Course Superintendents Association of America, The Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA), Industrial Minerals Association—North America, International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC), International Liquid Terminals Association (ILTA), Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA), Irrigation Association.

Leading Builders of America, NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of REALTORS®, National Association of State Department of Agriculture, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Club Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton.

National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Golf Course Owners Association of America, National Industrial Sand Association, National Mining Association, National Multifamily Housing Council, National Oilseed Processors Association, National Pork Producers Council (NPPC), National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association (NSSGA).

Portland Cement Association, Public Lands, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE), Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association Southern Crop Production Association, Sports Turf Managers Association, Texas Wildlife Association, Treated Wood Council, United Egg Producers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. SHUSTER. I next want to read a quote from a constituent of mine, Marty Yahner, a farmer from Cambria County, Pennsylvania.

''This illegal power grab clearly goes far beyond the power granted to the EPA by Congress through the Clean Water Act. Farmers, like me, are very concerned about the proposal giving unprecedented power to government agencies over how farmers can use their land. I'm also worried that the proposed rules will adversely impact the next generation being able to farm.''

That is not a Member of Congress. That is not a government official. That is a real-life farmer, and he has real concerns.

This rule will have serious economic consequences not just for our farmers, but for many others. This rule will threaten jobs and result in costly litigation. It will restrict the rights of landowners and the rights of States and local governments to carry out their economic development plans.

H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, requires the agencies to withdraw the flawed rule, consult with States and local governments and other stakeholders, and then use that input to develop and repropose a new rule that works.

This bill gives the agencies, their State partners, and stakeholders another chance to work together and develop a rule that does what was intended, provide clarity. This is a chance to find the thoughtful, balanced regulatory approach that is necessary.

We all want to protect our waters. With this bill, we have a chance to do that by restoring integrity to the rulemaking process and restore common sense.

With this bill, we have a chance to tell the administration, the EPA, and the Corps to do it right this time.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 1732, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this bill, H.R. 1732, very aptly name the RIP Act, rest in peace—oh, no, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act. It will rest in peace. It would be inevitably vetoed if the Senate chose to take it up, which I don't believe they will.

We are being asked to vote on things here that no one has seen or read, and that is why we are here today.

Now, the President wants us to vote on trade policy for the United States of America. I have read parts of it. Many Members haven't read any of it, but nobody—probably very few have read all of it. The public hasn't seen any of it.

Here we are again today. We are being asked to vote on killing something that nobody has read. No one in this Chamber knows what is in this rule.

Now, I would not rise to support the rule as initially proposed. It was garbled, poorly presented, and I believe there were many problems that it would have created, and that was especially distressing because it was a rule that was trying to fix something done in the Bush era. We are still dealing with the Bush era.

Because of a 4–1–4 Supreme Court decision, with two different tests for jurisdictional waters and total confusion, the Bush administration decided to write a rule to interpret the Clean Water Act.

When it was unveiled, it was opposed by all the groups that are supporting this bill today. They said: This is ridiculous. It is confusing. It just leaves way too much to interpretation. It can be applied in different ways in different parts of the country. There is no certainty here. It is a mess. Get rid of it.

Well, that didn't happen, and the Obama administration, in response to the requests of all those groups, said: Okay. We will take a cut at it.

Now, as I say, the first version was not very well done, and it raised more questions than it answered, but we now have at least some idea of some of the things this bill is going to do.

It is not going to regulate your birdbaths and ditches and all these other things that are out there on the Internet. In fact, it may solve real problems. We don't know that, but we are going to repeal it before it happens.

Now, here is a problem. This farmer in the South was made to go through the environmental review process and get a permit; yet farming and agricultural practices are supposed to be exempt.

I showed this to the Republicans who were using this in a joint hearing with the Senate. I asked the EPA Administrator and secretary of the Corps: Would this land, knowing it is agricultural land, be jurisdictional—they can't tell us what is in their rule—under your rule?

They said: No, that land would be exempt.

This person who had to go through a lengthy permitting process because of the confusion of the Bush guidance would not, under the proposed rule, have to go through any of that and could just go on farming.

Thank you very much.

Now, we are going to prevent him or her from getting that relief. Now, that is just one of the aspects of this rule that we know a little bit about—or at least we know the Administrator's interpretation of that part of the rule, that it would fix a problem for farmers.

I would suggest that there is a better way to proceed in the House, which would be let them publish the rule. If it solves a bunch of problems, great. If it solves a bunch of problems but still needs some tweaks, great. Let's intervene. Let's give them direction.

If it is something that you and everybody else feels we just can't live with, that it is poorly done—instead of this confusing process we are going through here, which I am about to explain contradicts legislation just passed 2 weeks ago—we can do this: I have already had it drafted for you. You don't need to take the time. It is less than a page. It is called a joint congressional resolution of disapproval.

Any major rule—this is a major rule—Congress has the right, under legislation that is 20 years old now, to reject it within 60 days. If the rule is not well written, once we see it and read it, you could reject it. What is the rush to repeal it before we have read it and we know what is in it?

Well, there is a lot of political stuff going on around here. I would say it is just politics playing to the crowd and the fears of people who haven't seen it or read it yet either, but they are worried about what it might be.

Well, it doesn't go into effect immediately, I will say to them. If it is bad, you can ask the same people that introduced this resolution, pass it forthwith, send it to the Senate, pass it forthwith, and that is the end of it, and we would start over.

Now, there is one other confusing aspect here, and that is that, just 2 weeks ago, the House voted on this language, which says that the bill before us purports to start the process over again, the fourth attempt at writing the rule with a whole lot more public hearings and everything, despite everything that has gone on to this point in time.

Two weeks ago, an amendment to the Energy and Water appropriations said there can be no new rule development, so that is already in the bill. Unless that were taken out of the bill, what we are doing here today can't happen.

You can't develop a new rule when it is precluded in the appropriations process, as passed by many of the people who are going to vote for this today. You have sort of contradicted yourself a little bit.

It makes it a little problematic. Do a new rule, but you can't do a new rule, so forget about it. What does that mean? We are stuck with the Bush guidance, which everybody hates and doesn't work and subjects farmers to unnecessary permitting processes.

I don't call that exactly progress or acting in the best interest of the American people and agriculture and a whole host of other people who might be impacted. I would just suggest that we forgo this little political demonstration today, just wait patiently for another 2 weeks when the trolls at OMB finally release the rule.

It has been down there for months. We need to reform OMB, and I hope some on the other side of the aisle would like to help me there. We need a more transparent rulemaking process in this country.

We should not rush ahead and not allow a rule to be published that might help people; and, if it doesn't help people, then you can kill it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Chairman SHUSTER's leadership on this issue. It is important that we go ahead and kill this proposed rule now because it will go final coming out of OMB, and that is a wreck.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015. I cannot stress enough the importance of this legislation to stop the Obama administration's Waters of the U.S. proposed rule and its damaging impacts on our country.

This rule, in its current form, is a massive overreach of EPA's authority and will impact nearly every farmer and rancher in America. It gives the EPA the ability to regulate essentially any body of water they want, including farm ponds and even ditches that are dry for most of the year.

□ 1615

Bottom line: under the EPA's proposed rule, nearly every body of water in the United States can be controlled by Federal regulators.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation that forces the EPA and the Corps to stop moving forward with the proposed Waters of the U.S. rule and do as they should have done from the beginning—working with States and local stakeholders to develop a new and proper set of recommendations.

I urge support for H.R. 1732. It is imperative that the administration listen to rural America.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, that gentleman hasn't read the rule, I haven't read the rule, and I don't know how one can assert very specifically what it might or might not do if you haven't read it when we have heard there have been major changes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the ranking member of the subcommittee of jurisdiction.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member DEFAZIO for the opportunity to rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, for several reasons. First, frankly speaking, I oppose the bill because it simply does not work. Just before the recess, the House passed the Energy and Water Appropriations, as was pointed out by Mr.

DEFAZIO, that included a rider which I opposed that would prohibit the Army Corps of Engineers from using any appropriated funds to develop or implement a change to the current rules that define the scope of Clean Water Act protections. Yet that is what the sponsors of H.R. 1732 say this bill is meant to do.

The sponsors of this bill claim that it will not kill the ongoing rulemaking but only tells the Corps and EPA to do the rulemaking over again. Yet just 2 weeks ago, as was pointed out, the House voted to prevent the agency from taking any action to change the current rules. So which is it? Does the majority want the agencies to do the rulemaking over? Or do they want to kill any effort to change the current process that has been uniformly criticized by farmers, developers, other industries, and environmental organizations as unworkable, arbitrary, and costly?

Secondly, I am opposed to H.R. 1732 because it is yet another attempt to delay needed clarification to the scope of the Clean Water Act. Remember, the executive branch has been trying to clarify the scope of the Clean Water Act since January 2003. Now that is what, 15 years ago, roughly, since the Bush administration released their Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for public comment. Since that time there have been six—again six—attempts by the executive branch to release their interpretation of the Waters of the United States.

We have waited 12 years for clarity. For 12 long years, Mr. Chairman, our Nation's streams and rivers have been vulnerable to pollution and degradation. For 12 years our government has spent millions of dollars working on bringing clarity to the decisions made by the Supreme Court. Delaying this further would cost our American taxpayers—all of us—many more millions of dollars and a lot of wasted time.

Intervening now and forcing the administration to start over again, particularly when we are on the cusp of clarity, is reckless. For example, stopping the administration's rulemaking to clarify the Clean Water Act could further impact the already dire circumstances Western States are facing with prolonged drought.

Mr. Chairman, 99.2 percent of my State in California drink water from public drinking water systems that rely on intermittent, ephemeral, and headwater streams. These streams are drying up in the West. And, to add insult to injury, our actions today would force the administration to withdraw a rule that protects those streams that provide drinking water for 117 million Americans.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation puts the legislative agenda of a well-heeled few ahead of the Nation's—our taxpayers'—drinking water. It aims to protect the rights of speculators and developers over the need to conserve and reuse every precious drop of water that falls in our State. The bill potentially creates new opportunities for individuals to overturn decades of Western water law for their own personal benefit.

Mr. Chairman, many of us have had many concerns with the proposed rule—the original one. But I appreciate that the administration has addressed those concerns and most of the concerns of the States and the stakeholders. The administration has pledged to work with stakeholders on implementation of the rule once it is final, which should happen in the next few months.

So, today, we will hear many platitudes that this bill is not about killing the rule but about simply asking for public comment. Yet such statements ignore the fact that the House just passed a rider, as was pointed out, in the Energy and Water bill to block the bill from taking effect and blocking any change to the existing rulemaking or guidance.

So, Mr. Chairman, today's rhetoric that this is simply an attempt to gather more public comment is simply that—just words. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1732.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), the chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, a gentleman who has put lots and lots of work into this issue over the past several months.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support today for H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015.

One of the reasons that we are doing this bill today is to provide clarity and certainty for the regulated community. Following the SWANCC and Rapanos Supreme Court decisions, determining the appropriate scope of jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act has been confusing and unclear. Both the regulated community and the Supreme Court have called for a rulemaking that will provide such clarity.

Last April, the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers published a rule in the Federal Register that, according to the agencies, would clarify the scope of Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. But in reality, this rule goes far beyond merely clarifying the scope of Federal jurisdiction under Clean Water Act programs. It amounts to a vast expansion of Federal jurisdiction.

To the agencies, clarity is simple: everything is in. This is a clear expansion of the EPA's jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act and flies in the face of two Supreme Court decisions, both of which told the agencies there are limits to Federal jurisdiction.

The proposed rule misconstrues and manipulates the legal standards announced in the SWANCC and Rapanos Supreme Court cases, effectively turning those cases that place limits on Federal Clean Water Act jurisdiction into a justification for the agencies to expand their assertion of Federal authority over all waters and wet areas nationally.

The agencies had an opportunity to develop clear and reasonable bright-line rules on which is jurisdictional versus not, but they instead chose to write many of the provisions in the proposed rule vaguely, in order to give Federal regulators substantial discretion to claim Federal jurisdiction over most any water or wet area whenever they want. This is dangerous because this vagueness will leave the regulated community without any clarity and certainty as to their regulatory status and will leave them exposed to citizen lawsuits. In addition, since many of these jurisdictional decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis, this will give the Federal regulators free rein to find jurisdiction.

This rule, in essence, will establish a presumption that all waters are jurisdictional and will shift to property owners and others in the regulated community the burden of proving otherwise. This rule will set a very high bar for the regulated community to overcome.

Mr. Chairman, the administration even explicitly acknowledges in its recently issued Statement of Administration Policy for H.R. 1732 that it does not want the bill to constrain the agencies' regulatory discretion.

The Clean Water Act was originally intended as a cooperative partnership between States and the Federal Government, with States responsible for the elimination, prevention, and oversight of water pollution. This successful partnership has provided monumental improvements in water quality throughout the Nation since its 1972 enactment because not all waters need to be subject to Federal jurisdiction. However, this rule will undermine Federal-State partnership and erode State authority by granting sweeping new Federal jurisdiction to waters never intended for regulation under the Clean Water Act.

In promoting this rule, Mr. Chairman, the agencies are asserting that massive amounts of wetlands and stream miles are not being protected by the States and that this rule is needed to protect them. Yet the agencies continue to claim that no new waters will be covered by the rulemaking, which raises the question of

how can the rule protect those supposedly unprotected waters without vastly expanding Federal jurisdiction over them? The agencies are talking out of both sides of their mouths. In reality, however, States care about and are protective of their waters, and wetlands and stream miles are not being left unprotected.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to proposing a rule that has sweeping ramifications for the country, the agencies played fast and loose with the regulatory process. The sequence and timing of the actions the agencies have taken to develop this rule undermine the credibility of the rule and the process to develop it.

Among other things, State and local governments and the regulated community all have repeatedly expressed concern that the agencies have cut them out of the process and have failed to consult with them, first during the development of the agencies' jurisdiction guidance, and now, in the development of the rule.

Mr. Chairman, if the agencies had taken the time to consult with the State and local governments and actually listen up front to the issues that our counties, cities, and townships are facing, we might not have had a proposed rule which, the agencies have admitted to Congress in multiple hearings, creates confusion and uncertainty.

If the agencies had followed the proper regulatory process, we wouldn't have a proposed rule that cuts corners on the economic analysis, used incomplete data, and only looked at economic impacts of the rule on one of the many regulatory programs under the Clean Water Act. If the agencies had done things right the first time, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee wouldn't have had to respond to the more than 30 States and almost 400 counties who have requested the EPA withdraw or significantly revise the proposed Waters of the United States rule. If the agencies had done things right, substantive comments filed on the rule wouldn't have been nearly 70 percent opposed to the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GIBBS. But the agencies didn't do things right.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, gives the agencies, their State and local government partners, and other stakeholders another chance to work together to develop a rule that does what was intended—to provide clarity.

This bill requires the agencies to withdraw the proposed rule and enter into a transparent and cooperative process with States, local governments, and other stakeholders to write a new rule. This is what EPA should have done in the first place.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GIBBS. The Regulatory Integrity Protection Act will ensure that the agencies cannot re-propose the same broken rule they released a year ago but does give the agencies an opportunity to get it right.

Mr. Chairman, I know my colleagues across the aisle all believe the agencies have heard the confusion and are committed to changing the rule to respond to the stakeholders' complaints. Unfortunately, the agencies have not provided Members of Congress or stakeholders with any real assurance that that will happen. All they tell us is to trust them.

In fact, at our joint hearing with the Senate earlier this year, when I asked Administrator McCarthy about whether the public would have a chance to review all of the changes they promised to make before the rule goes final, she said they weren't changing the rule enough to need to put it out for public comment again.

In our committee, Mr. Chairman, we have repeatedly heard from our friends on the other side of the aisle that we need to wait until the rule is finalized before taking action. If the agencies have not made the changes that they promised, or if the changes they have made do not work, we have congressional authority to disapprove of the rule.

While I appreciate my colleagues' interest in using the Congressional Review Act, waiting until the rule is finalized doesn't give us or the agencies a real chance to fix the problems that will be created.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GIBBS. Not only would the President have to sign any disapproval resolution we pass, but there are legal scholars who believe if the Congressional Review Act did pass, the agencies would be barred from ever going back and doing another rulemaking, which would leave us in the position of being stuck in the same regulatory uncertainty we are in today. I don't think I want this or any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want this.

As I said in the beginning, the reason we are voting on the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act today is to get a rule that provides real clarity, that works for the States, that works for local governments, and that protects our waters.

Nearly $220 billion in annual economic investment is tied to section 404 permits. Even more economic investment is tied to other Clean Water Act programs. I urge support for this bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, again, Mr. Chairman, I would remind the gentleman on the other side that we are not voting on the proposed rule. We are voting on a revised rule, and no Member of Congress nor any member of the potentially regulated community nor any member of any environmental group has seen or has knowledge of that rule.

The gentleman reports that this simply tells them to go back again because they didn't do enough. They had 700 days of public comments, and they accepted 1,429 public comments that went into this.

I would also remind the gentleman that I don't know how he voted on the amendment, but on the Republican Energy and Water bill 2 weeks ago, we precluded developing any new rule, none, zero. So kill the one we haven't seen, and you are stuck with the Bush guidance which everybody agrees is a disaster.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a member of the committee.

□ 1630

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1732. This bill would halt efforts to clarify the scope of the Clean Water Act, a clarification necessary to protect the environment, to protect wetlands, and to protect drinking water for a third of the population.

For over a decade, there has been great uncertainty about the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act, particularly as it applies to wetlands and streams, as a result of Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006, and of guidance documents issued under the Bush administration.

In an effort to provide regulatory clarity—a goal universally shared by State and local governments, industry, agriculture, and environmental organizations—the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers have conducted a formal rulemaking process.

The resulting clean water rule was proposed over a year ago and represents the culmination of years of study, independent scientific review, and unprecedented public comment and outreach. Just as the rule is at OMB and before it has even been published so people could read it, this bill guts all that work and requires EPA and the Corps, essentially, to start over.

The bill has no justifiable purpose. It kills the new rule before anyone has even had a chance to read it. It requires the agencies to conduct what appears to be two additional public comment periods, bringing the total up to six public comment periods in the last decade.

It requires the agencies to consult with stakeholders again, even though the rule was developed after 400 meetings with stakeholders, with comments filed by over 800,000 members of the public.

My Republican colleagues are always complaining about regulatory uncertainty, the resulting increased costs on businesses, bureaucratic delay, and waste of taxpayer dollars; yet this bill is unnecessary, repetitive, and serves no legitimate purpose other than to delay.

The harm it will cause is extensive. There is perhaps no greater responsibility than to protect the Nation's water supply. This bill would leave our environmental resources unprotected and the drinking water for 117 million Americans at risk. The rule is up in the air, unread, unseen, undecided, and unknown.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, all of a sudden, want to see this rule; but, when we passed the ObamaCare bill, nobody seemed to care about what it said in it. Again, this is new for me from my colleagues from the other side.

I think one thing is for certain. When you have so many people, so many States—the State of New York, I believe, is one that asked for significant revision—the counties, all these stakeholders crying out to have this rule significantly changed or do away with it is important to the American people.

This bill does exactly what the gentleman said. It delays this rule from going into place because it is a bad rule and will cause great economic harm to this country.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GIBBS for your leadership on this important issue. I am an original cosponsor of this very important bill.

Everyone in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, supports clean water. That is why I was such a strong advocate for the EPA to designate a portion of the Mahomet Aquifer in central Illinois as a sole source of drinking water, which was finalized just this past year.

This proposed rule on the Waters of the U.S., this attempt by the EPA to expand its authority under the Clean Water Act to lands that are traditionally dry is an overreach and must be reined in.

I am increasingly concerned of the trust gap between the EPA and the agricultural community. Earlier this year, EPA Administrator McCarthy apologized to ag producers for not bringing them to the table when the Agency put out its interpretive rule on conservation practices, which the EPA and the Corps of Engineers ultimately withdrew.

Unfortunately, this is just more evidence of the haste with which the proposed rule was developed, without appropriately seeking and implementing all necessary stakeholder input.

H.R. 1732 would require both the EPA and the Corps to withdraw the proposed rule, go back to the drawing board, and write a new rule with all stakeholders together. Frankly, this is what they should have done in the first place.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I would correct the Record—and far be it for me to correct the chairman—but, actually, the attorney general of New York, on behalf of the State of New York, as one of our witnesses, testified in favor of going forward with the rule, so there were others who objected.

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. The implementing agencies with their comments rejected the rule from New York. It sounds like New York is confused.

Mr. DEFAZIO. New York may be confused, and everybody is confused because they have not seen what it is that they are objecting to and would, again, suggest that the best course of action would be to actually see it.

The gentleman from Ohio brought up something very weird, saying that, somehow, if we used a simple resolution of disapproval, they couldn't write a new rule.

He is confusing it with the bill you passed last year, which said that the rule is rejected and you can't use anything you use to write that rule to write a new rule. A number of us raised questions about that at the time. You did pass that last year. That is probably what he is thinking of.

This is a simple resolution of disapproval. It would not have any impact on future actions of the Agency.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I think the American public, Mr. Chairman, must be quite confused. This rulemaking that we are talking about is actually about clean water; it is about a rulemaking process that hasn't been completed yet, and it is about a rule that we haven't seen, so it seems sort of odd that we are standing here commenting on it.

I just want to remind the other side that, thanks to the Clean Water Act, billions of pounds of pollution have been kept out of our rivers, and the number of waters that now meet clean water goals nationwide has actually doubled with direct benefits for drinking water, public health, recreation, and wildlife.

This is especially true from my home State of Maryland that is within the six-State Chesapeake Bay Watershed and several of its tributaries, including the Anacostia, the Patuxent, Potomac, and Severn Rivers that flow through the Fourth Congressional District.

The Chesapeake Bay Watershed is fed by 110,000 miles of creeks, rivers, and streams; and 70 percent of Marylanders get our drinking water from sources that rely on headwater or seasonal streams. Nationwide, 117 million people, or over a third of the total population, get our water from these waters.

However, due to the two Supreme Court decisions that have been referenced, there is, in fact, widespread confusion as to what falls under the protection of the Clean Water Act. That is precisely why this administration is working to finalize their joint proposed rule clarifying the limits of Federal jurisdiction under the act.

In fact, on April 6, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency submitted a revised clean water protection rule to the Office of Management and Budget for final review. From my understanding, the final rule may be published in the Federal Register later this spring. I share the view that we want OMB to just get on with it.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman has complained about the confusion in the litigation. That is precisely why we need to get through a final rulemaking, which has been years in the making. If the gentleman seeks clarity, let the administration just finish its job.

That is what the Supreme Court instructed the Federal Government to do 14 years ago with the 2001 SWANCC decision and, subsequently, the 2006 Rapanos case.

Along with those Supreme Court decisions, the Bush administration, as has been said, followed the exact same process in issuing two guidance documents in 2003 and 2008. In fact, they remain in force today.

It is, in fact, these two Bush-era guidance documents that have compounded the confusion, uncertainty, and increased compliance costs faced by our constituents—opponents and proponents alike—who all just say they want clarity.

You don't actually have to take my word for it. In fact, let me quote from the comments made by the American Farm Bureau Federation, something I don't do quite often:

> With no clear regulatory definitions to guide their determinations, what has emerged is a hodgepodge of ad hoc and inconsistent jurisdictional theories.

Those are the words of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

We all agree that it is confusing. Let the Obama administration finish what the Bush administration started and failed to do, and that is publish a rule

that finalizes the rule that gives stakeholders the clarity they have been seeking for 14 years.

Quite oddly, H.R. 1732 would actually halt the current rulemaking and require the agencies to withdraw the proposed rule and restart the rulemaking process. This is after 1 million public comments, a 208-day comment period, and over 400 public meetings.

In appearances before the Senate, House, and joint committees, high-ranking Agency officials have testified that the revised rule will address many of the concerns expressed during the public comment period. They have also stated that the revised rule will provide greater clarity to the current permitting process, reduce regulatory cost, and ensure more exacting protections over U.S. waters.

The bill that we are talking about would actually force the agencies to meet with the same stakeholders again and talk about the same issues again that they have already discussed several times over the last 14 years since the first Supreme Court decision—what a colossal waste of time and taxpayer money. Actually, the other side should be ashamed if they put a cost to restarting the procedure.

In fact, the rulemaking has been more than a decade, as we have described, in development. We need to let the administration get on with its work. As others have pointed out, just 2 weeks ago, the House passed—and I opposed it; many of our colleagues opposed it—the Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

It contained a policy rider that explicitly prohibits the Corps from spending any money to develop the same new clean water rule that this bill wants us to restart. Let me repeat that. The House has already passed a provision that states the Corps can use no money not just this fiscal year, but in future fiscal years, going forward in perpetuity.

Republicans try to make it sound as if all they want is for the EPA and the Corps to develop new rules right away, but it is really clear that what they want to do is stop these agencies from doing their jobs at all—no new rules and no clean water, what a shame.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have great regard for the gentlewoman from Maryland. I know that the Chesapeake Bay is incredibly important to not only Maryland, but the United States. The watershed I live in, much of it drains into the Susquehanna that flows into the Chesapeake, so we are very concerned in Pennsylvania about wanting to have clean water.

We also want to have an agriculture community prospering in Pennsylvania. They spent millions of dollars to try to clean it up.

Again, this notion that we haven't seen the rule is not that clear because we have. It is not clear to what the Democrats are saying. What we are saying is we have seen a proposed rule. We have seen a proposed rule.

Because they are not going to make substantial changes to the proposed rule, that means, if they were making substantial changes, they would have to come back and reopen this up and have a significant comment period, but they are not doing that.

Basically, the proposed rule is going to be very similar to the final rule. That is what scares the heck out of people—the farmers, builders, people across this country, landowners. This bill does force the EPA and the Corps to go back in and talk to the stakeholders because of the million comments. Seventy percent were ignored. They said revise or significantly change this. They ignored 70 percent of those million comments.

I am encouraging all Members to support this.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), a leader on this issue.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I support wetlands, and I support clean water. I spent much of my career actually working to restore coastal wetlands in Louisiana.

The irony here is that the agencies that are proposing this rule are actually the same agencies that right now are the largest cause of wetlands loss in the United States on the way they manage the Mississippi River system. The hypocrisy here is absolutely unbelievable.

This proposed rule goes outside the bounds of the law, the law which states ''navigable waters.'' Read this definition. It clearly goes beyond the scope of the parameters of the law. It goes outside the scope of jurisprudence.

Taking a pass right now would be a dereliction of duty. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We know what this rule is. We have had the EPA; we have had the Corps of Engineers before our committee, and it is crystal clear the direction this is going in.

Even the sister agency of the EPA and the Corps of Engineers, the Small Business Administration, has indicated that the cost estimate complying with this regulation goes well beyond the higher cost than that done by the EPA and the Corps of Engineers.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. The home State I represent, Louisiana, the watershed goes from the State of Montana to New York and comes all the way down. You can take this proposed definition, and you can basically apply it to 90 percent of the lands in south Louisiana.

This bill simply requires consultation with stakeholders, consultation with the property owners. This is a tax. This is a taking of private property. Mr. Chairman, I want to state: This is private property; this is people's homes; it is people's farms; it is people's small businesses, and it is impeding their ability to achieve the American Dream.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

□ 1645

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, the EPA has, once again, lost all common sense as it has decided unilaterally to redefine Waters of the U.S.

Under its proposed rule change, Waters of the U.S. would now be defined to include smaller bodies of water and even some dry land. This new definition would extend the EPA's regulatory reach to seemingly any body of water, including that water puddled in your ditch after a rainstorm. You heard me right.

Let me put it another way for an even better understanding. This rule is so broad that it could very well require you to get permission from a Federal bureaucrat before acting on your property. Small-business owners, farmers, Realtors, and homebuilders all agree that this bill is bad for business in southeastern North Carolina.

For those reasons, I am a cosponsor of this bill, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, which requires the EPA to scrap its current proposal and start anew by engaging stakeholders who are actually affected by this rule.

Mr. Chairman, common sense has had its share of setbacks in this country. Let's not let this rule be another one. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I thank the chairman for his fine leadership.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the chairman for his work on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, there is a simple truth that exists at all times and in every place: the bigger the government, the smaller the citizen. That is especially true when it comes to regulations. When the bureaucracy makes more rules, those rules limit the freedom and opportunities of real people—people who are just trying to work hard, make a living, and support themselves and their families.

Frankly, the EPA has crossed the line with this proposed water rule. It has crossed the line constitutionally,

and it has crossed a line by hurting people and threatening their livelihoods and private property.

Let me tell you a story about a place back in my district called Sandy Creek. It is named Sandy Creek for a reason; it has been dry for over 30 years. With the drought in California, there is no time soon that water is coming.

Now, long before this proposed rule that would expand the EPA's power even more, the EPA tried to regulate Sandy Creek. That would have added more costs to the people who owned the land. It would have meant more paperwork, Federal permits, compliance, and Federal regulators snooping around.

It took me years to finally get the EPA to stop. Do you know how I got them to stop? I had to have an individual come to Taft, California, get in my car, drive out, and walk in Sandy Creek, throughout the sand, before he believed there was no water to regulate.

Mr. Chairman, can you imagine what the EPA would try and do if they even had more authority to regulate things outside their jurisdiction?

These are the actions of an administration that is unaccountable and that doesn't care about the freedom and prosperity of its citizens. This is an administration that cares more about regulation than reform, that cares more about power than it does about people.

The House is going to pass a bill to stop this rule, this abuse of power. We are going to stop this regulation for all of the hard-working Americans who are tired of this Agency's power grabs just for the sake of power.

We are going to try to do it for all who wish they could have control over their own lives. The EPA doesn't need any more power, Mr. Chairman, the people do.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015.

We hear that this is all about clean water. This is about clean water, and we all want clean water. It is an issue that should not be demagogued in this debate. We all want clean water. We have kids, and we have mothers and fathers and grandparents.

This is about a process. It is about a process that needs to be transparent, and it is about where stakeholders are at the table. Who are these stakeholders? They are Americans. They are our farmers, our ranchers, the folks who put food on our tables; they are developers and construction workers who build our homes.

This has amazing implications if we don't get this rule right, Mr. Chairman. Can you imagine the EPA's requiring farmers to have to get a permit to till during a season? Can you imagine how long that could take? Your season could be too late to plant. What would that do to land value? to commodity prices?

We have to get this right. I rise in support of this bill as it is a commonsense, smart bill. We can do it together. We can get it right. The American people must be heard.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue as it is so important to our farmers and businesses in Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the gross regulatory overreach of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers regarding the proposed Waters of the United States rule.

Under the rule's proposed changes to the Clean Water Act, the Federal Government would have the power to regulate virtually any place water flows in the United States. This is not about clean water.

This includes things like creeks, streams, and groundwater but also manmade waterways like a fish pond, irrigation pipes, and dry ditching to harvest timber. If not stopped, this overreach will have damaging consequences for economic growth and jobs.

In Georgia's 12th District, many farmers and businesses are concerned about their ability to comply with these Federal mandates while maintaining their livelihoods. The Waters of the United States rule will grant the Federal Government power to dictate land use decisions, as well as farming practices, making it even more difficult to maintain a competitive and profitable farm or business.

I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 1732, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, there is something terribly wrong when the Federal Government is attempting to regulate our Nation's puddles, streams, and ditches.

The proposed rule that the Obama administration issued last year would, unfortunately, give the EPA the power to do just that. This rule would redefine the Waters of the United States under the Clean Water Act and significantly increase the Federal Government's jurisdiction over waters never intended for regulation.

The blatant power grab and regulatory overreach would not only dismantle a longstanding partnership between the States and the Federal Government, but it would also threaten American jobs, increase the costs of doing business, and heighten the likelihood of costly lawsuits.

The Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor, would require the Obama administration to withdraw its proposed rule and replace it with one that considers stakeholders' input and maintains the State-Federal partnership to regulate our waters. I urge my colleagues to support this vital bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You have heard a lot about the EPA, that it is a bad agency doing bad things; but, if it weren't for the EPA, many of our communities would be facing undrinkable water because of the pollution that is left behind, without any followup.

We discussed this during the committee, and one of the issues that was brought out was that some of the EPA's regional offices were being a little heavyhanded. I suggested they may be able to take it up with the administrators, themselves, to figure out how we could really bring that to the forefront. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start off with a few facts, and we have covered them already.

There are broad environmental and conservation organizations that also oppose the bill. For the RECORD, I will submit 59 of them that are in opposition.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE H.R. 1732, REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015 OUTSIDE GROUP LETTERS OF OPPOSITION MAY 12, 2015

Alliance for the Great Lakes, American Rivers, American Whitewater, Arkansas Wildlife Federation, Audubon Naturalist Society, California River Watch, Citizens Campaign for the Environment, Clean Oceans Competition, Clean Water Action, Coalition to Protect Blacksburg Waterways, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Eastern PA Coalition for Abandoned Mine Reclamation, Endangered Habitats League, Environment America, Environmental Law and Policy Center, Environmental Working Group, Freshwater Future, Friends of Accotink Creek, Friends of Dyke Marsh.

Friends of the Nanticoke River, Friends of the Weskeag, Galveston Bay Foundation, Great Lakes Environmental Law Center, Gulf Restoration Network, Izaak Walton

League of America, Jesus People Against Pollution, Lake Erie Region Conservancy, League of Conservation Voters, Little Falls Watershed Alliance, Loudoun Wildlife Conservancy, Maryland Conservation Council, Midshore Riverkeeper Conservancy, Milwaukee Riverkeeper, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, Montgomery Countryside Alliance, Natural Resources Defense Council, National Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, Nature Abounds.

Neighbors of the Northwest Branch, Anacostia River, Ocean River Institute, Ohio Environmental Council, Ohio Wetlands Association, People to Save the Sheyenne, Piedmont Environmental Council, Potomac Riverkeeper Network, Protecting Our Waters, River Network, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, St. Mary's River Watershed Association, Surfrider Foundation, Tip of the Mitt Watershed Council, Trout Unlimited, Virginia Conservation Network, WasteWater Education, Waterkeepers Chesapeake, West Virginia Highlands Conservancy.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. The Army Corps of Engineers—the Corps—and the EPA have testified that their revised clean water protection rule will provide more certainty and clarity to the current clean water permitting process, that it will reduce regulatory confusion and costs, and that it will protect our Nation's waters, our economy, and our American way of life, as was stressed in the committee hearing which we all attended. I believe that it is something that they were very sure they wanted to do.

Fact: on April 6, 2015, the Corps and the EPA submitted this revised clean water protection rule to OMB for final review, bringing it closer to publication later this spring, but my Republican colleagues are attempting to stop the rulemaking without even seeing the final product. As Mr. MCCARTHY just said, we are going to stop this regulation.

Fact: H.R. 1732 would halt the near final rulemaking needed to clarify Clean Water Act protection for countless streams and wetlands, many of which serve as primary sources of drinking water for one in three Americans. If you want to put it in millions, it would be 117 million people.

Fact: rather than allow the Agency to provide additional regulatory certainty and clarity, it would leave in place 2003 and 2008 Bush guidance documents, which have been uniformly criticized by industry as confusing, costly, and frustrating that provide little environmental benefit.

Fact: it is simply a bureaucratic redo, forcing the agencies to repeat steps in what has been a nearly decadelong rulemaking process of unprecedented public outreach, for no other reason than to prevent this administration from finalizing clean water protection rulemaking.

The last fact: if it is released, it fails to protect our water resources and our economy, and Congress simply has multiple avenues with which to address those concerns.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD the facts and the myths. I have five of them.

The proposed rulemaking, the Federal Clean Water Act authority over ditches—it reduces Federal authority over ditches by specifically excluding ditches, including roadside ditches that are constructed in dry lands, et cetera, and it goes on.

Myth number two, it is not based on sound science. Fact, in 2015, the Office of R&D—Research and Development—released its ''Connectivity of Streams and Wetlands to Downstream Waters'' report of more than 1,200 existing peer-reviewed publications which support this.

Myth number four, a power grab by the EPA to exert greater Federal authority—fact, it preserves existing statutory and regulatory exemptions for common farming, ranching, and forestry practices, and it goes on.

Myth number five, the EPA did not adequately consult with States and did not take local concerns into consideration. Fact, again, there were 900,000 public comments, and 19,000 provided substantive comments, and they reached out to other States.

MARCH 19, 2015.

MYTHS VS. FACTS: EPA AND CORPS' CLEAN WATER RULE MYTH #1—EXPANDED REGULATION OF DITCHES

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last April, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) proposed a Clean Water rule to clarify the jurisdictional scope of the Clean Water Act. This proposal was intended to simplify and improve the process for determining what waters (and wetlands) are, and are not, protected by the Act, consistent with the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Since that time, a number of questions or misconceptions about this proposal have been raised. This is the first in a series of Dear Colleagues to address these questions or misconceptions.

MYTH #1

The proposed rule expands Federal Clean Water Act authority over ditches.

FACT

The proposed rule reduces federal authority over ditches by specifically excluding ditches (including roadside ditches) that are constructed in dry lands and either (1) contain water less than year-round, or (2) do not flow into another waterbody subject to the Act.

The proposed rule retains existing authority over certain ditches that once were, and continue to function as, natural streams.

Recently, the agencies testified that they are reviewing over one million public comments submitted on the proposed rule and will make revisions to further clarify the regulation (including its application to ditches) in order to make it more effective in implementing the Clean Water Act, consistent with the science and the law.

If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the proposal, please see (http://democrats.transportation.house.gov/legislation/waters-united-states) or call the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

PETER A. DEFAZIO, M.C.,
Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, M.C.,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

MARCH 19, 2015.

MYTHS VS. FACTS: EPA AND CORPS' CLEAN WATER RULE MYTH #2—THE PROPOSED RULE IS NOT BASED ON THE SCIENCE

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last April, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) proposed a Clean Water rule to clarify the jurisdictional scope of the Clean Water Act. This proposal was intended to simplify and improve the process for determining what waters (and wetlands) are, and are not, protected by the Act, consistent with the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Yet, critics of this proposed rule have questioned the science behind the proposal.

MYTH #2

The proposed rule is not based on sound science.

FACTS

In January 2015, EPA's Office of Research and Development released its ''Connectivity of Streams and Wetlands to Downstream Waters'' report—a review and synthesis of more than 1,200 existing peer-reviewed publications from the scientific literature.

This Connectivity report noted that ''the scientific literature unequivocally demonstrates that streams, individually or cumulatively, exert a strong influence on the integrity of downstream waters. All tributary streams, including perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral streams, are physically, chemically, and biologically connected to downstream rivers via channels and associated alluvial deposits where water and other materials are concentrated, mixed, transformed, and transported.''

The Connectivity report also noted that ''the incremental effects of individual streams and wetlands are cumulative across entire watersheds and therefore must be evaluated in context with other streams and wetlands.''

In October 2014, EPA's Science Advisory Board completed its own scientific review of the Connectivity report, and concluded that the report is ''a thorough and technically accurate review of the literature on the connectivity of streams and wetlands to downstream waters'' and found that the scientific literature provides enough information to support a more definitive statement on the degree of connection between certain, geographically-isolated waters and downstream waters.

If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the proposal, please see (http://democrats.transportation.house.gov/legislation/waters-united-states) or call the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, M.C.,
Ranking Member, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

MARCH 24, 2015

MYTHS VS. FACTS: EPA AND CORPS' CLEAN WATER RULE MYTH #4—EPA IS SEIZING GREATER POWER OVER AGRICULTURE

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last April, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) proposed a Clean Water rule to clarify the jurisdictional scope of the Clean Water Act. This

proposal was intended to simplify and improve the process for determining what waters (and wetlands) are, and are not, protected by the Act, consistent with two decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Since that time, a number of questions or misconceptions about this proposal have been raised.

MYTH #4

The proposed rule is a ''power grab'' by the EPA to exert greater Federal authority over farming, ranching, and forestry operations.

FACTS

The proposed rule provides greater certainty to farmers, ranchers, and forestry operations and would preserve existing statutory and regulatory exemptions for common farming, ranching, and forestry practices, including exemptions for prior converted cropland, irrigation return flows, and normal farming, ranching, and silvicultural activities.

The proposed rule would not affect an existing Clean Water Act exemption for the construction and maintenance of farm or stock ponds constructed on dry lands, and would, for the first time, specifically exclude artificial stock watering and irrigation ponds constructed on dry lands from Clean Water Act jurisdiction.

The proposed rule does not just respect the current exemptions for ditches but it would expand the definition of ditches to make the exemption clearer.

No Clean Water Act permit is required today for the application of pesticides or fertilizer to dry land, and this will not change under the proposed rule.

Puddles on crop fields are not subject to the Clean Water Act today, and this will not change under the proposed rule.

In short, if you can plow, plant, or harvest today without a Clean Water permit, you will not need a permit for these activities under the proposed rule.

If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the proposal, please see http://democrats.transportation.house.gov/legislation/waters-united-states or call the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Sincerely,

DONNA F. EDWARDS,
Member of Congress.

———

April 13, 2015

MYTHS VS. FACTS: EPA AND CORPS CLEAN WATER RULE MYTH #5—EPA AND THE CORPS DID NOT CONSULT THE STATES

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last April, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) proposed a Clean Water rule to clarify the jurisdictional scope of the Clean Water Act. This proposal was intended to simplify and improve the process for determining what waters (and wetlands) are, and are not, protected by the Act, consistent with the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. However, questions and misconceptions about this proposal continue to be raised.

MYTH #5

During the rulemaking process, EPA and the Corps did not adequately consult with states and did not take local concerns into consideration when developing this rule.

FACTS

EPA consulted with various stakeholders, particularly with those from the agricultural community, and received over 900,000 public comments. Of these, approximately 19,000 provided substantive comments on the proposed rule.

In total, EPA held over 400 meetings throughout the country on the proposed rulemaking, and the agencies extended the public comment period twice for a total of 207 days, to listen to concerns and draft a better, clearer rule.

EPA developed a special process for engaging the states during the public comment period, engaging with Environmental Council of the States, the Association of Clean Water Administrators, and the Association of State Wetland Managers.

At a March 22, 2015, hearing before the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, the EPA's Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water characterized EPA's outreach efforts as ''unprecedented.''

Further, when describing EPA's meetings with state representatives, the Deputy Assistant Administrator stated, ''At the last meeting, which was scheduled for two hours, it was a little over an hour, and that meeting ended because, quite frankly, the states (ran) out of things they wanted to talk about.''

Since 2003, the agencies have received an estimated 1,429,000 total public comments during six separate rulemakings, lasting a total 700 days, or approximately 2 years.

''Quite candidly, I will tell you that there is not a lot of new in the way of issues that are being raised. Many of the issues that are being raised are the same ones that have been raised for several years.''—Quote from Ken Kopocis, EPA Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water (3/18/15 Hearing of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee)

If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the rule, please see (http://democrats.transportation.house.gov/legislation/waters-united-states) or call the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
Member of Congress.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Also, for the RECORD, I submit the Statement of Administration Policy from the Office of the President, which states at the end: ''If the President were presented with H.R. 1732, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.''

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2015.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1732—REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1732. If the President were presented with H.R. 1732, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill, which would require the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of the Army (Army) to withdraw and re-propose specified draft regulations needed to clarify the jurisdictional boundaries of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The agencies' rulemaking, grounded in science, is essential to ensure clean water for future generations, and is responsive to calls for rulemaking from Congress, industry, and community stakeholders as well as decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. The proposed rule has been through an extensive public engagement process.

Clean water is vital for the success of the Nation's businesses, agriculture, energy development, and the health of our communities. More than one in three Americans get their drinking water from rivers, lakes, and reservoirs that are at risk of pollution from upstream sources. The protection of wetlands is vital for hunting and fishing. When Congress passed the CWA in 1972, to restore the Nation's waters, it recognized that to have healthy communities downstream, we need to protect the smaller streams and wetlands upstream.

Clarifying the scope of the CWA helps to protect clean water, safeguard public health, and strengthen the economy. Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 focused on specific jurisdictional determinations and rejected the analytical approach that the Army Corps of Engineers was using for those determinations, but did not invalidate the underlying regulation. This has created ongoing questions and uncertainty about how the regulation is applied consistent with the Court's decisions. The proposed rule would address this uncertainty.

If enacted, H.R. 1732 would derail current efforts to clarify the scope of the CWA, hamstring future regulatory efforts, and deny businesses and communities the regulatory certainty needed to invest in projects that rely on clean water. H.R. 1732 also would delay by a number of years any action to clarify the scope of the CWA, because it would: (1) require the agencies to re-propose a rule that has already gone through an extensive public comment process; and (2) create a burdensome advisory process that would complicate the agencies' rulemaking and potentially constrain their discretion. The agencies have already conducted an extensive and lengthy outreach to a broad range of stakeholders who will continue to be engaged in the current process. Duplicative outreach and consultation would impose unnecessary burdens and excessive costs on all parties.

The final rule should be allowed to proceed. EPA and Army have sought the views of and listened carefully to the public throughout the extensive public engagement process for this rule. It would be imprudent to dismiss the years of work that have already occurred and no value would be added. The agencies need to be able to finish their work.

In the end, H.R. 1732, like its predecessors, would sow more confusion and invite more conflict at a time when our communities and businesses need clarity and certainty around clean water regulation. Simply put, this bill is not an act of good government; rather, it would hinder the ongoing rulemaking process and the agencies' ability to respond to the public as well as two Supreme Court rulings.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. There you are, Mr. Chairman.

We still oppose H.R. 1732, but I would really like to ensure that we continue to work with the EPA to get in place something that is really going to help America's farmers and industry.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Forty years ago, the Clean Water Act established a partnership between States and the Federal Government to regulate waters. The limits on Federal power under this partnership have also been reaffirmed by the Supreme Court not once, but twice, and I might add that my colleagues, when they were the majority party, tried twice to do what this rule is going to do, but they couldn't get it out of committee because there was not the support for it.

I am not sure what has changed except for the fact that Republicans are in the majority, but there is still a lot of opposition out there to it.

The administration's proposed rule abandons a successful partnership in favor of a vast expansion of the Federal Government's authority to regulate. This proposed rule was developed without consulting States and local governments or regulated communities, and it will have dire economic consequences.

In fact, as the gentlewoman mentioned, there have been 20,000 substantive comments on this, and 70 percent of them have opposed this rule.

As I made the point earlier, the proposed rule is out there. If they were going to change it, they would have to go back and reopen the comment period, but they are not changing it significantly.

□ 1700

The proposed rule will be very, very similar to what the final rule is. That is why we need to stop it. Two-thirds of the States object to this law rule, two-thirds of the States object to it. Local governments, farmers, builders, job creators, and stakeholders object to this rule. As mentioned, of those 20,000 substantial comments, 70 percent of them rejected this rulemaking. The Regulatory Integrity Protection Act rejects this flawed rule and flawed process that created it.

This bipartisan bill restores the integrity of the rulemaking process and the Federal and State partnership. The agencies simply need to go back and do it right. We cannot protect our waters and provide more regulatory clarity without sacrificing common sense and balance. Mr. Chairman, I encourage all Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the proposed Waters of the U.S. rule is critically flawed and needs to be rewritten. After following the rulemaking process very closely, I have no confidence that that the current rule will give any clarity for those who will be greatly impacted by this proposed rule. If anything, Mr. Speaker, the only clarity I can find in the proposed rule is that we will see an increase in the number of permits that the Corps of Engineers and EPA will need to issue for landowners to develop their land, and any litigation that may result.

The proposed rule would automatically regulate all tributaries that connect to a downstream water body and all streams and wetlands in floodplains or riparian areas of regulated water bodies unless they are deemed not navigable by the EPA or Army Corps. To me, that sounds like a dream for lawyers and a nightmare for everyone else. We must curb regulatory overreach and protect our economy as well as the rights of landowners.

During the public comment period, more than a million comments were submitted. Earlier this year during an Energy and Water Appropriations hearing the Corps informed us that 58 percent of the comments were in opposition to the rule, then later that month at an Interior Appropriations hearing the EPA informed us that 87% of the comments supported the rule. If the two agencies responsible for developing and implementing the rule cannot even agree on the number of comments submitted supporting the rule, how can they be trusted to implement the rule?

In the FY15 Omnibus we included Congressional direction to the EPA and the Army Corps to withdraw the flawed 'Interpretive Rule' that EPA had issued in conjunction with the proposed Waters of the US rule and the Administration withdrew the 'Interpretive Rule'. It's now time that we enact Congressional direction to withdraw the entire Waters of the US rule as proposed, and start fresh following the comment period.

Therefore, Mr. Chair I support this bill and I encourage all my fellow members to vote for it.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise today on behalf of Iowans in my district to support H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015, to prohibit the implementation of the rule concerning ''Waters of the United States (WOTUS)'' by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

The rule permitting the expansion of WOTUS grants EPA and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction over traditionally state regulated water under the auspices of the Clean Water Act. This includes water previously unregulated by the federal government, such as dry ditches and intrastate rivers.

These regulations simply defy common sense. Every constituent in my district desires clean water, but the EPA and USACE are transferring authority from state and local officials, who know the needs of stakeholders, to Washington bureaucrats.

In response, I am proud to join the 69 other Members as a cosponsor of this bipartisan bill along with the hundreds of organized stakeholders nationwide, along with thousands of individual farmers, raising serious concerns or issued public statements in opposition to adoption of these proposals. These regulations unnecessarily burden farmers and small business owners and prevent job creation, wage increases, and economic growth. I cannot permit such proposals to go unchallenged.

I thank so many of my colleagues for standing with me in this effort and rest assured, I will continue to fight against government overreach on behalf of Iowa's hard working farming families.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act. This harmful legislation undermines the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Army Corps of Engineers' ability to regulate and protect our wetlands and streams, and it is an assault on the Clean Water Act.

H.R. 1732 would block the EPA's current Clean Water rulemaking, forcing the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers to go back to the drawing board and start over with the process, undermining years of work undertaken by agencies, businesses, and numerous other stakeholders. Every American deserves to have access to clean water, and the proposed Clean Water rules, under the Clean Water Act, would safeguard the drinking water of more than 117 million people who currently rely on streams lacking clear protection. The EPA has acted to protect America's waters under the Act before, and it is an outrage that House Republicans are blocking the EPA and Army Corps from doing the same now. Americans and businesses deserve certainty and understanding regarding which waterways are covered by the Clean Water Act, and H.R. 1732 would only lead to more confusion.

The EPA engaged in extensive public outreach and received hundreds of thousands of public comments on the proposed Rule, and the Rule is built upon peer-reviewed science. At the very least, the public deserves to see the final rule before Congress decides to block it. Congress should let the EPA and the Army Corps do their jobs and protect America's small streams and wetlands from pollution. I oppose this legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1732, a bill which blocks efforts to clarify the Clean Water Act before agencies even produce a final rule.

There is consensus that the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act is confusing and has frustrated many in the regulated community. Two Supreme Court decisions and guidance dating from the Bush Administration has caused years of uncertainty and difficulty in the permitting process. Clarifying responsibilities under the Clean Water Act will ease those frustrations while protecting critical drinking water for our constituents.

The Administration has undertaken a comprehensive review process to solicit comment from all the stakeholders to rewrite the rules. While today's bill argues that the Army Corps and EPA have made insufficient effort to obtain input from the regulated community, there have been over 400 public meetings and hundreds of thousands of public comments. The public comment period lasted 207 days.

This bill would throw out that whole process and force the Administration to start from scratch, delaying regulatory certainty and clean water protections indefinitely. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill and evaluate the merits of the final rule when it is released in a few weeks.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 114–13 modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114–98. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1732

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF EXISTING PROPOSED RULE.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall withdraw the proposed rule described in the notice of proposed rule published in the Federal Register entitled ''Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act'' (79 Fed. Reg. 22188 (April 21, 2014)) and any final rule based on such proposed rule (including RIN 2040–AF30).

SEC. 3. DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PROPOSED RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall develop a new proposed rule to define the term ''waters of the United States'' as used in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PROPOSED RULE.—In developing the new proposed rule under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

(1) take into consideration the public comments received on—

(A) the proposed rule referred to in section 2;

(B) the accompanying economic analysis of the proposed rule entitled ''Economic Analysis of Proposed Revised Definition of Waters of the United States'' (dated March 2014); and

(C) the report entitled ''Connectivity of Streams & Wetlands to Downstream Waters: A Review & Synthesis of Scientific Evidence'' (EPA/600/R–14/475F; dated January 2015);

(2) jointly consult with and solicit advice and recommendations from representative State and local officials, stakeholders, and other interested parties on how to define the term ''waters of the United States'' as used in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

(3) prepare a regulatory proposal that will, consistent with applicable rulings of the United States Supreme Court, specifically identify those waters covered under, and those waters not covered under, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—

(A) taking into consideration—

(i) the public comments referred to in paragraph (1); and

(ii) the advice and recommendations made by the State and local officials, stakeholders, and other interested parties consulted under this section; and

(B) incorporating the areas and issues where consensus was reached with the parties.

(c) FEDERALISM CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.—As part of consulting with and soliciting advice and recommendations from State and local officials under subsection (b), the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

(1) seek to reach consensus with the State and local officials on how to define the term ''waters of the United States'' as used in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act;

(2) provide the State and local officials with notice and an opportunity to participate in the consultation process under subsection (b);

(3) consult with State and local officials that represent a broad cross-section of regional, economic, policy, and geographic perspectives in the United States;

(4) emphasize the importance of collaboration with and among the State and local officials;

(5) allow for meaningful and timely input by the State and local officials;

(6) recognize, preserve, and protect the primary rights and responsibilities of the States to protect water quality under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and to plan and control the development and use of land and water resources in the States;

(7) protect the authorities of State and local governments and rights of private property owners over natural and manmade water features, including the continued recognition of Federal deference to State primacy in the development of water law, the governance of water rights, and the establishment of the legal system by which States mediate disputes over water use;

(8) incorporate the advice and recommendations of the State and local officials regarding matters involving differences in State and local geography, hydrology, climate, legal frameworks, economies, priorities, and needs; and

(9) ensure transparency in the consultation process, including promptly making accessible to the public all communications, records, and other documents of all meetings that are part of the consultation process.

(d) STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.—As part of consulting with and soliciting recommendations from stakeholders and other interested parties under subsection (b), the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

(1) identify representatives of public and private stakeholders and other interested parties, including small entities (as defined in section 601 of title 5, United States Code), representing a broad cross-section of regional, economic, and geographic perspectives in the United States, which could potentially be affected, directly or indirectly, by the new proposed rule under subsection (a), for the purpose of obtaining advice and recommendations from those representatives about the potential adverse impacts of the new proposed rule and means for reducing such impacts in the new proposed rule; and

(2) ensure transparency in the consultation process, including promptly making accessible to the public all communications, records, and other documents of all meetings that are part of the consultation process.

(e) TIMING OF FEDERALISM AND STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator shall initiate consultations with State and local officials, stakeholders, and other interested parties under subsection (b).

(f) REPORT.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall prepare a report that—

(1) identifies and responds to each of the public comments filed on—

(A) the proposed rule referred to in section 2;

(B) the accompanying economic analysis of the proposed rule entitled ''Economic Analysis of Proposed Revised Definition of Waters of the United States'' (dated March 2014); and

(C) the report entitled ''Connectivity of Streams & Wetlands to Downstream Waters: A Review & Synthesis of Scientific Evidence'' (EPA/600/R–14/475F; dated January 2015);

(2) provides a detailed explanation of how the new proposed rule under subsection (a) addresses the public comments referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) describes in detail—

(A) the advice and recommendations obtained from the State and local officials consulted under this section;

(B) the areas and issues where consensus was reached with the State and local officials consulted under this section;

(C) the areas and issues of continuing disagreement that resulted in the failure to reach consensus; and

(D) the reasons for the continuing disagreements;

(4) provides a detailed explanation of how the new proposed rule addresses the advice and recommendations provided by the State and local officials consulted under this section, including the areas and issues where consensus was reached with the State and local officials;

(5) describes in detail—

(A) the advice and recommendations obtained from the stakeholders and other interested parties, including small entities, consulted under this section about the potential adverse impacts of the new proposed rule and means for reducing such impacts in the new proposed rule; and

(B) how the new proposed rule addresses such advice and recommendations;

(6) provides a detailed explanation of how the new proposed rule—

(A) recognizes, preserves, and protects the primary rights and responsibilities of the States to protect water quality and to plan and control the development and use of land and water resources in the States; and

(B) is consistent with the applicable rulings of the United States Supreme Court regarding the scope of waters to be covered under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

(7) provides comprehensive regulatory and economic impact analyses, utilizing the latest data and other information, on how definitional changes in the new proposed rule will impact, directly or indirectly—

(A) each program under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for Federal, State, and local government agencies; and

(B) public and private stakeholders and other interested parties, including small entities, regulated under each such program.

(g) PUBLICATION.—

(1) FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.—Not later than 3 months after the completion of consultations with and solicitation of recommendations from State and local officials, stakeholders, and other interested parties under subsection (b), the Secretary and the Administrator shall publish for comment in the Federal Register—

(A) the new proposed rule under subsection (a);

(B) a description of the areas and issues where consensus was reached with the State and local officials consulted under this section; and

(C) the report described in subsection (f).

(2) DURATION OF REVIEW.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall provide not fewer than 180 days for the public to review and comment on—

(A) the new proposed rule under subsection (a);

(B) the accompanying economic analysis for the new proposed rule; and

(C) the report described in subsection (f).

(h) PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS.—Subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act'') shall apply to the development and review of the new proposed rule under subsection (a).

(i) STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''State and local officials'' means elected or professional State and local government officials or their representative regional or national organizations.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, and this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–98. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall

be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–98.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 2 and 3 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. LIMITATION.

The Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency are prohibited from implementing any final rule that is based on the proposed rule described in the notice of proposed rule published in the Federal Register entitled ''Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act'' (79 Fed. Reg. 22188 (April 21, 2014)) if such final rule—

(1) expands the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) beyond those waterbodies covered prior to the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, 531 U.S. 159 (2001), and Rapanos v. United States, 547 U.S. 715 (2006);

(2) is inconsistent with the judicial opinions of Justice Scalia or Justice Kennedy in Rapanos v. United States;

(3) authorizes Federal Water Pollution Control Act jurisdiction over a waterbody based solely on the presence of migratory birds on such waterbody;

(4) increases the regulation of ditches, including roadside ditches, when compared to existing Federal Water Pollution Control Act regulations or guidance;

(5) increases the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to municipal separate sanitary sewer systems, water supply canals, or other water delivery systems;

(6) eliminates historical statutory or regulatory exemptions for agriculture, silviculture, or ranching;

(7) increases the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to groundwater or water reuse or recycling projects;

(8) requires Federal Water Pollution Control Act regulation of erosional features;

(9) requires Federal Water Pollution Control Act permits for land-use activities;

(10) requires Federal Water Pollution Control Act regulation of artificial farm and stock ponds, puddles, water on driveways, birdbaths, or playgrounds;

(11) is inconsistent with the latest peer-reviewed scientific studies;

(12) was promulgated without consulting with State and local governmental entities; or

(13) was promulgated without public notice or comment.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, despite nearly universal calls for increased clarity and certainty from certain stakeholders, my colleagues have made it a priority to halt the current clean water rulemaking and to force agencies to go back to the drawing board and start the process all over again, before the public will ever even see the final product.

After over a year of public outreach on a scale unprecedented in the history of the Clean Water Act, as well as countless congressional hearings, the agencies have submitted a revised clean water protection rule to the Office of Management and Budget for final interagency review, which is the last step before the revised final rule would be released to the general public later this spring.

This, in fact, is the basis of my amendment. You see, Mr. Chairman, to be fair, several of my constituents have expressed similar concerns with the substance of the proposed rule. In fact, Maryland farmers have visited with me on more than one occasion, and I have heard those concerns, and that is why I have pressed the agency witnesses who appeared before our subcommittees on several critical areas.

Indeed, in testimony to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the heads of both the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency have identified several specific areas where the proposed rulemaking may have lacked specificity and where the agencies have committed to clarifying changes in the final rule to address these areas.

For example, the American Farm Bureau and Maryland farmers expressed concern about the distinction between ephemeral—that is rain-dependent—streams, which are currently subject to the Clean Water Act, and erosional features, which are not. EPA has testified that the agencies expect the final rule to clarify the distinction between ephemeral streams and erosional features to ensure that the final rule does not inadvertently bring erosional features under the scope of the act.

Numerous groups, including the National Association of Counties, have expressed concern about the impact of the proposed rule on ''ditches.'' In response, the agencies testified that the proposed rule not only codified the current exemption for ditches but also ''expanded the definition of ditches that would be exempt under the clean water rule to make it clearer, [including] ditches that basically drain dry along public lands and highways.'' Further, the agencies committed to provide greater certainty in the final rule on what ditches are and are not protected by the act.

Other groups questioned whether the proposed clean water rule would capture municipal separate sanitary storm water sewer systems, that is, MS4s, or water reuse and recycling projects. The EPA Administrator testified before our committee that ''EPA has not intended to capture features . . . that have already been captured in . . . MS4 permits, [and it] is our intent to continue to encourage and respect those decisions and to encourage water reuse and recycling, which very much is consistent with the Clean Water Act and our overall intent.''

Further, the Administrator testified that the EPA would make it very clear that these exclusions are articulated in the final rule, ''so that people will see in writing what they have been asking us about.''

So my amendment simply addresses these concerns and claims. It says that if any of these claims prove to be true, then the Secretary and the Administrator are prohibited from issuing any final rule that would bring about these occurrences. Instead of using a legislative scalpel, my Republican colleagues have decided to use a meat cleaver. In my amendment, I have tried to address these concerns, and I have heard from my constituents and interested parties.

Under the amendment, the administration cannot expand the scope beyond those water bodies covered prior to the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the two cases that have been mentioned before, and it cannot be inconsistent with either Justice Scalia's or Justice Kennedy's judicial opinions in Rapanos.

In addition to that, they can't increase the regulation of ditches, they can't eliminate any historical statutory or regulatory exemptions for agriculture, which do not exist under the 2003 and 2008 documents. There are questions about ditches under the 2003 and 2008 guidance, but they are interpreted differently in different parts of the country.

As a fallback and an assurance to the regulated committee, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment so that clear legislative restrictions on the final rulemaking addressing the range of concerns that have been expressed by stakeholders are included. It will ensure that the rule does not go further than the Supreme Court decision and does not exceed historical scope, while reaffirming longstanding and existing exclusions.

Both agencies have made it crystal clear in their testimony before our committee and other committees of the House and the Senate earlier this year in a joint hearing with the Senate that many of these concerns were unfounded or would be addressed in the final rule, and so what the amendment I am offering would do, it would be a backstop in the unlikely event that anyone would think differently about regulating streams, ditches, and farmland.

I would ask for support of my amendment under the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I must strongly oppose the gentlewoman's amendment because it seeks to gut this legislation. This amendment is misleading. It would allow the EPA to move forward and finalize its flawed rule expansion under Federal jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act regardless of the consequences. If the EPA determines entirely of its own discretion that the rule was consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and other factors listed in the amendment, the rule would be finalized.

This amendment gives the EPA the authority to nullify the Supreme Court decisions which reined in the EPA's expansive claims to Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act and legally reinterpreted those decisions to be as broad and expansive as it would like.

The EPA has already stated that it believes its proposed rule is consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and with other factors listed in this amendment. Therefore, the effect of this amendment is to allow the EPA to finalize its flawed rule that many believe is not consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and the other listed factors.

This amendment will put the EPA solely in charge of America's waters and would undermine the Federal-State partnership that H.R. 1732 seeks to preserve. It would allow the EPA to finalize and implement its flawed rule without consultation with the States.

There has been a lot of debate and discussion today, and I want to just kind of address some of that because it goes to this amendment too, once they gut the bill. There was a lot of talk about the amendment that was included in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. That was really a backstop to stop them from moving forward on the current proposed rule, and they cannot repropose the same rule, but if this bill is passed into law, they could move forward and do what H.R. 1732 directs them to do.

Administrator McCarthy said they don't need to put anything out because there are no new changes, or major changes; that is why they don't need to put out a supplemental to the proposed rule. That is the problem. That is why we have this bill here today, and that is why I am against the gentlewoman's amendment, because they are not being open or transparent about what changes they made.

I have a letter from the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, talking about the administration policy in regard to H.R. 1732, and it talks about that they believe that this bill, passed into law, would constrain the Agency's discretion. That is the problem. We can't have a bunch of bureaucrats running around the country and deciding what are going to be waters of the United States and what are not going to be waters of the United States. We have to be clear about that and give clarity. All that H.R. 1732 says is for the EPA and the Corps to go back to the States and stakeholders and work out a rule to satisfy the Supreme Court decisions and that brings clarity and certainty and allows for economic expansion and protects waters at the same time, but if you open it up to having bureaucrats——

Ms. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Do you have a cost estimate of what it would cost to go back to the stakeholders for what you have described?

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time.

I know that the CBO put out $5 million or something like that. The problem we have here is that if this proposed rule goes forward, it costs at least $200-some billion to the economy. What this rule does, if it goes forward, under the Clean Water Act, it just makes it where farmers, landowners, homeowners would have to go through the Clean Water Act permit policy, permit provisions. All it does is create more red tape and bureaucracy and cost, and doesn't do anything to protect the water quality.

It is very important to remember that, I believe, if this rule goes forward as proposed, we could actually go backward in water quality because at some point when you layer on costs and red tape to farmers and businesses out there, they are going to throw their hands up in the air, and they are not going to do it, so it is going to stifle economic activity. It will possibly make us go backwards in water quality because if we don't have a growing economy, we don't have the resources to do the environmental stuff we want to do.

So it is very important that we kill this amendment that the gentlewoman offers because it guts the bill and support H.R. 1732 going forward. All it does is say to the EPA: Go back and work with the States, and don't propose the same rule you put out there that you won't tell us what your changes are, but go back and work with the States, do it in an open, transparent, and accountable process, and we can do something that protects water quality and the environment in this country and move this country forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–98.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. EFFECT ON STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, based on the proposed rule developed under section 3, issues a final rule to define the term ''waters of the United States'' as used in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Administrator shall—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the final rule, review each permit program being administered by a State under section 402, 404, or 405 of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1342, 1344, or 1345) to determine whether the permit program complies with the terms of the final rule; and

(2) not later than 10 days after the date of completion of the review, notify the State of—

(A) the Administrator's determination under paragraph (1); and

(B) in any case in which the Administrator determines that a permit program does not comply with the final rule, the actions required to bring the permit program into compliance.

(b) COMPLIANCE PERIOD.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the Administrator provides notice to a State under subsection (a)(2), the Administrator may not withdraw approval of a State permit program referred to in subsection (a)(1) on the basis that the permit program does not comply with the terms of a final rule described in subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority of the Administrator under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or any other provision of law—

(1) to withdraw approval of a State permit program referred to in subsection (a)(1), except as specifically prohibited by subsection (b); or

(2) to disapprove a proposed permit under a State permit program referred to in subsection (a).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, as allowed under the Clean Water Act, Michigan, my home State, and many other States have successfully attained permitting responsibility for pollutant discharges into their waters through their State environmental departments, as we do in Michigan. These programs have been long a very successful Federal-State partnership, allowing States, who

know their lands and waters better than anyone, to be able to keep local control of their permitting program to ensure protection of their waters in compliance with Federal law in their States. The scope and structure of these programs, of course, are determined by the definition of waters of the U.S.

So when the EPA comes out with a new definition of waters of the U.S., every State's program would go under review to ensure that it is compliant with that new definition. Though Michigan has had its authority to operate its own permitting program from the 1970s, its program has been under review by the EPA for several years. So, in response to the EPA's review of Michigan's program, Michigan passed a bipartisan law in 2013 to improve its State-run program to align with Federal law.

□ 1715

Maintaining these current State permitting programs—it is interesting—is supported in my State and other places both by environmental and agricultural interests, something that we don't often see. So it is really important to maintain these successful programs.

Interestingly enough, since the enactment of its 2013 law, Michigan has not lost any of our precious wetlands.

What my amendment would do is ensure that States that do this will be able to continue to control their State permitting program so that the people who know the States and its waters best can comply with their unique application of the law. Particularly in places like Michigan where we have the Great Lakes, that is important.

So here is what my amendment would do:

First, once a rule under this bill would be finalized, the EPA would have 90 days to determine if a State's program is still compliant under the new rule.

Second, the EPA would have a further 10 days to notify a State in writing if its permitting programs are compliant under that new rule.

And finally, if a State is not compliant, the EPA must allow States 2 years to comply with the new rule before they federalize a State's permitting program.

When a new rule for definition of waters of the U.S. comes out, it will automatically place every State's permitting program under review, running the risk of ending these successful partnerships. I believe, and I think others agree, we have to maintain the flexibility so that States can comply with the new rule before the EPA would remove a State's program.

Depending on the State, of course, statutory changes might be required. So we believe that 2 years would be a sufficient period of time for States like Michigan to work through the legislative process. It took Michigan over a year in 2013 to come to a conclusion of that reform.

In practice, to be fair, the EPA has granted broad discretion when reviewing a State's programs. What this amendment would do is simply codify into law that process so that States have the ability to come into compliance and maintain this important partnership. It is really important to the underlying purpose of the act.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan for offering this thoughtful amendment. We are prepared to support this amendment since we believe it helps protect a State's role in administering the Clean Water Act, especially those States with delegated authorities under sections 402 and 404 of the act. We also believe this amendment strengthens H.R. 1732 and enhances the role of States in carrying out the Clean Water Act. I encourage Members to support the Kildee amendment.

I would also ask the sponsor of this amendment if he would support this underlying bill with the amendment included. The reason I argue he should is because, under the current rule, without the underlying bill being passed, States would have to change the processes under the 402 and 404 permitting, and they currently would have no grace period. With this amendment in the underlying bill and passage of the underlying bill, that would solve that problem. And so his amendment strengthens the bill, but also gives the States the flexibility that he is asking for. I would ask that the sponsor of the amendment support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his support. I do think it is important that whenever we can agree, we do express that agreement. I think this amendment is a good example.

I know we all support the underlying purpose of the act. This particular amendment would ensure that, when there is a rule, States that do operate under delegated authority would be able to continue to protect the waters of the U.S. and the waters within their own States with the best knowledge on the ground. It has been a good experience in the State of Michigan. I think it is good for other States as well. I think that this amendment would help to ensure that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) having assumed the chair, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

RAFAEL RAMOS AND WENJIAN LIU NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 665) to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COORDINATOR.—The term ''Coordinator'' means the Blue Alert Coordinator of the Department of Justice designated under section 4(a).

(2) BLUE ALERT.—The term ''Blue Alert'' means information sent through the network relating to—

(A) the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer in the line of duty;

(B) an officer who is missing in connection with the officer's official duties; or

(C) an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer.

(3) BLUE ALERT PLAN.—The term ''Blue Alert plan'' means the plan of a State, unit of local government, or Federal agency participating in the network for the dissemination of information received as a Blue Alert.

(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''law enforcement officer'' shall have the same meaning as in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b).

(5) NETWORK.—The term ''network'' means the Blue Alert communications network established by the Attorney General under section 3.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 3. BLUE ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

The Attorney General shall establish a national Blue Alert communications network within the Department of Justice to issue Blue Alerts through the initiation, facilitation, and promotion of Blue Alert plans, in coordination with States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other appropriate entities.

SEC. 4. BLUE ALERT COORDINATOR; GUIDELINES.

(a) COORDINATION WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—The Attorney General shall assign an existing officer of the Department of Justice to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert communications network.

(b) DUTIES OF THE COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator shall—

(1) provide assistance to States and units of local government that are using Blue Alert plans;

(2) establish voluntary guidelines for States and units of local government to use in developing Blue Alert plans that will promote compatible and integrated Blue Alert plans throughout the United States, including—

(A) a list of the resources necessary to establish a Blue Alert plan;

(B) criteria for evaluating whether a situation warrants issuing a Blue Alert;

(C) guidelines to protect the privacy, dignity, independence, and autonomy of any law enforcement officer who may be the subject of a Blue Alert and the family of the law enforcement officer;

(D) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) the law enforcement agency involved—

(I) confirms—

(aa) the death or serious injury of the law enforcement officer; or

(bb) the attack on the law enforcement officer and that there is an indication of the death or serious injury of the officer; or

(II) concludes that the law enforcement officer is missing in connection with the officer's official duties;

(ii) there is an indication of serious injury to or death of the law enforcement officer;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(E) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a threat to cause death or serious injury to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) a law enforcement agency involved confirms that the threat is imminent and credible;

(ii) at the time of receipt of the threat, the suspect is wanted by a law enforcement agency;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(F) guidelines—

(i) that information should be provided to the National Crime Information Center database operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 534 of title 28, United States Code, and any relevant crime information repository of the State involved, relating to—

(I) a law enforcement officer who is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty; or

(II) an imminent and credible threat to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer;

(ii) that a Blue Alert should, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local governments), be limited to the geographic areas most likely to facilitate the apprehension of the suspect involved or which the suspect could reasonably reach, which should not be limited to State lines;

(iii) for law enforcement agencies of States or units of local government to develop plans to communicate information to neighboring States to provide for seamless communication of a Blue Alert; and

(iv) providing that a Blue Alert should be suspended when the suspect involved is apprehended or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective; and

(G) guidelines for—

(i) the issuance of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(ii) the extent of the dissemination of alerts issued through the network;

(3) develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects that address activities during the period beginning at the time of the initial notification of a law enforcement agency that a suspect has not been apprehended and ending at the time of apprehension of a suspect or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective, including protocols regulating—

(A) the use of public safety communications;

(B) command center operations; and

(C) incident review, evaluation, debriefing, and public information procedures;

(4) work with States to ensure appropriate regional coordination of various elements of the network;

(5) establish an advisory group to assist States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other entities involved in the network with initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alert plans, which shall include—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, representation from the various geographic regions of the United States; and

(B) members who are—

(i) representatives of a law enforcement organization representing rank-and-file officers;

(ii) representatives of other law enforcement agencies and public safety communications;

(iii) broadcasters, first responders, dispatchers, and radio station personnel; and

(iv) representatives of any other individuals or organizations that the Coordinator determines are necessary to the success of the network;

(6) act as the nationwide point of contact for—

(A) the development of the network; and

(B) regional coordination of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(7) determine—

(A) what procedures and practices are in use for notifying law enforcement and the public when—

(i) a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty;

(ii) a law enforcement officer is missing in connection with the officer's official duties; and

(iii) an imminent and credible threat to kill or seriously injure a law enforcement officer is received; and

(B) which of the procedures and practices are effective and that do not require the expenditure of additional resources to implement.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2), protocols developed under subsection (b)(3), and other programs established under subsection (b), shall not be mandatory.

(2) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2) shall, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government), provide that appropriate information relating to a Blue Alert is disseminated to the appropriate officials of law enforcement agencies, public health agencies, and other agencies.

(3) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS.—The guidelines established under subsection (b) shall—

(A) provide mechanisms that ensure that Blue Alerts comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations; and

(B) include standards that specifically provide for the protection of the civil liberties, including the privacy, of law enforcement officers who are seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or who are threatened with death or serious injury, and the families of the officers.

(d) COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The Coordinator shall cooperate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and appropriate offices of the Department of Justice in carrying out activities under this Act.

(e) RESTRICTIONS ON COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator may not—

(1) perform any official travel for the sole purpose of carrying out the duties of the Coordinator;

(2) lobby any officer of a State regarding the funding or implementation of a Blue Alert plan; or

(3) host a conference focused solely on the Blue Alert program that requires the expenditure of Federal funds.

(f) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Coordinator shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Coordinator and the effectiveness and status of the Blue Alert plans that are in effect or being developed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 665, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This week in Washington, D.C., we are celebrating National Police Week. This annual tradition, which draws tens of thousands of law enforcement officers from around the country, is a time to celebrate the critical role that police play in maintaining a free and safe society. It is also a time to mourn our Nation's fallen heroes.

Last year, 127 men and women gave their lives while protecting Americans' public safety, including three officers in my home State of Virginia. The average age of these fallen officers is just 40 years old, which is too young to be taken from their loved ones.

The Blue Alert system, which is currently in place in 20 States, is a cooperative effort among local, State, and Federal authorities, law enforcement agencies, and the general public.

S. 665, the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015, seeks to expand on these existing programs by encouraging an enhanced nationwide system for the distribution of time-sensitive information to help identify and locate a violent suspect when a law enforcement officer is injured or killed in the line of duty or when there is an imminent and credible threat against an officer.

Similar to the AMBER Alerts for missing children and Silver Alerts for missing seniors, Blue Alerts broadcast information about suspects, including a description of an offender who is still at large and, if available, a description of the offender's vehicle and license plate information. Like AMBER Alerts, Blue Alerts are intended to hinder the offender's ability to escape and will facilitate their capture.

S. 665 directs the Justice Department to designate an existing employee as the Blue Alert national coordinator, who will establish voluntary guidelines for the program and encourage those States that have not already done so to develop Blue Alert plans.

The House has passed similar versions of this legislation in the past two Congresses, but those bills were not taken up by the Senate.

The version of the Blue Alert bill that we consider today is different for two important reasons:

First, unlike the Blue Alert bills from prior Congresses that passed this body only to wither away in the Senate, S. 665 will be sent directly to the President's desk for signature following House passage. I urge him to sign this legislation without delay.

Second, S. 665 is named after New York City Police Officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu, who, in December 2014, were murdered in cold blood by a malevolent killer who traveled from Baltimore to Brooklyn with the stated intention of shooting police officers.

Officer Ramos left behind a wife and 13-year-old son. Officer Liu left behind his wife of just 2 months. This bill, a tribute to their service and sacrifice, will hopefully spare other families from the pain of losing a loved one.

I thank Senator CARDIN, Mr. REICHERT of Washington, and the many bipartisan cosponsors of both the House and Senate bills for their work on this important legislation. I also thank the many outside law enforcement organizations that have tirelessly promoted the Blue Alert program over the past several years.

This bill reaffirms Congress' commitment to ensure the safety of the men and women in our Nation's law enforcement communities and the citizens they serve and protect every day.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS of the Judiciary Committee for this timely presentation and the offering of this legislation on the floor this week, which is a time to commemorate and mourn and to uphold the Nation's law enforcement. It is a very important statement that we make today on the floor of the House.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, a ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and yes, as a Member of Congress from Houston, which has one of the Nation's most effective police departments, and as a cosponsor of the House companion measure, I rise in strong support of S. 665, the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015.

I, too, thank Senator CARDIN, Congressman REICHERT, and my colleague and friend, Congressman PASCRELL. I am also a cosponsor. I thank them for their particular leadership on this bill.

Every day, more than 900,000 officers protect and serve the people of the United States. On average, one law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty every 58 hours. Each year, there is an average of 58,930 assaults on our law enforcement officers, resulting in 15,404 injuries.

Just yesterday, in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, the community held a memorial for two dedicated public servants fatally shot during a traffic stop on Saturday night.

Married and the father of two, Benjamin Deen, a 34-year-old canine officer, was recognized in 2012 as the Hattiesburg Officer of the Year. Liquori Tate, just 25 years old, fulfilled a childhood dream when he graduated from the police academy and joined the police force less than 1 year ago. Many of us heard the sympathetic and emotional outpouring by his family of his love of being a law enforcement officer.

For the community of Hattiesburg, the senseless deaths of on-duty officers are the first in three decades. Hattiesburg is not alone, however, in these tragic developments. Law enforcement fatalities in the U.S. rose 24 percent in 2014, reversing 2 years of significant decline.

The number of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty rose from 102 in 2013 to 126 in 2014. Statistics released yesterday by the FBI show that 51 law enforcement officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty in 2014. This is an increase of almost 89 percent when compared to the 27 killed in 2013. Of those 51 felonious deaths, offenders used firearms in 46 of them.

Just 1 day before this tragedy in Mississippi, Officer Brian Moore was laid to rest thousands of miles away in Long Island, New York. After 6 p.m. on a Saturday, Moore and his partner came upon the gunman. After identifying himself as a police officer and asking the gunman about the object in his waistband, the gunman fatally shot Moore in the face.

Moore was 20 years old when he joined the New York Police Department. After over 5 years of service, he earned two Meritorious Police Duty medals and two Excellent Police Duty medals. He died several days after he was shot.

□ 1730

The killing of Officer Moore in New York City comes on the heels of the December killings of New York Police Department Officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu, for whom this legislation before us memorializes. These officers were killed on a Saturday afternoon while sitting in their parked patrol car by a man who shared his intent to kill police officers on social media.

This man traveled from Maryland to New York to execute his plan; and, unfortunately, at the same time Maryland authorities were warning the NYPD of this threat, Officers Ramos and Liu were being assassinated.

Benjamin Deen, Liquori Tate, Brian Moore, Rafael Ramos, and Wenjian Liu and other fallen heroes join the more than 20,000 U.S. law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice since the first known line-of-duty death in 1791, nearly 1,700 of whom hail from my home State of Texas and 121 from the Houston Police Department.

The brave men and women who risk their lives to keep the peace and keep us safe are too often taken by the violence they are working to prevent. When a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed, rapid dissemination of information about the suspected criminal is critical to ensuring justice for that officer and keeping the public safe.

Here lies the opportunity for this important legislation. The Blue Alert System is modeled after the AMBER Alert and the Silver Alert. Currently, 22 States, including my home State of Texas, have local Blue Alert programs in operation.

The gist of this legislation is to provide for the coordination and the provisions for other States to participate and to help other States participate in a Blue Alert plan. This Blue Alert plan, I hope, will save lives or will, in essence, save and protect law enforcement officers or bring their perpetrator, tragically, of their death, to justice.

This is an important statement this week as we mourn those who have fallen in the service of their country as law enforcement officers. This is an important action, if you will, to tell the families of these officers that we care. I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the chief sponsor of the companion House legislation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding generous time for my comments. I also want to thank you for your strong support for this legislation, and I take a moment also to thank Ms. JACKSON LEE for her strong words of support. Her passion was evident and felt in her words.

This is a very close topic to my heart, very near and dear to me. I think, as most Members in this body know, I spent 33 years in law enforcement before I came to Congress. I have been here 10 years; I tell people I just look like I have been here 40 years, but I have had the blessing of serving in many different ways, first in the Air Force and now in Congress.

Today is just an honor to stand here in support of this legislation because, this week, we have families from all across the country. When I arrived at the airport this afternoon, at 3:30, motorcades were lined up to escort the survivors of the fallen officers, honor guards standing at the gates where people are coming off the airplanes, to escort the families of the fallen officers.

These men and women risk their lives every day across this great Nation to protect our communities, protect our families, protect our children, and we need to help them. This bill does just that because, when they leave home, they don't know if they are coming back. The families don't know if they are coming back home that day or that evening.

My own family has had that experience watching me being wheeled into a hospital room with stab wounds in the side of my neck. They learned about it on TV. That was back in the seventies, so it was a little bit different time back then, but it is still a dangerous job.

We worked hard to work with the New York Police Department, the Sergeants Benevolent Association, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association to rename this bill after the two New York police officers, Ramos and Liu, because this is a story where this Blue Alert could have made a difference.

It could have made a difference because the suspect in this case shot his girlfriend in Maryland at 5:45 in the morning, and then at 2:45, 3 in the afternoon, showed up in New York, after posting on social media that he was going to make ''angels out of police officers that day.'' As Ms. JACKSON LEE said, the information came to NYPD too late.

We think Blue Alert can make a difference. We think Blue Alert can save lives. We think Blue Alert can keep our officers safer on the streets.

In Seattle, Washington, there is a community called Lakewood; and it is just a half an hour, 40 minutes, south of Seattle, the city of Lakewood. In 2009, there were four police officers sitting in a coffee shop.

They were having a squad meeting, a sergeant and three police officers—Sergeant Renninger, Officer Owens, Officer Griswold, and Officer Richard—just sitting there, having coffee, talking about what was going to happen that day, what they were going to focus on that day to keep that community safe.

A man walked in and assassinated all four officers. A 2-day manhunt occurred looking for that suspect, for that murderer, for that monster—2 days. If we had had Blue Alert—and during those 2 days, that suspect is on the loose. He is not only a danger to other police officers, he is a danger to the entire community. We need to find these people as soon as possible.

A Blue Alert—because we knew who this guy was, and in the New York case, we knew who this guy was—all we need to do is put the information out there sooner, quicker, faster, immediately so we could capture these people and put them behind bars and keep the community safe.

Also, a number of years ago, in 1982, I lost a friend, my best friend and my partner, and he was shot and killed chasing a murder suspect. I was one of the cops out there for 3 days searching for this guy in the foothills of the Cascade Mountains, about 45 minutes southeast of Seattle. In 1982, of course, we didn't have this technology. I know the feeling of losing a good friend, a good cop, a father of five, dedicated, would do anything for his community.

We have got to do everything we can to show support across this country for our cops on the street, for their families, and this week especially, when you see a police officer walking around the Capitol Grounds, make sure you say thank you. Make sure you say thank you to the family because this is a loss they will never, ever forget; and neither will we.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

I also want to make mention of a good friend who has worked with me on law enforcement issues here in this body, who was the mayor of Paterson, New Jersey. I always tell BILL PASCRELL that he would have made a good sheriff. He is a strong supporter of law enforcement, first responders, and firefighters.

He and I co-chair the Law Enforcement Caucus together. He is here in this body today, and I know he is going to be speaking on some of these issues this evening.

He has been a good friend to law enforcement, and I appreciate all the hard work that he has put into this bill and others to help support our law enforcement officers across this country.

I appreciate the time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman REICHERT for his belief in this bill and for his statement of the preciousness of life of our law enforcement officers and our families who depend upon them.

This bill, of course, in particular, would work with States to ensure the regional coordination of various elements of the network, which speaks directly to the heinous crime committed against the two New York police officers and someone who traveled from Maryland to New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a gentleman who lives in the region and who we have had the privilege of working with, from COPS on the Beat to the Blue Alert and many other bills dealing with our first responders, and a cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Anyone who listened to the gentleman from Washington State, Congressman REICHERT, if they have any doubt as to the significance, not only of this piece of legislation and the other three pieces of legislation that we will pursue after this, I don't know what it is going to take because he was on the front lines. He doesn't have to conjecture.

I personally thank Chairman GOODLATTE. I personally thank Ranking

Member CONYERS and, of course, our brothers in the Senate, Senator CARDIN, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM.

We had a press conference in April and introduced this legislation. At that press conference was Gina Miller. Gina Miller was the fiancée of a Washington State trooper, Tony Radulescu, who was shot at a traffic stop in Washington State and killed.

He went to high school in New Jersey. He was a vet from the gulf war, as many of our police officers are. I promised Gina I would not take off the wristband she gave me until we pass this legislation. It is fitting in this month, when we honor all law enforcement, it is fitting that we move this through the House of Representatives.

I am honored to stand with Mr. REICHERT as we present this, and I am honored and thank you all for coming on this piece of legislation.

We have heard the numbers about how many police officers were killed in the line of duty in 2013 and 2014. It is a grave reminder that these attacks are too common in our communities.

Last year, we mourned the loss of Jersey City Officer Melvin Santiago, who was killed in the line of duty responding to a gang-related robbery. Officer Santiago's death set off a series of targeted threats against the Jersey police officers from the assailant's fellow gang members.

The grave risk that our law enforcement officers face was tragically confirmed this past Christmas when on-duty New York Police Department Officers Ramos and Liu were murdered while simply sitting in their squad car.

When threats like this occur, the rapid dissemination of critical, time-sensitive information is essential, and the national Blue Alert system would provide that in New Jersey and across our Nation.

Regardless of what aspect you talk of about police work, law enforcement, talk must be followed by action.

□ 1745

So cops, the police officers just don't need a pat on the back from us while we place our grandchildren in the back of the car to see what it is like to sit in a police car. They need our actions here in Washington to help communities throughout America.

So I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for putting this bill before us tonight and the other bills that will follow.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), another distinguished gentleman who has worked on these issues and is now the ranking member of the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for the time; I want to thank the chairman for scheduling these bills; and particularly I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for bringing them.

My first job out of law school was attorney for the Memphis Police Department, and I served 3½ years working as the attorney for the Memphis Police Department. I know that police are on the front lines of democracy in seeing that we have a society that can function and that we have people's rights protected in a most direct way.

The ranking member talked about the losses of the lives in New York of Officer Davis; the two officers this bill is named for, Officers Ramos and Liu; and then there were the two officers killed in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, each of which is tragic and each of which caused me to grieve and be mournful about the loss of these men's lives in the course of duty.

While we have some issues with law enforcement in certain areas, we need to have law enforcement; and the loss of any life of a law enforcement member in the actions of their duties or because of their position is wrong, and we should have a system in place to apprehend and arrest somebody who, with probable cause, committed that crime.

I also want to thank the chairman of the committee for scheduling a hearing next week on civil rights issues. These issues go together. No one should lose their life wrongfully. We must deal with these issues, and it is commendable.

There are some good things happening in Congress. So many times I go home, and people talk about the acrimony and don't we get along. Well, we get some things done, and we get some things done together, and the Judiciary Committee is doing some of those things.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member, who is not here, for that.

I am a proud sponsor of this bill. I hope everybody will vote for it and pass it. It will save some law enforcement people's lives.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and if the gentlewoman from Texas is prepared to yield back, I am prepared to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was moved by all of the presentations that have been made here today, statements on the floor, by passionate Members of Congress. It reminded me of my time as a municipal court judge, seeing officers in clothing that would not be recognizable because they were undercover officers, seeking what we call probable cause warrants and trying to save communities.

I think this legislation is extremely important in this week because what it says is that we can all get along, that we can pass legislation that deals with the pain of our law enforcement officers and commits us to the statement that we want them to go home to their families. At the same time, we can use the words ''criminal justice reform'' and not offend by saying it is to help everyone: our law enforcement officers and our civilians.

I am also grateful that next week we will have the opportunity to hear a myriad of issues on this particular point.

But as we come together this week, officers of the law will be coming to Washington, D.C., from all parts of the Nation. This legislation will make the statement that we want to coordinate, we want to establish advisory groups, we want to establish guidelines for States, and we want to provide assistance to have the Blue Alert plans.

As we have saved children through the AMBER Alerts and helped find senior citizens through the Silver Alerts, I want to make sure that we bring more officers home to their families by ensuring that heinous criminals who are out to do them harm are caught before they do more harm.

I also want to say that I look forward to working on legislation that deals with bringing us together and making sure that we address all of the concerns.

So I join today with the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, and the National Sheriffs' Association in supporting this legislation, S. 665. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, I stand today mourning those who have been lost and joining our officers as they converge upon the United States Capitol, standing shoulder-to-shoulder. I want to say to them that America cares. We honor you; we mourn you; and we stand in assistance to you.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD a list of officers killed in the line of duty in my own hometown of Houston, Texas, from the Houston Police Department.

HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

LINE OF DUTY DEATHS: 112

Assault: 1
Automobile accident: 10
Fire: 1
Gunfire: 69
Gunfire (Accidental): 2
Heart attack: 2
Motorcycle accident: 9
Stabbed: 2
Struck by vehicle: 5
Vehicle pursuit: 1
Vehicular assault: 10

BY MONTH

January: 12
February: 7
March: 12
April: 10
May: 7
June: 15
July: 5

August: 14
September: 9
October: 6
November: 6
December: 9

BY GENDER

Male: 109
Female: 3

Police Officer Kevin Scott Will, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, May 29, 2011, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Eydelmen Mani, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer Henry Canales, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, June 23, 2009, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Timothy Scott Abernethy, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, December 7, 2008, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Gary Allen Gryder, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, June 29, 2008, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Officer Rodney Joseph Johnson, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, September 21, 2006, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Reuben Becerra DeLeon, Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, October 26, 2005, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Frank Manuel Cantu, Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, March 25, 2004, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Charles Roy Clark, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, April 3, 2003, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Keith Alan Dees, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, March 7, 2002, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer Alberto ''Albert'' Vasquez, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, May 22, 2001, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Dennis E. Holmes, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, January 10, 2001, Cause: Heart attack.

Police Officer Jerry Keith Stowe, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, September 20, 2000, Cause: Assault.

Police Officer Troy Alan Blando, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, May 19, 1999, Cause: Gunfire.

Sergeant Kent Dean Kincaid, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, May 23, 1998, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Cuong Huy ''Tony'' Trinh, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, April 6, 1997, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Dawn Suzanne Erickson, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, December 24, 1995, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer David Michael Healy, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, November 12, 1994, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer Guy P. Gaddis, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, January 31, 1994, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Michael P. Roman, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, January 6, 1994, Cause: Vehicle pursuit.

Sergeant Bruno David Soboleski, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, April 12, 1991, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer John Anthony Salvaggio, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, November 25, 1990, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer James Bruce Irby, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, June 27, 1990, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer James Charles Boswell, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, December 9, 1989, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Fiorentino M. Garcia, Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, November 10, 1989, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Officer Elston Morris Howard, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, July 20, 1988, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Andrew Winzer, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, February 18, 1988, Cause: Automobile accident.

Officer Maria Michelle Groves, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, April 10, 1987, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Officer William Moss, Houston Airport Police Department, EOW: Monday, September 12, 1983, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer Charles Robert Coates, II, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, February 23, 1983, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer Kathleen C. Schaefer, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, August 18, 1982, Cause: Gunfire (Accidental).

Officer James D. Harris, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, July 13, 1982, Cause: Gunfire.

Detective Daryl W. Shirley, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, April 28, 1982, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Winston J. Rawlins, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, March 29, 1982, Cause: Fire.

Police Officer William Edwin DeLeon, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, March 29, 1982, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Jose A. Zamarron, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, April 18, 1981, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Detective Victor R. Wells, III, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, October 2, 1980, Cause: Gunfire.

Deputy City Marshal Charles H. Baker, Houston City Marshal's Office, EOW: Thursday, August 16, 1979, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Timothy Lowe Hearn, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, June 8, 1978, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer James F. Kilty, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, April 8, 1976, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer George G. Rojas, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, January 28, 1976, Cause: Stabbed.

Police Officer Richard H. Calhoun, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, October to, 1975, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Francis Eddie Wright, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, August 2, 1975, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer Johnny Terrell Bamsch, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, January 30, 1975, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Jerry Lawrence Riley, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, June 18, 1974, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer David Huerta, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, September 19, 1973, Cause: Gunfire.

Patrolman Antonio Guzman Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, January 9, 1973, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Jerry L. Spruill, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, October 26, 1972, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer David Franklin Noel, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, June 17, 1972, Cause: Stabbed.

Police Officer Claude R. Beck, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, December 10, 1971, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer Robert Wayne Lee, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, January 31, 1971, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Leon Griggs, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, January 31, 1970, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Kenneth L. Moody, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, November 26, 1969, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Bobby L. James, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, June 26, 1968, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Ben Eddie Gerhart, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, June 26, 1968, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Louis R. Kuba, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, May 17, 1967, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Louis L. Sander, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, January 21, 1967, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Floyd T. DeLoach Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, June 30, 1965, Cause: Gunfire .

Police Officer Herbert N. Planer, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, February 18, 1965, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer James Franklin Willis, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, July 1, 1964, Cause: Automobile accident.

Sergeant Charles R. McDaniel, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, August 4, 1963, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer James T. Walker, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, March 8, 1963, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer Gonzalo Q. Gonzalez, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, February 28, 1960, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer John W. Suttle, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, August 3, 1959, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer C.E. Branon, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, March 20, 1959, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Noel R. Miller, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, June 6, 1958, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Robert Schultea, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, August 25, 1956, Cause: Gunfire.

Auxiliary Officer Frank L. Kellogg, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, November 30, 1955, Cause: Gunfire.

Captain Charles R. Gougenheim, Houston Police Department EOW: Saturday, April 30, 1955, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Jack B. Beets, Houston Police Department EOW: Saturday, April 30, 1955 Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Fred Maddox Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, February 24, 1954, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Smith Anderson ''Buster'' Kent, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, January 12, 1954, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer Howard B. Hammond, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, August 18, 1946, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer George D. Edwards, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, June 30, 1939, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer M.E. Palmer, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, March 24, 1938, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer A.P. Martial, Houston Police Department EOW: Monday, November 8, 1937 Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer James T. Gambill, Houston Police Department EOW: Tuesday, December 1, 1936 Cause: Heart attack.

Detective Rempsey H. Sullivan, Houston Police Department EOW: Saturday, March 9, 1935 Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Harry T. Mereness, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, October 18, 1933, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Officer J.D. Landry, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, December 3, 1930, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Officer Willie Bonner Phares, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, September 30, 1930, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Edward D. Fitzgerald, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, September 20, 1930, Cause: Gunfire.

Motorcycle Officer C.F. Thomas, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, December 17, 1929, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Detective Ed Jones, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, September 13, 1929, Cause. Gunfire.

Detective Oscar Hope, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, June 22, 1929, Cause: Gunfire.

Detective A. Worth Davis, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, June 17, 1928 Cause: Gunfire.

Detective Carl Greene, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, March 14, 1928, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer R. Q. Wells, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, July 30, 1927, Cause: Automobile accident.

Officer Perry P. Jones, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, January 30, 1927, Cause: Gunfire.

Detective E. C. Chavez, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, September 17, 1925 Cause: Gunfire.

Detective Pete Corrales, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, January 25, 1925, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer J. Clark Etheridge, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, August 23, 1924, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer George Benard Crawford, Magnolia Park Police Department, EOW: Saturday, September 17, 1921, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer Dave Murdock, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, June 27, 1921, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Jeter Young, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, June 19, 1921, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Detective Johnnie Davidson, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, February 19, 1921, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Ira Raney, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Ross Patton, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Horace Moody, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer E. G. Meinke, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Rufus E. Daniels, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Detective Isaac Parson, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, May 24, 1914, Cause: Gunfire (Accidental).

Detective Joseph Robert Free, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, October 18, 1912, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer John M. Cain, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 3, 1911, Cause: Gunfire.

Deputy Chief William E. Murphy, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, April 1, 1910, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer John C. James, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, December 12, 1901, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Herman Youngst, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, December 12, 1901, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer William F. Weiss Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, July 30, 1901, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer James E. Fenn, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, March 15, 1891, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Henry Williams, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, February 8, 1886, Cause: Gunfire.

Patrolman Richard Snow, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, March 17, 1882, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer C. Edward Foley, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, March 10, 1860 Cause: Gunfire.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I will close with a prayer that those who are already lost will know that we pray for their eternal rest, and for those who live, that we pray for their continued service to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee; as the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; as the representative from Houston, which has one of the Nation's most effective police departments; and as a co-sponsor of the House companion measure, I rise in strong support of S. 665, the ''Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015.''

Every day, more than 900,000 officers protect and serve the people of the United States. On average, one law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty every 58 hours. And, each year, there is an average of 58,930 assaults on our law enforcement officers, resulting in 15,404 injuries.

Just yesterday, in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, a community held a memorial for two dedicated public servants fatally shot during a traffic stop on Saturday night. Married and the father of two, Benjamin Deen, a 34-year-old K–9 officer, was recognized in 2012 as the Hattiesburg ''Officer of the Year.'' Liquori Tate, just 25 years old, fulfilled a childhood dream when he graduated the police academy and joined the police force less than one year ago. For the community of Hattiesburg, these senseless deaths of on duty officers are the first in three decades.

Hattiesburg is not alone in these tragic developments. Law enforcement fatalities in the U.S. rose 24 percent in 2014, reversing two years of significant decline. The number of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty rose from 102 in 2013 to 126 in 2014. Preliminary statistics released yesterday by the FBI show that 51 law enforcement officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty in 2014. This is an increase of almost 89 percent when compared to the 27 killed in 2013. And, of those 51 felonious deaths, offenders used firearms in 46.

Just one day before this tragedy in Mississippi, Officer Brian Moore was laid to rest thousands of miles away in Long Island, New York. Around 6 p.m. on a Saturday, Moore and his partner came upon the gunman. After identifying himself as a police officer, and asking the gunman about the object in his waistband, the gunman fatally shot Moore in the face. Moore was just 20 years old when he joined the New York Police Department and, over five years of service, he earned two medals for meritorious police duty and two for excellent police duty.

The killing of Officer Moore in New York City comes on the heels of the December killings of NYPD Officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu, for whom the legislation before us memorializes. These officers were killed on a Saturday afternoon, while sitting in their parked patrol car, by a man who had shared his intent to kill police officers on social media. This man traveled from Maryland to New York to execute his plan. Unfortunately, at the same time Maryland authorities were warning the NYPD of this threat, Officers Ramos and Liu were being assassinated.

Benjamin Dean, Liquori Tate, Brian Moore, Rafael Ramos, and Wenjian Liu—these fallen heroes join the more than 20,000 U.S. law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice since the first known line-of-duty death in 1791, nearly 1,700 of whom hail from my home state of Texas and 121 from the Houston Police Department.

The brave men and women who risk their lives to keep the peace and keep us safe are too often taken by the violence they are working to prevent. So when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed, rapid dissemination of information about the suspected criminal is critical to ensuring justice for that officer and keeping the public safe.

These officers deserve more than just a response after violence, they deserve an effective, nationwide system that can widely disseminate advance warnings when an imminent and credible threat is made against them.

Having in place such a system could be the difference between life and death. And, for Officers Ramos and Liu, having such a system in place may have given them a fighting chance. The measure before us seeks to meet these safety challenges by putting in place such a system.

The Blue Alert system is modeled after the Amber Alert and the Silver Alert programs, which have been very successful in finding abducted children and missing seniors. Currently 22 states, including my home state of Texas, have local Blue Alert programs in operation. There is no national system, however, to coordinate alerts across multiple state lines.

This legislation addresses this gap by directing the Attorney General to establish a national communications network within the Department of Justice to disseminate information when an officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, or the target of an imminent, credible threat to do the same, and assign a Department of Justice officer to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert Network.

The National Blue Alert Coordinator will—

(1) provide assistance to states and local governments using Blue Alert plans;

(2) establish voluntary guidelines for states and local governments for developing these plans; develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects;

(3) work with states to ensure regional coordination of various elements of the network; and

(4) establish advisory groups, to assist states, local governments, law enforcement agencies and other entities in initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alerts through the network.

The Coordinator will also determine what procedures and practices to use in notifying law enforcement and the public when a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty, or is the target of an imminent, credible threat to do the same, and which procedures and practices are the most cost effective to implement.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to expand this excellent program nationwide. Passage of S. 665

will not prevent the loss of all brave law enforcement officials in the future, but it can help. Even if it saves one life, and enables one officer to return safely home to his or her loved ones, this legislation will have proven its value.

It is particularly timely that we consider this measure during National Police Week.

This week is a special occasion during which we recognize our law enforcement officers and honor those who lost their lives in the line of duty. But it would be careless not to also reflect on the events that are unfolding across the Nation in response to tragic incidents involving the use of lethal force against unarmed citizens.

The measure before us will enhance officer safety, which should always be one of our major concerns, but the issuance of alerts alone is not enough. The safety of law enforcement officers and community members are undeniably intertwined, but recent events have made it clear that the mutual trust and respect necessary for this relationship needs to be strengthened.

If we are to succeed in the vital mission of building trust and mutual respect between law enforcement and the communities they serve, we must work to really see each other. We must also work to understand each other's reality.

Citizens need to see the risks and dangers the men and women of law enforcement experience when they put on their badge. Law enforcement needs to see the same risks and dangers men and women in their communities experience when they walk down the street or drive their cars. We must see that we are not enemies and we must commit to addressing these problems in a productive and nonviolent manner.

In order to fully see each other, we need to gain a clear picture of what is happening in our communities. The lack of comprehensive and reliable data feeds into this distrust and is an obstacle to moving us forward.

As stated by FBI Director Comey, we cannot effectively address concerns about ''use of force'' policies and officer-involved shootings if we do not have a firm grasp on the demographics and circumstances of such incidents.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 1810, the CADET Act, which would mandate the data collection and analysis necessary to properly educate and train law enforcement. We simply cannot have an informed discussion about sound policy if we do not improve the way we collect and analyze data.

But it does not stop there. If we are to truly succeed in this mission, we in Congress must have a frank conversation about the policies we have enacted that have caused and exacerbated this distrust.

We must recognize the role that our actions have played in constructing a criminal justice system that creates more criminals and victims than justice. And, we must do our part by taking up the task of reforming our criminal justice system so that it is fairer and delivers equal justice to all persons.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bipartisan legislation because it increases safety for us all and it is an important step towards repairing the relationship between law enforcement and the communities that they serve.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, and the National Sheriffs Association in supporting S. 665.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this good and important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 665.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DON'T TAX OUR FALLEN PUBLIC SAFETY HEROES ACT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 606) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 606

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act''.

SEC. 2. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN COMPENSATION RECEIVED BY PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS.

Subsection (a) of section 104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting ''; and'', and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) amounts received pursuant to—

''(A) section 1201 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796); or

''(B) a program established under the laws of any State which provides monetary compensation for surviving dependents of a public safety officer who has died as the direct and proximate result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty,

except that subparagraph (B) shall not apply to any amounts that would have been payable if death of the public safety officer had occurred other than as the direct and proximate result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include statements and extraneous material on H.R. 606 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), who is also a member of the Ways and Means Committee, for introducing the legislation that we are considering today.

Mr. PAULSEN has been a great champion for our Nation's law enforcement, and this bill will provide much-needed relief to the families of fallen public safety officers.

As we celebrate National Police Week, we are reminded of the sacrifices of our many brave men and women who wear the badge.

When law enforcement officers pay the ultimate price and give their lives in the line of duty, we have a responsibility to help take care of the families that they leave behind.

For too long, the law has been silent on whether the benefits surviving spouses and dependents receive through State and Federal Public Safety Officers' Benefits programs are subject to Federal income tax. This bill will remove all ambiguity and codify the IRS' 1977 ruling that PSOB benefits should not be subject to taxation.

When a public safety officer has been catastrophically injured or killed in the line of duty, their families should not also have to deal with paying taxes on the benefits they receive after that loved one has paid the ultimate price while protecting their fellow Americans. The sacrifices of our men and women who wear the badge keep us safe, and now we have the opportunity to help provide for those that they leave behind.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank both Chairman RYAN and Ranking Member LEVIN of the Ways and Means Committee for allowing the bill coming to the floor today, and I thank my good friends Representatives PAULSEN and REICHERT, my co-chair, for presenting this bill with me and for their continued support of our law enforcement.

Our public safety officers make extraordinary sacrifices to protect our communities by putting their lives on the line day in and day out.

Members take an oath after we are elected. The first part of the oath, our chief priority, is to protect the country from foreign, but it also says domestic, foreign and domestic. That is our priority. That is the main reason why we

are in the Congress of the United States. There are a lot of other reasons, but that is our primary oath to the people of this country. And that is why the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and myself—there isn't a day that goes by that we are not talking about how we could support police officers, not in word but in deed, those folks who put their lives on the line, be they trooper, be they sheriff officer, be they municipal police officer, be they an authority police officer, regardless.

We heard the tragic numbers before in the previous bill.

Officer Rafael Ramos, who died with Officer Liu, was sitting in a squad car. Officer Ramos was a 40-year-old married father who was studying to become a pastor when he was killed. His friends and family remember him as a selfless man of faith. He left behind a wife and two children. Officer Ramos loved playing basketball with his sons in the park, watching the Mets, and playing Spanish gospel music.

It is families like these that we honor in this legislation. The last thing a family mourning their lost loved one who died in the line of service should be faced with is a tax penalty.

We have a responsibility to take care of the families of the officers slain in the line of duty. It is a priority. When everything is a priority, nothing is a priority. We are saying in this legislation this is a priority of ours.

This commonsense legislation ensures that the families of fallen public safety officers are not taxed on the death benefits they receive should a horrible tragedy occur and their family member be taken from them on the job.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this legislation to be passed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman from Washington, Chairman REICHERT, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 54 years, we have celebrated National Police Week during the third week of May; and once again, thousands of officers and the families of law enforcement are here in Washington this week to remember and honor the sacrifices of our officers who serve and protect our homes, our small businesses, and our families every day. That is because, Mr. Speaker, every day, our Nation's police officers—900,000 officers across this country—wear their uniforms with pride. They go about their jobs without a second thought to the dangers that come with protecting others and in securing our community.

Sadly, though, we are reminded too often of the dangers that these heroes face.

Just 3 days ago, in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Officers Benjamin Deen and Liquori Tate were shot and killed while making a routine traffic stop. They were just 34 and 24 years old.

□ 1800

Last July in Minnesota, Mendota Heights police officer Scott Patrick tragically lost his life in the line of duty. A 19-year veteran, Officer Patrick is remembered as a loving father of two children and somebody who was friendly, helpful, and was always looking to serve others. This year, he would have celebrated his 48th birthday. Instead of a party, his family spent the day in court for the murder trial of his killer.

It is not only law enforcement that put their lives on the line to protect and serve our community. Just last week, 44-year-old Kevin McRae, a 24-year veteran of the Washington, D.C., fire department, tragically lost his life when a high-rise building where he had been fighting a fire for nearly an hour collapsed. He leaves behind a wife and three young children.

For these public safety officers and these first responders who have lost their lives in the line of duty, we have a responsibility to ensure that their families are taken care of. In fact, that is why the Federal Government and many State governments provide that public safety officer benefit to the dependents of those heroes that are killed in the line of duty.

However, because current law is silent on whether State or Federal survivor benefits are subject to Federal income tax, there is a question of whether the IRS can collect tax on these benefits. And the last thing these families need after losing a loved one is for the IRS to come knocking. That is why I worked with Senator AYOTTE to introduce the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act. It will ensure that families of fallen law enforcement officers and firefighters who die in the line of duty receive the benefits they were promised without a tax grab from the IRS.

While the IRS ruled back in 1977 that Federal PSOB benefits should be treated just like workers compensation and not be subject to taxation, the IRS has refused to make a similar rule for State-based payments and instead has forced families to go through a burdensome private letter ruling.

Clarifying current law will provide relief. It will provide certainty to surviving dependents, and it will guarantee they are not forced to pay Federal income tax on survivor benefits after their loved ones have given the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Sheriff REICHERT, my colleague, and I want to thank Congressman PASCRELL for their bipartisan leadership of the Law Enforcement Caucus and standing up for this legislation and the other bills we have heard today on the floor. I also want to thank Senator AYOTTE for her leadership in the Senate. It was this legislation that was a passion project of hers ever since the IRS went after one of her constituents' survivor benefits.

The bill is endorsed by many different law enforcement organizations: The Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems, the National Troopers Coalition, the Sergeants Benevolent Association, the International Union of Police Associations, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and the Major County Sheriffs' Association.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will close by just asking my colleagues to support this legislation for the families of those police officers, firefighters, and first responders who help keep us safe.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of Mr. PASCRELL if he has any additional speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has yielded back his time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, currently the IRS has not ruled on the tax treatment of State payments, instead allowing any dispute, as Mr. PAULSEN just pointed out, to be resolved via what they call a private letter ruling.

This bill will provide clarity and relief to surviving dependents, guaranteeing they are not forced to pay an excessive tax after their loved ones have given the ultimate sacrifice.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we are together on this. I wish we were together on a lot of other things, but we are together on this because we will do anything to support our law enforcement officers in the United States of America, the greatest country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with the comments made by Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. PAULSEN on how important this legislation is to the families who have lost a loved one. They should not be burdened further with additional taxes on the benefits that that family should be receiving, the sad loss of their loved one in service to their community. This is the second bill tonight that we are considering in support of and showing our appreciation for and honoring

those who serve across this country today and who have lost their lives in service to this country and all the communities across this great Nation.

In fact, the first piece of legislation that we considered earlier was the Blue Alert legislation, and that was one of the recommendations that came out of the President's own police and community task force. So, as Mr. PASCRELL said, not only are the Members of the House and the Senate in agreement here, but also the administration, which is a moment that we all need to pause and appreciate that we are all together on this. We see how important and how critical this legislation is and how important and critical it is to show our support for those men and women who leave their families each and every day to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mrs. Speaker, as we pass the bipartisan Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act, I'd like to share with you a little bit about fallen Michigan State Trooper Paul K. Butterfield II. On September 9th, 2013, Trooper Butterfield was shot on a routine traffic stop.

Responding units located Trooper Butterfield on the ground suffering from a gunshot wound to the head. He was then flown to a regional hospital, where he eventually succumbed to his wounds while in surgery.

Trooper Butterfield was a dedicated public servant; after serving in the U.S. Army, he joined the Michigan State Police where he served for 14 years until his death in the line of duty. Family and friends remember him for being soft-spoken, kind, and always smiling.

This bill honors the legacy of not only Trooper Butterfield, but all first responders who have laid down their lives. Several hundred first responders die every year in the line of duty. These officers, and their families, should know that we support them and what they do. I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation to ensure that families of public safety officers will receive the full benefits they deserve should their loved ones succumb to the ultimate sacrifice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 606.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2146

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act''.

SEC. 2. EARLY RETIREMENT DISTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, FIREFIGHTERS, AND AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS IN GOVERNMENTAL PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 72(t)(10)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or'',

(2) by striking ''means any employee'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(i) any employee'', and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(ii) any Federal law enforcement officer described in section 8331(20) or 8401(17) of title 5, United States Code, any Federal customs and border protection officer described in section 8331(31) or 8401(36) of such title, any Federal firefighter described in section 8331(21) or 8401(14) of such title, or any air traffic controller described in 8331(30) or 8401(35) of such title.''.

(b) APPLICATION TO DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLANS.—Section 72(t)(10)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''which is a defined benefit plan''.

(c) DISTRIBUTIONS NOT TREATED AS MODIFICATION OF SUBSTANTIALLY EQUAL PAYMENTS.—Section 72(t)(4)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting ''or a distribution to which paragraph (10) applies'' after ''other than by reason of death or disability''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2146 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act, H.R. 2146, is a straightforward bill that would simply ensure fairness to public safety officials by extending the same treatment that applies to State and local public safety officials to Federal public safety officials as well.

I spent 33 years in law enforcement. I know from my own experience and from those with whom I worked just how strenuous a job protecting our fellow Americans can be. You never know when or what kind of situation you might be called to intervene in. It is taxing both mentally and physically. I could tell lots of stories here tonight over my 33-year career to illustrate that point, but I won't put Congress through that. Sometimes it is so mentally and physically draining that many law enforcement officials are subject to mandatory retirement at young ages. Think of someone who has spent an entire lifetime, 30, 35 years, in law enforcement, and the things that they have witnessed and seen.

I was a homicide detective. I, unfortunately, was in an assignment where you had to process the scenes of murder victims and collect the remains of people who had been victims of serious assaults resulting in death. Those memories never leave you. The stress of responding to a ''person with a gun'' call, a ''man with a knife,'' a domestic violence call, and never knowing what is going to happen day after day after day in responding to those calls—it is a stressful job. Through no fault of their own, they may need to access savings earlier than a standard retirement age. So we should ensure they are granted access without penalty.

Under the current law, Mr. Speaker, individuals who attempt to access their retirement savings before the age of 59½ are hit with a 10 percent tax. In 2006 Congress removed this penalty for State and local government public safety officers accessing their retirement accounts at the age of 50. This legislation would give Federal law enforcement officers, Federal firefighters, and air traffic controllers, who often must retire early, the same treatment. They are treated equally as local officials and officers. We previously recognized the need for this to happen at the State and local level, and it is just common sense that Federal public safety officials should receive the same opportunity.

When it comes down to it, these men and women have spent a majority of their lives protecting us, and because of that, we should be able to protect them from the IRS.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. REICHERT for all the work he has done on this legislation to bring it to the floor this evening. We are talking about H.R. 2146.

Law enforcement officers face physically demanding work day in and day out. Current law recognizes this by making Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters eligible to retire after 20 years and at age 50.

By the way, if I may say something on this, Mr. Speaker, I don't particularly like this idea because it is a way to get rid of experienced police officers throughout the United States of America. If you dump on them the fact that what we are going to do is we are going to play games with their pension funds, you force even more out. We are not saving any money, and we are not saving any time when we push the most experienced officers off the payroll.

A flaw in the system makes it impossible for many of these retirees to access their earned benefits in their fifties. Most Federal employees—we are talking about Federal here—receive retirement benefits through the Federal Employees Retirement System. This three-part system is made up of a defined pension plan, a defined TSP contribution plan, and Social Security.

However, although Federal law enforcement officers can retire at 50 and access two-thirds of their retirement benefits, they face a 10 percent tax penalty if they withdraw from the defined contribution plans like TSP before the age of 59½. State and local law enforcement officers do not face the same penalty because Congress rightly recognized they should not be penalized after a physically taxing career protecting our communities.

Federal law enforcement officers do not enjoy these same protections. This bill would bring equity to the men and women carrying out their sworn duty to protect and serve. It would address a fundamental unfairness in the U.S. Tax Code by removing Federal law enforcement from the 10 percent penalty provisions that currently apply to early withdrawals from government plans.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the bill would ensure that the penalty-free withdrawals apply to both governmental defined benefit and defined contribution plans like the Federal Thrift Savings Plan.

There is no justifiable reason that Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters from a diverse array of agencies and missions must wait up to 9½ years longer than their State and local counterparts before they can fully access their savings without incurring a penalty.

□ 1815

The brave men and women who work in our law enforcement agencies, fire departments, and others who sacrifice themselves each day deserve equitable treatment under the Tax Code.

Let's stand up for their fair treatment and well-deserved retirement benefits for the men and women who work so hard to protect us.

The American Federation of Government Employees writes:

On a daily basis, Federal firefighters, BOP correctional workers, Customs and Border Protection officers, and Federal law enforcement officers secure our Federal buildings' safety, handle the most dangerous offenders behind bars, and patrol our Nation's borders. When these Federal employees meet all of the established requirements for Federal retirement, they deserve full access to their government retirement plan.

Let's honor the faithful commitment these officers have shown us by showing our commitment to them here on the floor of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this very commonsense bill, as Mr. PASCRELL just laid out, to correct an inequity that exists within the retirement system for Federal law enforcement officers.

Public safety employees are often subject to mandatory retirement upon reaching a certain age. Unfortunately, for many Federal law enforcement officers, this forced retirement occurs a couple of years before they are able to legally access their retirement accounts without a penalty.

It makes no sense to force these officers who protect us and who serve our communities to then retire without being able to access their own money that they have earned and diligently saved. The Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act corrects this inequity and gives these public safety officers the certainty they deserve after years of service.

I want to thank Sheriff REICHERT for his leadership on this issue and look forward to its passage.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wanted to just comment on some of the words from my friend, Mr. PASCRELL. Again, I appreciate his partnership in co-chairing the Law Enforcement Caucus with me and all those who are members of the Law Enforcement Caucus in recognizing this is a very important week, a sad week, for a lot of families that are here in Washington, D.C., putting names of their loved ones on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

On Thursday night, there will be a candlelight vigil at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. On Friday afternoon, with the President, there will be a service on the front lawn of the Capitol recognizing those who lost their lives in service to their communities across this country with all of those family members present in the audience.

There are three bills tonight that we considered that have come together to really, I think, show bipartisan support from the administration, to the House of Representatives, to the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans coming together to show their support for the men and women who wear the badge and the uniform across this country.

There are still things that we can do, and people wonder what the Federal Government can do for local law enforcement. Well, we showed three things tonight that we can do to help local law enforcement and show our support for them.

Mr. PASCRELL pointed out, I think, one other, and that is the retirement issue. I think that is another thing that we can work on. I agree with Mr. PASCRELL on that issue.

I think that there is another issue that we can work on that some Members may not be fully aware of, and that is the delayed payment of death benefits for those killed in the line of duty.

For example, Mr. Speaker, in my community, a police officer died in the line of duty over 3½ years ago—3½ years ago—and, as far as I know, today, his family has still not received the death benefit that is due. Three-and-a-half years is too long for a family to wait when their loved one has lost their life in service to this country.

Mr. PASCRELL and I will continue to work together with the law enforcement organizations across this country looking for ways that we can support them and show that we care and show the families that we care.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we vote on H.R. 2146 in the House today, I would like to share with you the dire reality facing our brave first responders who put their lives on the line for the safety of the American people.

The health-related risks associated with the work of our first responders, though rarely considered by the average American, are largely due to stress and overexertion. The United States Fire Administration (USFA) tracks the number of first responder fatalities each year and has provided valuable analysis for nearly four decades. The data shows that over the course of the past 10 years, 757 first responders in the United States have suffered from heart-related fatalities; including heart attacks, due to the extremely stressful nature of their work.

While firefighting can be an incredibly rewarding profession for a first responder—make no mistake—it is also one of the deadliest. High rates of cancer and heart attacks plague our public safety defenders. Under our current law, first responders can retire at the age of 50, as long as they have completed 20 years of service. Those 20 years are consumed by immediate midnight response calls, the physical toll of carrying heavy equipment, ventilating smoke-filled areas, salvaging building contents, rescuing victims and administering emergency medical care.

H.R. 2146 is a bipartisan proposal that would reform federal tax law by allowing firefighters, federal law enforcement officers and air traffic controllers, to access funds from their government plans after age 50 and without facing a 10 percent penalty fee. These first responders have more than earned their ability to access their retirement after over 20 years of strenuous service. We should feel ashamed for penalizing our public safety defenders by levying penalties and fees on those who are entitled and deserve to retire.

When our lives are on the line and we call 911, we expect help to come without hesitation and our brave first responders do not fail in their duty. For this reason we must not fail them after a lifetime of service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2146, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

DON'T TAX OUR FALLEN PUBLIC SAFETY HEROES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 606) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

YEAS—413

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—18

Barletta
Capps
Crawford
DesJarlais
Engel
Fincher
Fleischmann
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Katko
Lieu, Ted
Lynch
Marchant
Meng
Rokita
Ruiz
Rush
Sewell (AL)

□ 1857

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. TIPTON changed their votes from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Robert A. Brehm and Mr. Todd D. Valentine, Co-Executive Directors of the New York State Board of Elections, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held May 5, 2015, the Honorable Dan Donovan was

elected Representative to Congress for the Eleventh Congressional District, State of New York.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
Albany, NY, May 6, 2015.

Hon. KAREN HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This correspondence is being sent to advise that the unofficial results as calculated after the close of polls at the Special Election held on Tuesday, May 5, 2015 for Representative in Congress from New York's 11th Congressional District are as follows: Vincent J. Gentile received 15,808 votes, Dan Donovan received 23,409 votes, James C. Lane received 527 votes.

Absentee and provisional ballots will be counted pursuant to New York's statutes, beginning on Wednesday, May 13, 2015, Absentee ballots mailed to eligible voters numbered 5,528 and voted ballots returned to date number 2,922. The number of absentee and provisional ballots will not alter the outcome of this special election.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no pending litigation that would alter the outcome of this contest,

As soon as official results are certified to this office by the boroughs of Richmond and Kings in the City of New York, constituting the 11th Congressional District, our official Certification of Election will be prepared and transmitted, as required by law.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BREHM.
TODD D. VALENTINE.

□ 1900

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR., OF NEW YORK, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Daniel M. Donovan, Jr., be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect Donovan and the members of the New York delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. DONOVAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 114th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR., TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. My dear friends, the good people of Staten Island and Brooklyn of the great city and State of New York have sent to us a man to represent the Empire State of New York, the open door for immigrants who have come here historically from all over the world, and we welcome him on behalf of this delegation, as well as the good Democrat and Republican Members of this House of Representatives.

I welcome him to the House and look forward to the great contribution he will make to our city, our State, the Congress, and our great country.

I would like to introduce someone also of good democratic stock from the great State of New York, PETER KING, who will join with me in welcoming our friend from Richmond County.

Mr. KING of New York. Thank you, Congressman RANGEL.

It is my privilege to introduce a man who has been a friend for many years. He has been a career prosecutor. For 12 years, he was district attorney in Staten Island. He was overwhelmingly elected. He is a true public servant. He is universally respected and is a man of unquestioned integrity. He is going to be an outstanding Congressman.

It is my privilege to introduce the Congressman from Brooklyn and Staten Island, the Honorable Dan Donovan.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join you, and I am humbled by the confidence that the people of the 11th Congressional District of New York have placed in me.

I want to thank all of my volunteers and supporters for helping me get here. I want to thank my family for everything that they have done for me. I promise to make all of them proud of my representation of them here as a Member of the greatest legislative body in the world.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN), the whole number of the House is 433.

REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 231 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1732.

Will the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1903

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. YOUNG of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–98 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 248, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

AYES—167

Adams	Cleaver	Eshoo
Aguilar	Clyburn	Esty
Bass	Cohen	Farr
Beatty	Connolly	Fattah
Becerra	Conyers	Foster
Bera	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Courtney	Fudge
Boyle, Brendan F.	Crowley	Gabbard
	Cummings	Gallego
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Garamendi
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Grayson
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Green, Al
Bustos	DeGette	Green, Gene
Butterfield	Delaney	Grijalva
Capuano	DeLauro	Hahn
Cárdenas	DelBene	Hastings
Carney	DeSaulnier	Heck (WA)
Carson (IN)	Deutch	Higgins
Cartwright	Dingell	Himes
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Honda
Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael F.	Hoyer
Chu, Judy		Huffman
Cicilline	Duckworth	Israel
Clark (MA)	Edwards	Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY)	Ellison	Jeffries
Clay	Engel	Johnson (GA)

Johnson, E. B.	McGovern	Schakowsky
Kaptur	McNerney	Schiff
Keating	Meeks	Schrader
Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott (VA)
Kennedy	Moulton	Scott, David
Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Serrano
Kilmer	Nadler	Sherman
Kind	Napolitano	Sires
Kirkpatrick	Neal	Slaughter
Kuster	Nolan	Smith (WA)
Langevin	Norcross	Speier
Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Takai
Lawrence	Pascrell	Takano
Lee	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Lewis	Perlmutter	Titus
Lipinski	Peters	Tonko
Loebsack	Pingree	Torres
Lofgren	Pocan	Tsongas
Lowenthal	Polis	Van Hollen
Lowey	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Quigley	Veasey
	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Richmond	Visclosky
	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman Schultz
Maloney, Carolyn	Ruppersberger	Waters, Maxine
	Ryan (OH)	Watson Coleman
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda T.	Welch
Matsui		Wilson (FL)
McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
McDermott	Sarbanes	

NOES—248

Abraham	Emmer (MN)	LaMalfa
Aderholt	Farenthold	Lamborn
Allen	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Amash	Fleming	Latta
Amodei	Flores	LoBiondo
Ashford	Forbes	Long
Babin	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Barr	Foxx	Love
Barton	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Benishek	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bilirakis	Garrett	Lummis
Bishop (GA)	Gibbs	MacArthur
Bishop (MI)	Gibson	Marino
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Massie
Black	Goodlatte	McCarthy
Blackburn	Gosar	McCaul
Blum	Gowdy	McClintock
Blumenauer	Graham	McHenry
Bost	Granger	McKinley
Boustany	Graves (GA)	McMorris Rodgers
Brady (TX)	Graves (LA)	
Brat	Graves (MO)	McSally
Bridenstine	Griffith	Meadows
Brooks (AL)	Grothman	Meehan
Brooks (IN)	Guinta	Messer
Buchanan	Guthrie	Mica
Buck	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Bucshon	Hardy	Miller (MI)
Burgess	Harper	Moolenaar
Byrne	Harris	Mooney (WV)
Calvert	Hartzler	Mullin
Carter (GA)	Heck (NV)	Mulvaney
Carter (TX)	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer
Chaffetz	Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse
Clawson (FL)	Hill	Noem
Coffman	Holding	Nugent
Cole	Hudson	Nunes
Collins (GA)	Huelskamp	Olson
Collins (NY)	Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo
Comstock	Hultgren	Palmer
Conaway	Hunter	Paulsen
Cook	Hurd (TX)	Pearce
Cooper	Hurt (VA)	Perry
Costello (PA)	Issa	Peterson
Cramer	Jenkins (KS)	Pittenger
Crenshaw	Jenkins (WV)	Pitts
Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Poliquin
Curbelo (FL)	Jolly	Pompeo
Davis, Rodney	Jones	Posey
Denham	Jordan	Price, Tom
Dent	Joyce	Rangel
DeSantis	Katko	Ratcliffe
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Reed
Dold	King (IA)	Reichert
Donovan	King (NY)	Renacci
Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Ribble
Duncan (SC)	Kline	Rice (SC)
Duncan (TN)	Knight	Rigell
Ellmers (NC)	Labrador	Roby
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Walker
Rogers (AL)	Sinema	Walorski
Rogers (KY)	Smith (MO)	Walters, Mimi
Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Walz
Rooney (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Roskam	Stefanik	Wenstrup
Ross	Stewart	Westerman
Rothfus	Stivers	Westmoreland
Rouzer	Stutzman	Whitfield
Royce	Thompson (PA)	Williams
Russell	Thornberry	Wilson (SC)
Ryan (WI)	Tiberi	Wittman
Salmon	Tipton	Womack
Sanford	Trott	Woodall
Scalise	Turner	Yoder
Schweikert	Upton	Yoho
Scott, Austin	Valadao	Young (AK)
Sensenbrenner	Vela	Young (IA)
Sessions	Wagner	Young (IN)
Shimkus	Walberg	Zeldin
Shuster	Walden	Zinke

NOT VOTING—17

Barletta	Fleischmann	Meng
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Rokita
Capps	Hinojosa	Ruiz
Crawford	Lieu, Ted	Rush
DesJarlais	Lynch	Sewell (AL)
Fincher	Marchant	

□ 1910

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 231, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. AGUILAR. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Aguilar moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1732 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING THE SUPPLY OF WATER FOR SAFE DRINKING, TO MITIGATE AGAINST WESTERN DROUGHT, FOR AGRICULTURAL USES, AND FOR PROTECTION FROM FLOODING.

In the process of rulemaking required by this Act, the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall protect the quality and integrity of surface waters and wetlands that are available:

(1) For public water supplies, which are a significant source of drinking water for municipalities, including in the Great Lakes where the Lake Erie algal bloom has forced cities such as Toledo, Ohio, to rely on bottled water.

(2) To mitigate against the harmful impact of drought in California and other western States, which has reached historic proportions.

(3) For agricultural uses, including irrigation.

(4) To mitigate against the adverse impacts of flooding and coastal storms, such as the Mississippi River Flood of 2011 and Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Sandy.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1915

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This motion is simple. It requires the Army Corps and the EPA to ensure that important surface waters and wetlands are protected during the new rulemaking process this bill starts.

This motion requires that the quality of public water supplies be protected. Around the country, we have seen drinking water sources contaminated, like the algal bloom in Lake Erie that forced Toledo, Ohio, to use bottled water.

In California, the historic drought has reduced many surface waters to stagnant pools of water. Seven million Californians rely on these streams for their drinking water. We need to make sure these drinking water sources are protected to keep families and communities healthy.

The drought in California has reached emergency levels, and this motion ensures that waters and wetlands that help mitigate the drought in the West are protected. These waters need protection under this rule because, if they are contaminated, then we have

few other options to ensure communities in southern California have access to water sources.

California is implementing water use restrictions to deal with the drought, but it doesn't make sense to take these steps if we don't make sure the wetlands and waters that recharge them are protected.

Finally, this motion guarantees that water used for agriculture, including for irrigation, are safeguarded. California's agriculture industry depends on clean water, and this motion preserves the exemptions agriculture already gets under regulations.

In short, this is a commonsense amendment to the bill to guarantee protections for water used for the public's drinking supply, for lessening the impact of the drought in California and the West, and for agriculture.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose this motion to recommit.

First of all, it has nothing to do with drought. Second, it is just a backdoor attempt to allow the EPA to take control of all the waters in America. In addition to that, my colleagues from California have tried, time and time again, to work with their colleagues on the other side of the aisle to solve this drought problem in California, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused to work together. Again, this has nothing to do with drought.

The purpose of H.R. 1732 is to uphold the Federal-State partnership in regulating the Nation's waters by maintaining the balance between the States and the Federal Government in carrying out the Clean Water Act.

H.R. 1732 restricts the administration's current administrative efforts to expand Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act and requires the Agency to engage in federalism consultation with their State and local partners to implement the Clean Water Act.

However, this motion is designed to undermine the legislation by giving the EPA unfettered discretion in making State water quality determinations in order to allow the EPA to continue to implement this flawed rule.

In effect, the amendment says that the underlying bill will not apply virtually anywhere the EPA decides that the bill should not apply. This amendment would further erode the Federal and State partnership that H.R. 1732 seeks to preserve.

Let me remind my colleagues that 32 States have said revise or eliminate this rule. My colleagues, all day, have talked about we haven't seen the final rule, but we have seen the proposed rule, and the proposed rule is going to be very similar to the final rule. We have seen this happen time and time again.

We have to stop this rule. I urge my colleagues, all 435 Members of this body, to take notice. This is another attempt by the executive branch to take Congress' constitutional authority away from us. We should all take this as a serious challenge.

For too long, this body has allowed the executive branch to take our authority granted to us by the constitution. I say, whether it is a Republican or Democrat administration, we have to stop that.

The bill, H.R. 1732, is a step in the right direction. It is a good bill that maintains the balance of regulation and of our Nation's water.

We must preserve the Federal-State partnership that exists under the Clean Water Act, which has been for 40 years, until this administration's attempting to impose an overbearing EPA on our States.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2146.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 175, nays 241, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—175

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts

Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta
Capps
Crawford
DesJarlais
Fincher
Fleischmann
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Lieu, Ted
Lynch
Marchant
Meng
Rokita
Ruiz
Rush
Sewell (AL)

□ 1926

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 155, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

AYES—261

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—155

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta
Capps
Crawford
DesJarlais
Fincher
Fleischmann
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Lieu, Ted
Lynch
Marchant
Meng
Rokita
Ruiz
Rush
Sewell (AL)

□ 1932

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 5, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEAS—407

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney

Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—5

Amash
Massie
McClintock
Ribble
Yoho

NOT VOTING—20

Barletta
Capps
Crawford
DesJarlais
Fincher
Fleischmann
Goodlatte
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Lieu, Ted
Lynch
Marchant
Meng
Rokita
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sewell (AL)
Wenstrup

□ 1941

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF OFFICERS LIQUORI TATE AND BENJAMIN DEEN OF HATTIESBURG, MISSISSIPPI

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of the two police officers who were killed in the line of duty in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, on May 9, 2015, Officer Benjamin Deen and Officer Liquori Tate.

I am joined tonight by my fellow colleagues and Mississippians, Congressman GREGG HARPER and Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON. We would like to take this time to lend our prayers to the families of these two young men, to the Hattiesburg Police Department, and to the community for their loss.

This week, our Nation observes National Police Week, and we recognize the bravery, fortitude, and sacrifice demonstrated by police officers nationwide. They put their lives on the line to defend our communities and our citizens against criminals and thugs.

I ask the House to join us tonight in honoring the lives of Liquori Tate and Benjamin Deen by joining me in a moment of silence.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill H.R. 1735.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WIOA TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1124) to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1124

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''WIOA Technical Amendments Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO WORKFORCE INNOVATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) DESIGNATION OF AREAS SERVED BY RURAL CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS AS LOCAL AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 106(b) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3121(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) AREAS SERVED BY RURAL CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.—The Governor may approve, under paragraph (2) or (3), a request for designation as a local area from an area described in section 107(c)(1)(C).''.

(b) LOCAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARDS.—Section 107(i)(1)(B) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3122(i)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''the day before the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''the day before the date of enactment of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998''.

(c) PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.—Section 116 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3141) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv), by striking ''clause (i)(IV)'' and inserting ''clause (i)(VI)''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking ''for a program described in subsection (d)(2)(A)''.

(d) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—Section 132(b) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3172(b)) is amended, in paragraphs (1)(B)(iv)(I) and (2)(B)(iii)(I), by inserting ''less than'' after ''fiscal year that is''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 102(b)(2)(D)(i)(III) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3112(b)(2)(D)(i)(III)) is amended by striking ''section 106(b)(5)'' and inserting ''section 106(b)(6)''.

(2) Section 129(b)(1)(C) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3164(b)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''subsections (b)(6) and (c)(2) of section 106'' and inserting ''subsections (b)(7) and (c)(2) of section 106''.

(3) Section 134(a)(2)(B)(ii) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3174(a)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking ''section 106(b)(6)'' and inserting ''section 106(b)(7)''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 400(b) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 780(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b)(1) Each member of the National Council shall serve for a term of 3 years.

''(2)(A) No member of the National Council may serve more than two consecutive full terms beginning on the date of commencement of the first full term on the Council. Members may serve after the expiration of their terms until their successors have taken office.

''(B) As used in this paragraph, the term 'full term' means a term of 3 years.

''(3) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which such member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if enacted 1 day after the date of enactment of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1945

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HON. JAMES CLAUDE WRIGHT, JR., FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 254) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 254

Resolved, That the House has learned with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable James Claude Wright, Jr., former Member of the House for 18 terms and Speaker of the House of Representatives for the One Hundredth and One Hundred First Congresses.

Resolved, That in the death of the Honorable James Claude Wright, Jr. the United States and the State of Texas have lost a valued and eminent public servant and citizen.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

FALLEN HEROES FLAG ACT OF 2015

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 723) to provide Capitol-flown flags to the immediate family of fire fighters, law enforcement officers, members of rescue squads or ambulance crews, and public safety officers who are killed in the line of duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 723

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Fallen Heroes Flag Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PROVIDING CAPITOL-FLOWN FLAGS FOR FAMILIES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND RESCUE SQUAD WORKERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the immediate family of a fire fighter, law enforcement officer, member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew, or public safety officer who died in the line of duty, the Representative of the family may provide the family with a Capitol-flown flag, together with the certificate described in subsection (c).

(b) NO COST TO FAMILY.—A flag provided under this section shall be provided at no cost to the family.

(c) CERTIFICATE.—The certificate described in this subsection is a certificate which is signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Representative providing the flag, and which contains an expression of sympathy from the House of Representatives for the family involved, as prepared and developed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Capitol-flown flag'' means a United States flag flown over the United States Capitol in honor of the deceased individual for whom such flag is requested; and

(2) the term ''Representative'' includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Clerk shall issue regulations for carrying out this Act, including regulations to establish procedures (including any appropriate forms, guidelines, and accompanying certificates) for requesting a Capitol-flown flag.

(b) APPROVAL BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The regulations issued by the Clerk under subsection (a) shall take effect upon approval by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2020 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act, to be derived from amounts appropriated in each such fiscal year for the operation of the Capitol Visitor Center, except that the aggregate amount appropriated to carry out this Act for all such fiscal years may not exceed $30,000.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment, except that no flags may be provided under section 2 until the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives approves the regulations issued by the Clerk of the House of Representatives under section 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 723, the Fallen Heroes Flag Act. The bill before us would allow Members of Congress to honor a firefighter, law enforcement officer, member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew, or public safety officer who died in the line of duty by providing the family of the deceased individual, at their request, a United States flag flown over this Capitol.

Our Nation's flag would be accompanied by a certificate containing an expression of sympathy for the family of the individual who passed away, signed by both the Speaker of the House and the individual's Representative here in Congress.

This measure, authored by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) allows our House to express its gratitude and recognition for an individual who made the ultimate sacrifice in the name of public service to this great country.

Many in our country put their lives on the line every day to serve others. They are the firefighters who charge into burning buildings in order to save life or property; they are the police officers and other law enforcement officers who respond to incidents and through their actions shield others from harm; they are the members of rescue squads or ambulance crews who spend countless hours perfecting life-saving skills and rush to the scene of a disaster; and they are the public safety officers who work to patrol our roads, man the dispatch communication lines, and work within our justice system to accomplish countless other safety services for our communities.

Our Nation is exceedingly blessed to have individuals who answer the call to

dedicate their lives serving others. We are very grateful to be surrounded by individuals who work hard each day to save and protect lives. Each swore an oath to uphold our laws, and each sacrifices safety in the defense of others.

These individuals are our daily heroes. The rescue workers and law enforcement officers are our sons and daughters, they are our mothers and fathers, they are our sisters and brothers who each day rise up and stand in the defense of others. And in some cases, these heroes pay the ultimate sacrifice, and they are killed in the line of duty, just as we heard earlier. It is a tragedy in the truest sense of the word when one of these extraordinarily fine individuals loses their life, most especially while in the act of saving the life of another.

I stand here, Mr. Speaker, not just as a Member representing my congressional district but also as someone who knows firsthand the sacrifices that these men and women put forward to serve their communities. Before I came to Congress, I served my community as a police officer, as a deputy sheriff, and eventually as a sheriff in a county in Florida. I know what it means for so many men and women to come to work every day not knowing—you can never predict the events of the day and what those events may hold for you. But one thing is certain: you will answer the call for help with everything you have got. When you kiss your wife or husband goodbye or your children goodbye, when you start your shift, they want to know you are going to come home. But they also know that the realities of life are it is possible that you may make the ultimate sacrifice for your community.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we recognize their selfless efforts of sacrifice and offer this meaningful token as an expression of our Nation's gratitude. It is an honor to stand here today in support of this legislation. Each Member of Congress should have the ability to recognize these brave individuals for their heroism and to extend a gesture of sympathy and gratitude to their immediate families.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague across the aisle, Congressman NUGENT, in support of H.R. 723, the Fallen Heroes Flag Act.

This sensible bill provides for Capitol-flown flags in memory of firefighters, police, and emergency response personnel who are tragically killed in the line of duty.

While we can never fully convey our gratitude to public safety and emergency personnel who risk their lives practically every day, it is my hope that this small gesture brings some level of comfort to the families of those who have given the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

We recognize their sacrifice and that of their families and loved ones. We are eternally grateful. As Members of Congress, we often have the sad duty and solemn responsibility of expressing condolences to families who have lost a loved one in the line of duty. At no expense to these families, this is one small way to express our condolences and gratitude for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 723, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING). He is the distinguished sponsor of this bill.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his years of service in law enforcement and for his dedication here in the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I think it is particularly appropriate that this bill will be passed during National Police Week at a time when we honor those who put their lives on the line every day. This isn't just an abstraction. This is really very real, as we saw tonight with the delegation from Mississippi acknowledging their two police officers who were murdered on Saturday night. And just last week in New York a neighbor and constituent of mine, Brian Moore, a member of the NYPD, was shot down. He was murdered in Queens Village in Queens, New York, a young man, 25 years old. He already had 150 arrests. He was a member of an elite anticrime unit. He was shot down in the prime of life. His father was a retired police sergeant. His cousins were on the NYPD and also the Nassau County Police Department.

So these are real, Mr. Speaker. These are real lives. These are real lives that are lost. These are real people putting their lives on the line, and there are real families who suffer when they are left behind. That is why it is so important, I think, that we in Congress acknowledge that. One way to do that is by being able to present a flag signed by the Speaker and by the Member of Congress who represents the person who was killed in the line of duty.

Tonight we had a new Member of Congress sworn in, DAN DONOVAN from Staten Island. DAN was with me on Friday at the funeral of Brian Moore. Also, we had two tragic deaths in December, Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, two NYPD officers who were murdered in Brooklyn. DAN and I were at that funeral along with thousands and thousands, in fact, tens of thousands of officers from all over the country.

So it is important that we stand in solidarity with the men and women of blue. They come under terrible onslaughts and attacks. So much of it is untrue, so much of it is slanderous, and so much of it is carried on by the media. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is these men and women are out there every day. They are out there doing their job, and it is really important that we stand with them. The very least we can do is stand here in Congress and support them and also then pay them the tribute of standing with their family with the flag when that terrible moment comes that they lose their lives in the line of duty.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for his leadership, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his bipartisan spirit, and I strongly urge support of this legislation.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say how proud I am to stand with Mr. NUGENT as well as with my fellow Notre Dame alumnus, Mr. KING, in backing this very sensible and decent piece of legislation. I would also say, as he was mentioning the unfortunate tragedies that have happened to members of the NYPD, as a proud resident of the city of Philadelphia, I have only been a Member of Congress for a few months, but I have been in elective office for 6 years, and during that time we, unfortunately, lost more Philadelphia police officers killed in the line of duty, as well as three Philadelphia firefighters killed in the line of duty. That was more than in any 5- or 6-year period in the city's history, which dates to 100 years before the founding of our country.

So it is a sad and solemn reminder of the sacrifice that they are willing to make on our behalf each and every day.

I believe that supporting this legislation is a proper gesture that we can make here in this House, and I am happy to support it. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a proud day. Mr. BOYLE, I do appreciate your comments in regard to those who serve us. Mr. KING, I think your reputation precedes you in regard to caring about those who care for us every day.

It is a thankless job a lot of times to be a fireman or a police officer or an EMT. Those folks go to work because they want to help people. They don't go to work because they want to hurt someone. They are driven by this desire to do right and to do good every day.

It is really easy sometimes, I think, that we forget that these are men and women who, whether they wear the badge of a law enforcement officer or a firefighter or an EMT or any other public safety officer, do their job because

they are committed to their community. They do it because they love their community. So when some folks want to rush to judgment, I would just suggest that until you walk in their shoes, until you know what it is like to serve in that capacity, I would ask that people use a little restraint and maybe wait until investigation is complete before we start making decisions in regards to guilt or innocence.

I had to do that as sheriff. I had deputies who were involved in fire fights where other folks were killed. But you wanted to make sure that—listen, we want to know the facts. We want to know the truth. And if a police officer does something that is wrong, then he should be dealt with. But not all police officers do things wrong. They are human beings, and sometimes they do make mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill talks to those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice, no matter how they served this great country, whether it was in the fire service or the law enforcement service or public safety in any manner. This is about recognizing them and their families for their service. These first responders and public safety officers stand side by side with each other supporting each other in a common goal. Whether you are a fireman or a police officer, it is a common goal to do the right thing.

They and their families live with these risks. They know what the job brings, the risks that are incurred, but they do that selflessly. Every time they put on that uniform to go to work, they do it knowing that something bad could happen to them that could change the lives of their children and their families forever.

Mr. Speaker, this bill allows us in Congress to offer a simple yet meaningful expression, I believe, of sympathy. We can't make up the family's loss to them, but we can remember these fallen heroes, and we can offer their families our gratitude as we honor those loved ones' memories, as I think this body should do every day because there are folks that stand the line for us, whether it is fighting a fire, rescuing us from a trapped vehicle at a scene of horrific destruction, whether it is tornadoes or earthquakes, law enforcement officers have to go places that no other folks want to go.

□ 2000

I just thank you, Mr. KING, for bringing this bill forward. I want to thank my good friend on the other side of the aisle, Mr. BOYLE, for standing for what is right, and I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 723.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week was National Small Business Week; and, while back in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, I attended a ceremony honoring Jim and Colleen Small for receiving the 2015 Western Pennsylvania District Small Business Persons of the Year Awards.

For Jim and Colleen, pursuing a second career as businessowners trumped an early retirement, so they decided to open UPS Store #5642 in State College, Pennsylvania.

Like many small-business owners starting out, Jim and Colleen faced challenges, but through community outreach, a dedicated staff, and lots of hard work, the Smalls now run a very successful small business.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the backbone of our economy, and I couldn't think of a better way to celebrate National Small Business Week than by recognizing two outstanding local small-business leaders.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Small on receiving this well-deserved award, and I thank them for all that they do for our community.

UCR BOURNS COLLEGE 25TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the University of California, Riverside's Bourns College of Engineering. In 1990, UCR opened its new public engineering college to educate the next generation of engineering leaders. Since then, the college has produced over 5,600 engineering graduates and is ranked first among public universities of the same size.

Not only does the UCR Bourns College of Engineering offer a quality engineering education, it is committed to recruiting students who are a true reflection of the ethnic and cultural diversity of the world in which we live.

The college is also home to world-class engineering researchers who are leveraging Federal dollars to improve air quality, predicting wildfires, discovering alternative energy fuels, and developing new materials that will change our lives.

I want to applaud UCR's chancellor, Kim Wilcox, and dean of engineering, Reza Abbaschian. I know they will lead the Bourns College of Engineering down an even more successful path over the next 25 years.

THANKING UNNAMED GARLAND POLICEMEN

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this is National Police Week, and I did want to rise in recognition of the brave law enforcement officers of the police department in Garland, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, just a little over a week ago, May 3, two heavily armed assailants opened fire outside an event at the Curtis Culwell Center in Garland, Texas. Thankfully, some of Texas' finest police officers were on hand to protect the innocent lives inside.

Traffic police and SWAT officers from the Garland Police Department did their job. They subdued these two would-be mass murderers before they were able to take a life.

To date, these heroes remain unnamed, but we cannot overlook their bravery and their willingness to put their lives on the line to protect ours. They kept this crisis from becoming a tragedy, and they averted what likely could have been the largest mass casualty situation north Texas has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to the Garland Police Department my sincerest appreciation for their service and their bravery. These heroes deserve our deepest appreciation for their selfless preservation of human life.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to bring light to the secretive, job-killing global trade pact called the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the TPP. Supporters want to rush it through Congress using a procedure called fast-track authority, which forces a vote with no opportunity to amend the deal. This should alarm all Americans.

In its current form, this deal would outsource even more of America's good jobs out from under our working families, degrade global environmental and working standards, and cause investor rights to override worker rights. It propels a global race to the bottom.

The trade ambassador and the administration assert that the TPP has strong and enforceable labor standards and environmental commitments. The TPP includes four nations—Mexico,

Brunei, Vietnam, and Malaysia—that are notorious labor and human rights violators.

They are already out of compliance with the standards supposedly in TPP. Frankly, our U.S. Trade Representative has had a bad habit of sweeping trade violations right under the rug.

Our history of trade agreements in Guatemala, Honduras, and Colombia show the need for stronger obligations and a rigorous plan for implementing and overseeing them.

Including commitments in the final agreement is not enough. These nations have to change their laws and practices, and we have to enforce them.

Mr. Speaker, we should vote against TPP because what is going to happen is more American workers will be cashed out, and exploited workers around the world will find life gets harder.

NEED FOR LONG-TERM HIGHWAY BILL

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to act swiftly to prevent the highway transit trust fund from expiring. If we do not act, this critical program will expire in just 7 legislative days.

I am proud to be a member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and my district in Illinois is a central hub for the shipment of goods and people over road, rail, water, and air.

I truly believe that, by investing in our infrastructure, we are making a down payment on our Nation's long-term economic well-being. These investments not only create jobs, but they create jobs that cannot be outsourced. By investing in our infrastructure now, as opposed to punting the ball down the field, we are saving money in the long term.

Over half a million good-paying construction jobs hang in the balance, and construction on 6,000 critical projects across the country could be put on hold. This is unacceptable and why we must act now to provide certainty that our local communities, businesses, and hard-working families deserve.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Hello, America. Do you know what is going to happen in just a few days? In 7 legislative days, the United States highway trust fund runs out of money—kaput, it is over—a fund established by President Eisenhower in the 1950s, out of money.

What is the House of Representatives doing? What is your Representative and your Senator doing? Well, I suspect debating the Trans-Pacific Partnership—the TPA—when, in fact, this is the big jobs issue.

The trade negotiations, you can debate it forever; but if you really want to create jobs in America, pay attention to this, America. Pay attention to the fact that the Federal highway trust fund expires in 7 legislative days. We have got work to do here; we have got a lot of work to do, and it is not happening.

I am a Californian. I represent the State of California. We have a pretty high opinion of ourselves in California, maybe deserved or not; but what it means to us when the highway trust fund shuts down, what it means is a lot of jobs. 73,572 jobs will be jeopardized at the end of this month of May. We are looking at 5,692 active highway and transit projects will stop, red light stop, don't go forward.

For California, in just 7 legislative days, a very, very important thing happens—actually, far, far more important than the Trans-Pacific Partnership or the trade promotion authority. This is where the big jobs are in America. Building the infrastructure of America is how you create jobs today and on into the future because you lay the foundation for economic growth.

If you couple those transportation programs with another long, long-standing American law, which is Buy America, Make It In America, you not only create the foundation, but you also create immediate manufacturing jobs of all kinds. From the bulldozers, to the tractors and the backhoes, to the steel and the concrete, you buy it in America; you build the infrastructure in America, and you create immediate jobs.

How many? Well, I think we all know Duke University. It is more than a basketball school. It also happens to be one of the more thoughtful research institutions in the United States. They produced a little book that about 535 of the Representatives of the American people ought to be reading.

This ought to be the bedtime reading for the Senators and the Members of Congress: ''Infrastructure Investment Creates American Jobs,'' Duke University Center on Globalization, Governance, and Competitiveness.

I am going to read just a few things here just to drive this point home.

Old and broken transportation infrastructure makes the United States less competitive than 15 of our major trading partners and makes manufacturers less efficient in getting goods to market.

You want to get goods to market, build the infrastructure.

Underinvestment costs the United States over 900,000 jobs, including more than 97,000 American manufacturing jobs.

You want to Make It In America, build the infrastructure.

Maximizing American-made materials when rebuilding infrastructure has the potential to create even more jobs. Relying on American-made inputs can also mitigate safety concerns related to large-scale outsourcing.

It is our Make It In America policy. It is the agenda that we have been driving for the last 5 years here. Build the infrastructure, Buy America, Make It In America.

Competitiveness, a lot of talk, everybody wants to talk about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or the TPA. You want to be competitive; you build the American infrastructure—again, Duke University.

The United States boasts the world's largest stock of transportation infrastructure as measured by combined bridges, airports, seaports, and miles of road, rail, pipeline, and inland waterways.

It is a very good start, foundation.

The United States is not well positioned compared to its major trading partners in terms of quality of transportation infrastructure. Global assessments of transportation infrastructure place the United States in 16th place out of 144 nations.

You want to improve our competitiveness, you want to create jobs, build the infrastructure.

□ 2015

The quality of transportation infrastructure affects the United States' competitiveness, point No. 6, and here is what we can do about it.

Instead of the administration's spending all of its energy and all of its time talking about how we are going to deal with international trade that, in all likelihood, will create fewer jobs in America—so much so that they have to put into that Trans-Pacific Partnership a provision that would actually pay American workers who have lost their jobs—why don't they talk about their own GROW AMERICA Act?

This is the Department of Transportation. This is the President's program, the GROW AMERICA Act. It is, really, a good piece of legislation. It is not yet introduced, unfortunately, but it calls for $7.6 billion to fix our highway system—this is all annual—$6.8 billion to improve public transportation, $3.4 billion to strengthen our rail systems—Amtrak and other kinds of rail systems—and $1 billion to accelerate our freight support system. If you really want to do international trade, you really have to build the freight management system in this Nation. It has got to go out, not just in, and you can't do it with the antiquated freight systems that we have in the United States. This is $476 billion over a 4-year period of time. It is a good project—it is fully paid for—but we are not even talking about it here.

We have got work to do. The purpose of this 1 hour, which will, actually, be significantly less than an hour, is to say, ''Hello, America. Wake up. Ask your Members of Congress: 'What are

you doing about transportation? What are you doing in 7 legislative days to fix the transportation system? Are you paying attention? Are you paying attention to your State? to your community that you represent? to the jobs that you are going to see and the highway projects and the transit projects? Are you paying attention?'' In 7 legislative days, at the end of this month, the Federal highway trust fund terminates along with the projects that are supported by it. It is a problem. It is our problem. We need the courage to act, and we need to pay attention to what is really important, which happens to be the transportation infrastructure of this great Nation. We need to rebuild it.

Joining me this hour is the gentlewoman representing the Capital of the United States, Washington, D.C., Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Delegate NORTON, thank you for joining us tonight. I am looking forward to your presentation.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank my good friend from California because it is you who have done a great service to the Nation's infrastructure and transportation by taking out this hour virtually every week. Sometimes it is a lonely hour, but I want you to know that some of us notice.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am not lonely tonight with you. I am glad you have joined us.

Ms. NORTON. I will say that the way in which you have persisted is really a model for how Members get things done in this House, so I have come down, first, to thank and honor you for what you have done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

Ms. NORTON. I have to say, in listening to you, I simply can't figure it out, as your one-man show alone should have been enough to get this bill reauthorized. It is a very unusual way for one Member to take one issue and just not let it rest. Our committee and this Congress owe you a great debt of thanks particularly when you consider, Mr. GARAMENDI, that you are talking about a bill that has strong bipartisan support in a Congress that is not known for bipartisanship. So I thank you from the bottom of my heart for what you have done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you. Thank you for your leadership on the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, because you are carrying the weight of this particular piece of legislation.

Ms. NORTON. And it is weighing us down. I am afraid we are not getting anywhere, but if we keep trying and if we keep following your leadership and the leadership of Mr. SHUSTER on that side of the aisle and of Mr. DEFAZIO on this side of the aisle, you couldn't have a better partnership in this Congress. I can't believe we won't be able to get something done, but May 31, my friend, looms, as you said in 7 days—or is it 6? The fact is that we are counting down, and there are some of us coming on the floor with you each day to count down. I was here on a 1-minute earlier today, and I think Members are beginning to understand the obligation that they have to take on, the obligation that you have taken on as a lonely Member for months now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It has to be done. We absolutely have to do this with your leadership on the subcommittee in trying to find a path to build the infrastructure and in looking for ways to pay for it.

Actually, the administration in the GROW AMERICA Act found a way to pay for it—with the earnings of American corporations that are overseas. Bring those back; tax them; and we would have enough money, together with the existing excise tax, to build our infrastructure over the next 4 to 5 years, so we have got to do it.

Ms. NORTON. And that would give us a long-term bill. The administration admits that it, too, is not the answer because, after that, we still have to come up with a new way to pay for transportation and infrastructure. You, yourself, talked about when this all started, which was in the Eisenhower administration. We have gotten so efficient now. I drive a hybrid car, which doesn't use much gas. So we have got to be prepared to really think through an entirely new way of funding transportation and infrastructure.

You mentioned the GROW AMERICA Act. I will be introducing that act soon.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Good.

Ms. NORTON. The administration does want it introduced. Mr. GARAMENDI, we need it, if for nothing else but as a marker. What are we talking about? If nothing has been introduced, I am not sure the American people will recognize just how far we have to go.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You have to lay down the marker. You laid down the first proposal, and it is really good. I said 4 years. Actually, it is a 6-year bill—$478 billion—and it covers all of the elements. All of the elements are there. If somebody has got a better idea, we haven't heard it.

I am delighted. When you introduce that bill, count me as one of the coauthors of it, and I look forward to working with your leadership to push it along.

Ms. NORTON. Oh, you would be the very first one given what you have done on this floor, and I am glad you mentioned some parts of the bill and its cost. Yes. Guess what? It costs money; it costs something to do transportation and infrastructure; but the administration has had many Members' support of bringing back untaxed funds abroad that want to come back and of using it for something that everybody is for.

I understand that our ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO, has written Mr. RYAN of Ways and Means to ask for a joint hearing of our committee with the Ways and Means Committee so that we can work together, and there are rumors, because that is all we hear about of this bill these days, that there may be one in June. You will notice that that is after May 31.

Mr. GARAMENDI. This is a major concern in that it seems as though the most common thing that happens here in Congress is a game that we used to play as children. It is called ''kick the can.'' You would get an old No. 16 can, and you would kick it around the yard. We kick the can down the road here so often instead of really gripping the issue and saying, ''Okay. Let us do something that lays out a long-term, 6-year plan where the States and the counties and the cities can actually project projects and know that the funding is going to be there so they can be efficient and effective and prioritize.'' Instead of doing that, we just kind of kick the can down the road.

They are talking about a 6-month, until the end of September, with the same level of funding. We are going to lose a lot of jobs, and the opportunity to build the systems that we absolutely have to have in order to grow our economy is not going to happen. I just go, ''Why would we do that? We have a good model.''

I am looking forward to the introduction of the GROW AMERICA Act that you are going to introduce. Tell us what is wrong with this. Tell us where it doesn't meet the needs.

My Republican colleagues and Democratic colleagues, what is missing? What improvements should there be? Tell us what it is. We will deal with it.

The funding source, as you said, makes sense. American corporations—Apple and others—have billions of dollars—almost $1 trillion—of profits overseas that are not taxed. Bring it home. Use that to invest in America. Bring the capital home so that you can put labor and capital together, starting with infrastructure, and build this Nation. Mr. DELANEY, our colleague from Maryland, has a good proposal, a bipartisan proposal, that does that.

Run with it, Congress. Run with it, Senate. Let's do something.

Ms. NORTON. Oh, you have made such an important point because you say, if not this, what?

The Democrats—we on this side of the aisle—are willing to sit down with you to come up with whatever bill we can compromise on. We just have to be shown a bill. The reason I am going to introduce the GROW AMERICA Act is so that we can begin there. Maybe they don't want that. Okay. Let's bargain

down from there, but we can't do nothing. We can't go home and say, ''Well, we did nothing,'' and we certainly can't simply wait for our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Now, I want my friend from California to know that representatives of the states were in the House today and I went to say a few words to them. They were in one of our committee rooms—a group that calls itself the ''Big Seven.'' They were the leaders in the States. They were the Governors, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors. They were begging for this bill, so they had their own meeting here.

I think that it behooves us to ramp up the pressure, we who are on the inside. When you see that those who represent the infrastructure we are talking about are on the Hill, pleading, without an answer from either side, well, our side is trying to answer; and because there is so much bipartisanship, there is just no reason that we shouldn't be sitting down and trying to figure this out.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We really must do that.

Yesterday, I was in the Central Valley—Modesto, California—for a meeting, and I had to drive to San Francisco for a speech over Interstate 580, the Altamont Pass, and it is so broken up. There is the fast lane on the Altamont Pass, as you go up over the mountain, that actually has about a 6-inch crack in the fast lane. As you drive down, you are driving down on one side of the crack. You have one wheel on one side and the other wheel on the other side of this crack, and you say, ''Whoa, I hope I can make it through here.'' That is a major transportation route with tens of thousands of cars traveling on it every day. So the state of good repair? Not in California.

What does it mean? If we were to take the GROW AMERICA Act that you are going to introduce, it would mean that, compared to this year, 2015, we would have $7.6 billion more across the Nation to repair the highways in our Nation. The Altamont Pass, it is downright dangerous—I was shocked—but they don't have any money to fix it. There would be $7.6 billion for all of this Nation to do it.

Then the buses, the transit agency in San Francisco. I was parked in San Francisco, waiting for a stoplight. A bus pulls up, and it had to be a 1950 bus. It was rusted out, and I am sure the seats were torn apart. All good credit to San Francisco for trying, but across the Nation, it is the same way—here in Washington, D.C., with the transit agencies, Amtrak.

By the way, Amtrak came to Congress. They wanted money—this is some good news—and we actually passed an Amtrak bill out of the House of Representatives a couple of months ago. Yet do you know what they wanted to do? They wanted to get a waiver on the Buy America provisions. They have to build, I think, 28 locomotives and train sets—high-speed—and they didn't want to buy it in America. I am going, no, no way. If we are going to spend American taxpayer money, spend it on American-made equipment, on American jobs. Make It In America. No way are you going to get out of that.

□ 2030

I also want to talk about this, but you have got a bridge behind you.

Ms. NORTON. I do. You talked about the project in your district, and that project with the crack in the road is emblematic of what is happening in the United States.

Mr. GARAMENDI, they can't even start on that repair because that is a major project. So another patch, as we call it, or short-term funding, means that the backlog of major projects remains. You can't start what America needs, which are major projects. If we could put them all here in this Chamber, they would pile up to the ceiling. They simply have to sit there with 6-month patches or even a 1-year patch. Yours is a major Federal highway, and California can't do anything about it.

I went to such a highway in my own city, and that is why I brought this poster. The Washington Post picked it up and says, ''Norton Uses Bridge to Make a Point.'' It is interesting. Although this bridge also has real defects, I was using it to make another point, that every form of transportation depends upon this bridge in the Nation's Capital: the intercity buses; the intracity buses; the street car, if you are going to a major highway; the Metro—all of it comes to a head there.

A point that you touched upon, which is seldom made here, is a point I tried to make when I went to the H Street—or Hopscotch—Bridge, and that is that the failure to rebuild that bridge is keeping a complete overhaul of Union Station from occurring, not to mention a whole new community that would be built over it, because they can't move on those major economic development projects until the bridge is done, and it will take 5 years to rebuild that bridge.

So you see, Mr. GARAMENDI, we are not just holding up obvious infrastructure projects; we are holding up major economic development projects that simply can't get started until the roads and bridges are fixed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, you couldn't be more accurate, and you certainly did make the point. I was looking at the picture there. You have got the Northeast corridor, the entire Amtrak system underneath that bridge into Union Station, which I think is probably just to what I would say stage left, and the rail system goes through there, and then the highway system. I didn't realize that this is holding up the reconstruction of Union Station.

Ms. NORTON. So that we can get high-speed rail. So you can't get high-speed rail unless you dig down. You can't do that unless people can get over this bridge. You talked about billions of dollars of highway bridge and transit that is being held up. I don't even want to begin to try to calculate how much economic development that depends upon our fixing those major road projects is not getting done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, also, the lives of our citizens. I don't have the placards with me, but in previous presentations I have shown pictures of the Interstate 5 bridge that collapsed in Washington State near the Canadian border. It shut down commerce going north. You were not going north on that bridge because it collapsed. And then there was the bridge over the Mississippi River in the Twin Cities, in Minneapolis. That bridge collapsed. I think five people lost their lives there. This is an ongoing issue, one that we need to deal with.

The solution is at hand. The solution is at hand. Every community in this Nation has a transportation issue of one sort. It might be a transit, a bus, a train, or a bridge, or a highway, but we all have it.

I am going to make one more point, and this will be my last, and then I will let you wrap it up. I am going to go back to what is the discussion of the day here in Washington, the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the TPA, the authorization of the fast track legislation. Ninety-nine percent of our trade goes through the ports, and this is part of the GROW AMERICA Act. It is part of the freight system. I don't think this trade bill should pass, but should it become law, you have to have the infrastructure that goes with it, and you cannot have a robust trade program unless you have a well-built port system.

By the way, one of the things that is going to happen is, because of our energy boom, the United States is creating an enormous amount of natural gas. That natural gas is in the process of being transported, shipped overseas in what is known as liquefied natural gas. You supercool, you supercompress the natural gas; you put it into a tanker, a big ship, and you transport it.

A new facility will go online in Louisiana, and it is called the Cheniere facility at Sabine Pass. It will take 100 tankers, ships, to handle the volume of that one export facility, and there are five others that are in the permitting process. I am saying, Wait a minute, that is a strategic national asset; that is part of our infrastructure. Why don't we ship that strategic asset on American-built ships with American sailors? If we passed a simple law here, which

actually replicates the North Slope oil law back in the 1960s, we could replicate that and simply say: If we are going to export liquefied natural gas, do it on American-built ships with American sailors. We would build over the next two decades more than a hundred ships in American shipyards with American-built equipment and Americans doing the welding and building those ships, probably well over 100,000 jobs; and the seamen, the merchant marine, they would be American.

It all fits together. It is part of our transportation infrastructure. It is using our great national assets, improving them, the transportation system, and then using those assets to create American jobs. Buy America, make it in America, transport that natural gas on American-built ships with American mariners, and take what will be your legislation, the GROW AMERICA Act, and build the infrastructure.

I am looking forward to the introduction of your legislation. I am looking forward to your leadership in making this happen. We have got to talk about this every single day until we wake up, until America wakes up, and says: Wait a minute, guys, do something for our Nation; build the foundation of economic growth.

Thank you so very much for joining us, Delegate. I will let you close.

Ms. NORTON. Well, again, Mr. GARAMENDI, you have my thanks, and you should have the thanks of this entire House. I am glad you closed with the program you did—you talked about the ports—because in the GROW AMERICA Act is a multimodal freight program. This is the first time it has ever been in the transportation bill.

Now, you gave an example: multimodal, because we are trying to make sure that rail and highway and port projects are coordinated together. That is the efficient use of all modes of transportation together. Here on the East Coast, The Panama Canal is coming and now you have every single port trying to get that business, and you have the private sector investing like mad in railroads because they want that business, and the buses want that business.

The private sector, Mr. GARAMENDI, is doing its job, but you can't, in fact, in the States do the ports and the freight all by yourself or with the private sector alone. And so this bill, the GROW AMERICA Act, brings it all together, gives us for the first time something that we have had in ground transportation, multimodal, but we have not had it in freight transportation so that those ports you are focusing on would grow, and we grow them here, just as you said, buying American.

I thank you once again for all you have done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you so very much. I thank you for your leadership. I am looking forward to the introduction of the bill and to push that through. Whether we can do it in 7 days or not—we could. It is possible. All the language is written. You will introduce it. The way of paying for it is known. We have just got work to do.

I am just thinking about the greatness of this Nation and the enormous potential that we have, and how we just let that slip away, for lack of solid programs that really build this Nation. I think about Eisenhower and what he did with the great highway system that we have, the Interstate Highway System. There is much to be done. I look forward to your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that our Republican colleagues have been listening to our debate and have decided to come and take the next hour and carry forth to Make It in America, build the infrastructure and the foundation for economic growth. I look forward to hearing the gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). The gentleman yields back the balance of his time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Do you have more you wish to say?

Ms. NORTON. Yes, I certainly do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thought we had completed, but I guess I am not yielding back quite yet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Ms. NORTON. Again, I thank the gentleman for the leadership he has taken on not only this bill but on infrastructure in our country. I did want to say a few more words because in these last 6 days we can't leave words unsaid.

I want to say that what my chief frustration is—there is really no serious thinking going on in this House about ways to replace the highway trust fund except what is in the GROW AMERICA Act, and that, of course, would be for one 6-year period. The reason I bring this up is because I want the American people to help us think about what has happened to the highway trust fund. We have got to bring it together this time and grow America with repatriated taxes that would otherwise not be there.

But let's think of why we have to do that. The efficiency that we now have and we ought to be proud of that, but it means that that 1950s approach, which worked so magically, is now entirely out of date, and there have got to be other ways to fund transportation and infrastructure. I was very frustrated that in the last bill, we call it MAP–21, there were not even pilots to guide us, like the so-called VMT miles driven that all of us, even those of us who are in hybrid cars, those who therefore don't contribute as much on the present highway fund, would play our part.

We need to sit around a table right here in the House and figure out what to do in the long run because we didn't do that last July when this bill was extended. There are even some people talking about, well, it can go to July because it runs out in July. Yeah, it runs out in July, and then look what happens. Treasury funds will have to be transferred just to make sure that we keep level funding going, and that level funding, meaning just base funding, will mean that no new major projects will be started in the States because of what has come to be called lack of certainty. I know of no major project that can be finished in 6 months. If it takes you 2 or 3 years, leave alone the 5 years like my H St Bridge project I spoke about, then you don't start it at all. So the money just lies fallow. It goes to no good major need.

So who is to blame? They are going to look to us and say, What are you doing? That is why we are coming on this floor. They are going to look to us to stop doing the same thing over and over again and think of something that we didn't do the last time. These short term patches are what we did the last time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, we have done it over and over again, and the general talk around this building is that we are going to kick the can down the road yet again, probably for another 6 months, just like we extended the last one for 9 months. It is not the way to do it, and the result is bad public policy and an inability to really build the foundation for our economic future.

You mentioned the funding, the notion of a joint committee hearing between the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Ways and Means to discuss the funding options that you just described, and so we should talk about what the options are, and then select the one that makes the most sense for this Nation's well-being.

□ 2045

We can do that. That is what we were hired to do and what the voters put us here for.

Ms. NORTON. Meanwhile, as you indicated, GROW AMERICA would be a way to do it for at least 6 years.

I went to speak with the various organizations representing the States that were here today. I had my staff look at what the States are doing. Frankly, I found the States in a desperate position. There are States that have already done gas tax increases or reforms of their own. You have got to be pretty desperate to raise your own tax and leave ours where it was 20 years ago.

Iowa, Wyoming, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont, the District of Columbia,

South Dakota, these State have nothing in common, except that they couldn't continue to go on without funding.

Six States are making progress on trying to raise their own gas tax in the absence of our doing something. Those States, in the same way, don't have anything in common. When I say ''making progress,'' it generally means one House has at least done it, and they are trying to get the other House to raise the gas tax. They are Georgia, Michigan, North Carolina, Utah, and Washington State.

Then there are another seven States which are considering changes because they just can't wait any longer to get long-term projects going: Idaho, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, South Carolina, and Vermont.

When I came into the meeting today, there was someone from the South Dakota Department of Transportation speaking, and it was interesting because they raised the gas tax in South Dakota, a very red State, and it included an amendment also to raise the speed limit by 5 miles an hour. I think that would make it something like 80 miles an hour out there.

He said—and he just laughed at this—that, although they had raised the gas tax on the residents in the legislature, nobody talked about anything except the increase the speed limit. That is how little the notion that you shouldn't raise your gas tax had become in a State like South Dakota.

The States are way ahead of us and looking to us for leadership. These 6-month increments are the exact opposite of leadership—delaying, as I indicated before, Mr. GARAMENDI, billions of dollars of other infrastructure that the Federal Government wouldn't have to pay for often, that can't get done, like a road or a bridge. That is why I went to such an example in my own district.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD a list of the top five critical infrastructure projects in my own district, the Nation's Capital. The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board has also written to this region's bipartisan delegation, and I would like to have its resolution also included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

TOP FIVE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STALLED UNTIL THERE IS A LONG-TERM SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

1. Rehab of 14th St. NW, Thomas Circle to FL Ave.

2. Safety & Geometric Improvements to I–295/DC295

3. 11th St. SE Bridge (various components)

4. Improved Signal System and Communication Network

5. Intersection of PA Ave. and Potomac Ave. SE

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION,
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD,
April 27, 2015.

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington DC.
Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington DC.
Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington DC.
Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN INHOFE AND SHUSTER, AND RANKING MEMBERS BOXER AND DEFAZIO: On behalf of the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) at the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG), I transmit the attached board resolution and policy principles for the reauthorization of the federal transportation programs.

Our policy principles represent a commonsense approach to reauthorization. We urge Congress to enact legislation that will fund priority needs and promote effective planning and project development.

As we face the expiration of MAP–21, this moment offers an opportunity to demonstrate that our nation is still capable of taking care of its most basic needs as we plan for future generations. We urge Congress to act decisively and comprehensively.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL MENDELSON,
Chairman.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

The Honorable Ben Cardin, United States Senate, Maryland.

The Honorable Barbara Mikulski, United States Senate, Maryland.

The Honorable Don Beyer, United States House of Representatives, 8th District, Virginia.

The Honorable Barbara Comstock, United States House of Representatives, 10th District, Virginia.

The Honorable Gerald Connolly, United States House of Representatives, 11th District, Virginia.

The Honorable Robert Wittman, United States House of Representatives, 1st District, Virginia.

The Honorable Tim Kaine, United States Senate, Virginia.

The Honorable Mark Warner, United States Senate, Virginia.

The Honorable John Delaney, United States House of Representatives, 6th District, Maryland.

The Honorable Donna Edwards, United States House of Representatives, 4th District, Maryland.

The Honorable Steny Hoyer, United States House of Representatives, 5th District, Maryland.

The Honorable Christopher Van Hollen, United States House of Representatives, 8th District, Maryland.

The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton, United States House of Representatives, District of Columbia.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION,
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2015.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE POLICY PRINCIPLES FOR THE 2015 REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Whereas, the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), which is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Washington Region, has the responsibility under provisions of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21) for developing and carrying out a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Area; and

Whereas, since 2000 the TPB has been calling attention to the region's long-term transportation funding shortfall, and has documented its unmet preservation, rehabilitation and capacity expansion needs for the region's highway and transit systems; and

Whereas, federal funding for transportation infrastructure plays a significant role in the National Capital Region; projects such as the interstate system and the Metro system could never have been built without the leadership, long-standing commitment, and financial support of the federal government; and

Whereas, the Washington region continues to face the challenges of accommodating growth in people and employment, more pervasive congestion on highways and transit systems, and delays in completing critical rehabilitation needs and key expansion projects; and

Whereas, MAP–21 was enacted on July 6, 2012 as a two-year bill, and was extended on August 8, 2014 through May 31, 2015, which was the ninth time in the last decade that Congress has enacted a short-term extension of the federal highway and transit programs.

Whereas, it is anticipated that Congress will likely again enact a short-term extension prior to the May 31st expiration of MAP–21, but the need for sustained and long-term federal funding could remain unaddressed; and

Whereas, the lack of predictability in federal funding programs has undermined the ability of state and local implementing agencies to effectively plan and build transportation facilities that are vital to meet the challenges of the future; and

Whereas, the lack of sustained and adequate federal funding for transportation undermines economic growth in our region and across the nation and hinders our global competitiveness; and

Whereas, both Maryland and Virginia took historic steps in 2013 to address their transportation funding shortfalls by raising new revenues, and the District of Columbia took similar steps five years ago, but nonetheless, the inadequacy of sustainable federal funding remains a critical concern; and

Whereas, the TPB has regularly communicated its positions regarding federal transportation legislation to Congress, including policy principles in 2002 and 2008, and a letter on May 21, 2014 calling upon Congress to protect the Highway Trust Fund from insolvency; and

Whereas, at the November 19, 2014 meeting, the TPB directed staff to develop a set of policy principles for the reauthorization of the federal surface transportation program that the Board might communicate to the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas, on April 3, 2015, the TPB Technical Committee received a briefing and commented on draft proposed policy principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board approves the attached 2015 Policy Principles for the Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Programs'' and further, be it

Resolved that the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board calls on the United States Congress to reauthorize an enhanced federal surface transportation program for a full six-year period, consistent with the attached Policy Principles.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD,
April 15, 2015.

2015 POLICY PRINCIPLES FOR THE REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

The federal government has an historic interest in transportation. The benefits of federal investment in a balanced, multimodal transportation system have long been recognized as critical to our national interest, promoting economic growth and providing access to opportunities for all individuals. In addition, the federal government has a unique obligation to support interstate commerce and to meet critical emergency and security requirements, and thus should provide an equitable contribution towards the cost of maintaining, operating and building our transportation infrastructure.

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board supports the following policy principles as a common-sense approach for reauthorization of the federal surface transportation programs.

1. Increase Federal Transportation Funding

A substantial increase in federal surface transportation funding levels is needed to address the current under-investment in the maintenance, operations and expansion of the nation's transportation system.

All reasonable and predictable strategies for sustained long-term funding should be pursued, including:

Increases in federal fuel taxes or other user-based taxes and fees;

Indexing fuel taxes and user fees to inflation so as to maintain the buying power of transportation funds;

Implementing pricing strategies enabled by emerging technology for all modes of travel, including rates that vary by time of day, type of vehicle, level of emissions, and specific infrastructure segments used;

Incentivizing federal support and coordination of innovative financing techniques, including public/private partnerships;

Utilizing savings from tax reform legislation; and

Creation of national infrastructure banks or bonding programs.

2. Fund Priority Needs

An explicit program focus, with enhanced funding, is needed to put and keep the nation's transportation infrastructure in a state of good repair.

Federal transportation policy should provide for increased federal funding focused on metropolitan congestion and other metropolitan transportation challenges, with stronger partnerships between federal, state, regional and local transportation officials.

The federal commitment to balanced multi-modal transportation systems must be reaffirmed including by restoring parity between the transit commuter benefit and the parking commuter benefit. As communities seek to reduce dependency on driving and serve non-drivers, alternatives must be developed and supported. In particular, federal funding for public transit and safe pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure should be enhanced.

3. Promote Effective Planning and Project Development

More timely, detailed, and flexible requirements to comply with MAP–21's mandate for performance based planning and programming should be promulgated. Adequate and timely federal support, including funding, should be provided to the states and metropolitan areas to adopt and implement the program requirements.

The current set of performance measures outlined in MAP–21 should be allowed time to take effect and be evaluated before enhancements are considered.

Streamlining federal planning and environmental review processes, outlined in MAP–21, that are aimed at ensuring timely delivery of transportation projects, should be supported.

Given the critical role of goods movement in our economy and the demands of freight on our infrastructure, a national freight program should be a key component of a long-term reauthorization act.

Ms. NORTON. I want to emphasize, as we approach the end, how little of a partisan problem we are talking about this evening. Republican Governors have signed the laws that I have referred to.

The committee—Mr. GARAMENDI will remember this—had Republican Governors, State department of transportation executives, cities, counties, regional councils, and the rest before us, and the notion of devolution came up.

This hearing was interesting because when devolution has come up, and devolution simply means that if States are raising their gas tax. Well, let's stop doing a Federal highway or surface transportation bill.

These States are raising their gas tax, and they are waiting for us to raise ours so that the partnership that is represented by State gas taxes and Federal gas taxes will remain whole until we find some other way to do this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PASS A SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining in the hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 16 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. GARAMENDI spoke about the Eisenhower years, which gave us the present highway trust fund. Its lasting effects make it a monumental contribution to American law. Our generation has the obligation to move on, now that we have become so efficient that the highway trust fund, as set up 50 years ago, is obsolete.

I remind the House that, during the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln built the railroad system. How could you do that during a time when the country is split apart, and in this House, we can't figure out a way to get a highway surface transportation bill passed?

I looked up the latest figures—actually, 2015—on how our country ranks today. We ought to compare that to what Lincoln did, now going on 150 years ago, and what Eisenhower did 50 years ago.

We now rank 25th in the world for infrastructure quality. We are behind every last one of our allies, and now, we see some developing countries creeping forward. We better watch out for China. They are not in the top 30 now, but they are going to get there soon.

I remind this House that the way in which this country became the heavyweight that it is in the world was through the development of its infrastructure. We had to somehow create a seamless infrastructure that would go from across the continental United States, from east to west and from north to south.

With that, everything else became possible. Without that, we are simply going to be overtaken by nations that are far behind us now but, as I indicated are getting caught up.

I wanted to say a word about at least one other section of the GROW AMERICA Act because it relates to transit systems which are under special strain and which, interestingly enough, are embraced by people, from big cities to the smallest towns.

When I say ''transit systems,'' I am talking about everything from light rail and street cars that we have here in a big city like the Nation's Capital to rapid transit and buses that rural America depends upon and that are simply breaking down and unable to handle the traffic.

There is a very special provision of $115 billion to invest in these transit systems. The reason that this investment would be so acceptable is that there is no part of America that it does not touch.

I am not talking about, for example, subway systems of the kind we have in the District of Columbia and New York. I am talking about light rail and street cars and buses and rapid transit buses that small-town America uses and depends upon, and that is in the GROW AMERICA Act.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the Democrats on the Transportation and Infrastructure committee are having a roundtable where each member is going to discuss a project that is stuck because we have not passed a surface transportation bill. What we are trying to do at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow is put a face on what infrastructure means.

What infrastructure means, for example, in the District of Columbia, is

the H Street or Hopscotch Bridge. I didn't take on one of the bridges that is simply falling down. There are altogether 31 projects in the District of Columbia that are awaiting funding. I have asked that the projects be put into the RECORD. Some of you would be interested if you were from the District, but it doesn't matter. You all have projects like this in your districts.

Unless we raise the ante, unless we make this an offer that this House cannot refuse, we are going to keep patching this bill until there is nothing left to patch.

This is a House that does not move, even in a crisis. We saw that with the Department of Homeland Security appropriation, that they simply would not give up. Finally, when the administration wouldn't change its immigration executive order, they simply had to let it pass. That is how we figured that one out.

Surely, there is a more rational way to figure out a surface transportation bill. I am working—at least on my side of the aisle—with 1-minutes this week, with the Special Order hour Mr. GARAMENDI has taken out, with social media, and with our work with the many organizations who have come here because this is National Highway and Transportation Week, as they have so declared. We are trying our best.

In this case, we are not trying to reach a compromise. We are simply trying to get to a bill so that we can simply sit down and talk about it. If you don't want to talk about the GROW AMERICA bill, put your own version of a bill, but don't insult the American people by giving us nothing except another patch.

I appreciate that, at least on my own committee, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, there is an earnest effort to find a solution to this crisis. I commend Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for working together in search of a solution. I call upon the Ways and Means Committee, through whom the funds must come, to do their job.

Together, we can do this. We are not going to let this House rest; we are not going to drop this issue, even on May 31, when the funds are set to run out and we have to find a patch. We are going to keep coming to this floor so that the American people know that there are at least some Members of this House who are struggling to get a surface transportation bill, are earnest about it, and won't give up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2100

CONSTRUCTION OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to talk for a little while tonight about some challenges that we are facing as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have never run for office before, and I will tell you I never had intentions of running for office. After sitting home watching from my home State of Louisiana, watching what is happening in Washington, and watching the dysfunction in this Nation, I think that the major motivation for running for office was more out of frustration than anything else—the disparity, the inconsistency in policies, decisions being made that lack, I think, the public interest and are being made more so as a result of political decisions.

Unfortunately, what I am going to talk about tonight I don't think will be the only subject that I end up coming back and talking about over the next several months.

It seems that, oftentimes, the Federal Government's decisions, their policies, their regulations seem to lack any type of connectivity to what is actually happening on the ground—decisions being made in a vacuum, decisions lacking, I think, the true expertise. What I am going to talk about tonight is an example of that.

This picture right here is a picture or the result of bad Federal policy. Now, the administration would lead you to believe that this picture is what is going to happen by building the Keystone pipeline.

This is oil, Mr. Speaker. This is oil in all of these bags that was recently picked up, but the administration would make you think that this is what is going to result from constructing, from building the Keystone pipeline.

The irony is that these bags don't have anything to do with the Keystone pipeline. This was actually oil that was picked up just in the last few months from an oil spill that happened in the Gulf of Mexico, the Deepwater Horizon oil spill 5 years ago—5 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

This administration has been asked over and over and over again by the State of Louisiana and by the coastal parishes in our State to force the responsible parties to go clean up the oil, and it is not happening. It hasn't happened. They haven't been held accountable.

It is unbelievable to me that we have an administration out there talking about their opposition to the Keystone pipeline because they are concerned about the environmental consequences at the exact same time—and over the last 5 years—allowing this to continue. It is hypocrisy. It is absurd, and it is obviously not in the public interest, Mr. Speaker.

The only reason that the White House, the only reason that the State Department is involved in any decisionmaking whatsoever in the Keystone pipeline is a result of the fact that the pipeline actually crosses the border between Canada and the United States. That is the one thing that actually introduces the Federal Government into this decision.

For the most part, pipelines can be permitted and built by States, with State approval. They don't need interaction or approval from the Federal Government.

Now, by not building the Keystone pipeline or not approving it, many folks in the administration would lead you to believe that that is actually going to benefit the environment, that it will result in less oil consumption, that it will result in less greenhouse gases being released into the environment, into the atmosphere. The reality is that that is not accurate at all.

The reality is that, first of all, if you don't build the Keystone pipeline, you are still going to transport that oil. The Canadians will still be producing that oil, but what is going to happen is they will use other modes of transportation. They will use things like barges. They will use things like rail.

I think it is noteworthy to look at the statistics, to look at the historic performance of these other modes of transportation, which clearly indicate that transporting by pipeline is actually the safest means, the safest mode of transportation to get this product into the United States.

It is safest in regard to different incidents. It is safest in regard to spills, impacts on individuals, on communities, on the economy, on the environment. The safest way to transport is doing it by pipeline.

I mentioned that the oil will still be transported. Here is an example of what happens when you transport through other modes, when you don't transport by pipeline. This is an example of what happens.

As a result, you have had additional oil being transported by rail lines. Look at the extraordinary spike. Look at the extraordinary spike in the spills and the impacts to the environment as a result of transitioning to that mode of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen in the news the various accidents that have happened all over the Nation as a result of this flawed policy of refusing to allow for this pipeline to proceed.

The State of Louisiana is a logistics—it is an intermodal hub. We have five of the top 15 ports in the United States. We have enough pipelines in our offshore region that they would go around the Equator if you put them end on end.

We have an extraordinary network of pipelines, demonstrated right here.

You can see this high concentration of pipelines that are all over our State and in the adjacent State of Texas and in all 48 States in this graphic here very, very clearly.

I will say it again. The only reason the administration is involved in the Keystone pipeline decision is because that pipeline crosses the U.S. Canadian border. It is the sole reason.

All of these pipeline networks in here probably did not include Federal approval in regard to crossing over international borders. Take a look at this, Mr. Speaker. Take a look at, as I recall, 1.5 million miles of pipelines across the country.

The reality is that major components of the Keystone pipeline are actually already built or can be built without the approval of the Federal Government. That 1-foot section crossing over our Canadian border on the north is the only reason, again, that the administration is involved in this.

The fact remains, number one, by building the Keystone pipeline, it will not result in additional greenhouse gases being released. The Canadians are going to continue to produce the oil. The oil will be sent either through other modes of transportation in the United States, or it will be sent to other countries.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, the Clean Air Act regimes of these other nations, in most cases, is not as stringent or as strict as it is in the United States, so resulting in a net increase in the greenhouse gases that this administration is so concerned about.

I will say it again. By not approving this pipeline, you are going to force the oil onto barges, onto trucks, onto rail, or other less safe means of transportation.

I certainly have nothing against those other modes of transportation. They are all critically important, but to see this administration hide behind the oil spill or the suggested oil spill impacts of the pipeline is simply absurd. Facts prove otherwise.

As you see here, the majority of this pipeline, by far, can be built without the Federal Government's approval. It is simply nonsensical. It is nonsensical to watch this administration hide behind false excuses to drag this decision out for years, whenever it is contrary to our economy.

What is going to happen if we don't build this pipeline? In addition to using other means of transportation, we will be importing oil, not from the North American continent, but from other countries like Venezuela, like Nigeria and Middle Eastern nations that make up the top 10 nations that export oil to the United States.

In many cases, Mr. Speaker, I will say again, Venezuela, countries that don't share American values; yet we are exporting hundreds of billions of dollars and thousands and thousands of jobs to other countries.

Who is running this place?

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate passed a bipartisan bill that was going to allow for the pipeline to be approved, for us to put this behind us and move towards other things, towards higher priority things that actually should have the attention of the United States Congress and the White House, as opposed to these things, decisions that should have been made years ago, and we should have passed on from there.

As a result of these ridiculous decisions, all these tortured reports, all the involvement of various agencies—including the EPA, the State Department, and other agencies—we are continuing to go through this long process, dragging this out, resulting again in less safe means of transportation.

Whether it is coming in through ships from other countries, across the Atlantic Ocean, or it is coming in on rail lines, it is coming in tugs and barges on our waterways, it is being transported to the United States, through less safe means of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, in closing, that this is what happens when you have bad Federal policy, when you are making bad Federal decisions. This is what happens.

You result in thousands of pounds of oil, in miles and miles of shoreline, tens of miles of shoreline, still oil in our home State of Louisiana, as a result of bad Federal policy.

We are watching a similar bad Federal policy unroll right now as the administration continues to invent impediments to what makes sense, to what statistically makes the most sense—by approving a pipeline and getting out of the way—and obstructing our economy development, jobs for Americans, and North American energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2215

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2048, USA FREEDOM ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. FOXX from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–111) on the resolution (H. Res. 255) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARLETTA (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a successful procedure to clear a blocked artery.

Mr. RUIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of jury duty.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 136. An act to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service; To The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 179. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building''; To The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 994. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building''; To The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent Resolution stating the policy of the United States regarding the release of United States citizens in Iran; To The Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 254, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 13, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable James Claude Wright, Jr.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR., Eleventh District of New York.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SHUWANZA GOFF, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 27 AND APR. 4, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Shuwanza Goff	3/28	4/4	Burma		2,079.00		15,126.10				17,205.10
Committee total					2,079.00		15,126.10				17,205.10

SHUWANZA GOFF, Apr. 21, 2015.

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, EMILY MURRY, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 27 AND APR. 4, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Emily Murry	3/28	4/4	Burma		2,079.00		15,226.10				17,305.10 −310.00
Committee total					2,079.00		15,226.10				16,995.10

EMILY MURRY, May 4, 2015.

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, JORDAN, KUWAIT, IRAQ, SAUDI ARABIA, ISRAEL, AND SPAIN, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 27 AND APR. 3, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Boehner	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. John Kline	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. Tom Cole	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. Martha Roby	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. George Holding	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Mike Sommers	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]	890.00				1,430.00
Jen Stewart	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Michael Ricci	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Jeff Shockey	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Rob Blair	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	[3]					540.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	[3]					586.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	[3]					586.00
Hon. John Kline	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	[3]					586.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	[3]					586.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	[3]					586.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	[3]					586.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	[3]					586.00
Hon. Tom Cole	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	[3]					586.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, JORDAN, KUWAIT, IRAQ, SAUDI ARABIA, ISRAEL, AND SPAIN, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 27 AND APR. 3, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Martha Roby	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00		[3]				586.00
Hon. George Holding	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00		[3] 5,885.00				6,471.00
Jen Stewart	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00		[3]				586.00
Michael Ricci	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00		[3]				586.00
Jeff Shockey	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00		[3]				586.00
Rob Blair	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00		[3]				586.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Hon. John Kline	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Hon. Tom Cole	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Hon. Martha Roby	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Jen Stewart	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Michael Ricci	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Jeff Shockey	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Rob Blair	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00		[3]				369.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Hon. John Kline	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Hon. Tom Cole	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Hon. Martha Roby	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Jen Stewart	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Michael Ricci	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Jeff Shockey	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Rob Blair	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00		[3]				1,000.00
Hon. John Boehner	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Hon. John Kline	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Hon. Tom Cole	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Hon. Martha Roby	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Jen Stewart	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Michael Ricci	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Jeff Shockey	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Rob Blair	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00		[3]				250.00
Committee total					37,351.00		6,775.00				44,126.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN BOEHNER, May 4, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TUNISIA, UKRAINE, GERMANY, AND FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 2, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Hon. Mike Conaway	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Hon. Kay Granger	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Hon. Fred Upton	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Hon. Peter Welch	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Hon. Diane Black	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Hon. Erik Paulsen	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Hon. Tom Graves	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Natalie Buchanan	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Barrett Karr	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Kelly Dixon	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Robert Karem	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		[3]				576.00
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Hon. Mike Conaway	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Hon. Kay Granger	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Hon. Fred Upton	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Hon. Peter Welch	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Hon. Diane Black	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Hon. Erik Paulsen	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Hon. Tom Graves	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Natalie Buchanan	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Barrett Karr	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Kelly Dixon	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Robert Karem	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		[3]				769.00
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Hon. Mike Conaway	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Hon. Kay Granger	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Hon. Fred Upton	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Hon. Peter Welch	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Hon. Diane Black	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Hon. Erik Paulsen	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Hon. Tom Graves	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Natalie Buchanan	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Barrett Karr	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Kelly Dixon	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A
Robert Karem	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		[3]				N/A

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TUNISIA, UKRAINE, GERMANY, AND FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 2, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Mike Conaway	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Kay Granger	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Fred Upton	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Peter Welch	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Diane Black	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Erik Paulsen	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Tom Graves	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Natalie Buchanan	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Barrett Karr	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Kelly Dixon	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Robert Karem	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Committee total					27,384.00						27,384.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY, May 1, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CAMBODIA, VIETNAM, BURMA, KOREA, AND JAPAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 4, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Sander Levin	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Mike Thompson	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Doris Matsui	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Dan Kildee	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Mark Takai	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Wyndee Parker	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Katherine Monge	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Drew Hammill	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Kate Knudson Wolters	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Bina Surgeon	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Rachel Klay	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Sander Levin	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Charles Rangel	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Anna Eshoo	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Mike Thompson	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Doris Matsui	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Dan Kildee	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Mark Takai	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Wyndee Parker	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Katherine Monge	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Drew Hammill	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Kate Knudson Wolters	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Bina Surgeon	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Rachel Klay	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Sander Levin	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Anna Eshoo	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Mike Thompson	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Doris Matsui	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Dan Kildee	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Mark Takai	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Wyndee Parker	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Katherine Monge	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Drew Hammill	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Kate Knudson Wolters	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Bina Surgeon	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Rachel Klay	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Sander Levin	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Mike Thompson	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Doris Matsui	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Dan Kildee	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Mark Takai	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Wyndee Parker	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Katherine Monge	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Drew Hammill	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Kate Knudson Wolters	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Bina Surgeon	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Rachel Klay	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Sander Levin	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Mike Thompson	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CAMBODIA, VIETNAM, BURMA, KOREA, AND JAPAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 4, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Doris Matsui	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		[3]				338.00
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		[3]				338.00
Hon. Dan Kildee	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		[3]				338.00
Hon. Mark Takai	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		[3]				338.00
Wyndee Parker	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		[3]				339.00
Katherine Monge	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		[3]				339.00
Drew Hammill	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		[3]				339.00
Kate Knudson Wolters	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		[3]				339.00
Bina Surgeon	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		[3]				339.00
Rachel Klay	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		[3]				339.00
Committee total					$34,927.20						$34,927.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, May 1, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Collin C. Peterson	1/29	2/1	Panama		789.00		160.00		611.48		1,560.48
Committee total					789.00		160.00		611.48		1,560.48

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Magan Milam Rosenbusch	1/11	1/13	Romania		251.10						251.10
	1/13	1/15	Poland		568.12						568.12
	1/15	1/17	Ukraine		741.38						741.38
Commercial airfare							2,721.50				2,721.50
Paul Terry	1/11	1/13	Romania		251.10						251.10
	1/13	1/15	Poland		568.21						568.21
	1/15	1/17	Ukraine		741.38						741.38
Commercial airfare							2,620.82				2,620.82
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Peter Visclosky	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Kay Granger	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,162.12				878.98		2,041.10
Commercial airfare							1,034.80				1,034.80
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. John Carter	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Steve Womack	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Marcy Kaptur	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,162.12				878.98		2,041.10
Commercial airfare							1,636.70				1,636.70
Hon. Steve Israel	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/14	United Kingdom		1,162.12				878.98		2,041.10
Commercial airfare							6,130.10				6,130.10
Paul Juola	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Tim Prince	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Brooke Boyer	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Kaitlyn Eisner-Poor	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Harold Rogers	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Ander Crenshaw	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Tom Cole	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Diaz Balart	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
Commercial airfare							1,382.90				1,382.90
Hon. Chris Stewart	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. David Jolly	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Sanford Bishop	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Charles Dutch Ruppersberger	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Henry Cuellar	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
William Smith	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Dale Oak	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
B.G. Wright	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Anne Marie Chotvacs	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Steve Marchese	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Clelia Alvarado	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Chaka Fattah	3/10	3/11	Israel		439.00				2,652.54		3,091.54
Commercial airfare							2,786.36				2,786.36
Hon. Nita Lowey	3/7	3/10	India		906.00						906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00						911.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00						546.00
Commercial airfare							1,135.00				1,135.00
Erin Kolodjeski	3/7	3/10	India		906.00						906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00						911.00
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		648.00						648.00
Commercial airfare							1,094.80				1,094.80
Jennifer Hing	3/6	3/10	Bahrain		1,022.22				142.92		1,165.14
	3/10	3/13	Jordan		1,066.23				264.65		1,330.88
Commercial airfare							12,012.00				12,012.00
Megan Milam Rosenbusch	3/6	3/10	Bahrain		1,022.22				142.92		1,165.14
	3/10	3/13	Jordan		1,066.23				264.65		1,330.88
Commercial airfare							12,012.00				12,012.00
Ground transportation							105.44				105.44
Tom O'Brien	3/6	3/10	Bahrain		1,022.22				142.92		1,165.14
	3/10	3/13	Jordan		1,066.23				264.65		1,330.88
Commercial airfare							12,012.00				12,012.00
Andrew Cooper	3/6	3/10	Bahrain		1,022.22				142.92		1,165.14
	3/10	3/13	Jordan		1,066.23				264.65		1,330.88
Commercial airfare							12,012.00				12,012.00
Ground transportation							95.06				95.06
Committee total					118,554.95		68,791.48		71,575.00		258,921.43

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Adam Kinzinger	1/29	1/31	Panama		526.00		569.35		611.48		1,706.83
Hon. Markwayne Mullin	1/29	2/1	Panama		789.00		160.00		611.48		1,560.48
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	2/13	2/18	England		1,808.54		1,098.10		455.40		3,362.04
Jessica Wilkerson	2/13	2/18	England		2,069.28		1,035.00				3,104.28
Hon. John Shimkus	3/8	3/12	Lithuania		826.72		8,003.90		963.84		9,794.46
Committee total					6,019.54		10,866.35		2,642.20		19,528.09

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. FRED UPTON, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Robert Dold	1/29	2/1	Panama		665.72		(3)		771.48		1,437.20
Hon. Luke Messer	3/7	3/10	India		906.00		(3)				906.00
Hon. Luke Messer	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)				911.00
Hon. Luke Messer	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00		1,135.00				1,681.00
Committee total					3,028.72		1,135.00		771.48		4,935.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Gregory Meeks	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00		(3)				305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00		(3)				914.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.58		(3)				274.58
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,214.51		344.43				1,558.94
Sophia Lafargue	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00		(3)				305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		844.00		(3)				844.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		261.64		(3)				261.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,214.51		344.43				1,558.94
Thomas M. Hill	3/09	3/10	Belgium		294.59		4,004.30				4,298.89
	3/10	3/12	Latvia		448.31						448.31
	3/12	3/14	Poland		550.13						550.13
Timothy Mulvey	3/09	3/10	Belgium		294.59		4,039.30				4,333.89
	3/10	3/12	Latvia		448.31						448.31
	3/12	3/14	Poland		550.13						550.13
Douglas Seay	2/15	2/18	Poland		825.00		5,784.20				6,609.20
Kyle Parker	2/15	2/17	Poland		562.10		7,127.70				7,689.80
	2/19	2/21	Belgium		633.67						633.67
	2/17	2/19	Germany		639.17						639.17
Amy Porter	1/18	1/20	Democratic Rep. of Congo		837.00		15,785.00				16,622.00
Worku Gachou	1/18	1/20	Democratic Rep. of Congo		827.00		15,785.00				16,612.00
Hon. Tom Emmer	2/24	2/24	Guantanamo Bay, Cuba				(3)				
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	3/12	3/13	Kuwait		393.00		15,728.00			* 575.00	16,696.00
	3/13	3/16	Egypt		1,353.50					* 4,636.00	5,989.50
Hon. Reid Ribble	3/10	3/11	UK		369.00		20,560.20				20,929.20
	3/12	3/13	Kuwait		393.00						283.00
	3/13	3/15	Egypt		725.00						725.00
Paul Behrends	3/12	3/13	Kuwait		393.00		17,593.80				17,986.80
	3/13	3/16	Egypt		1,353.50						1,353.50
Hon. Darrell Issa	3/19	3/22	Belgium		1,134.00		2,410.20				3,544.20
Hon. Tom Marino	3/19	3/23	UK		1,656.59		1,026.60				2,683.19
Hon. Eliot Engel	2/06	2/08	Germany		819.85		(3)				819.85
	2/06	2/06	Tunisia				(3)				
Hon. Edward R. Royce	3/07	3/10	India		831.00		(3)			* 7,175.07	8,006.07
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)			* 7,770.05	8,681.05
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		495.00		1,135.00			* 6,586.60	8,216.00
Hon. Matthew Salmon	3/07	3/10	India		906.00		(3)				906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)				911.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00		1,135.00				1,681.00
Hon. Ami Bera	3/07	3/10	India		746.00		(3)				746.00
	3/10	3/13	China		751.00		(3)				751.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		386.00		1,135.00				1,521.00
Shelley Su	3/07	3/10	India		881.00		(3)				881.00
	3/10	3/13	China		841.00		(3)				841.00
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		501.00		1,094.80				1,595.00
Jennifer Hendrixson White	3/07	3/10	India		843.00		(3)				843.00
	3/10	3/13	China		817.00		(3)				817.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		556.00		1,097.00				1,653.70
Elizabeth Heng	3/07	3/10	India		852.00		(3)				852.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)				911.00
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		587.00		986.00				1,573.80
Hunter Strupp	3/07	3/10	India		856.00		(3)				856.00
	3/10	3/13	China		861.00		(3)				861.00
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		819.00		1,097.70				1,916.70
Peter Freeman	3/07	3/10	India		856.00		(3)				856.00
	3/10	3/13	China		861.00		(3)				861.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		819.00		1,097.70				1,916.70
Greg Simpkins	2/15	2/20	Ethiopia		648.00		6,259.32				6,907.32
	2/16	2/20	South Sudan		1,414.50					*300.00	1,714.50
Travis Adkins	2/15	2/20	Ethiopia		653.00		6,259.32				6,912.32
	2/16	2/20	South Sudan		1,455.00						1,455.00
Committee total					43,238.18		131,831.50			*27,042.72	202,112.40

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
* Indicates Delegation Costs.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. Jim Sensenbrenner	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. Tom Marino	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. Jerrold Nadler	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. David Cicilline	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Susan Jensen	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Shelley Husband	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Allison Halataei	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
George Fishman	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
John Manning	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Committee total					9,559.00				27,192.00		36,751.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Countries visited: Ireland, Turkey, Cypress, Jordan, Israel and the West Bank.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Pete Sessions	3/7	3/10	India		906.00		(3)				906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)				911.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00		(3)				546.00
Committee total					2,363.00						2,363.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. PETE SESSIONS, Chairman, Apr. 21, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Steve Chabot	3/10	3/12	Chile		473.00						473.00
	3/12	3/13	Argentina		342.00				*273.20		615.20
	3/13	3/14	Uruguay		247.00				*1,907.00		2,154.00
Commercial airfare							11,020.49				11,020.49
Kevin Fitzpatrick	3/10	3/12	Chile		473.00						473.00
	3/12	3/13	Argentina		342.00				*273.20		615.20
	3/13	3/14	Uruguay		247.00				*1,907.00		2,154.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Commercial airfare							12,027.39				12,027.39
Committee total					2,124.00		23,047.88		4,360.40		29,532.28

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
*Transportation and overtime and translator incurred by each traveler.

HON. STEVE CHABOT, Chairman, Apr. 22, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Paul Ryan	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00				1,561.10		1,866.10
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00				2,277.51		3,191.51
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.59				4,723.52		4,998.10
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.20		344.33		15,761.86		17,127.40
Hon. David G. Reichert	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		844.00						844.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		261.64						261.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.21		344.33				1,365.54
Hon. Vern Buchanan	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00						914.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.58						274.58
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.21		344.33				1,365.54
Hon. Adrian Smith	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00						914.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.58						274.58
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.20		344.33				1,365.53
Hon. Patrick J. Tiberi	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		844.00						844.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		261.64						261.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		519.40		6,245.13				6,764.53
Angela Ellard	2/14	2/15	Georgia		248.00						248.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		787.00						787.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		204.64						204.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		964.20		344.33				1,308.53
Geoff Antell	2/14	2/15	Georgia		277.50						277.50
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		816.50						816.50
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		234.14						234.14
	2/18	2/21	Japan		993.70		344.33				1,338.03
Steve Claeys	2/14	2/15	Georgia		277.50						277.50
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		816.50						816.50
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		234.14						234.14
	2/18	2/21	Japan		993.70		344.33				1,338.03
Brendan Buck	2/14	2/15	Georgia		223.25						223.25
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		762.25						762.25
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		179.89						179.89
	2/18	2/21	Japan		939.45		344.33				1,283.78
Austin Smythe	2/14	2/15	Georgia		207.50						207.50
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		746.50						746.50
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		181.64						181.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		906.20		344.33				1,250.53
Hon. Charles W. Boustany	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00						914.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.58						274.58
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.21		344.33				1,365.54
Hon. George Holding	3/7	3/10	India		906.00						906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00						911.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00		1,135.00				1,681.00
Hon. Sander M. Levin	2/14	2/15	Colombia		2,069.00		222.97		4,595.00		6,886.97
	2/15	2/15	Panama		99.00				885.00		984.00
Committee total					29,946.25		11,046.40		29,803.99		70,796.63

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael Pompeo	2/6	2/6	Africa								
	2/6	2/8	Europe		819.85						
							[3]				819.85
Hon. Devin Nunes	2/6	2/8	Middle East		710.81						
	2/8	2/9	Asia		388.00						
							[3]				1,098.81
Jeffrey Shockey	2/6	2/8	Middle East		710.81						
	2/8	2/9	Asia		388.00						
							[3]				1,098.81
Hon. Devin Nunes	2/18	2/21	Asia		771.02						
Commercial airfare							13,752.20				14,523.22
Hon. Michael Quigley	3/10	3/13	Middle East		1,455,00						
Commercial airfare							13,337.10				14,792.10
Amanda Rogers Thorpe	3/10	3/13	Middle East		1,455,00						
Commercial airfare							13,604.70				15,059.70
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/27	3/28	Europe		543.21						
	3/28	3/30	Middle East		710.82						
	3/30	3/30	Middle East								
	3/30	3/31	Middle East		368.94						
	3/31	3/31	Middle East								
	3/31	4/2	Middle East		1,000,00						
	4/2	4/3	Europe		233.26						
							[3]				2,856.23
Jeffrey Shockey	3/27	3/28	Europe		543.21						
	3/28	3/30	Middle East		710.82						
	3/30	3/30	Middle East								
	3/30	3/31	Middle East		368.94						
	3/31	3/31	Middle East								
	3/31	4/2	Middle East		1,000,00						
	4/2	4/3	Europe		233.26						
							[3]				2,856.23
Committee total					12,410.95		40,694.00				53,104.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. DEVIN NUNES, Apr. 28, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, Apr. 20, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, U.S. COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Janice Helwig	2/9	3/31	Austria	Euro	15,830.00		11,675.50				27,505.50
Robert Hand	2/16	2/21	Austria	Euro	1,348.58		1,775.40				3,123.98
Hon. Chris Smith	2/18	2/20	Austria	Euro	337.15		4,705.10				5,042.25
Mark Milosch	2/18	2/21	Austria	Euro	674.29		1,810.40				2,484.69
Nathaniel Hurd	2/18	2/21	Austria	Euro	674.29		1,775.50				2,449.79
David Kostelancik	2/25	3/3	Tajikistan	Somoni	1,486.00		6,626.80				8,112.80
Mischa Thompson	3/17	3/24	Belgium	Euro	2,505.51		1,710.00				4,215.51
			Paris	Euro							
Alex Johnson	3/24	3/27	Serbia	Dinar	600.00		3,782.10				4,382.10
Commitee total					23,455.82		33,860.80				57,316.62

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1419. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subpart J — Value-Added Producer Grant Program (RIN: 0570-AA79) received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1420. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Export-Import Bank's export report for April 2015; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1421. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Annual Report on Federal Government Energy Management and Conservation Programs, Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1422. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2014 Performance Report to Congress, required by the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1423. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2014 Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act Financial Report, required by the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1424. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2014 Performance Report to Congress for the Animal Drug User Fee Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1425. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2014 Animal Drug User Fee Act Financial Report, required by the Animal Drug User Fee Act, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1426. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Organ Procurement and Transplantation: Implementation of the HIV Organ Policy Equity Act (RIN: 0906-AB05) received May 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1427. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Alabama's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Birmingham, Alabama [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0905; FRL 9927-16-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS58) received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1428. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permitting for Greenhouse Gases: Providing Option for Rescission of EPA-Issued Tailoring Rule Step 2 Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permits [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0071; FRL-9926-98-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS57) received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1429. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus thuringiensis Cry1A.105 Protein in Soybean; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0454; FRL-9926-23] received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1430. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Infrastructure Requirements for the Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0744; FRL-9927-45-Region 10] received May 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1431. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0908; FRL-9925-42] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1432. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0910] received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1433. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Concentration Averaging and Encapsulation Branch Technical Position, Revision 1 received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1434. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Foreign Trade Regulations (FTR): Reinstatement of Exemptions Related to Temporary Exports, Carnets, and Shipments Under a Temporary Import Bond [Docket No.: 140821699-5179-02] (RIN: 0607-AA53) received May 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1435. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the twenty-seventh quarterly report to the Congress on Afghanistan Reconstruction, pursuant to Public Law 110-181, Sec. 1229; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1436. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report to Congress for the six-month period ending March 31, 2015, as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1437. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1438. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-50, ''Pre-K Student Discipline Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1439. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-51, ''Health Benefit Exchange Authority Financial Sustainability Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1440. A letter from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1441. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's updated Strategic Plan for the period 2015 through 2019, in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1442. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of final rules — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-82; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2015-0051, Sequence No.: 2] received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1443. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Equal Employment and Affirmative Action for Veterans and Individuals with Disabilities [FAC 2005-82; FAR Case 2014-013; Item I; Docket 2014-0013, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM76) received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1444. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Review and Justification of Pass-Through Contracts [FAC 2005-82; FAR Case 2013-012; Item II; Docket No.: 2013-0012; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM57) received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1445. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Enhancements to Past Performance Evaluation Systems [FAC 2005-82; FAR Case 2014-010; Item III; Docket No.: 2014-0010, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM79) received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1446. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-82; Item IV; Docket No.: 2015-0052; Sequence No.: 1] received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1447. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-82; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2015-0051, Sequence No.: 2] received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1448. A letter from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting the Commission's audited Seventy-Third Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2014, pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1449. A letter from the Board of Trustees, National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the Garden's financial statements and schedules for the years 2012 and 2013, with the independent auditors' report, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1535; Public Law 105-225, Secs. 153510 and 10101; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1450. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines, policy statements,

and official commentary, with reasons for amendment, in conformance with the Commission's statutory obligations under 28 U.S.C. 994(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1451. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Patents and Other Intellectual Property Rights [Docket No.: NASA-2015-0001] (RIN: 2700-AE02) received May 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1452. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill, the ''Department of Veterans Affairs Purchased Health Care Streamlining and Modernization Act''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1453. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections to the North American Free Trade Agreement Uniform Regulations [CBP Dec. 15-07] (RIN: 1515-AE04) received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1454. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Medicare Program; Changes to the Requirements for Part D Prescribers [CMS-6107-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AS60) received May 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Armed Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 1735. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–102, Pt. 2).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2250. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 255. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military constructions, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 114–111). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2247. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide for transparent testing to assess the transition under the Medicare fee-for-service claims processing system from the ICD-9 to the ICD-10 standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. LANCE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2248. A bill to provide that service of the members of the organization known as the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II constituted active military service for purposes of laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2249. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2251. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibilities with respect to Internet domain name functions unless it certifies that it has received a proposal for such relinquishment that meets certain criteria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 2252. A bill to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2253. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2254. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 2255. A bill to make participation in the American Community Survey voluntary, except with respect to certain basic questions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 2256. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit an annual report on the Veterans Health Administration and the furnishing of hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2257. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the reproductive treatment provided to certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. COOK, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 2258. A bill to amend section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, to modify the authority of the President of the United States to declare national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RIGELL (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 2259. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a member of the armed forces and the spouse of that member shall have the same rights regarding the receipt of firearms at the location of any duty station of the member; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BASS, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 2260. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 2261. A bill to facilitate the continued development of the commercial remote sensing industry and protect national security; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 2262. A bill to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 2263. A bill to rename the Office of Space Commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2264. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a space-available transportation priority for veterans of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2265. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MENG, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. TAKAI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BERA, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2266. A bill to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2267. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to provide an exception to the avoidance of transactions by bankruptcy trustee under section 548 where the transaction was a good faith payment by a parent of post secondary education tuition for that parent's child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2268. A bill to end the use of corporal punishment in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. POLIS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2269. A bill to expand the workforce of veterinarians specialized in the care and conservation of wild animals and their ecosystems, and to develop educational programs focused on wildlife and zoological veterinary medicine; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK of Washington (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2270. A bill to redesignate the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, located in the State of Washington, as the Billy Frank Jr. Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, to establish the Medicine Creek Treaty National Historic Site within the wildlife refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina):

H.R. 2271. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to critical electric infrastructure security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 2272. A bill to amend section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, to require that the annual budget submissions of the Presidents include the total dollar amount requested for intelligence or intelligence related activities of each element of the Government engaged in such activities; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2273. A bill to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2274. A bill to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 2275. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration and to improve employment services for veterans by consolidating various programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POSEY, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 2276. A bill to establish a moratorium on oil and gas-related seismic activities off the coastline of the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 2277. A bill to prohibit employers from compelling or coercing any person to authorize access to a protected computer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 2278. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the diversity immigrant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 2279. A bill to establish a moratorium on oil and gas-related seismic activities off the coastline of the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2280. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate bird-safe building materials and design features into public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2281. A bill to provide for the elimination of the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2282. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the enrollment of veterans in certain courses of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2283. A bill to require face to face purchases of ammunition, to require licensing of ammunition dealers, and to require reporting regarding bulk purchases of ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2284. A bill to provide for the retention and future use of certain land in Point Spencer, Alaska, to support the mission of the Coast Guard, to convey certain land in Point Spencer to the Bering Straits Native Corporation, to convey certain land in Point Spencer to the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 50. A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Health Care Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H. Res. 254. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable James Claude Wright, Jr., a Representative from the State of Texas; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H. Res. 256. A resolution expressing support for designation of May as Stroke Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. TORRES, and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 257. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week on May 6, 2015, through May 12, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 258. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting the Federal workforce; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 259. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 2015 as ''National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.R. 2250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made byLaw . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 2252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 2253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 2256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 2258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

SUCH AS Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 2259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The 2nd Amendment of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 2261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 2262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 2263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause XII–XIV of the Constitution of the United States, which gives Congress the authority to:

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI to th U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8 ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 2270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States . . .''

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 2277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment IV

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constituion

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that ''The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department of Officer thereof.''

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 2283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 50.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 10, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution:

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 36: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 91: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 93: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 114: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 140: Mr. FORBES and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 160: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 188: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 201: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 232: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 235: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. YODER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FARR, Mr. BLUM, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 288: Mr. WALZ and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 290: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 303: Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 310: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 333: Mr. WALDEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 343: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 353: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 374: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 375: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 411: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 449: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 474: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 483: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 504: Mr. OLSON, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 528: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 532: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 560: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 565: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 571: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 578: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 590: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 604: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 624: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 628: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 653: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 662: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 690: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 699: Ms. MOORE and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 702: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 711: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 721: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LONG, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 723: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 726: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 802: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 815: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 817: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 835: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 837: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 842: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 845: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 863: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 864: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 866: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 868: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 880: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. NUNES, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 915: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 920: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 923: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 990: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 999: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1018: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1057: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1062: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1073: Mr. COOK and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1086: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1114: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1117: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1125: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1131: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1133: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1151: Mr. PETERS, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1171: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1173: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1188: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1190: Mr. HANNA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1197: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROSS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1209: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1221: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1222: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1227: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1233: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1234: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1249: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1250: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1258: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1269: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1283: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1284: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1300: Mr. WALKER, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1301: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1309: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1310: Mr. KATKO and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1331: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1340: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1384: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1399: Mr. ISRAEL and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1404: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1434: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1453: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1461: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 1462: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1464: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1475: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1478: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1479: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1482: Mr. YARMUTH and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1504: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1507: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1515: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1516: Mr. WALZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1517: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1528: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1531: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1532: Mr. KLINE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1548: Mr. COHEN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mrs. Napolitano.

H.R. 1559: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1571: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1587: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1599: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1600: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1602: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1604: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1608: Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KIND, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1610: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1611: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1615: Mr. PERRY and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1634: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1635: Mr. STEWART and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1637: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1640: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1644: Mr. BARR, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 1650: Mr. JONES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1654: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1655: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NUNES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1657: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1664: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1669: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1674: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1677: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1708: Ms. MOORE and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1713: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1718: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1722: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1734: Mr. BOST and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1737: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HILL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1739: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1742: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1752: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1767: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1769: Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1773: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1785: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 1786: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1814: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1818: Mr. POCAN, Mr. GIBSON, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1832: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1834: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 1842: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1846: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1848: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1853: Mr. HARPER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1854: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1859: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1884: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1901: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1902: Mr. CONYERS and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1911: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1919: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1932: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1942: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1948: Mr. HONDA and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1978: Ms. LEE and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1982: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1986: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1989: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1994: Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2016: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2017: Mr. UPTON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 2025: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2026: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2042: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 2044: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 2050: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2061: Mr. LONG, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2066: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2072: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2089: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2090: Mr. POCAN and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2110: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2123: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2128: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2140: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 2142: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2146: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2156: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2173: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2174: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2191: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2192: Mr. FARR and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2193: Mr. HONDA and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2201: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2210: Mr. OLSON and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2213: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2215: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2216: Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2227: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2236: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2241: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MENG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. DELANEY.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 18: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. DENHAM.
H. Res. 12: Mr. BEYER.
H. Res. 28: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Res. 54: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LATTA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. MOULTON.
H. Res. 82: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 112: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 130: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H. Res. 145: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Res. 147: Ms. MENG, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 161: Ms. DELBENE.
H. Res. 181: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 193: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H. Res. 203: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 206: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Res. 209: Mr. HENSARLING.
H. Res. 227: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. KEATING.
H. Res. 232: Mr. POLIS and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 233: Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 235: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 236: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 241: Mr. DOLD.
H. Res. 253: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING COLONEL CHARLES E. POWELL

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a dear friend and constituent, Colonel Charles E. Powell. Charles is being honored this week by the Texas Southwest Council of the Boy Scouts as their Distinguished Citizen of the Year.

Charles was born in Nashville, Arkansas on May 7, 1931. After finishing high school, Charles was accepted into the United States Naval Academy in July of 1950 and graduated with distinction on June 4, 1954. That day, he commissioned into the United States Air Force.

Shortly after his commission, Charles became an Air Force pilot and logged over 7000 flying hours. During the Vietnam War, he logged over 700 combat flying hours as a Rescue C–130 commander and is credited with fourteen combat saves. After the war, Charles served in many different leadership roles throughout the Air Force. In 1980, he was tasked to be the base commander of Goodfellow Air Force Base in San Angelo, TX. At the time, Goodfellow was scheduled to be closed and it was Charles' job to prevent the base from being closed. He began working with local community leaders and assisted in shaping a new military mission for Goodfellow Air Force Base. Today, Charles' impacts can still be felt at Goodfellow Air Force Base, as it serves as a training school for thousands of service members from across all branches to train in cryptology, intelligence, and firefighting. Charles' dedication and leadership helped save a community that many veterans have come to love and adopt as their own home.

After his decorated military career, Charles continued to serve San Angelo as a leader. Charles went on to serve as vice president of the Southwest Bank, known today as First Financial Bank. In addition to serving as VP of the Southwest Bank, Charles created and directed the SWB Investment Center Inc. He served as the Chairman, President, and CEO of the Center until he retired in 1995. From there, Charles served on a variety of community service based boards such as the San Angelo Chamber of Commerce, the United Way of Tom Green County and Texas, the Fort Conch Historical Society, the San Angelo City Council, among many more.

Throughout the years, Charles has been supported by his loving wife Joanne. Joanne has assisted my constituents in my San Angelo office during my entire tenure. Joanne is also an instrumental figure in assisting with our annual military service academy nominations, which is a year round process for her. With Joanne's assistance, many of the young men and women in our district go on to serve our nation and attend one of our distinguished service academies. Charles and Joanne's support and dedication to this effort have made them very special pieces to my team. I am truly grateful for all of their hard work and dedication to the San Angelo community and to Texas' 11th district.

By serving his country and his community, Charles has upheld the Scout Oath: 'To do my duty to God and my country and to obey the Scout Law; To help other people at all times; To keep myself physically strong, mentally awake and morally straight.' His service has set an example for many generations of Boy Scouts. I am honored to have the opportunity to celebrate the achievements of Colonel Powell with the Texas Southwest Council of the Boy Scouts. Again, I offer my congratulations to Charles for being this year's Texas Southwest Council of the Boy Scouts' Distinguished Citizen.

HONORING BOB CARR AND THE GIVE SOMETHING BACK FOUNDATION

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bob Carr, founder of the Give Something Back Foundation.

Bob Carr is a true American success story. Mr. Carr grew up in the countryside near Lockport, Illinois. The son of a waitress who worked nights to support the family, Mr. Carr graduated from the University of Illinois with a bachelor's degree in mathematics and a master's degree in computer science. He now is the President and CEO for Heartland Payment Systems, the fifth largest payment processor in the United States. Mr. Carr has received numerous industry accolades including being named Entrepreneur of the Year twice by Ernst and Young and receiving the first Lifetime Achievement Award from the bankcard industry.

In 2003, Bob Carr founded the Give Something Back Foundation to help financially disadvantaged, academically-oriented students at Lockport Township High School earn a college degree. In addition to awarding scholarships, the foundation also provides students with a mentor and offers guidance to prepare them for college. Since its founding, the Give Something Back Foundation has assisted 54 college graduates and has expanded to include 21 high schools throughout Will County.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the great service that Bob Carr and the Give Something Back Foundation have given to the students of Will County, Illinois.

HONORING DR. YOEL AND MRS. EVA HALLER

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the life and accomplishments of Yoel and Eva Haller on the occasion of their combined ''170th Birthday.'' Dr. and Mrs. Haller are truly remarkable constituents of California's 24th congressional district, and have touched the lives of countless others through their lifelong efforts in activism, medicine and philanthropy.

Eva was born in Budapest, Hungary in 1930. During World War II, she helped create anti-Hitler leaflets before going into hiding during the German occupation of Budapest. Later, after moving to the United States, Eva and her late husband Murray Roman cofounded the Campaign Communications Institute of America. More recently, Eva has passionately devoted her time, skills and resources to a number of causes. She has served on the boards of dozens of non-profit foundations and institutes, including Free the Children USA, the Women's Leadership Board at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, and the Jane Goodall Institute. She has also been honored with various recognitions and awards from Glasgow Caledonian University, the Forbes Women's Summit and the United Nations Population Fund, among many others.

Yoel has dedicated his career to caring for others as a practicing Obstetrician/Gynecologist and later as a professor of OB–GYN medicine at the University of California, San Francisco Medical School. Dr. Haller also served as the Medical Director of Planned Parenthood San Francisco-Alameda Counties. In retirement, Yoel has joined his wife in advocating for numerous organizations and causes.

Dr. and Mrs. Haller were married in 1987 and have spent their lives together advocating for those less fortunate and the betterment of our community. The Hallers' generous philanthropy has benefitted not only the Santa Barbara community, but organizations and individuals around the world. We are grateful for their tireless dedication to improving the lives of others and making the world a better place. Today, as this exceptional couple celebrates their 85th birthdays, I wish them health and happiness in the years to come.

KENTUCKY RIVER COAL CORPORATION'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th Anniversary of the Kentucky River Coal Corporation, marking a major milestone in its long and important history in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Kentucky River Coal Corporation was formed in April 1915, creating a land company with a large ownership of land, timber, coal, oil and gas and other minerals in eastern Kentucky. Congregating larger boundaries of mineral properties made possible the arduous construction and development of the first railroad into eastern Kentucky and resulted in mineral extraction entities employing thousands of people in the region.

As with most American companies and people, Kentucky River Coal Corporation struggled through the Great Depression, but stood strong through the First and Second World Wars, providing the natural resource base that literally helped power America. Timber from its properties was used in the early manufacturing of automobile parts, like wooden spokes, as well as for housing across the country. With the discovery of oil and natural gas, Kentucky River Coal Corporation's lands again produced important resources to power the nation.

Through the decades since its formation, Kentucky River Coal Corporation has been a model corporate citizen in Kentucky, paying millions of dollars in taxes, and donating to various worthwhile causes. Through its charitable outreach, Kentucky River Coal Corporation has consistently funded important educational programs, established scholarships for students, and made donations to many institutions of higher learning across the state. The company has played an instrumental role in supporting local volunteer fire departments, helping them meet regulatory standards with training and equipment. In effort to support tourism in our region, the company partnered with the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife to return the majestic Elk to eastern Kentucky, where the herd now thrives, providing a model for successful reintroduction of wildlife.

Additionally, Kentucky River Coal Corporation joined with Operation UNITE to provide over $500,000 in much-needed funding to assist with substance abuse treatment and rehabilitation. Hundreds of families across the region, devastated by a loved one suffering from addiction, have expressed gratitude for the opportunity for treatment that they otherwise could not afford.

Over its 100 year history, Kentucky River Coal Corporation's lessees have produced over 580 million tons of high quality central Appalachian coal used for decades in electrical generation and manufacturing across the nation. About one out of every 130 tons of coal produced in the United States over the past 100 years came from Kentucky River Coal Corporation. Over its history, the company has returned millions of dollars in taxes to governments, paid salaries to employees, provided contributions to various charitable and educational institutions, and paid distributions to the shareholders located throughout the United States, generating untold economic benefits to communities and shareholders across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this great milestone for the Kentucky River Coal Corporation. I believe this company is poised for continued growth and success in the natural resources sector, providing energy for a strong America.

HONORING MARTHA PERINE BEARD

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to honor and thank Mrs. Martha Beard for an outstanding forty-four year career of serving the public and to wish her well on retiring as Memphis Regional Executive of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis on May 8th, 2015.

Originally from Mobile, Alabama, Mrs. Beard received a Bachelor of Arts from Clark Atlanta University and a Master's in economics from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. After, Mrs. Beard joined the St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank as a management trainee and served in many different positions before being transferred to the Memphis Branch in 1997. As the Regional Executive, Mrs. Beard was responsible for conducting regional economic research, gauging monetary policy input for banking and business leaders, and hosting community seminars that provided education and materials covering the Memphis zone. The zone included western Tennessee, northern Mississippi, and eastern Arkansas.

During her tenure in Memphis, Mrs. Beard was extremely active in the community. She served on the boards of Memphis Tomorrow, the Greater Memphis Chamber, United Way, St. Jude Children's Hospital, Baptist Health Care, and Mid-South Minority Business Council. She has been profiled by many of the area's publications and received numerous awards for her work from organizations like Leadership Memphis, the FBI, and the United Way.

On behalf of Tennessee's 8th Congressional District, I would like to congratulate and wish the best of luck for all future endeavors to the family and friends of Martha Perine Beard.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LUZERNE COUNTY HEAD START

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to help commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the establishment of Luzerne County Head Start, which provides my constituents with valuable services in early childhood education and family development. The organization plays a vital role within our community, and I am thankful for its work.

Luzerne County Head Start has offered crucial aid to children and families since its inception in 1965. The program has worked tirelessly to provide 1,162 children in Luzerne and Wyoming Counties with an environment that is favorable to early academic development. Last month, I enjoyed spending time at the Hazleton Head Start Center, and was impressed with the students and faculty I met. The three and four year olds were excited to read and engage in their class science project. They are learning the skills that will help them to succeed in kindergarten. Additionally, Head Start strives to encourage similar standards in healthy physical development. Members of the Head Start faculty educate their students about comprehensive health and nutrition, supplying them with information that will increase their well-being.

In addition to placing an emphasis on early childhood development, Luzerne County Head Start also focuses on strengthening families. In order to assist them in achieving greater self-sufficiency, the organization provides families with a wide array of services, including housing, employment, and education. Notably, Head Start offers support to parents interested in attaining a high school General Equivalency Diploma as well as other education and employment opportunities, all of which go a long way in ensuring brighter futures for parents and their children.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to honor Luzerne County Head Start as it celebrates its 50th Anniversary, and I commend the work that its faculty undertakes in order to serve the children and families of Luzerne and Wyoming Counties.

RECOGNIZING MARTIN DOSTER FOR RETIREMENT AFTER 33 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and congratulate Mr. Martin Doster on his retirement after serving 33 years with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Mr. Doster has been a vital member of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation since 1982 and has dedicated his career to conserve, improve, and protect New York's natural resources and environment.

Mr. Doster has served as the Western New York Regional Remediation Engineer for the Division of Environmental Remediation since 1989 and formerly was an engineer with the division of water beginning in 1982. During his tenure Mr. Doster oversaw the New York State Superfund Emergency Response Program where he was responsible for managing and coordinating efforts to remediate property impacted by hazardous waste. He has been

responsible for the design and construction of many significant projects in Western New York, such as the Buffalo River Restoration Project and the Buffalo Color Remediation. Mr. Doster has also protected Western New York's Environment by implementing and enforcing the Clean Water Act, The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and the Toxic Substances Control Act.

Mr. Doster's service to the Western New York community does not stop with his work at the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Mr. Doster has helped educate future Civil and Environmental Engineers at University at Buffalo through graduate level courses and lectures. He has served as a leader in his community as a Past President and Chairman of the First Trinity Lutheran Church. Mr. Doster has the utmost pride in his community; this is demonstrated by his volunteer service to the American Red Cross as a local team supervisor, service as a Boy Scout Troop Leader and devoting 8 years as a DEC Team Leader for Brush Up Buffalo.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize Mr. Martin Doster. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Doster on an accomplished career, and to commend him for the exemplary work he has done to enrich the communities and protect the environment of Western New York.

NATIONAL SYRINGOMYELIA AWARENESS MONTH

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as National Syringomyelia Awareness Month, with the hope that increased awareness of this disorder will bring a cure.

Syringomyelia, often referred to as SM, is a progressive disease of the spinal cord and has no known cure. Over 40,000 Americans are affected by SM and those individuals can suffer from chronic pain and even paralysis. It is imperative that we educate the public and provide resources to the medical community in order to find a cure for this disease.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me not just today but every day in helping to raise awareness to Syringomyelia.

INTRODUCING THE ENDING CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN SCHOOLS ACT OF 2015

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to end the use of corporal punishment in our nation's schools.

Corporal punishment is a form of physical punishment where someone deliberately inflicts pain on another individual in order to punish them. In schools, it includes the spanking or paddling of children by school officials.

While corporal punishment in schools has its place in our nation's history, it must be banned immediately. Not only is there no conclusive evidence that it is actually beneficial in modifying disruptive behavior, but it is disproportionately used as a form of punishment for African American students and children with disabilities. These punishments can result in physical as well as emotional harm to children.

Schools are supposed to be safe places where students are protected from harm. They are intended to nurture children as they grow and develop. However, 19 states still allow corporal punishments in school. Last year, the Children's Defense Fund (CDF) reported that, on average, 838 children were hit each day in public school, based on a 180-day school year. This equates to just over 150,500 instances of corporal punishment per year. This statistic is astonishing considering the fact that 31 states have already banned corporal punishment in schools.

This bill would prohibit any educational institution from receiving federal funding that allows school personnel to inflict corporal punishment on students and creates grants to encourage climate and culture improvements in schools which promote positive behaviors.

Mr. Speaker, corporal punishment is not proven as an effective means of disciplining children or modifying disruptive behavior. School should be a safe space for children to learn, grow, and develop, not live in fear of those who have been charged with their academics. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

UNVEILING THE SOUTHBURY SENIOR CENTER WALL OF HONOR

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the unveiling of the Wall of Honor at the Southbury Senior Center.

Today, we recognize the senior citizens from Southbury who proudly served our country in uniform. These men and women answered the call of duty to protect our nation and defend its ideals. They served during war and during peace, at home and abroad. No matter their deployment or their mission, each of our veterans deserves the recognition and accolades they will receive during today's ceremony.

While we can never fully repay our veterans for their service and sacrifice, I believe it is important to take every opportunity to thank and honor them. I hope when the wall is revealed, each veteran will feel the appreciation and gratitude of our community and the entire nation.

I would like to thank Wayne Rioux, Amanda Hadgraft, the staff and volunteers at Southbury Senior Center for creating this memorial to recognize these local American heroes.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,152,487,619,906.99. We've added $7,525,610,570,993.91 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE LUFKIN HIGH SCHOOL PANTHERS, 2015 CLASS 5A STATE SOCCER CHAMPIONS

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, state championship titles are always an extraordinarily exciting accomplishment for athletes. But when that state championship is unprecedented, it takes on a new dimension.

It is truly an honor to acknowledge the outstanding achievement of the history-making Lufkin High School Panthers soccer team. The Panthers completed their most impressive season yet by claiming the title of 2015 Class 5A State Soccer Champions, a victory which is also the first state soccer title claimed by a northeast Texas school of its size.

After an unsteady start to their season with two back to back losses, the Panthers immediately recognized the challenging road ominously lying ahead of them. With renewed focus and zeal, the Panthers recovered from those losses and overcame stiff competition from their fellow east Texans to become the district champions. Due to their hard work and dedication, the Panthers then entered the playoffs with an exceptional win-streak of nineteen matches.

Lufkin's first playoff match was to be a challenge for the team when the game lasted for nearly an hour before a goal was scored. The Panthers battled on to keep the score at 1–0, winning the game and advancing to the next round of the playoffs. Five hard-fought victories followed, and the Panthers then advanced to the championship game against Georgetown's undefeated East View High School. Even though the championship was played on East View's home field, the Panthers were undeterred due to the fact that they had never lost a game away from home. Dedicated fans from the ''Panther Nation'' arrived in exuberant force, driving the long distance to cheer on their home team.

The team's skill and fans' encouragement were the necessary ingredients in the final match. Time and again the Panthers' defense was tested, and their offense was held back. This did not last, however, and the Panthers were finally able to overcome East View's defenses and score. When the game was over,

the score stood as testament to the Panthers' dogged determination coupled with their tantalizing talent. The final score was Lufkin 3 and East View 1. The Lufkin Panthers had won the state championship.

Congratulations should be extended to team members Terry Mark, Sammy Villegas, Rodrigo Vargas, Cristian Julian, Cesar Camacho, Jesus Cisneros, Bradley Slusher, Alexis Roque, Omar Zamarripa, Javy Montes, Kacy Bennett, Javier Patlan, Chris Marquez, Dorian Bravo, Cristhian Pineda, Luis Lopez, Jake Williams, Joel Rodriguez, Gustavo Garcia, Ivan Hernadez, Omar Roque, and Miguel Gonzales.

The staff and faculty who led and inspired the Panthers to victory consists of Lufkin High School Principal Mark Smith, Lufkin ISD Superintendent Dr. LaTonya Goffney, Head Coach Russell Shaw, Assistant Coach David McPherson, Assistant Coach Eliazar Caldera, Trainer Forestt Bridges, Trainer Sarah Hartman, Student Trainer Edgar Medellin, Student Manager Coltone Radke, and Student Manager Jessie Santoyo.

It is a privilege to highlight this landmark achievement of East Texas' own Lufkin High School Panthers soccer team. The Panthers not only made history by capturing the title of 2015 Class 5A State Soccer Champions, but they brought Panther pride to their team, their school, the Lufkin community, the First Congressional District of Texas, and the entire State of Texas. The Lufkin Panthers' story of commitment and success is now recorded in the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

HONORING THE CENTER FOR VICTIMS OF TORTURE'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Center for Victims of Torture (CVT), torture survivors and CVT staff and volunteers on the occasion of the organization's 30th anniversary. Since its inception in 1985, CVT has become a global leader in treating victims of torture here in the U.S. and around the world. CVT has provided life-saving mental health services and rehabilitative treatment to thousands of torture survivors from the Bosnian War in Sarajevo in Eastern Europe to the Continent of Africa from Liberia to Sierra Leone.

CVT represents the best of the United States to our planet's most vulnerable citizens, and is one of only three healing treatment centers in the world. The professionals who care for torture survivors represent hope and dignity for thousands of people from more than 60 countries around the globe.

In 1985, CVT set forth on a mission to extend interdisciplinary care to torture survivors in Minnesota, and over the years expanded those services to countries around the world, with healing centers today in Ethiopia, Jordan, Kenya and Uganda. The work has grown to include training professionals in the United States and international locations in the specialized rehabilitation skills needed for people suffering the post-traumatic effects of torture, and also to advocating for human rights and put an end to torture practices.

For the past three decades, CVT has helped more than 30,000 survivors reclaim their lives. Through combined direct services, capacity building and policy advocacy work, CVT has touched the lives of more than 50,000 survivors and approximately 100,000 of their family members.

CVT was instrumental in helping Congress to pass the original Torture Victims Relief Act in 1998, which authorizes federal funding for torture survivor rehabilitation programs in the U.S. and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 2015, the Center for Victims of Torture commemorates 30 years of helping torture survivors rebuild their lives and restore their hope. It is a great honor to work with CVT and its dedicated staff and volunteers. Please join me in paying tribute to the Center for Victims of Torture and its distinguished commitment to providing healing and hope to those who most need it.

CELEBRATING THE CAREER OF HARKER HEIGHTS COUNCILMAN SAM MURPHY

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of Harker Heights Councilman Sam Murphy who will retire on May 12, 2015. Sam's extraordinary commitment to community service reflects the best values of Central Texas.

Sam thrived in a 22-year career in the U.S. Army where he took on assignments in the United States, Europe, Korea, and Vietnam. During his prestigious military career, he graduated from Airborne and Ranger schools, had a teaching assignment in the Gunnery Department of the U.S. Army Field Artillery School, graduated from the U.S. Marine Corps Command and Staff College, and had an assignment at the U.S. Air Force Academy as the Air Officer Commanding of Cadet Squadron 29. He retired from the Army at Fort Hood, Texas on October 1, 1989.

Sam continued his public service by joining the office of former Representative Chet Edwards. He proved to be a leader and voice of the people as he represented servicemen and veterans in then District 11. During his time as Rep. Edwards' liaison to military and veteran communities, Sam's personal military history proved to be an invaluable asset when serving those who have sacrificed so much to preserve our freedoms. Sam retired on March 31, 2007 after working for U.S. Rep. Edwards for 16 years.

With his established community service and his proven leadership skills, Sam successfully ran for Harker Heights City Council. He continued to serve and better his community every day. Throughout his time on the Council, Sam made a positive impact on his beloved hometown and for that we are forever grateful.

Sam's service doesn't stop when the work day is over. He is active in local community affairs including serving as Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of Heart O' Texas Federal Credit Union, teaching federal and state government at Central Texas College's Fort Hood Campus, co-founding the Harker Heights Economic Development Corporation and co-founding the Leadership Belton program. His military background and experience prepared him for being president of the Central Texas—Fort Hood Chapter of the Association of the United States Army.

Retirement is to be celebrated and enjoyed. It is not the end of a career, but rather the beginning of a new adventure. I commend Sam Murphy for his hard work and dedication to his community. I wish Sam, his wife Peggy, and their children and grandchildren only the best in the years ahead.

CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH CYCLONES SPECIAL OLYMPICS TEAM

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the 25th Anniversary of the Carrollton-Farmers Branch Cyclones Special Olympics Team founded in 1990 by Julia Scott and Patrick Noonan. The non-profit organization will be celebrating this landmark achievement at a special May 15, 2015 appreciation dinner to honor the founders.

The Cyclones are a chartered Special Olympics Texas team serving the needs of adults and children with intellectual disabilities. The organization provides them with year-round sports training and athletic competition in a wide variety of sports. Some of the sporting events that the Cyclones participate in include bowling, basketball, aquatics, track & field, bocce ball, and flag football.

Since the founding of the Cyclones in 1990, the organization has functioned as an all-volunteer group committed to providing services to hundreds of athletes with intellectual disabilities. Additionally, the non-profit organization regularly raises all the funds needed to support the training, travel, and competition costs of their athletes through a bowling event and a gala.

The Cyclones have been tremendously successful in their endeavors, with Carrollton-Farmers Branch athletes competing with success at both regional and state levels.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating the Carrollton-Farmers Branch Cyclones Special Olympics Team on their successes and in celebrating their 25th Anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO JESSICA MARSHALL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Jessica Marshall upon winning the Congressional Art Competition in the 3rd District of Iowa. Jessica, a junior at Griswold High School, is the daughter of Michael and Tracy Marshall of Lewis, Iowa.

The Congressional Art Competition, ''An Artistic Discovery,'' is open to high school students nationwide. Since 1982, the competition has been an opportunity for Members of Congress to encourage and recognize the artistic talents of their young constituents. One winner is selected by a panel of 16 judges, one from each county in Iowa's 3rd District.

Jessica's piece, ''Word Art: The Young Child,'' was named the winner out of over 75 entries. It is a unique and moving graphite pencil drawing of a young boy drawn entirely of words. Jessica's creativity and dedication to her craft is admirable. The example set by this young woman demonstrates the rewards of harnessing one's talents and sharing them with the world. ''Word Art: The Young Child'' will be displayed in the halls of the Capitol for all to admire and enjoy.

I commend Jessica for her artistic talents and I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in congratulating her for being chosen as the winner of the Congressional Art Competition in the 3rd District of Iowa. It is an honor to serve Iowans like Jessica and her parents, and I wish her the best of luck in her future academic and artistic endeavors.

RECOGNIZING CINDY BERANEK

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Ms. Cindy Beranek on her outstanding teaching career. For more than thirty-two years, Ms. Beranek engaged the imaginations of her art students at Stratford Senior High School.

Her passion for art and teaching was evident in her students' artwork. Stratford High School is always well represented in the annual Congressional Art Competition, often earning top honors, and, in the case of the 2015 competition, they took home all four awards, including the grand prize.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize the powerful role that teachers play in molding our children's minds, but it is a rare teacher who also shapes their hearts. Ms. Beranek leaves a legacy of devoted service to the Stratford community, but takes with her the thanks and appreciation of a countless many students who will always treasure their time in her classroom.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HAROLD CUMMINGS

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sadness to honor the life of a friend, neighbor, and local stalwart from the Town of Vernon, Harold ''Hal'' Cummings, who passed away this month.

Most recently, Hal served as town attorney in Vernon, but he held a number of local positions over the years including the Conservation Commission, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the Board of Education. He was also involved in his local church and Rotary Club and was a founding member of the local Chamber of Commerce. This list of accomplishments demonstrates that Hal held the well-being of Vernon, Connecticut close to his heart. Hal, his wife Isabel and their children Jay, Joel, and Justin fostered a commitment to community that runs deep through their family and is felt profoundly by Vernon residents. Hal's passing is a loss for our town and the many local employees and advocates who relied on his experience and advice.

While Harold had long served as the town's top Republican as the Chairman of the Republican Town Committee, he and I shared a mutual respect and friendship that transcended party affiliation. My respect for Harold stemmed from his unwavering and long-standing commitment to the betterment of our community, and from the many times we worked together to make progress in the town of Vernon.

Hal's record of military service, as well as that of his son Joel, was a source of great pride for him. After I was elected to Congress, he always made positive, informed comments on military policy, the stresses of active duty service, and the need to help America's veterans. Hal was a staunch supporter of the New England Civil War museum, one of Vernon's most treasured destinations—yet another example of his widespread involvement in our community.

Harold was known throughout Vernon for his positivity, and his hard work to keep our town running smoothly. I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the life and achievements of Harold Cummings, and expressing our deepest condolences to his friends and family.

REINTRODUCING THE WILDLIFE VETERINARIANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 2015

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce the Wildlife Veterinarians Employment and Training Act of 2015. This legislation will promote robust public health policy, promote needed job growth, and create more affordable opportunities for individuals who are interested in becoming wildlife and zoological veterinarians.

As you know, wildlife and zoo veterinarians are the primary source of essential health care and management that is required for animals in both their natural habitat and in captivity. These physicians preserve natural resources and the lives of animals while subsequently helping to protect human health by preventing, detecting and responding to exotic and dangerous diseases.

As global interaction between humans, livestock and wildlife have intensified over the decades, the threat posed by emerging infectious diseases to humans and wildlife continues to increase. Controlling pandemic and large-scale outbreaks of disease has become more challenging over the years, yet there has never been a time where this is a more pertinent issue. We must take preventative measures to ensure the well-being of both animals and humans. However, the United States faces a shortage of positions for wildlife and zoo veterinarians to ensure our safety from this threat.

Following their graduation, professionals that practice wildlife and zoological veterinary medicine move on to earn relatively low salaries, compared to their companions in animal medicine. Studies have also shown that on average, veterinarian graduates owe roughly $130,000 in student loans. The expectation of a low salary, combined with enormous educational debt, amidst insufficient employment opportunities, discourages these students from pursuing these vitally important careers. Moreover, due to the severe lack of practical training and formal educational programs specializing in wildlife and zoological veterinary medicine, many that do graduate are unable to make significant contributions to the field immediately.

My bill directly addresses these issues which prevent and dissuade veterinarians from practicing wildlife and zoological medicine. It will also contribute to the national job creation effort by funding new positions for wildlife and zoo veterinarians to enter upon graduation. The bill will limit the amount of educational debt for students while providing incentives to practice wildlife and zoo veterinary medicine through the establishment of scholarships and loan repayment programs. Lastly, my legislation will advance education by helping schools develop pilot curricula around wildlife and zoo veterinary medicine by expanding the number of practical training programs available to students.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, wild animals play a very critical role in our natural resources and contribute to maintaining a balanced ecosystem. The number of endangered species has only increased. Invasive non-native species and infectious disease threaten our public health. Therefore, wildlife and zoological veterinarians must be prioritized and given the resources and recognition necessary to protect both animal and human lives.

I urge my colleagues to extend a helping hand to America's veterinarians by supporting this important piece of legislation.

CELEBRATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 2015, students, faculty, and staff will gather in historic St. Mary's City, Maryland, to celebrate the St. Mary's College of Maryland Class of 2015 Commencement. They—along with many others across Maryland and our country—will also be marking the 175th anniversary of the College's founding.

Since its humble beginnings in 1840 as a public, nonsectarian boarding school for girls at the elementary through secondary levels, St. Mary's College of Maryland has been a center of learning and educational empowerment. Set along the St. Mary's River, where Leonard Calvert and the first English settlers disembarked from the *Ark* and *Dove* in 1634 to found the colony of Maryland, it expanded in the early twentieth century to become the State's first junior college and became co-educational. In the 1960s, the school transitioned into a four-year college and granted its first undergraduate degrees in 1971. Recognizing its tradition of excellence in liberal arts education, its high standards, and its unique history, the Maryland General Assembly formalized St. Mary's College of Maryland as a public honors college in 1992. Today, it continues to graduate some of Maryland's best and brightest students from thirty-one academic programs.

I am proud to represent the students, faculty, and staff of St. Mary's College of Maryland in Congress as well as to have served as a member of its Board of Trustees since 1995. Alumni of the College run businesses, contribute to the arts and athletics, conduct research in marine biology and the environment, report the news through national outlets, and serve in government—including in my Congressional office. They are continuing their alma mater's tradition of preparing graduates to make a difference wherever they live and work throughout Maryland and across our country.

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the entire St. Mary's College of Maryland community, led by its dynamic new President, Tuajuanda Jordan, on reaching its 175th year of serving as a living memorial to those first Maryland colonists' commitment to religious freedom, tolerance, and opportunity.

RECOGNIZING ST. CLOUD AREA CHAMBER BUSINESS AWARDS RECIPIENTS

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the recipients of the St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce Small Business Owner of the Year, St. Cloud Area Family Owned Business of the Year, and the St. Cloud Area Emerging Entrepreneur.

Larry Logeman is the 2015 St. Cloud Area Small Business Owner of the Year. Larry is quite literally a man with a plan. Though he did not grow up with the dream of one day owning a business, he wrote a plan to become a business owner and set a personal deadline of 5–7 years. Nearing the end of his timeframe, he bought Executive Express. Larry's customer-focused business model has served him well. What began as a modest shuttle service between central Minnesota and the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport grew into a business with 85 employees, 31 vehicles, and a projected revenue stream of $3 million in 2015.

Viking Coca-Cola, owned by Michael Faber, is the St. Cloud Area Family Owned Business of the Year. After Joe Faber, one of the founders and owners of the company, passed away in the 1990s, his son Michael moved back to Minnesota to join the management team. Keeping it in the family proved fruitful for the business. With Michael's help, Viking Coca-Cola capitalized on its existing success by expanding to canning and adding new products where consumer needs arose. The company now boasts nearly 500 employees and has a multi-state distribution operation. To top it all off, Michael and the company are active members in the community, helping local organizations and participating in charitable events.

Luke Riordan, owner of DAYTA Marketing, is the St. Cloud Area Emerging Entrepreneur. DAYTA's success is attributed to its focus on a specific subsect of the digital communications field—people and businesses who need help with social media but at an affordable price. Luke and his team work closely with their clients towards a noticeable online presence for their businesses. Luke's ambition matches the digital marketing industry—it's not slowing down. His company's doors opened in early 2012, and in the last three years they've expanded into larger office space four times and now have 25 employees.

I know I speak for the entire 6th District when I say I am so proud of these individuals' hard work and the example they set for those around them. Small businesses—and their owners—truly are the lifeblood of our beloved nation. The St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce picked an excellent group to highlight this year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body join me in honoring Larry Logeman, Viking Coca-Cola, and Luke Riordan for their invaluable contributions to St. Cloud and the surrounding area, and the State of Minnesota.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF KAISER PERMANENTE'S SACRAMENTO MEDICAL CENTER

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kaiser Permanente's Sacramento Medical Center as the Center celebrates its 50th anniversary. For half a century, Kaiser's Sacramento Medical Center has provided high quality care to residents of the Greater Sacramento area. As members, physicians, and staff gather to celebrate the Center's 50th anniversary, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Kaiser Permanente Sacramento Medical Center and its indispensable place in the Sacramento health care community.

Kaiser Permanente was founded 70 years ago in Oakland, by Henry J. Kaiser, a business leader who believed in providing affordable, quality health care. Today, Kaiser Permanente is the nation's oldest and largest health care system.

On May 1, 1965, Kaiser Permanente began providing health care for the first time in the Sacramento region with the purchase of the 64-bed Arden Community Hospital on Morse Avenue. The hospital opened with 13 physicians serving 12,000 members. Since then, Kaiser Permanente has grown into a leading health care provider and one of the largest private employers in the region with more than 737,200 members, 1,530 physicians, and 11,780 staff.

The Sacramento Medical Center has been integral to Kaiser Permanente's success in the region, earning numerous honors over the years, including Top Hospital from The Leapfrog Group, Top Performer from The Joint Commission, and Best Hospital by U.S. News & World Report. As the population of the region has grown, the Sacramento Medical Center has grown to meet its needs. The Center now has 287 beds and one of the busiest emergency rooms in the region. The Center is home to the Comprehensive Community Cancer Center, an Advanced Neuroscience Center, and a certified Primary Stroke Center.

In addition, Kaiser Permanente has helped improve the health of the region through its involvement in community programs, including support of the local nonprofit clinics, Sheriff's Community Impact Program, Arden Manor Recreation and Park District, Mutual Assistance Network, and the San Juan Unified School District.

Mr. Speaker, as the physicians, staff, and members of the Kaiser Permanente Sacramento Medical Center come together to celebrate the Center's 50th anniversary, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring their excellent work in the Sacramento Region. I am confident that the Sacramento Medical Center will continue to be a leader and a model for quality health care for many years to come.

HONORING KEVIN JONES

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Kevin Jones, a dedicated educator and principal of Center High School in Center, Colorado. In recognition of his continued excellence, the Colorado Association of Secondary School Principals has selected Mr. Kevin Jones as the 2015 Colorado High School Principal of the Year.

Mr. Jones earned this competitive award achieving many successes despite the challenges of a rural and bilingual institution. Six

out of the last seven years have seen the school earn the Colorado Department of Education's Center of Education Excellence while simultaneously earning the Colorado Education Initiative's Healthy Schools Champion Award for 4 consecutive years. Mr. Jones' leadership and personal attention to each student along with constructive assessment of teachers and the curriculum on a regular basis has enabled Center High School to rise considerably above academic standards in the state.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly a privilege to honor Mr. Jones for his enthusiasm and ability to inspire students and his staff. His dedication to teaching and his desire to excel as an educator and leader continue to benefit his community. I congratulate Mr. Jones on his selection for this prestigious award.

ROSIE TILLES OBITUARY

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, as night fell she entered, like a light: on October 17, 1910, Rosie (Willie) Thurmond was born on a small rural farm in Lexington, Mississippi. Alfred and Missouri (Polk) Thurmond were resilient and spiritually fulfilled parents who taught their daughter to love and always be faithful to God, church and family. Rosie was the eldest of four Thurmond children: Alfred, Jr. (departed), Joseph (departed), and an only sister, Juanita. In living out her parents' expectations of her, in a way, Rosie's own narrative is suggestive of other God fearing women pioneers' stories. No different than the likes of Harriet Tubman who escaped slavery to become an important abolitionist, Rosie possessed the same strength of character, which inevitably called her to migrate from one place to another, and then all at once return for others. Many times she traveled back to the Jim Crow South and northern states. Who will never remember that Rosie went by Amtrak and Greyhound bus to liberate family and friends from various forms of oppression? Ultimately, she would selflessly welcome many of her people to the same sense of freedom she found in southern California. Los Angeles, was the warm and sunny place she fondly called her home. The length and quality of this blessed woman's life is to be examined by the use of nonlinear contexts, spaces, stories, memories, photographs and God-filled times that span the miraculous course of one hundred and four years. So long a journey. Hers was a supply of great love and great associations. Rosie lived just long enough to put some of the pieces of the great mysteries of this life together. Her sunrise was like her sunset—deepening in a Word and a Love that has always been. On March 3, 2015, as night fell she returned to the Light.

Because she was born in the early 1900's and lived in a segregated cotton county, Rosie's timely life was certainly full of social, political, economic, and educational hardships. Because of rigid anti-black laws, she faced insurmountable obstacles. Being a person of color and growing up in the South meant she had little if any genuine recourse in a racial caste system. Thus, Rosie would only travel a limited path toward academic achievement. As a girl child, with plaited hair, she was forced to leave the Sharp Rural School in the fourth grade to work alongside her parents in sweltering fields throughout Holmes County. She knew an early life of August heat and sweat, March rainfall, floods and manual labor, which can scarcely be understood by young people today. She often shared the details of her small farm life. Her recollections were of ''quiet songs,'' saving dimes, forgotten relics, and homemade remedies, like lard salves and Vicks vapor rubs, which she promised could cure everything from fevers to the flu.

Rosie told the old childhood stories about growing food, making soap, washing clothes by hand, hanging them on a line to dry, plucking birds, fetching water from wells, gathering firewood for potbelly stoves, picking cotton, and marching the long dusty miles to and from Zion Hill AME. But what child could bear such a trying life? A child who knew who her Heavenly Father was, a child who thought to pray in the Spirit at all times and on every occasion. According to Rosie, color did not matter. She didn't hate nobody. She loved everybody. So even though racism and poverty made it extremely difficult for girls of color to advance, the same systematic measures of disparity that created a strong sense of depression and rage in others, cultivated Rosie's individual desire for change, and her unwavering commitment to the embodiment of peace, and her quest for equal access to greater opportunities.

What was once, always shall be; and now imagine a life devoted to service and prayer. As a young door keeper in the house of the Lord, Rosie would rise afore the sun, boil a kettle, and travel to the little white church house altar, long before the other congregants gathered there. And far before Rosie left Lexington for Jackson, and Jackson for California, she carried ''God's will be done'' prayers, and cadences like ''If I Can Help Somebody'' along the old Tchula road. She served God by singing spirituals and hymns with His choirs. She went to Sunday school, prayer meetings and revivals. As a beginning usher, she distributed bulletins, service programs, and paper stick-fans. She collected the tithes and offerings. Young Rosie was adept at it.

As a symbol of her friendship and deep love for a young man from her hometown, she courted and then married the late Abner Cross in 1929. They settled on the Roger plantation in the Rose Bank community. The Rose Bank Baptist Church soon became her new place of worship. In the midst of the Great Depression and attacks on Pearl Harbor, their union brought forth the lives of four children: Earlene, Lonnie (departed) James, (departed) and Gerlee (departed). As fate would have it, Gerlee died of pneumonia at age seven. And then Rosie faced the trials of a mother's deepest anguish. When asked how she endured the loss of a child, she often said her faith in God healed the wounds of that grief. When more seasons changed, and her marriage ended, she did not give up or sit down and grieve. Rosie continued to trust in God for comfort, peace, hope and direction. Alas: She left Lexington and her family in order to see if she could live differently in Jackson, Mississippi. Her new way of living developed in parallel. Rosie experienced the innovations of city life. She loved the modern amenities of a grander place of greater size and population. She liked the nuances of going to downtown Jackson or ''Little Harlem'' for Cotillions. But more relevantly, she was glad to be an usher for the Blair Street Baptist Church. However, there were still recollections of rural life and the family she left behind. Nonetheless, Rosie gladly worked at the Old Baptist Hospital on State Street. She was a nightshift cook for disabled children, doctors and nurses. While in Lexington she also worked and studied diligently to become a beautician. It seems only fitting that Rosie's ordered steps would start her out on a new journey.

In the summer of 1951, Rosie decided that she would move to Los Angeles, California. She boarded a westbound Amtrak train, with a small suitcase, and a letter of recommendation from a White employer who praised her exceptional domestic work and cooking skills. Although she was leaving the only state that she had ever known, she traveled with a great sense of optimism. Further assured by her unwavering faith in God, and a belief that the outcome of this westward journey would welcome her into a land ripe with the new possibilities, she eagerly moved in with her close friends George and Frankie Sims. She stayed with them until she was able to secure a day job and save enough money to rent her own housing. During this time, she also began attending various worship services around Los Angeles. She was in search of a new church home. Eventually her diligence led her to First African Methodist Episcopal Church at 8th and Town Avenue. This church would later become the foundation for FAME. During her membership at FAME, Rosie served in various capacities. She was a Sunday school teacher, and a member of both Usher Board No. 1 and the Sarah Allen Women's Missionary Society.

As Rosie continued to settle into the blessings of her new California life, the Sims introduced her to their good friend Clarence Tilles (departed). Clarence was a kind and gentle man of great integrity. They would marry in 1952 and remain together and in love until his death in 1990. While Rosie embraced newlywed life, she began to encounter some of the familiar racial inequalities that were rampant in the South. Although the city of Los Angeles did not practice some of the more overt segregation policies found in southern states, there was extreme discrimination in housing, which prevented many minorities from renting apartments or purchasing homes in specific areas of the city. Despite these constant obstacles, Rosie and Clarence were finally able to rent a modest two bedroom apartment near downtown Los Angeles. They moved into the William Meade Housing Project, which is located near historic landmarks like The San Antonio Winery, Olvera Street and Union Station. Because of the loud barking that came from the neighboring Ann Street Animal Shelter, the William Meade Housing Project was also known as ''Dog Town.''

Nevertheless, Rosie and Clarence's new home provided a deep sense of belonging and community, which would later be enhanced by

the arrival of deeply missed members of Rosie's Mississippi family. The new settlers included her daughter (Earlene), her granddaughter (Mary) her mother (Missouri), her Aunt (Lee), her brother (Alfred Jr.), her Sister (Juanita), her nieces (Debra, Denise, Shelia and Rochelle) and nephews (Dyke and the late Bernard Redmond). Rosie and Clarence would also host numerous friends and family as they vacationed or relocated to California. She called the old red brick, William Meade Housing Project home for over 40 years. She not only helped raise her grandchildren and great-grandchildren there, she was also able to establish close knit ties and bonds with generations of families in her community. She also participated and volunteered to fill bags in a community based outreach program that fed disadvantaged families in the project. This is yet another example of how Rosie devoted her life to family and to the service and care of others. When Clarence went home to be with God, Rosie moved across the street from her second home: The First African Methodist Episcopal Church of Los Angeles.

Before becoming physically unable to do so, Rosie attended three services every Sunday for over twenty years. She also attended prayer meetings every Wednesday at Noon. Yet even as her memory faded, and her eyesight weakened and her gait became more unsteady, she persevered. She told anyone who asked her how she was doing that I'm slow but sure. Again, Rosie's was a steady upright walk with the Lord. As she did in childhood, Rosie faithfully began each day of her older life in prayer. She was often overheard calling out the names of family and friends in her evening petitions to God. When she felt like she could not go any further, she took to her easy chair and received the spiritual nourishment she required by watching The Church Channel from sun up until sundown.

It has been said that the things you do for yourself are gone when you are gone, but the things you do for others remain as your legacy. Rosie leaves an incredible legacy for her family and friends to value. Since Rosie lived such a rich yet unembellished life, not a soul has to worry about how to divide the love she left behind. During the last several years, Rosie lived at the St. John of God Retirement and Care Center in Los Angeles. She was blessed to have many visitors. Although sometimes when her memory failed her, she would lean over to see who she thought you might have been. When guessing failed and she could not recall, Rosie would often shake her head and say that she had so many relatives and loved ones that she could not remember them all by name. She would simply look you in your eyes and say, ''You know your name.'' Those beloved names include her devoted daughter Earlene Dye, her loving sister Juanita Redmond, 11 grandchildren, 21 great-grandchildren, and 15 great-great-grandchildren, a great number of relatives and friends and members of her extended church family.

The end is in the beginning and lies far ahead.—Ralph Ellison.

HONORING MS. BARBARA WAGNER

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to honor Ms. Barbara Wagner. Ms. Wagner is being honored by the Buffalo Gay Men's Chorus with the prestigious title of 'Artistic Director Emeritus'.

Ms. Wagner was the founding artistic director of the Buffalo Gay Men's Chorus. She helped found the group in 2001 and conducted their first meeting on September 11th. Although this day was tragic to all Americans, this group was able to find solace during their first rehearsal. Ms. Wagner bound the newly formed choir with the song ''How Can I Keep From Singing,'' which would then go on to be performed at every concert and rehearsal for her 10 year tenure and beyond.

While the choir was under Ms. Wagner's leadership, the Buffalo Gay Men's Choir received numerous awards, and performed on some of the grandest stages in Buffalo. With Ms. Wagner's direction the BGMC received multiple ''Best in Buffalo'' Awards from the local Artvoice newspaper, and was recognized by the Empire State Pride Agenda in 2005 for excellence in music and dedication to the community. Ms. Wagner led the choir to receive the prestigious Buffalo and Erie County Arts Council Award for exceptional contributions to the arts and cultural community in Western New York. Under Ms. Wagner's leadership the choir performed at the historic Kleinhans Music Hall in Buffalo, and alongside the renowned Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra.

Ms. Barbara Wagner's commitment to The Buffalo Gay Men's Chorus is to be recognized with the distinguished title of 'Artistic Director Emeritus', during a special ceremony in their upcoming concert. I ask today, Mr. Speaker, that we honor her dedication to the arts and successes as choir director.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BELOVED RODNEY ROLLO

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Northwest Florida's beloved Rodney Rollo. Rodney was a true patriot, and he will be greatly missed.

Rodney was born in Pensacola, Florida and raised in neighboring Santa Rosa County, Florida. After graduating from Milton High School, Rodney answered the call of duty, enlisting in the United States Navy in 1947. After serving 20 years with honor and distinction, Rodney retired from the Navy in 1967 as a Chief Hospital Corpsman and moved to Washington D.C., where he worked as Chief of Administrative Services for the American Psychiatric Association. However, as with so many others born and raised along the Gulf Coast, Rodney returned to his hometown in 1975, and he and his wife, Ann settled in Milton.

Rodney was a proud lifelong Republican, and after moving back to Northwest Florida, he quickly immersed himself in local politics, becoming a leader in civil society. Rodney and Ann joined the Santa Rosa County Republican Executive Committee, and, with an unwavering commitment to advancing the conservative principles upon which our country was founded, they worked tirelessly to register Republicans across Santa Rosa County. In just over a decade, Rodney and Ann's efforts helped triple the number of registered Republicans in the county, and soon thereafter, every county elective office was held by a Republican. Rodney's leadership was recognized on many occasions, as he served multiple terms as Chairman of the Santa Rosa County Republican Executive Committee.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to recognize the life and service of Rodney Rollo. He was a loving husband, patriot, and defender of freedom, and his immense contributions to Northwest Florida will be felt for years to come. My wife Vicki and I extend our deepest condolences and prayers to his sister, Betty Rollo Wolfe; nieces and nephews: Janet (Larry) Chambers, Tom (Sue) Palmer, Jeannie Cotton, Sam (Nancy) Palmer, John Palmer, Rebecca (Doug) Griener, and Sandra Clark, and the entire Rollo family.

THE ENGAGEMENT OF THE U.S. BISHOPS IN MORAL QUESTIONS REGARDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I recently hosted a briefing entitled Catholic Engagement on Nuclear Disarmament: What are the moral questions? and one of the speakers, Dr. Stephen M. Colecchi, presented the following statement:

At the time of Senate ratification of the New START Treaty in 2010, Cardinal Francis George, OMI, then President of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, whose death we recently mourned, declared: ''The horribly destructive capacity of nuclear arms makes them disproportionate and indiscriminate weapons that endanger human life and dignity like no other armaments. Their use as a weapon of war is rejected in Church teaching based on just war norms.''

The Cardinal was standing on a firm foundation of longstanding teaching when he made that assertion. The 1983 pastoral letter, ''The Challenge of Peace,'' established the U.S. Catholic bishops as a moral voice on nuclear disarmament. The bishops argued that ''each proposed addition to our strategic system or change in strategic doctrine must be assessed precisely in light of whether it will render steps toward 'progressive disarmament' more or less likely.''

Ten years later in the ''Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace,'' the bishops declared: ''The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal.'' This vision continues to shape their public engagement.

At the time of the drafting of the 1983 pastoral, I worked as a religious educator and was active in efforts to engage Catholics in discussions of the various drafts of the peace pastoral. The process of producing this document was significant. The bishops actively solicited feedback from both experts and people in the pew on each of three drafts. The bishops remained the teachers, but they acknowledged that prudential judgments were also involved and this required dialogue.

Consultations were held at the national and local levels, and in many settings, at universities, parishes and think tanks. These dialogues helped shape the final pastoral letter, but perhaps more importantly they also raised awareness of the fundamental issues related to nuclear weapons among many Americans. Today the Conference of Bishops is working with others to revitalize Catholic thinking and engagement on issues involving nuclear weapons today as decades have passed since they first became involved with this issue in a major way.

Over the years, in light of Church moral teaching, the bishops have also exercised leadership regarding specific elements of U.S. nuclear policy. In the late 80s they raised moral questions regarding missile defense initiatives. The bishops supported the Strategic Arms Reduction treaties (Start I and II) in the early 1990s. And in the late 90s they supported the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, lamenting its defeat in the Senate. The bishops welcomed the 2002 Moscow Treaty as a positive step, but called on the United States, and by implication other nations, to do much more.

During the past decade, the Conference of Bishops has opposed federal funding for research on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, the Reliable Replacement Warhead and new nuclear weapons. They weighed in on the Nuclear Posture Review, asking President Obama to narrow the purpose of the nuclear arsenal solely to deterring nuclear attack. They made a major effort to offer vigorous support for Senate ratification of the New START Treaty in 2010, and have supported and welcomed the P5+1 dialogue with Iran over their nuclear program, as has the Holy Father and the Holy See.

At its Deterrence Symposium in July 2009, the U.S. Strategic Command turned to the Conference of Bishops to offer moral reflections. Cardinal Edwin O'Brien, then an Archbishop and a member of the bishops' International Committee, gave a major address on ''Nuclear Weapons and Moral Questions: The Path to Zero.'' He urged the nuclear powers to ''move beyond'' deterrence. Subsequently, he joined Global Zero and addressed their February 2010 summit in Paris.

In his speech at the 2009 Deterrence Symposium, Cardinal O'Brien reiterated the longstanding position of the U.S. bishops: ''The moral end is clear: a world free of the threat of nuclear weapons. This goal should guide our efforts. Every nuclear weapons system and every nuclear weapons policy should be judged by the ultimate goal of protecting human life and dignity and the related goal of ridding the world of these weapons in mutually verifiable ways.''

U.S. Church leaders are not naive about the challenges that lie along the path to a world without nuclear weapons. Cardinal Francis George wrote a letter to President Obama in 2010 in which he ''. . . acknowledged that the path to a world free of nuclear weapons will be long and difficult. It will involve many steps:

Verifiably reducing nuclear arsenals as the new START Treaty continues to do;

Ratifying and bringing into force the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty;

Reducing our nation's reliance on nuclear weapons for security as the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review began to do;

Securing nuclear materials from terrorists;

Adopting a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty to prohibit production of weapons-grade material;

Strengthening the International Atomic Energy Agency to monitor nonproliferation efforts and ensure access to peaceful uses of nuclear power; and

Other actions that take humanity in the direction of a nuclear-weapons-free world.''

The Cardinal went on to say, ''We are pastors and teachers, not technical experts. We cannot map out the precise route to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, but we can offer moral direction and encouragement. Although we cannot anticipate every step on the path humanity must walk, we can point with moral clarity to a destination that moves beyond deterrence to a world free of the nuclear threat.''

Given these longstanding concerns of the U.S. Bishops to reduce nuclear weapons and secure nuclear materials, in April 2015, Bishop Oscar Cantú, Chairman of the Committee on International Justice and Peace, spoke on a panel on ''Nuclear Weapons and the Moral Compass'' sponsored by The Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See and The Global Security Institute at the UN Headquarters in New York, and in November 2014, Bishop Richard Pates, a member of the Committee, spoke at a seminar on ''Less Nuclear Stockpiles and More Development'' sponsored by the Pontifical Academy of Sciences in Rome.

The bishops of the United States are deeply engaged in the moral enterprise of working for a world without nuclear weapons. As Bishop Cantú said in his April UN talk: ''To achieve this goal, we must, in the words of Pope Francis, acknowledge that 'now is the time to counter the logic of fear with the ethic of responsibility, and so foster a climate of trust and sincere dialogue.'''

RECOGNIZING THE VETERANS OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS POST 5327 FOR THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE 2015 RUN FOR THE WALL

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the veterans of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 5327 in Wentzville, Missouri for their participation in the 2015 Run for the Wall.

Since 1989, Run for the Wall has united veterans across the country through a 10-day motorcycle ride spanning from Ontario, California to the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC. Participants of this ride are not limited to just veterans; each year a number of current service members, families and supporters of our nation's armed services join veterans in this nationwide journey to find healing and remember those we have lost in battle.

As they make their way across the United States, Run for the Wall riders visit memorials, veterans' hospitals, and schools to discuss and pay tribute to the men and women who have served this country with honor and distinction. Additionally, this event serves as a time of reflection for all participants, building awareness for those who are still missing and emphasizing the motto that no soldier should be left behind.

This year, participants will depart on three different routes beginning on May 13, 2015. The central route will arrive in Wentzville, Missouri on the evening of May 18, 2015, wherein VFW Post 5327 will provide dinner and lodging for riders. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all participants of the ride and the veterans of VFW Post 5327 for their contribution to the cause.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have had the great privilege of meeting many of our nation's veterans, and I am always humbled by their selflessness. They have made remarkable sacrifices to protect the liberty we enjoy in this great country. Without our nation's veterans, we would not have the rights and privileges that we take for granted as Americans each and every day.

In closing, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the Run for the Wall mission and its participants.

STOP WARRANTLESS SEARCHES ON AMERICANS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nearly two years have passed since a then-unknown 29-year-old nerd-turned-international fugitive aired the NSA's dirty secrets to the world. Edward Snowden is no patriot. However, the alarming information about the NSA's abuse of power he revealed cannot be ignored. Until Snowden, most Americans were unaware that their own government was trampling on their Fourth Amendment rights. Most people did not know their every move could be tracked by Big Brother. They trusted that this agency acted purely in the interest of national security to keep us safe. Not only were Americans in the dark on this, but so were many Members of Congress (including myself) who voted for legislation that NSA then used and abused to conduct its rogue activities.

Post 9/11 and with two ongoing wars, many believed that government surveillance—including warrantless searches and seizures—was limited to foreign nationals, not American citizens.

That would be consistent with federal law and the Constitution. But this did not happen. For example, NSA uses Section 215 of the Patriot Act. The Patriot Act permits targeted surveillance when that surveillance is justified by a court. Instead, NSA collects bulk meta data—such as surveillance of phone numbers in whole zip codes or phone carriers. These Soviet Style dragnet tactics went far beyond the scope of what Congress authorized in Section 215 of the Patriot Act. Government

simply cannot disregard the law just because it is inconvenient.

We also now realized that the agency has misused and expanded the intent of Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). NSA uses Section 702 as a means to gather not only data but content and to allow law enforcement to later search this data for information about American citizens without a warrant. Because it gathers and searches content of individual communications, Section 702 is more intrusive than Section 215. FISA permits the collection of such data of a suspected agent of a foreign power, but the federal government is also storing and later searching the content of emails, text messages and phone calls of American citizens—all without a warrant. In the course of this collection, the data of American citizens, many of which have done nothing wrong or illegal, gets collected.

That kind of reverse targeting of American citizens is not what Congress intended, is inconsistent with the Constitution and must stop.

The NSA has claimed it has no interest in monitoring the activity of ''ordinary'' Americans. My response to that is simple: then don't do it. But, most Americans have a hard time accepting that line. They question that for the simple fact that had Edward Snowden not revealed what was really going on within NSA in the first place, this snooping and spying would still be going on in the dark shadows of government operations. And, equally important, they know that this snooping and spying is still going on today.

It's time for Congress to rein in this blatant violation of the Fourth Amendment and stop the warrantless searches of Americans. This issue—protecting the Fourth Amendment—has unified liberals and conservatives. This week, Congresswoman Rep. ZOE LOFGREN (D–CA), Congressman Rep. THOMAS MASSIE (R–KY), and I introduced the End Warrantless Surveillance of Americans Act. The bill would prohibit warrantless searches of government databases for information that pertains to U.S. citizens. It would also forbid government agencies from mandating or requesting ''back doors'' into commercial products that can be used for surveillance.

The legislation mirrors an amendment we offered to the USA Freedom Act, which was backed by a broad bipartisan coalition including Members of Congress and outside groups across the political spectrum.

The USA Freedom Act that passed out of the Judiciary Committee last week is an improvement over current law and a step in the right direction. But we can do more to protect the Fourth Amendment. In addition to stopping bulk data collection, Congress should also act now to fix the other loophole and stop warrantless searches under Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). Failure to address this gaping loophole in FISA leaves the constitutional rights of millions of Americans vulnerable and unprotected. This bill also ensures that the federal government does not force companies to enable its spying activities. The NSA has and will continue to violate the constitutional protections guaranteed to every American unless Congress intervenes. Until we fix this and make the law clear, citizens can never be sure that their private conversations are safe from the eyes of the government.

Last year the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed similar legislation as an amendment to DOD Appropriations.

Congress should do all that it can to reform our national intelligence agencies and to protect the constitutional rights of all Americans, including passing this legislation to close the loophole and ensure that the NSA abides by the letter and spirit of the law. It is our duty to make this right and ensure that the Fourth Amendment rights of the people we represent will no longer be trampled on by the NSA.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTHWEST FLORIDA MILITARY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50th Anniversary of the Northwest Florida Military Officers Association (NWFMOA).

Chartered in 1965 in Fort Walton Beach, Florida, initially as a social network for retired officers, the Northwest Florida Military Officers Association has transformed into a sizeable advocacy effort on behalf of our Nation's military members and dependents and adheres to the selfless values of the Military Officers Association of America founded in 1929.

Throughout the last five decades, the members of NWFMOA have worked hand-in-hand with our forces stationed at Eglin Air Force Base, Hurlburt Field, and Duke Field, and their tireless efforts have helped ensure our brave men and women in uniform receive the training and equipment needed to successfully accomplish their assigned missions and safely return home. In addition, NWFMOA has been a stalwart presence educating decision makers on how best to make certain our veterans reintegrate into the civilian sector and to safeguard the benefits they have earned through service.

With membership open to all commissioned and warrant officers of all branches of the U.S. Armed Forces, as well as the United States Public Health Service (USPHS) and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the work of the NWFMOA cannot be overstated.

Mr. Speaker, Northwest Florida is proud of its rich military heritage and the members of our Armed Forces who call it home. I want to thank the members of the Northwest Florida Military Officers Association for a half century of steadfast dedication to the Gulf Coast military and veterans' community and for their lifelong example of service for the cause of Freedom.

CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MR. NGUYEN NGOC HANH

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the life of Mr. Nguyen Ngoc Hanh for his outstanding achievements as a soldier, photographer, and teacher. His contributions to documenting the Vietnam War over forty years ago continue to inform us about this conflict.

Mr. Hanh was recognized among the Top Ten Photographers of the Photographic Society of America in 1968 for his coverage of the Tet Offensive. His stunning portraits of soldiers and Viet Cong detainees capture the emotion and humanity of the war. He began photographing the conflict in 1956, while serving in a paratrooper battalion. By 1961, at the age of thirty-four, the South Vietnam Armed Forces assigned Mr. Hanh as its official war photographer. Perhaps his most well known photograph is a portrait of a tearful young woman in Hue recently widowed and holding her husband's tags.

After the fall of Saigon in 1975, Mr. Hanh declined to use his personal pass for a helicopter transport and instead chose to remain with his fellow soldiers. This led to Mr. Hanh's imprisonment by the North Vietnam Army. For the first year and four months of his confinement, Mr. Hanh's lived in a metal container too small for him to stand and too narrow for him to lie down. He remained detained until 1983, and on his fourth attempt was able to flee from Vietnam to Thailand in 1985.

Four years later, at the age of sixty-two, Mr. Hanh immigrated to San Jose. He soon established the Vietnam Photographic Association while also working at a Fremont technology company delivering mail. Since 1989, Mr. Hanh has trained hundreds of photography students in San Jose. He also exhibited his photos at the annual Vietnamese New Year Tet Festival in San Jose, as well as at several nonprofit fund raising events to raise money for the disabled vets of the South Vietnam Armed Forces. His work has contributed immensely not only to San Jose, but also to our country. I thank him for his contributions, and I recognize him as an outstanding member of the Vietnamese-American community.

RECOGNIZING THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF SECOND BAPTIST CHURCH OF LOS ANGELES

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Second Baptist Church of Los Angeles on the celebration of its 130th anniversary.

In 1885, Second Baptist Church was organized as Southern California's first African-American Baptist church. It quickly developed into one of South Los Angeles' most esteemed and effective institutions, offering vital

support throughout the community. Over the years, a wide and diverse population of Angelenos have benefited from the church's child care and educational services, its scholarship programs, and its involvement in creating housing for families and shelter space for homeless women and children.

Second Baptist Church has also played an active role in our nation's long and ongoing dialogue about civil rights. In 1954, Second Baptist members raised $1,500 for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund to pay for printing the legal briefs for the Brown vs. Board of Education case, which desegregated America's schools. The church also hosted the NAACP's national conventions in 1928, 1942, and 1949.

Second Baptist Church's unflagging commitment to social justice and helping the least among us is also reflected in its long and distinguished list of speakers—a list including ministers, advocates, officials, and scholars. The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a frequent speaker throughout his career. Malcolm X, W.E.B. Du Bois, Ralph Bunche, and the Rev. Adam Clayton Powell, Sr. are just a few of the other orators to have spoken within the walls of Second Baptist.

Because of the church's substantial involvement in some of the most important social fights of our age, it was listed as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument in 1978, and was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2009. Both are well-deserved honors for this church and for the beautiful Lombardy Romanesque Revival building in which it is housed.

It is my great privilege to represent Second Baptist Church and its congregation in Congress. In times of trial and in times of joy, this church has been a source of strength and unity for all who have been touched by its mission. On its 130th anniversary, Second Baptist Church is both a marker of how society has progressed in its lifetime, and a guiding light continuing to point us towards a brighter future of brotherhood, peace, and justice for all. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating all that Second Baptist Church has done to move the hearts and minds of Angelenos and all Americans, and to wish the church and its congregation a very happy 130th anniversary.

RECOGNITION OF FORMER U.S. SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE JAMES ''JIM'' WRIGHT, JR.

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pleasure to pay tribute to the life and legacy of Former Speaker of the House James ''Jim'' Wright, who passed away on Wednesday, May 6th at the age of 92. Speaker Wright served in Congress for more than three decades and left an indelible legacy as chairman of the House Public Works Committee. He was elected by his peers as Speaker in 1987.

Jim Wright was born in Fort Worth, Texas, the son of a traveling salesman. He was educated at Weatherford College and the University of Texas at Austin. Jim Wright dedicated his life to serving the public. He bravely served in the United States Army Air Forces during World War II and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for flying combat missions in the South Pacific. Subsequently, he was elected to the Texas House of Representatives in 1946. He served as mayor of Weatherford, Texas from 1950 to 1954. He was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1954 and was reelected 16 times.

Speaker Wright was a visionary who served the people of Fort Worth and this nation well. He is deserving of this tribute. Because of his leadership, the House experienced one of its most prolific periods. Speaker Wright demonstrated his skill as a political leader and master legislator by shepherding extraordinarily complex legislation through the House. He understood that the business of legislating and good politics required great skill in the art of compromise.

Speaker Wright never backed down from a challenge, and even after leaving office, he continued to serve the public diligently. I was always able to consult with Speaker Wright regarding difficult legislation, and he never failed to provide thoughtful and principled insight.

Our country has lost one of its finest statesmen, and I have lost a close personal friend whose wisdom, dignity and knowledge of the legislative process was unquestionably enviable. He is among the most influential Speakers in the history of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Jim Wright is an unforgettable public servant and leader. A man fueled by passion and concern for others, he set the bar high for his successors. He is survived by his wife, Betty and four children. I stand today to honor Former Speaker of the House, Jim Wright, and to thank him for his work in service to the people of Texas and throughout this great nation. He left a powerful legacy that will live for generations.

THE ENGAGEMENT OF THE U.S. BISHOPS IN MORAL QUESTIONS REGARDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I recently hosted a briefing entitled Catholic Engagement on Nuclear Disarmament: What are the moral questions? and one of the speakers, His Excellency Archbishop Bernardito Auza, Permanent Representative of the Holy See to the United Nations, presented the following statement:

The Holy See has always been morally against nuclear weapons and has always called for their abolition. It has worked and continues to work for a world without nuclear weapons.

In February 1943, two years and a half before the Trinity test, Pope Pius XII had already voiced deep concern regarding the violent use of atomic energy. In an address to a meeting of Western military scientists in 1953, Pope Pius XII said that the possession of ''ABC'' (Atomic-Biological-Chemical) weapons made legitimate self-defense against an aggressor a less likely prospect, because ''if the damage resulting from war is not comparable with that of the 'injustice tolerated,' one may be obliged 'to submit to the injustice.'" Devoting his entire 1954 Easter Message to the question of nuclear weapons, he spoke of the effects of a nuclear war by evoking ''the vision of vast territories rendered uninhabitable and useless to mankind . . . transmissible diseases . . . and monstrous deformities.'' Given such totally uncontrollable and indiscriminate consequences, the Pope demanded ''the effective proscription and banishment of atomic warfare,'' calling the arms race a ''costly relationship of mutual terror.'' This was the first clear papal condemnation of the nuclear arms race, sixteen years before the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Already well within the Cold War era and right after the Cuban missile crisis, Pope Saint John XXIII, in his 1963 Encyclical Pacem in Terris, called for the abolition of nuclear weapons and for the establishment of an adequate disarmament program to achieve that end. He spoke very clearly about the theory or doctrine of deterrence as the principal cause of the arms race and of arms proliferation and about the tremendous economic burdens the arms race provoked. He argued quite extensively that ''justice, right reason, and the recognition of man's dignity cry out insistently for a cessation to the arms race. The stockpiles of armaments that have been built up in various countries must be reduced reciprocally and simultaneously by the parties concerned. Nuclear weapons must be banned. A general agreement must be reached on a suitable disarmament program, with an effective system of mutual control. Unless this process of disarmament be thoroughgoing and complete, and reaches men's very souls, it is impossible to stop the arms race, or to reduce armaments, or—and this is the main thing—ultimately to abolish them entirely. Everyone must sincerely co-operate in the effort to banish fear and the anxious expectation of war from men's minds. But this requires that the fundamental principles upon which peace is based in today's world be replaced by an altogether different one, namely, the realization that true and lasting peace among nations cannot consist in the possession of an equal supply of armaments but only in mutual trust. And we are confident that this can be achieved, for it is a thing that not only is dictated by common sense, but is in itself most desirable and most fruitful of good.''

In his address to the UN General Assembly on 4 October 1965, Pope Paul VI characterized nuclear weapons as ''nightmares'' and ''dark designs.'' He also stressed that the weapons themselves ''lead astray the mentality of peoples.'' His plea of ''jamais plus la guerre,'' of ''war never again,'' reverberated in the General Assembly Hall. But his appeal to let weapons fall from our hands, ''especially the terrible weapons that modern science has given us,'' in clear reference to nuclear arms, still remains unheeded. Pope Paul's call to end the nuclear arms race reached its culmination in his 1977 World Day of Peace message, in which he demonstrated that nuclear arms offered a false sense of security. He reiterated this in his message to the U.N. General Assembly on Disarmament in 1978, calling the peace of nuclear deterrence ''a tragic illusion.'' He also reiterated an assertion made earlier in his papacy, that the nuclear arms race retarded

the development of peoples, citing the ''crying disproportion between the resources in money and intelligence devoted to the service of death and the resources devoted to the service of life.''

In 1982, Pope Saint John Paul II addressed a message to the United Nations General Assembly on its second conference devoted to Disarmament. The Pope said that in the ''current conditions of the Cold War, 'deterrence,' considered not as an end in itself but as a step toward a progressive disarmament, may still be judged morally acceptable. Nonetheless, in order to ensure peace, it is indispensable not to be satisfied with this minimum, which is always susceptible to the real danger of explosion.'' The Holy Father, therefore, did not countenance deterrence as a permanent measure.

As time progressed and the central promise of the NPT remained unfulfilled, the Holy See stepped up its efforts to argue for the abolition of nuclear weapons. In his 2006 World Day of Peace Message, Pope Benedict XVI criticized the argument of nuclear arms for security as ''completely fallacious'' and affirmed that ''peace requires that all strive for progressive and concerted nuclear disarmament.''

Since the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT, there has been an increased attention to the humanitarian dimension of and the risks associated with nuclear weapons. This heightened interest was manifested by cross-regional humanitarian statements in the UN and other regional and international fora and, in particular, by the organization of three Conferences on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons in Oslo (March 2013), Nayarit (February 2014), and Vienna (December 2014). These Conferences have seen increased participation of States, of non-governmental organizations and of the greater civil society.

During the Vienna Conference, the Holy See presented three documents: first, the official Statement delivered by the Delegation of the Holy See; second, the message that Pope Francis sent to His Excellency Mr. Sebastian Kurz, President of the Vienna Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons in December 2014; and, third, a paper entitled ''Nuclear Disarmament: Time for Abolition.''

On April 9, 2015, the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations in New York organized a conference entitled ''Nuclear Weapons and the Moral Compass.'' The Speakers were neither nuclear scientists nor political authorities, but rather religious leaders: an Anglican Bishop, a Rabbi, an Evangelical Minister, an Imam, and a Catholic Bishop in the person of Bishop Oscar Cantú, Bishop of Las Cruces and Chairman of the USCCB Committee on International Justice and Peace.

The objective of the Conference was to insist on and strengthen the moral argument against not only the use but also the possession of nuclear weapons. Arguing against the policy of deterrence, the Conference served to echo and further disseminate the Paper that the Holy See presented in Vienna and Pope Francis's strong stand for the abolition of nuclear weapons The timing of the Conference was in anticipation of the then imminent Ninth Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which opened yesterday at the UN in New York and will continue until May 22.

The NPT is one of the best known and most adhered to Treaties, with Palestine being the 191st Party to it. The Holy See has been a Party to the NPT since the very beginning, not because it has nuclear weapons or has to be constrained from developing nuclear weapons capabilities, but to encourage nuclear possessing States to abolish their nuclear weapons, to dissuade non-nuclear possessing States from acquiring or developing nuclear capabilities, and to encourage international cooperation on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The documents that the Holy See presented in Vienna advanced anew the moral argument against both the possession and the use of nuclear weapons, and aimed to sustain and advance the discussion along this line.

The Holy See considers it a moral and humanitarian imperative to advance the efforts towards the final objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It argues that disarmament treaties are not just legal obligations; they are also moral commitments based on trust between States, rooted in the trust that citizens place in their governments. If commitments to nuclear disarmament are not made in good faith and consequently result in breaches of trust, the proliferation of such weapons would be the logical corollary.

Despite some progress and much effort on the part of many, nuclear disarmament is currently in crisis. The institutions that are supposed to move this process forward have been blocked for years. The central promise of the NPT has remained a dream. In fact, while the pre-NPT nuclear power countries not only have not disarmed but are also modernizing their nuclear arsenals, some pre-NPT non-nuclear countries have acquired or are in the process of acquiring nuclear arms capabilities. What is even more terrifying is the possibility that non-state actors, like terrorist and extremist organizations, could acquire nuclear weapons.

The possession of nuclear weapons and the reliance on nuclear deterrence have had a very negative impact on relations between and among States. National security often comes up in discussions on nuclear weapons. All States have the right to national security, but this principle must not be applied in a partial and discriminatory manner, for example, when one State affirms that it needs nuclear weapons for its national security, while at the same time affirming that another State cannot have them. It is urgent to revisit in a transparent and honest manner the definition made by States, especially the nuclear weapons states, of their national security.

Nuclear weapons cannot create for us a stable and secure world. Peace and international stability cannot be founded on mutually-assured destruction or on the threat of total destruction. The Holy See believes that peace cannot be reduced solely to maintaining a balance of power between enemies. On the contrary, as Pope Francis affirms in his letter to the President of the Vienna Conference, ''Peace must be built on justice, socio-economic development, freedom, respect for human rights, the participation of all in public affairs and the building of trust between peoples.''

In its argument against the possession and use of nuclear weapons, the Holy See also focuses attention on (1) the costs of the nuclear stalemate to the global common good; (2) the ''illusions of security'' inherent in the possession of nuclear arms; (3) the inequality at the root of the non-proliferation regime according to the NPT; and (4) the enormous toll that current nuclear policies take on the poor and on the world's priorities.

The United Nations will soon adopt the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda. The Sustainable Development Goals contained therein are daunting and require enormous means to implement. It would be naïve and myopic if we seek to assure world peace and security through nuclear weapons rather than through the eradication of extreme poverty, making healthcare and education accessible to all, and promoting peaceful institutions and societies through dialogue and solidarity.

For our own good and that of future generations, we have no reasonable and moral option other than the abolition of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons are a global problem and they impact all countries and all peoples, including future generations. Moreover, ever-growing interdependence and globalization demand that whatever response we may have against the threat of nuclear weapons must be collective and concerted, based on reciprocal trust.

Arguing for nuclear abolition from the moral perspective, the Holy See appeals to human consciences. As Paul VI affirmed in his 1965 Address to the United Nations General Assembly, ''Today, as never before, in an era marked by such human progress, there is need for an appeal to the moral conscience of man. For the danger comes, not from progress, nor from science. The real danger comes from man himself, who has at his disposal ever more powerful instruments, which can be used for destruction as for the loftiest conquests.''

No one could ever say that a world without nuclear weapons is easily achievable. It is not; it is extremely arduous; it is even a utopia for some. But there is no alternative than to work unceasingly towards its achievement. As President John F. Kennedy said in his Commencement Address at the American University on 10 June 1963, ''The pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war—and frequently the words of the pursuers fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.''

Let me conclude by reaffirming the conviction that Pope Francis expressed in his December 2014 message to the President of the Vienna Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons: ''I am convinced that the desire for peace and fraternity planted deep in the human heart will bear fruit in concrete ways to ensure that nuclear weapons are banned once and for all, to the benefit of our common home.''

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise and recognize the Centennial Anniversary of the United States Navy Reserve.

Following the outbreak of World War I in 1914, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels and Assistant Secretary and future President Franklin D. Roosevelt initiated plans to formally launch a world-class naval reserve force necessary to protect the United States. On March 3, 1915, Congress passed legislation establishing the United States Naval Reserve, which is known today as the United States Navy Reserve.

The creation of the Navy Reserve harkens back to our Nation's tradition of Citizen Sailors protecting and defending the shores of the United States, when residents of seaside towns along the New England coast engaged British warships in the Atlantic before the Continental Congress officially established the Continental Navy. The Navy Reserve has built on this proud tradition, and during the years following its original inception, the Navy Reserve grew tremendously.

The successful growth of the Navy Reserve proved to be crucial during World War II. Ten out of eleven sailors in the Navy during World War II were reservists, and, according to former Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan, who served as the first Secretary of the Navy following the creation of the Department of Defense, the three and a half million Naval Reservists that served during World War II made possible the rapid expansion of our naval service into the largest the world has ever known. Navy Reservists were there from the very beginning of the war. In fact, Navy Reserve Sailors from Minnesota aboard the USS Ward fired the first shots by the United States against Japanese forces on the day of Pearl Harbor, destroying a Japanese mini-submarine. With the outbreak of the war, the reserves grew further, and in 1942, the Naval Aviation Cadet Program was created, African-American males were accepted for enlistment, and the Women Accepted for Voluntary Emergency Service (WAVES) program was created, which allowed women to volunteer for service within the Navy Reserves. By the end of World War II, 91,000 women were actively serving, and over its century of service, five Presidents—John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford and George H. W. Bush—have served in the Navy Reserves.

The Navy Reserves continued to support the United States Navy through the Korean War, Cold War, the Berlin Crisis, Vietnam, Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and our continued fight against terrorism. Since September 11, 2001, the Navy Reserve has completed more than 70,000 mobilizations in support of contingency operations around the world and continues to be a vital component of the United States Navy.

Mr. Speaker, throughout our Nation's history, Citizen Sailors and then Navy Reservists have protected the United States with honor, courage, and commitment. The millions of Americans who have served and the thousands who serve today are testaments to the patriotism and professionalism of the best Navy Reserve force the world has ever seen, and I am honored to recognize its Centennial Anniversary and thank the men and women of the Navy Reserve for their steadfast service and dedication to the cause of Freedom.

SENATE—*Wednesday, May 13, 2015*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Holy One, we desire to do Your will. May we acknowledge You as the source of all that is worthy. Thank You for Your gracious righteousness that is the same yesterday, today, and forever. Lord, help us to find rest and contentment in You.

Remind our lawmakers not to seek security apart from You. May they not forget that righteousness exalts a nation and that You are our shelter and shield. Equip them with everything good for doing Your will. Give them steadfast hearts, which no unworthy affection may drag downward. Teach them to serve You as You deserve.

And, Lord, sustain those who are dealing with the trauma of the Amtrak train derailment in Philadelphia.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

AMTRAK TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, many of us awoke to terrible news this morning. We are still awaiting more information about what happened outside of Philadelphia, but we know this tragedy will touch the lives of many.

The Senate sends its condolences to the victims, those who were injured, and their families and loved ones. We also reaffirm our gratitude to our Nation's first responders.

TRADE LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it was really quite something to watch President Obama's party vote to filibuster his top domestic legislative priority yesterday. That is what we saw right here in the Senate. It left pretty much everyone scratching their heads.

The Democratic leader made clear yesterday that he was not interested in debating the ''merits of the bill.'' In other words, he told us that this filibuster is for political reasons only.

It makes sense, considering that this filibuster is all about appeasing a facts-optional crowd on the left that hasn't been able to marshal much of a serious, fact-based argument to support its opposition to more American exports and more American trade jobs.

You don't have to take my word for it. It is President Obama who said the far left's arguments don't ''stand the test of fact and scrutiny.'' It is President Obama who says the far left is just ''making stuff up.'' And it is President Obama who warns the far left about ''ignoring realities.''

In other words, hardly anyone believes there is a serious policy leg for these folks to stand on—not that there is a viable process excuse for this filibuster, either.

A senior Senator in the Democrat leadership essentially rebutted the latest process argument yesterday. He said: ''[N]o one disputed in committee that we'd get a vote separately''—separately—''on the customs bill'' because it contained a provision, he said, that would bring down TPA.

What we can infer from this is that the demand to merge four separate trade bills—including the Customs bill—into one trade bill isn't a strategy designed to pass better trade legislation but a poison pill designed to kill it. So we certainly won't be doing that, because our goal here should be to score a serious policy win for the American people and not claim a symbolic scalp for the extreme left.

That is why Republicans have chosen to work closely with President Obama to advance a serious trade and economic growth agenda. It is not a natural position for us, I assure you, or for the President to be in politically, but we agree that strengthening the middle class by knocking down unfair trade restrictions is a good idea. Since we agree on the policy, I think we have a duty to the American people to cooperate responsibly to pursue it. And that is just what we have done. Not a single Republican—not one—voted yesterday against at least opening the debate on this 21st century American trade agenda.

Now, all that is needed to move forward is for our Democratic friends who tell the public they support trade to withdraw support for a filibuster they know is wrong on the merits.

Yes, I understand it may be uncomfortable for our Democratic colleagues to cross loud factions in their party, but Republicans proved yesterday that it is possible to put good policy over easy politics.

So Democrats have to choose. Will they allow themselves to keep being led around by the most extreme elements of their party, even when it runs counter to the needs of their constituents, or will they take a stand and lead? The American people are counting on them to make the right choice.

When they do, they will find the same willing partners who have always been here. They will find we are ready to continue working across the aisle in good faith to move forward.

Recall that we have only gotten as far as we have already because of a significant bipartisan compromise on Chairman HATCH's part. He worked very closely with Senator WYDEN to hammer out a trade package that garnered an astonishing 20 votes in the Finance Committee, with just 6 Senators opposed—just 6. That huge level of bipartisan support really surprised everybody. We have seen some unfortunate partisan rear-guard action since then that is designed to sink these American trade jobs. But we can rise above it. That is why Republicans remain committed to carrying forward the kind of bipartisan momentum we saw over in the Finance Committee, just as we have been all along on other issues. We are happy to work with any Senator in a serious way. The door is open.

I have made clear that there would be an open amendment process. I have made clear that Senators would receive fair consideration once we proceed to debating this bill. The bipartisan path forward I offered yesterday morning is still on the table. I remain committed to the significant concession my party already made about processing TPA and TAA. I don't like TAA. I think it is a program very hard to defend. But I understand that if we are going to get TPA, our friends on the other side need TAA. If Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN can agree to other policies, we can consider those, too. What we won't be doing is pursuing poison-pill strategies such as the one I mentioned already.

Let's also agree that no Senator is in a position to guarantee that some bill can clear both Houses of Congress, receive a signature from the President, secure the blessings of the Supreme Court, and whatever else our friends might demand. This wouldn't be much

of a democracy if Senators could actually make such an impossible guarantee.

So look, we want to have a serious discussion. We want to actually get a good policy outcome. That has always been our goal. I hope more will now join us to allow debate on the trade discussion our constituents deserve.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

AMTRAK TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader in extending my thoughts to the terrible situation in Pennsylvania. That accident occurred last night at 9 p.m. We now have six reported dead and many, many more injured. There were about 300 people on that train. I join him in commending the first responders for the work they did and are doing as we speak.

TRADE LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have heard the expressions ''red herring'' and ''loss leader,'' all these terms that try to focus attention someplace where it shouldn't be focused. That is basically what the Republican leader has done this morning.

He, of course, misconstrued what I said on the floor yesterday. I said that I am not here to debate the intricacies of this trade bill. Some can do that better than I. I have no qualms about saying that about myself. It is a very specialized area. But I do understand that the debate was not taking place because we were not on the bill. I said that I understand the procedure around here—and I do.

The procedure is pretty simple. It is a fact that virtually all legislation that passes the Senate needs major bipartisan support. This year is an example. Nearly every bill passed by the Senate has enjoyed the support of over 90 percent of Senate Democrats. It is just a reality that the 114th Congress will take Democratic votes to get things done.

Many Democrats don't support fast-track. I don't. The vast majority of Democrats don't. But without following all of the loss leaders, the red herrings the Republican leader threw out, the Finance Committee reported out four bills, and it is only logical we consider all four of them.

I have said, and I say it again, it is only logical we take the Republican leader's words for what they are. He said: Let's get on the bill, and then we will start the amendment process.

Well, we can't start the amendment process very well if we are not having an opportunity to amend and change the bills that aren't there. They would just be thrown to the winds. That is, Customs is very important and enforcement and, of course, the situation dealing with African trade.

We put a reasonable alternative on the table for Senate Republicans to accept. All the Republican leader needs to do is say yes, and we can open debate on these trade bills.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last week there were celebrations all around the world celebrating the 70th anniversary of Victory in Europe Day.

Here in our Nation's capital, we celebrated the day that Europe was officially liberated. Just outside of the Capitol, dozens of World War II aircraft flew up and down the Mall honoring and celebrating the end of the war that engulfed Europe—over the Lincoln Memorial, the National World War II Memorial, the Washington Monument, over the Capitol, and points in between.

I grew up in a little town and I was a little boy, but I can still remember the war ending. I don't really remember what I remember, but I knew it was something that was important to everybody there. It was a big deal in Searchlight, as it was everyplace in America. The war was at an end. Americans were thankful that the war was over. They were thankful that their fathers, sons, brothers, and—yes, Mr. President—World War II daughters were able to come home. They had fought valiantly on battlefields across the world, and they would be coming home—as I mentioned, the women, the WAVES, the WACs, and SPARS—all these women, thousands and thousands who participated in the war, for that manner.

Across America we were all happy that freedom and democracy had prevailed over a regime that was fueled by hatred.

I heard on the radio this morning a brief account of Winston Churchill. That was many years ago, 70 years ago today giving a speech. He had only been Prime Minister 3 days, and he gave one of his most famous speeches, about all he had to offer. They were engulfed in this war. They were doing it alone. It was a stunning speech that history will always remember. But after that war was over, we were happy. England was happy. Freedom and democracy had prevailed over a regime that was fueled by hatred.

As I got older and could understand a little more, I first became really focused on World War II. I am sorry to say I did not do it until I was in college, but I remember it as if it were 5 minutes ago, looking at those pictures in the book ''The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich'' by William Shirer. Those pictures I will never ever forget. I can see them now in my mind's eye. In that book, there were pictures of the liberation of the concentration camps.

I learned how the world learned of the enormity of the Holocaust, the genocide of 6 million Jews. The world saw the incredible extent to which the Nazis had taken their hatred of the Jews. It is hard to comprehend, but nothing—nothing—could adequately describe how horrible the situation was. Sadly, though, as I look around the world today, there are still glimpses of that same hate that we as a human race had hoped to extinguish those seven decades ago.

It is not always on the front pages of the press or on the television sets, but it is still there. Hate wears many masks: violence, intimidation, segregation, vile rhetoric, and, of course, disenfranchisement. Anti-Semitism is that and more. Though it assumes different identities, in the end, it is still hate. It pains me to say there seems to be a resurgence of anti-Semitism across the world. I look at Israel and I see the vicious attacks carried out against innocent Jews there: the slaughter of Jewish worshipers in a Jerusalem synagogue last November; Hamas's campaign of terror, indiscriminately targeting innocent Israelis with their thousands and thousands of rockets.

I look at Europe and see the heinous acts being perpetuated there against Jews. For example, in the Netherlands, the home of a prominent rabbi was attacked twice in one week. In Paris, hundreds and hundreds of protesters attacked synagogues, smashed the windows of Jewish shops and cafes, and set several afire. In France, there was also an attack on a Jewish grocery store following the Charlie Hebdo shootings. Anti-Semitic slogans, such as ''Gas the Jews'' have been shouted at several demonstrations throughout Germany. Jewish museums throughout Norway were forced to close because of fear of attacks.

I look at the United Nations Human Rights Council in Geneva and am sickened by its long history of bias against Israel and the people of Israel. Then I see what is happening on some college campuses here in the United States, and I am shocked by the vitriol being directed at Jews and supporters of Israel.

Last Sunday, the New York Times reported that in the midst of campus debates about boycotts of Israel, Jewish students felt increasingly intimidated. At several colleges, swastikas have been painted on the doors of Jewish fraternities and in some instances on the doors of Jews who were in their rooms. Some Jewish students feel the need to hide their heritage and support for Israel given the intense backlash. That is sad.

The former president of the University of California system, Mark Yudof, recently was quoted as saying:

> Jewish students and their parents are intensely apprehensive and insecure about this movement. I hear it all the time: Where can I send my kids that will be safe for them as Jews?

That is just stunning. Bigotry and hatred have no place in the world today, especially not in a country that has long prided itself on being a beacon of freedom and acceptance. Instead, it is incumbent upon all Americans to not only stand up to anti-Semitism wherever we see it but also to stand in solidarity with the Jewish people.

Three things: Let's stand against anti-Semitism; let's stand with Israel and the Jews throughout the world; and, third, let's stand against hate.

THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. REID. I want to say a brief word about something I mentioned as I started my remarks. My friend, the Republican leader, has stated that the extreme left is causing a problem on this bill. It is not the extreme left. It is Democrats who are concerned about the middle class.

We do not focus here on the middle class. Republicans are focused elsewhere. We have done nothing on minimum wage, and we have done nothing on student debt. We have done nothing on equal pay for men and women. We have done nothing to create jobs—nothing. We are here. In a matter of 1 week or 2 weeks, the authorization for highways will be gone. It is different than other authorizations we do because under the law we passed previously, when that law expires, there is no contract authority, and that program will come to a screeching halt. We have a few dollars left to carry on for a few more weeks, but it will not be spent.

It is a shame my friend, the Republican leader, keeps referring to the extreme left—whatever that means—when we start talking about the middle class. That is one reason we are concerned about this trade bill that is before us today.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NORTH KOREA

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the threat from North Korea to U.S. national security and to our friends and allies in East Asia.

On May 9, North Korea claimed it had test-fired a ballistic missile from a submarine, raising concerns across the region. If these reports are accurate, experts point out that North Korea may have succeeded for the first time in installing a missile launcher of about 2,500 tons onto a submarine.

If that is true, with this test, North Korea violated a series of United Nations Security Council resolutions, including resolutions 1718, 1874, 2087, and 2094.

According to a more cautious assessment from South Korean officials, it appears North Korea will be able to deploy a fully operational submarine capable of launching a ballistic missile in only 4 to 5 years. This launch is the latest confirmation of Pyongyang's growing nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities while the Obama administration seems to have fallen asleep at the switch with regard to our policy to deter the growing North Korea threat.

According to the Director of National Intelligence's 2015 Worldwide Threat Assessment, ''North Korea's nuclear weapons and missile programs pose a serious threat to the United States and to the security environment in East Asia.''

We should remember North Korea has already tested nuclear weapons on three separate occasions—2006, 2009, and in February of 2013. Most recently, nuclear experts have reported that North Korea may have as many as 20 nuclear warheads, a number that could double by next year, and that Pyongyang has the potential to possess as many as 100 warheads within the next 5 years.

We know North Korea is a nuclear proliferator. They cooperated with the Syrian regime on their nuclear weapons program before Israeli jets destroyed that facility in 2007. We know North Korea's conventional arsenal is rapidly expanding and threatens not only our close allies in South Korea and Japan but could also threaten the United States, our homeland, in the near future.

According to the DNI, ''North Korea has also expanded the size and sophistication of its ballistic missile forces, ranging from close-range ballistic missiles to ICBMs, while continuing to conduct test launches. In 2014, North Korea launched an unprecedented number of ballistic missiles.''

The DNI report goes on to say that ''Pyongyang is committed to developing a long-range, nuclear-armed missile that is capable of posing a direct threat to the United States.'' We should not forget that North Korea is an aggressive, ruthless regime that is not even afraid to kill its own innocent people.

On March 26, 2010, North Korean missiles sank the South Korean ship Cheonan, killing 46 of her crew, and several months later shelled a South Korean island, killing four more South Korean citizens. It is also quickly developing other tools of intimidation as well, such as cyber capabilities, as demonstrated by the attack on the South Korean financial and communication systems in March of 2013 and the infamous Sony Pictures hacking incident in November of 2014.

We should also not forget that this regime remains one of the world's foremost abusers of human rights. The North Korean regime maintains a vast network of political prison camps where as many as 200,000 men, women, and children are confined to atrocious living conditions and are tortured, maimed, and killed.

On February 7, 2014, the United Nations Human Rights Council released a report detailing North Korea's horrendous record on human rights. Here is a description of some of the torture methods common in North Korea as described by former North Korean state security officials interviewed for the report.

> The room had wall shackles that were specially arranged to hang people upside down. Various other torture instruments were also provided, including long needles that would be driven underneath the suspect's fingernails and a pot with a water-hot chili pepper concoction that would be poured into the victim's nose. As a result of such severe torture, suspects would often admit to crimes they did not commit.

This report makes for horrifying reading and gives us a glimpse of the utter depravity of this regime. What then is the U.S. policy to counter North Korea's belligerence and human rights abuses? The answer is precious little.

The administration's policy of strategic patience has been a failure. All that our so-called patience has done is allowed the regime to significantly advance its military capabilities and to systematically continue to torture its own people.

I call on the administration to immediately reverse course and begin the process of applying more pressure to the North Korean regime through additional financial sanctions, increased military engagement with our allies in

the region, and more assertive diplomacy with China, which wields significant control over the fate of the regime.

We should never negotiate with Pyongyang without imposing strict preconditions that North Korea take immediate steps to halt its nuclear program, cease all military provocations, and make credible steps toward respecting human rights of its people.

We should not forget that in a deal with the United States over 20 years ago, North Korea pledged to dismantle their nuclear program. Today, we are reaping the harvest of failed policies of engagement with a regime that has no respect for international agreements or international norms.

As it negotiates with other rogue states that seek to obtain nuclear weapons to threaten the free world, I urge the administration to draw the appropriate conclusions from our failed North Korea policy.

As we talk about human rights violations and violations of international norms, there was a report printed yesterday with the headline ''North Korea Said to Execute a Top Official, With an Antiaircraft Gun.'' This is a country violating human rights, killing its own people, and willing to watch as its own people starve to death. Now there is a report that they are killing people with anti-aircraft guns. This is a regime that doesn't deserve strategic patience but deserves the full commitment of the United States in our efforts to make sure we are bringing peace to the region and long-term peace to the world.

I yield the floor.

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

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last week we passed an important bill that protected the rights of the American people. It said the people in Congress have a right to be involved in an agreement the President negotiates on Iran's nuclear program. Well, that was an important piece of legislation, and I was glad to see it passed with overwhelming bipartisan support.

The bill on trade promotion authority, which we have been talking about this week, is also very important. This bill is about U.S. trade with other countries and the proper role Congress should play in that. It is also very much about America's future, and that is why Republicans are so committed to this piece of legislation.

The problem is Senate Democrats have pulled the rug out from under the American people and the President. They blocked the Senate from even considering this important piece of legislation. This is not the normal story of Democrats v. Republicans or Senator REID v. Senator MCCONNELL. Oh, no. This is a story about Senator REID v. President Obama.

America's economy grew by just 0.2 percent in the first quarter of this year. When the Democratic leader orders the Senators on his side of the aisle to block this bill, is he saying the American people should be satisfied with 0.2 percent growth? Is that satisfaction?

If we are going to get America's economy going and growing again, we need to increase opportunities for America's farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers to sell their products overseas.

According to the Commerce Department, 95 percent of the world's customers live outside the United States. That means there are billions of people around the world who want to buy American products, and that means creating jobs for Americans who make those products. It means lower prices for many of the products Americans want to buy at home. It means more money for the American economy, which is good for all of us. Now, all of that comes from more U.S. trade with other countries.

The bill we are debating right now is very important to American families and to the American economy. Trade promotion authority is a valuable tool. It helps make sure there are strong rules that hold other countries accountable for their unfair trade practices. It also helps us forge agreements to tear down the barriers that block American goods from foreign markets. The sooner we renew trade promotion authority, the sooner American families can start reaping the benefits.

It is outrageous Senate Democrats are keeping us from taking this step to help these families all across the country. The benefits of trade are substantial for places such as my home State of Wyoming.

Exports from Wyoming to other countries amounted to almost $2 billion last year—$2 billion. The Wyoming chemical industry alone exported nearly $1 billion worth of material.

One of our most important chemical exports is soda ash, which is a chemical used to make things such as glass and detergents. It is the largest inorganic chemical export in the United States, and it is responsible for thousands of American jobs. Our producers face high tariffs in some countries, and they are competing with China for the customers.

If we pass this bill and follow that up with the kind of trade deals it allows, we could add another $40 million in new soda ash exports, and that means a lot of jobs here at home.

Trade promotion authority helps give American producers a fair chance to compete for business overseas.

In Wyoming, our farmers and ranchers also export beef, lamb, and grain. We export machinery, minerals, and energy from our oil and gas producers. Wyoming's presence in the global marketplace has been increasing, and we as a nation cannot afford to stop that progress now. We need more access to more markets and we need fair competition.

So the question is: Why are the Democrats standing in the way of all of that? Democrats are blocking more than just the money for American workers and our economy. Economic prosperity itself strengthens our Nation and makes it more secure.

Ronald Reagan once said: ''Our national security and economic strength are indivisible.'' He understood that national defense is expensive and that America needs a strong economy to pay for it. Reagan understood that American trade with other countries can help strengthen our military alliances as well. American goods sold overseas provide an American presence all around the world. They are economic boots on the ground.

The Secretary of Defense, Ash Carter, said something similar in a speech last month. He said: ''Our military strength ultimately rests on the foundation of our vibrant, unmatched, and growing economy.''

He said the kinds of trade deals this bill would promote are ''as important to me as another aircraft carrier.'' Now, that is the current Secretary of Defense agreeing with what President Ronald Reagan said years ago.

The Defense Secretary also talked about what all of us in the Senate know to be true: If America does not continue to lead in global commerce and does not attract more trading partners, someone else will. More likely than not, that is going to be China.

America needs to step up and start negotiating effective, fair, and enforceable trade agreements or we are going to be allowing China to write the rules for global trade. If that happens, every Senator here knows those rules will not favor American workers and American exports. Senate Democrats know that, and they are still standing in the way of this legislation.

Last year, our exports supported nearly 12 million American jobs. That is an increase of 2 million jobs since 2009. It is great news, but it is not enough.

According to the latest numbers that came out last Friday, there are another 17 million Americans who are either unemployed, are working part time because they cannot find full-time work or have absolutely given up and stopped looking for a job. There are 17 million Americans who are waiting for our economy to really start growing again.

We need to create more stable, long-term jobs for those Americans who have been left behind by the weak economy over the past 6 years. More

U.S. trade with other countries can help make that happen. This trade promotion authority bill is the first step toward reaching that goal and Democrats know that. Why then are they fighting so hard to make sure this bill fails? Why are they fighting so hard to block those jobs? This legislation would give the President a clear roadmap—a roadmap to follow while negotiating trade deals. It also ensures that Congress and the American people have a say about whether a deal goes through. That part is extremely important.

I mentioned the fight we just had with the White House to make sure the American people and Congress can review an agreement with Iran over its nuclear program. Well, this bill says right up front that Congress will get to have an up-or-down vote on any trade deals.

This isn't about expanding the powers of the President. I know a lot of Senators have serious concerns about how President Obama has abused his authority in unchecked and unprecedented ways. A lot of Americans have those same concerns. This bill is not just about this President. It is about the next President and the one after that. It is about American workers, American families, and growing the American economy for all of us. It is about making sure America continues to lead and Americans continue to prosper. American exports to other countries are the key to this. This bill on the floor right now can make sure all of that happens, and it makes sure the American people have their say.

It is time for Senate Democrats to call off their destructive fight with the President. It is time for Senate Democrats to stop blocking trade, stop blocking jobs, and stop blocking progress for American families and for our economy.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on May 4, 2015, Officer Brian Moore was killed in the line of duty. This was an exceptional young police officer in New York City. He was young enough that he still lived in his father's home, but he was experienced enough, old enough that he had already become a decorated officer in the NYPD and had made over 150 arrests since joining the department just 5 years ago.

Commissioner Bill Bratton said: ''In his very brief career, he already proved himself to be an exceptional young officer.''

We have heard a lot about law enforcement gone wrong, but the reality is that every single day police officers are under threat and they are in danger.

All Brian Moore did on the evening of May 2 was pull up behind someone who was acting in a suspicious manner, and as they began talking to him, the man turned and fired at the car. Officer Moore was struck in the cheek. He had trauma to his brain. Ninety minutes after the shooting, officers arrested the man who perpetrated this crime. He did it with a stolen weapon—one of 23 weapons that were stolen in a 2011 robbery at Little's Bait & Tackle Pawn Shop in Perry, GA.

Detective Mike Cerullo said of him:

He was a great kid. I can't say a bad thing about him. He always had a smile on his face.

Officer Moore was an officer who was rising through the ranks very quickly and who was beloved in his community. He grew up on Long Island, tragically and ironically in a town with an athletic field at the high school named after Edward Byrne—another alumnus of that high school who was killed in the line of duty as a 22-year-old rookie in 1988. That name may be familiar to us because we now hand out millions of dollars in Byrne grants all across the country—another alumni of this particular high school shot down.

Brian is one of 86 people across this country who are killed by guns every day—2,600 a month and 31,000 a year. Not every single one of these deaths is preventable. I don't know whether Brian Moore's was preventable. But what I know is that many of these deaths are preventable, that there has to be a reason why these numbers are so out of whack with every single other country in the industrialized world. A lot has to do with the reality of this place, that as these numbers continue to go up day after day, month after month, year after year at catastrophic levels, we do absolutely nothing about it.

We have to start thinking about not just the cost to the families—and it is not just the mother and the father and the brother and the sister. If we look at the pictures of Brian Moore's funeral, they are heartbreaking, seeing the tragedy that is washing over the family members.

The average homicide by gun has 22 different victims who are affected by it. It often leads to cycles of violence in which there are killings for retribution, in which the trauma spirals lives of children and brothers and sisters downward.

Let's look for a second at the cost of one murder. Here are some numbers overall. A recent study showed that the annual cost of gun violence in America is $229 billion with a ''b.'' That is $47 billion more than Apple's 2014 worldwide revenue. But here is the cost of just one murder—$441,000 in direct costs. Eighty-seven percent of it is paid for by taxpayers. It costs over $400,000 to lock up the perpetrator, $2,000 when he is charged and sentenced, $11,000 for mental health treatment for the victim's families, $10,000 for the victim's hospital expenses, $450 just to transport to the hospital, and then $2,000 for police response and investigations.

That is not why we should take on the issue of gun violence in this country; we should do it simply to try to stop this scourge of murders. But if we care about being a good steward of the taxpayers' dollars, then $441,000 a year that could be saved just by eliminating one of the 86 a day seems like a pretty good deal.

Jose Araujo, from Milford, CT, was working for Burns Construction Company in Bridgeport when he was shot at his job on a construction site after a suspect asked for a job and he was referred to the company office. He started to head for the office, but then he turned around and shot Jose.

A family friend said:

He was a gentle giant. Wherever he walked in there was a smile on his face. He always gave you a strong handshake.

Another friend said:

He's nice, generous and a man of peace.

Jose's girlfriend said:

He was such a great person and if the world had more people like him—oh, what a beautiful world we would live in.

Jose leaves behind a 5-year-old son.

Sanjay Patel was killed on April 6 in New Haven, CT. He was just working, as millions of other Americans do, putting in his hours as a manager at a CITGO gas station, when he was shot four times by an apparent robber at the station. The perpetrators took money and store merchandise. Specifically, they stole a box of cigars. They killed this guy over a box of cigars.

Sanjay's wife was 6 months pregnant at the time. He told her he didn't want her to work while she was pregnant, in part because she had been injured in a house fire last year. In a tearful interview, she said her husband took excellent care of her and the baby. He brought her ice cream and breakfast in bed. ''This is my first baby,'' she said, ''and my husband was so happy.''

The stats are overwhelming, whether it be the number of people who are killed by guns or the cost to U.S. taxpayers. I try to come to the floor every couple of weeks just to give voice to the victims of gun violence, figuring that if the numbers don't move this place, maybe the stories of those who are lost will. I can only tell a few a day, but, frankly, it would take me more time than we have here for debate on the floor to tell 86 stories every single day.

This isn't just about the fact that I come from Newtown, CT; this is about the fact that there is a regular drumbeat of gun violence throughout this country. By doing nothing in the Senate and the House week after week, month after month, year after year, we effectively become complicit in these murders. We silently endorse this epidemic of gun violence when we don't even try to make gun trafficking illegal at a Federal level; when we don't stand with 90 percent of the American public and the vast majority of gun owners—80 to 90 percent—and simply say you shouldn't be able to get a gun if you are a criminal and you have to prove you are not a criminal before you get a gun; when we don't endorse simple gun safety technology to make sure the gun that was used to kill Officer Moore can't be used by someone who isn't its intended user, its owner, the technology developing—we could help; we could assist—that would cut down on stolen firearms that are used to kill and hurt people.

I will keep coming down to the floor whatever chance I get to tell a handful of these tragic stories from Connecticut, to New York, to Chicago, to Los Angeles, giving voices to the victims of gun violence so that someday, somehow, the Senate will recognize that although we can't eliminate these numbers, although we can't bring them down to zero, with smart, commonsense legislation, we can make sure these numbers are much lower than they are today and that there is much less tragedy visited on American families and much less cost to American taxpayers.

I yield back, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF MATTHEW CHISM AND OFFICER EDDIE JOHNSON

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, all across the country right now people are honoring the men and women who serve in law enforcement as we honor National Police Week. I was the cochair of the Senate Law Enforcement Caucus. Senator COONS and I founded that caucus when we came to the Senate a little over 4 years ago. I am proud to be able to speak on behalf of those who serve and their families.

I just had a meeting with the Federal Law Enforcement Association to talk about the challenge of these jobs and the challenge to families and the importance of understanding the moment you are in. One of the observations I made to them—going back to some legislation I worked on a few years ago to allow police officers to carry their weapons when they went from State to State—is that you may not remember everybody that you arrested, but everybody you arrested remembers you.

The vulnerability of police and their families is sometimes equal to and sometimes exceeds the vulnerability of those of us whom the police, every day, step up to protect. This is a week when we really take a moment to recognize that. We take a moment to recognize those who serve. I want to pay tribute today particularly to two Missouri officers who were killed in the line of duty last year: Deputy Sheriff Matthew Chism of the Cedar County Sheriff's Office and Officer Eddie Johnson of the Alton Police Department.

Deputy Sheriff Chism, of Stockton, MO, was tragically killed in November of last year. He was 25 years old. Deputy Sheriff Chism was shot and killed while conducting a traffic stop. He had served with the Cedar County Sheriff's Office for just under 2 years. Deputy Sheriff Chism is survived by his wife and his young son. Clearly, that family has paid a tremendous price for the willingness of their husband and father to step up and defend us.

Officer Eddie Johnson, Jr., of Alton, MO, was involved in a fatal vehicle crash while responding to a structure fire on October 20 of last year. In addition to being an officer with the Alton Police Department, Officer Johnson also served as the fire chief of the volunteer fire department and as a reserve deputy for the Oregon County Sheriff's Department. He was 45 years old. He is survived by his wife and their three children.

So difficult things happen to those who serve. We saw two of our officers, the St. Louis County police officers at Ferguson, MO, who were shot recently as someone was shooting into a crowd there expressing concern about police activity. But the very people trying to be sure that the crowd was able to express that concern were then the victims of violence that has not yet been really figured out—why the person who fired those shots was shooting at a crowd, whether he was shooting specifically at police in that crowd or just shooting into the crowd or what that person was doing.

The desire of people who serve and put on that uniform every day is to serve and protect. That is their No. 1 goal, I am confident, in virtually every case in taking that job. The No. 1 hope of their family is that those people come home safely at the end of their shift. You know, life is uncertain in many ways, but more uncertain when you actually decide you are going to pursue a service to others that puts you intentionally in harm's way—people who are not only prepared to serve but willing to serve, prepared to stand in the way of danger to others but willing to stand in the way of danger to others. It is a determination of what to do that other people don't make and don't bear the responsibility the same way. So it is important for us right now to think about those who serve.

I was glad to join Senator CARDIN as a cosponsor, with others, of the National Blue Alert Act—the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act. This bill created a national alert system to apprehend violent criminals who have seriously injured or killed police officers. These two officers were killed while in their squad car. This alert system would be used to quickly get that information to other police agencies and to the public, as they are trying to find someone who would think about doing that sort of thing.

We passed that bill on April 30. The House of Representatives passed it yesterday. It is now on the way to the President's desk. It is a good thing for us to step up and be willing to do. This is a job where you go to work every day not knowing what is likely to happen that day. We saw events in my home State, in Ferguson, MO, last August that brought attention to the danger that police face.

I heard even the President talking about Baltimore just a few days ago. He made the comment that we have difficulty in communities and difficulty in people's lives—people who are not prepared for opportunities and they do not get opportunities. The President said something like this: And then we send the police into those environments, and we act surprised when bad things happen, when unfortunate things happen, when violence occurs, when police are in the middle of a situation that suddenly does not work out the way any of us would want it to.

Police are dealing with major problems. I cosponsored with Senator STABENOW last year the Excellence in Mental Health Act, trying to be sure that we are dealing with people's behavioral health problems like we deal with all other physical health problems. One out of four adult Americans has a behavioral health problem that is diagnosable—according to the NIH, almost always treatable—and then one out of nine has a behavioral health problem that severely impacts how they function as an individual, according to the National Institutes of Health.

We have no greater support of that effort to try to begin to try to treat behavioral health like all other health than the police organizations around the country that stepped forward and

have said: This is a problem that we deal with all the time, and there are better ways to deal with it than expecting police officers to deal with someone whose behavioral health problem leads them to violence or into another situation.

By the way, people with behavioral health problems are more often the victims of violence than they are the perpetrators of violence. So often this is part of what we ask police to respond to. We expect police to be psychiatrists and psychologists and first responders and experts at protecting others. Then, we can easily begin to want to question what equipment they used, what uniform they were told they needed to have on for the exercise that they were about to participate in, the public safety moment they were about to be part of.

These are hard jobs. They are difficult jobs that often come into the moment of difficulty in other people's lives—people who for whatever reason do something that they would normally not do, react in a way that they might normally not react or react out of incredible frustration because of the situation they found themselves in. But we expect the police to step forward and immediately be able to respond to that situation in a way that protects others. Does every police officer do the right thing every time? Probably not. Does almost every police officer do their very best to do the right thing ever time? Absolutely, they do. It is the exceptions that get attention, as they should. But for those of us who every day benefit and benefit in this building from the work they do—I remember on 9/11. One of my memories of 9/11 is that I am one of the last people to leave the Capitol Building and the police officer who is there telling me to get out as quickly as I could. As she says that to me, I realize, as I am leaving the door to try to get to a safer place, she—the police officer who says that I need to get out of here right now—is still standing at the place where she told me: You need to get out of here right now. Whoever else might have been left in the building, she was trying to be sure that they got out of the building, too.

That is what we expect the police to do. That is what their families know every day when they go to work, that they may be called on to do extraordinary things. For those who serve, we are grateful. This is an important week to be grateful to police officers whom we see and police who are helping us whom we do not see. So I am pleased to be here to thank them for their service.

TRADE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, on another topic, I would just like to say that I hope we can move forward with the ability to have trade agreements. I was disappointed yesterday that we were not able to move forward and not vote on a trade agreement but to vote on the framework that at some point in the future would allow us to negotiate a trade agreement.

You cannot get the final negotiation on a trade agreement unless the people with whom you are negotiating know that the trade agreement is going to be voted on—yes or no—by the Congress. It cannot be an agreement that the Congress can go back and look at and say: Well, we do not really like that provision. We do not like this provision. Let's send it back, but let's not do what they said they were willing to do as part of this negotiation.

Trade is good for us. Trade is in almost all cases about tearing down barriers to our products, because we have very few barriers to those that we trade with. So trade is almost always an opportunity to sell more American products in other countries, particularly as it relates to the most likely first agreement we would get if we would get trade promotion authority. That agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, will make a huge difference in the way that part of the world develops, if they develop based on a trade relationship where the rule of law matters, a trade relationship where everyone is treated in a way where you are looking for a way to come back and have more ability to work together in the future, where you are working on trade relationships where not every ounce of profit has to be made on any one deal, because you are always thinking about what happens next.

We have great opportunities there and they do too. That part of the world will be dramatically different 10 years from now and even more different 20 years from now, if our system becomes a system that becomes the basis for how they move into their economic future and create economic opportunity for them and for us—as opposed to the other alternatives, which are much more colonial in nature, much more cynical in nature, much more likely to be one big trading partner, and there is one little trading partner in every deal.

That is not the way this works. That is not the way it should work, but we can't get to that final opportunity for American workers unless we have an agreement where we understand what happens to that agreement once it has been negotiated.

The best thing, the best offer does not come until the people on the other side of the negotiating table know they are doing this under trade promotion authority, an authority that every President since Franklin Roosevelt has had, and every President since Franklin Roosevelt asked for, until this President, who didn't ask for it until his second term and then clearly didn't do anything to push for it until after the congressional elections last year.

But this is a 6-year ability to create more opportunities for American workers and jobs that provide good take-home pay for American workers. I hope the unfortunate decision not to move forward and get this done is a decision the Senate quickly has a chance to rethink, revote on, and move forward.

With that, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Morning business is closed.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

OUR COUNTRY'S WORD ON THE INTERNATIONAL STAGE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it has been nearly 2 years since the Syrian tyrant Bashar al-Assad attacked his own people with sarin gas, crossing President Obama's so-called red line. At the time, President Obama grudgingly called for airstrikes against Assad but hesitated at the moment of decision. When Secretary of State Kerry opened the door to a negotiated solution, Vladimir Putin barged in, allowing Assad the pretext of turning over his chemical weapons to avoid U.S. airstrikes. The amen chorus proclaimed a strategic master stroke.

But it wasn't so. Street-smart observers were onto Assad's game. He only needed to keep a tiny fraction of his chemical stockpile to retain his military utility. Syria thus could open most—but not all—of its facilities at no cost to the regime.

In fact, because most of Syria's chemical agents were old, potentially unreliable yet still dangerous, the regime actually benefitted by getting the West to pay for the removal of the old stockpiles.

And where are we now? Exactly where a few of my colleagues and I warned we would be. News reports just this week indicate that the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons has discovered new evidence of sarin gas and VX nerve agent—9 months after the organization declared Syria had disposed of all of its chemical weapons. In the meantime,

Assad has simply shifted to chlorine gas for chemical attacks against his own people, which is also prohibited by the Chemical Weapons Convention, even though Syria signed that convention as part of President Obama's deal in 2013.

I am appalled by these reports that the Syrian regime has obtained stocks of chemical weapons, but I cannot say I am surprised. Anyone with eyes to see knew the message President Obama had sent. When he flinched in 2013 in the face of Assad's brazen and brutal use of sarin gas on civilians, it only emboldened Assad to continue testing U.S. resolve.

Of course, the fallout goes far beyond Syria. The failure to enforce the U.S. red line against the use of chemical weapons in Syria has severely damaged U.S. credibility around the world. I hear this message from leaders of countries not just in the region but across the globe. The message sounds most loudly with Iran, where the Ayatollahs continue their headlong pursuit of nuclear weapons capabilities with impunity. Regrettably, then, we are reaping the bitter fruits of President Obama's weakness in 2013.

There are two simple lessons we must draw from this sad sequence of events. First, our country's word on the international stage must be good and it must be credible. When a President draws a red line and fails to back it up, it only emboldens our enemies and makes America appear as the weak horse. Remember, Osama bin Laden famously said that when given the choice between a weak horse and a strong horse, people will, by nature, root for the strong horse. Under Barack Obama, America increasingly looks like the weak horse.

Second, we cannot trust tyrannical regimes to abide by agreements unless we force them to do so. This means that any agreement with Iran about its nuclear weapons program must contain the most stringent conditions, impose the most intrusive verification procedures, and ultimately prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapons capability.

The framework agreement President Obama has reached with Iran meets none of those standards. Moreover, the administration's concealment of Syria's cheating surely foreshadows how it will look the other way when Iran cheats on any final deal.

Assad's cheating on his chemical weapons agreement today is devastating for the people of Syria, but Iran's cheating on a nuclear agreement in the future could be catastrophic for the United States and the world at large.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PATRIOT ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, in February, the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center estimated that nearly 20,000 foreign fighters had joined ISIS or other related groups in Syria. Among those, some 3,000 were from Western countries. In other words, many of them either had American passports or those that are part of the visa waiver program and could travel, really, without anything other than that passport in the country. Over 150 were from the United States.

Just last week, in describing the widespread nature of this growing threat, FBI Director James Comey said that the FBI is working on hundreds of investigations in the United States, hundreds of investigations. In fact, according to Comey, all 56 of the FBI's field divisions now have open inquiries regarding suspected cases of homegrown terrorism—again, not people coming from Syria or Afghanistan or someplace in the Middle East, these are often Americans who have become radicalized due to the use of social media or the Internet—much as 5 years ago we saw at Fort Hood, TX, a major in the U.S. Army, Nidal Hasan, who had been radicalized by a cleric, Anwar al-Awlaki.

Major Hasan actually pulled out his weapon and killed 13 people, 12 uniformed military, 1 civilian, and shot roughly 30 more in a terrible terrorist attack at Fort Hood, TX.

So today we are not just worried about a major attack on a significant cultural or economic hub, we also have to worry about ISIS-inspired terrorists all around the country, even as we witnessed in my home State of Texas just on May 3.

When you begin to look at the story—that I will ask to be made part of the RECORD—written by the New York Times on May 11, 2015, it explains how this new threat of homegrown terrorism is inspired. I will quote a few pieces of it:

> Hours before he drove into a Texas parking lot last week and opened fire with an assault rifle outside a Prophet Muhammad cartoon contest, Elton Simpson, 30, logged onto Twitter.
>
> ''Follow @__AbuHu55ain,'' Mr. Simpson posted, promoting a Twitter account believed to belong to Junaid Hussain, a young computer expert from Birmingham, England, who moved to Syria two years ago to join the Islamic State and has become one of the extremist group's celebrity hackers.

Well, there is a question—as the article goes on to say—whether or not Mr. Simpson and his colleague, who came, I believe, from Phoenix, AZ, and went on to Garland, TX, to carry out this attack—whether they were actually recruited ahead of time by ISIL or whether ISIL just claimed credit after the fact. But the article goes on to say:

> It was the first time that the terror group had tried to claim credit for an operation carried out in its name on American soil. . . . Yet Mr. Simpson appears to have been part of a network of Islamic State adherents in several countries, including the group's hub in Syria, who have encouraged attacks and highlighted the Texas event as a worthy target.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, this New York Times article from May 11, 2015, and a Wall Street Journal article from May 12, 2015, by Michael B. Mukasey.

So what FBI Director Comey has expressed concern about recently is apparently very real. It is as real as the daily newspaper recounting the attack on May 3 in Garland, TX, of all places.

Terrorists are sending a clear signal to those in the United States and other Western countries: If you can't fight us abroad, we are going to bring the fight to you in your own country.

This heightened threat environment has led Pentagon officials to raise the security level at U.S. military bases. The last time the threat level was raised to this level was the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks.

I still remember when the former admiral, Bobby Inman, who served for a long time in the Navy and then also in the intelligence community, was asked about 9/11. He said: It wasn't so much a failure of intelligence, as it was a failure of imagination.

Nobody imagined that terrorists would hijack a plane and fly it into one of our Nation's highest skyscrapers, thus, in the process, killing approximately 3,000 people.

So we need to remember not to have a failure of imagination when it comes to the tactics used by terrorists and those who inspire them abroad. Remarks like those from Director Comey and the Director of our National Counterterrorism Center are certainly troubling ones for us to hear, and it counsels caution.

While the United States has been mostly successful in thwarting attacks on our homeland since 9/11, the threats are still very real. In fact, the terrorist threat has evolved and become more complex in recent years.

In Texas, we rightly recognize that the role of government should be constrained to focus on core functions. At the Federal level, of course, this means things such as passing a budget. But surely it also means protecting our country and its security and the security of the American people.

That brings me to some business that we are going to have to conduct here in the Congress sometime within the next couple of weeks before certain provisions of the U.S. PATRIOT Act expire on June 1. I believe that if we allow these provisions to expire, our homeland security will be at a much greater

risk. So I think we need to talk a little bit about it and explain not only the threat but what our intelligence community and our national security officials are doing, working with Congress and the administration, to make sure Americans are safe, and the PATRIOT Act is part of it.

I recognize there are many who perhaps haven't read the PATRIOT Act or whose memories have perhaps dimmed since those terrible events on 9/11 and who think we don't need the PATRIOT Act. But I would argue that the PATRIOT Act serves as a tool for intelligence and law enforcement officials to protect our Nation from those who are seeking to harm us. Three of those useful tools will expire at the end of the month, including section 215, which allows the National Security Agency to access certain types of data, including phone records.

There has been a lot of misunderstanding and, frankly, some of it downright deceptive, about what this does, when, in fact, section 215 is a business records collection provision that happens to be applied to collecting phone records but not the content of phone records. This is one of the misleading statements made by some folks who think we ought to let this provision expire.

Right now, under current law, which is set to expire June 1, our intelligence community can get basically three types of information about a phone record: the calling and receiving number, the time of the call, and the duration. That is it—no content, no names or addresses. You can't even get cell tower identification that would tell one where the call is coming from.

Much has been said about this program, and, as I said, much of it misleading or downright false, but I want to focus now on the oversight that is built into this program because I think Americans understand we need to take steps in a dangerous world to keep the American people safe, but they also value their privacy, and justly so. We all do. So it is important to remind the American people and our colleagues as we take up this important provision of law about what we have already built into the law to protect the privacy of American citizens who are not engaged in any communication with foreign terrorists or being inspired by foreign terrorists to commit acts of terrorism here in the homeland.

Let me talk about the barriers we have created in the law for an NSA—National Security Agency—analyst to overcome before seeing any real information from this data. First, for the NSA to have access to phone records at all—at all—a special court must approve an order requiring telephone companies to provide those call records to the Agency. That order has been in place since roughly 2006, where the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, the specialized court created by Congress for this purpose, has issued an order requiring the telephone companies to turn over these call records—again, no content, no name and address, but merely the sending number, the receiving number, and the duration. That is the core information which is required.

It is important to point out that these records include only the most basic limited information. They do not include the information I suggested earlier—the content, names and addresses, and the like.

So the National Security Agency is not, as some have assumed wrongly, able to retrieve old phone conversations. They do not collect that sort of information, nor are they able to simply listen in on any American's phone conversations under this authority. That would be a violation of the protections Congress has put in place under the provisions of the PATRIOT Act.

Before an analyst at the NSA can even search for or query the database, they must go through even more controls, and these are important. To be granted the ability to search the database, the analyst must demonstrate to the FISA Court—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court created by Congress for this purpose—that there is a reasonable, articulable suspicion that the phone number is associated with terrorism.

This is similar—not the same but similar—in many respects to the protections offered in a criminal case under the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution where law enforcement agencies would have to come in and establish probable cause that a crime has been committed before a search would be allowed. But since this is an investigation into foreign-induced terrorist activity, the standard Congress set was a reasonable, articulable suspicion that the phone number is associated with terrorism. If the court determines that standard has been met, they can grant access to the conversation but not under any other circumstance.

If the NSA believes the phone number belongs to someone who intends to attack our country, the Agency must go back to court another time to be granted other abilities to surveil that individual.

In addition to these checks and balances between the National Security Agency and the courts, all three branches of government have oversight over this program. And strong oversight of the intelligence community is absolutely essential to safeguarding our freedoms and our liberty.

Because parts of this program are by and large classified, you are not going to hear public debates about it. Indeed, that puts defenders of the program at some disadvantage to those who attack it—sometimes in a misleading or deceptive sort of way—because it is very difficult to counter that with factual information when they are talking about a classified program, or parts of which are classified. It is important that our enemies don't know exactly what we are doing because then they can wire around it.

We live, of course, in a world with many threats, as I said, many of them in our backyard. Many of them can be thwarted with good intelligence and law enforcement. And I make that distinction on purpose—intelligence and law enforcement. Law enforcement—as we learned with 9/11, we can't just treat terrorism as a criminal act. It is a criminal act, but if we are going to stop it, we need access to good intelligence to thwart it before that act actually occurs. It is not enough to say to the American people: Well, we will deploy all of the tools available to law enforcement to prosecute the person who murders innocent people. We need to keep the commitment to protect them from that innocent slaughter in the first place, and the only way we do that is by using legitimate tools of intelligence, such as this program I am discussing.

Earlier this year, for example, the United States frustrated a potential attack by a man from Ohio. He was an ISIS sympathizer and had plans to bomb the building we are standing in today, the U.S. Capitol. That potential attack was thwarted by the use of good intelligence under the limitations and strictures and procedures I described a moment ago. Over the past 2 years, the FBI has told us they have stopped 50 American citizens from traveling overseas and joining the Islamic State and then coming back. So clearly the intelligence community has a vital role to play in safeguarding the American people in our homeland.

Some in the intelligence community have said the bulk data collection I have described here briefly has led to a safer United States, and it is because of programs such as these that we are much better off than we were pre-9/11. That is very important because the last thing I would think we would want to do here in Congress is to return us to a pre-9/11 mentality when it comes to the threat of terrorism both abroad and here at home and to make it harder for our national security personnel to protect the American people.

I believe the portion of the PATRIOT Act in question provides our intelligence community with the tools they need in order to effectively protect all Americans.

I have been briefed on this program. We just had a briefing yesterday by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, by the FBI Director, by DOJ personnel, and by the leader of the National Security Agency. It was held downstairs in a secure facility because, as I said, much of it was classified.

Much of it we can't talk about without alerting our adversaries to ways to circumvent it. But all responsible Members of Congress have taken advantage of the opportunity to learn about how this program works as part of our oversight responsibilities.

I remain convinced that this program, like many others, has helped to keep us safe while using appropriate checks and balances to ensure that our liberties remain intact. And Congress, by maintaining strong oversight of these and other government programs, can have a win-win situation that both protects American lives and protects American liberties.

Mr. President, I want to draw my colleagues' attention to an opinion piece that appeared today in the Wall Street Journal that was written by Michael B. Mukasey, who, of course, was a former U.S. district judge and more recently Attorney General of the United States from 2007 to 2009. General Mukasey writes in this article about the Second Circuit opinion that has prompted so much recent discussion about section 215 of the PATRIOT Act and the bulk metadata collection process I described a moment ago. I think he makes some very important points.

First of all, he makes the important point that it is a good thing Congress has created a special Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court because the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, no matter how good they are as judges, simply doesn't have the experience to deal with parsing the law on intelligence matters and things such as this 215 provision I talked about a moment ago.

He makes the important point that intelligence by its nature is forward-looking and our criminal justice system, which is what most courts have experience with, is backward-looking—in other words, something bad has already happened and the police and investigators and prosecutors are trying to bring somebody to justice for committing a criminal act. But our intelligence community is supposed to look forward and to help prevent those terrible accidents or incidents from occurring in the first place.

The second point General Mukasey makes in this article is that the Second Circuit panel of judges assumes that many Members of Congress are simply unaware of the provisions of the PATRIOT Act I mentioned earlier—section 215, this metadata collection—which is a terrible and glaring mistake on the part of the Second Circuit panel.

As I pointed out yesterday, just as we have done many times previously, Members of the Senate and the Congress generally have regular or at least periodic briefings on these intelligence programs as part of our oversight responsibilities. For the Second Circuit panel to suggest that Congress didn't know what it was talking about when it authorized these programs and when it wrote this provision of the law is simply erroneous.

The third point General Mukasey makes is that the judges didn't even stop the program in the first place. So it makes one really wonder why they handed down their opinion about 3 weeks before the expiration of this provision, when Congress is going to have to take up this matter anyway, unless they wanted to have some impact on our deliberations here.

What Attorney General Mukasey suggested, I think, is good advice. There needs to be an appeal to the Second Circuit Court en banc and then to the U.S. Supreme Court to get a final word. We don't need to settle on what he calls a ''Rube Goldberg'' procedure that would have data stored and searched by the telephone companies, he says, whose computers can be penetrated and whose employees have neither the security clearance nor the training of the NSA staff.

Mr. President, I commend this article to my colleagues.

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

[From the New York Times, May 11, 2015]

CLUES ON TWITTER SHOW TIES BETWEEN TEXAS GUNMAN AND ISIS NETWORK

(By Rukmini Callimachi)

Hours before he drove into a Texas parking lot last week and opened fire with an assault rifle outside a Prophet Muhammad cartoon contest, Elton Simpson, 30, logged onto Twitter.

''Follow @__AbuHu55ain,'' Mr. Simpson posted, promoting a Twitter account believed to belong to Junaid Hussain, a young computer expert from Birmingham, England, who moved to Syria two years ago to join the Islamic State and has become one of the extremist group's celebrity hackers.

This seemingly routine shout-out is an intriguing clue to the question of whether the gunmen, Mr. Simpson and Nadir Soofi, 34, both of Phoenix, were acting in concert with the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL, in carrying out an attack outside a community center in Garland, Tex. The Islamic State said two days later that the two men, who were killed by officers after opening fire, were ''soldiers of the Caliphate.'' It was the first time that the terror group had tried to claim credit for an operation carried out in its name on American soil.

As the gunmen were driving toward the Curtis Culwell Center, Mr. Hussain logged onto Twitter himself from half a world away, firing off a series of posts in the hour before the attack began at 7 p.m. on May 3. One message posted to his account about 5:45 p.m. seemed to predict imminent violence: ''The knives have been sharpened, soon we will come to your streets with death and slaughter!''

After the attack, Mr. Hussain was in the first wave of people who praised the gunmen, before his account was suspended.

Law enforcement officials have not presented any conclusive evidence that the Islamic State planned or directed the attack. Yet Mr. Simpson appears to have been part of a network of Islamic State adherents in several countries, including the group's hub in Syria, who have encouraged attacks and highlighted the Texas event as a worthy target.

Counterterrorism officials say the case shows how the Islamic State and its supporters use social media to cheerlead for attacks without engaging in the secret training, plotting and control that has long characterized Al Qaeda. But a close look at Mr. Simpson's Twitter connections shows that he had developed a notable online relationship with some of the Islamic State's best-known promoters on the Internet, and that they actively encouraged such acts of terror.

Speaking of the Texas case last week, James B. Comey, the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said the distinction between an attack ''inspired'' by a foreign terrorist group and one ''directed'' by the group ''is breaking down.''

''It's not a useful framework,'' he added.

Mr. Simpson was radicalized years before the Islamic State announced in 2014 that it was creating a caliphate, a unified land for Muslims, and drew global attention for territorial gains and brutal violence. He was investigated by the F.B.I. starting in 2006 and was sentenced to probation in 2011 for lying to investigators. But like many young Muslims drawn by the sensational image of the Islamic State, he enthusiastically joined its virtual community of supporters.

An analysis of Mr. Simpson's Twitter account by the SITE Intelligence Group, which tracks extremist statements, found that Mr. Simpson followed more than 400 other accounts, including ''hardcore I.S. fighters from around the world.'' They included an alleged British fighter for the Islamic State, known as Abu Abdullah Britani, who according to SITE is believed to be Abu Rahin Aziz, a radical British national who skipped bail to join the terror group. They also included an alleged American fighter called Abu Khalid Al-Amriki and numerous female Islamic State jihadists.

Many of Mr. Simpson's posts announced the new Twitter handles of Islamic State members whose accounts the social media company had suspended, messages commonly called ''shout-outs.''

''He was taking part in shout-outs of ISIS accounts that were previously suspended, and this shows a pretty deep involvement in the network online,'' says J. M. Berger, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and co-author of a book about the Islamic State. ''He was wired into a legitimate foreign fighters network.''

Starting last fall, the Islamic State has repeatedly called for attacks in the West by supporters with no direct connection to its core leadership, and there have been at least six attacks in Europe, Canada and Australia by gunmen who appeared to have been inspired by the group. Each attacker left an online trail similar to that of Mr. Simpson, though not all were in contact with Islamic State operatives in Syria.

A review of Mr. Simpson's Twitter account shows that he interacted not just with sympathizers of the Islamic State, but also with fighters believed to be in Syria and Africa. Some of these fighters later posted on Twitter details of Mr. Simpson's biography not yet in the public sphere, suggesting that he had shared details about his life with them.

''The thing that clearly stands out if you peruse the Texas shooter's timeline is his third to last tweet,'' the one promoting Mr. Hussain, said Daveed Gartenstein-Ross, a senior fellow who researches extremism at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies and who shared a PDF of Mr. Simpson's Twitter history.

Veryan Khan, who helps run the Terrorism Research and Analysis Consortium, said that Mr. Simpson probably urged others to follow Mr. Hussain in order to draw broader attention to his forthcoming attack. ''He wanted to make sure everyone in those circles knew what he'd done,'' she said. ''It was attention-seeking—that's what it looks like,'' added Ms. Khan, whose organization tracks some 5,000 Islamic State figures and supporters.

While still living in Birmingham, Mr. Hussain rose to notoriety as a hacker working under the screen name Tr1Ck, and he was believed to be a core member of what was called TeaM p0isoN. The team claimed a string of high profile cyberattacks, hacking into a Scotland Yard conference call on combating hackers and posting Facebook updates to the pages of its chief executive, Mark Zuckerberg, and former President Nicolas Sarkozy of France.

Mr. Hussain was eventually arrested, and he served a six-month prison sentence before traveling to Syria. He has since been linked to a number of Islamic State hacking attacks overseas, though some security officials have doubts about his role.

Another well-known promoter of the Islamic State who engaged with Mr. Simpson was a jihadist known on Twitter as Mujahid Miski, believed to be Mohamed Abdullahi Hassan, a Somali-American from Minnesota. Though Mr. Hassan lives in Somalia, he has emerged as an influential recruiter for the group.

On April 23, the account Mujahid Miski shared a link on Twitter to a listing for the Muhammad cartoon contest and goaded his followers to attack it. ''The brothers from the Charlie Hebdo attack did their part. It's time for brothers in the #US to do their part,'' he wrote. Among the nine people who retweeted his call to violence, according to SITE, was Mr. Simpson.

Three days later, Mr. Simpson reached out to Mujahid Miski on Twitter, asking him to message him privately. Whether they actually communicated, or what they may have said, is not publicly known. Minutes before Mr. Simpson arrived at the cartoon event in Garland and began shooting, he went on Twitter one last time to link the attack to the Islamic State. ''The bro with me and myself have given bay'ah to Amirul Mu'mineem,'' he wrote, using the vocabulary of the Islamic State to say that they had given an oath of allegiance to the Emir of the Believers—the leader of the Islamic State, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi.

''May Allah accept us as mujahedeen,'' he wrote, adding the hashtag ''#TexasAttack.''

Among those who retweeted this last post was Mr. Hussain, the Islamic State hacker in Syria. ''Allahu Akbar!!!!'' he wrote. ''2 of our brothers just opened fire at the Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w) art exhibition in Texas!'' he added, using the Arabic abbreviation for ''peace be upon him.''

After Mr. Simpson's death, Mujahid Miski tweeted a series of posts, calling Mr. Simpson ''Mutawakil,'' ''One who has faith,'' a variation on Mr. Simpson's Twitter handle, ''Atawaakul,'' meaning ''To have faith.''

''I'm gonna miss Mutawakil,'' Mujahid Miski wrote. ''He was truly a man of wisdom. I'm gonna miss his greeting every morning on twitter.''

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 12, 2015]

IMPEDING THE FIGHT AGAINST TERROR

THE APPEALS-COURT RULING ON SURVEILLANCE WILL HAVE DAMAGING CONSEQUENCES IF OBAMA DOESN'T APPEAL

(By Michael B. Mukasey)

Usually, the only relevant objections to a judicial opinion concern errors of law and fact. Not so with a federal appeals court ruling on May 7 invalidating the National Security Agency's bulk collection of telephone metadata under the USA Patriot Act.

Not that the ruling by the three-judge panel of the Second Circuit in New York lacks for errors of law and fact. The panel found that when the Patriot Act, passed in the aftermath of 9/11, permitted the government to subpoena business records ''relevant'' to an authorized investigation, the statute couldn't have meant bulk telephone metadata—consisting of every calling number, called number, and the date and length of every call.

That ends up subpoenaing everything, the panel reasoned, and what is ''relevant'' is necessarily a subset of everything. In aid of this argument the panel summons not only the dictionary definition of an investigation, but also the law that relates to a grand-jury subpoena in a criminal case, which limits the government to ''relevant'' information.

Yet the judicial panel failed to consider the purpose of the statute it was analyzing. The Patriot Act concerns intelligence gathering, which is forward-looking and necessarily requires a body of data from which potentially useful information about events in the planning stage may be gathered. A grand jury investigation, by contrast, is backward-looking, and requires only limited data relating to past events. A base of data from which to gather intelligence is at least arguably ''relevant'' to an authorized intelligence investigation.

Equally serious an error is the panel's suggestion that many, perhaps most, members of Congress were unaware of the NSA's bulk metadata collection when they repeatedly reauthorized the statute, most recently in 2011. The judges suggest that an explanation of the program was available only in ''secure locations, for a limited time period and under a number of restrictions.'' In addition to being given briefing papers, lawmakers had available live briefings, including from the directors of the FBI and the National Intelligence office.

In any event, no case until the judicial panel's ruling last week has ever held that a federal tribunal may engage in telepathic hallucination to figure out whether a statute has the force of law.

The panel adds that because the program was highly classified, Congress didn't have the benefit of public debate. Which is to say, no truly authorized secret intelligence-gathering effort can exist unless we let in on the secret those from and about whom the intelligence is to be gathered. Overlooked in this exertion is the Founders' foresight about the need for secrecy—expressed in the body of the Constitution in the requirement that each legislative house publish a journal of its proceedings ''excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy.''

But isn't the misbegotten ruling by this trio of federal judges correctable on appeal? Or won't it be made moot because the Patriot Act must be reauthorized by June 1 and Congress will either enact substitute legislation, or let the statute lapse, or simply reauthorize it with full knowledge of how the program works? Here the Second Circuit's opinion is problematic in ways not immediately apparent.

The judges didn't reverse the lower-court opinion upholding the NSA data-collection program and order the program stopped. Rather, the panel simply vacated that opinion and sent the case back to the lower court to decide whether it is necessary to stop the program now. By rendering its order in a non-final form, the panel made it less likely that the Supreme Court would hear the case even if asked, because the justices generally won't take up issues that arise from non-final orders.

Moreover, the opinion tries to head off the argument that if Congress reauthorizes the Patriot Act in its current form, lawmakers will have endorsed the metadata program. The panel writes: ''If Congress fails to reauthorize Section 215 itself, or re-enacts Section 215 without expanding it to authorize the telephone metadata program, there will be no need for prospective relief, since the program will end.'' That is, unless Congress adopts the panel's view of what Congress has done, rather than its own view of what it has done, the program must end.

Then there is the opinion's timing. The case was argued eight months ago. This opinion, or one like it, easily could have been published in time for orderly review by the Supreme Court so the justices could weigh matters arguably critical to the nation's security. Or the panel could have followed the example of the D.C. Circuit and the Ninth Circuit—which have had cases involving the NSA's surveillance program pending for months—and refrained from issuing an opinion that could have no effect other than to insert the views of judges into the deliberations of the political branches.

What to do? An administration firmly committed to preserving all surveillance tools in a world that now includes al Qaeda, Islamic State and many other terror groups, would seek a quick a review by the Supreme Court. But President Obama has already stated his willingness to end bulk collection of metadata by the government. Instead, he wants to rely on a Rube Goldberg procedure that would have the data stored and searched by the telephone companies (whose computers can be penetrated and whose employees have neither the security clearance nor the training of NSA staff).

The government, under Mr. Obama's plan, would be obliged to scurry to court for permission to examine the data, and then to each telephone company in turn, with no requirement that the companies retain data and thus no guarantee that it would even be there. These constitute burdens on national security with no meaningful privacy protection.

The president's plan would make protecting national security more difficult. We would all have been better off if the Second Circuit panel had avoided needless complication and instead emulated the judicial modesty of their Ninth Circuit and D.C. Circuit colleagues.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 80, the nomination of Sally Yates to be Deputy Attorney General; that there be 1 hour for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that following disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the

table; that no further motion be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session and the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here today for the 99th time to remind us that we are sleepwalking our way to a climate catastrophe, and that it is time to wake up.

NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the United States, recently announced an ominous milestone. This March, for the first time in human history, the monthly average of CO_2 in our atmosphere exceeded 400 parts per million. This chart shows the global concentration of carbon dioxide over the last few years as measured by NOAA. The level varies with the seasons. The Earth sort of inhales and exhales carbon dioxide as the seasons pass. But overall, we can see the steady prominent upward march of CO_2 levels, rising right here to above 400 parts per million for the month of March 2015.

Scientists at NOAA's Mauna Loa Observatory in Hawaii first measured an atmospheric concentration of CO_2 above 400 parts per million in 2013—for the very first time. It reached up and it touched 400 parts per million for the first time and then receded again. Now, 2 years later, as we continue dumping carbon pollution into the atmosphere, the average weekly air sample from NOAA's entire global network of sampling stations measured an average—a month-long average—of 400 parts per million for the entire month of March. That is a daunting marker.

Global carbon concentrations haven't been this high for at least 800,000 years, much longer—much longer—than humankind has walked the Earth. Every year, that concentration increases.

The fact that increasing levels of carbon in the atmosphere warm the planet has been established science for 150 years. Science on this was being published in scientific journals when Abraham Lincoln in his top hat was walking around Washington. We have pumped more and more carbon pollution into the atmosphere, and we have measured corresponding changes in global temperatures.

Now, there is some mischief afoot, people who cherry-pick the data to create false impressions—to create false doubt. Well, the honest thing to do is to look at all of the data. When we look at all of the data, we see long-term warming. We see warming so obvious that scientists call the evidence unequivocal—unequivocal. That is about as strong a science word as we can have.

Evidence of the changing climate, the consequences of unchecked carbon pollution, abounds: more extreme weather, rising sea levels, and warming and acidifying oceans—all as predicted. These changes are already starting to hurt people, through more severe heat waves, parched fields, flooded towns and homes, altered ecosystems, and threatened fisheries. We have certainly seen the fisheries change at home in my State of Rhode Island. We are already starting to pay the price of our continued and reckless burning of fossil fuels.

Dr. James Butler, the Director of NOAA's Global Monitoring Division, says:

> Elimination of about 80 percent of fossil fuel emissions would essentially stop the rise in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, but concentrations of carbon dioxide would not start decreasing until even further reductions are made.

We need to cut our use of fossil fuels, we need to cut energy waste, and we need to generate more of our energy from clean and renewable sources. We need to do it, and we can do it. We have the technologies and the policies available right now. We can choose to level the playing field for clean energy, to make polluters pay for the climate costs of their pollution, and to move forward to a low-carbon economy—the one with the green jobs, with the American innovation, with the safer climate. But we are not going to get there with business as usual.

That brings me to the fast-track trade bill, which, I am glad to say, failed its procedural vote in the Senate this week—a bill that would make it easier for the administration to commit the United States to new sweeping trade agreements.

The first agreement waiting to get through is the Trans-Pacific Partnership—some call it the TPP—which is being sold as ''a trade deal for the 21st century.'' But when it comes to climate change, the fast-track bill and the Pacific trade bill aren't 21st century solutions. They are business as usual.

Past trade deals have not been kind to workers in Rhode Island. I have been to Rhode Island factories and seen the holes in the floor where machinery had been unbolted and shipped to other countries for foreign workers to perform the same job for the same customers on the same machines. That is what we saw from trade bills. The trade advocates always say it is going to be wonderful, but then what do we see? Jobs offshored again and a huge trade deficit.

Past U.S. trade deals have required participating countries to join some multilateral environmental agreements, including agreements to protect endangered species, whales, and tuna; to help keep the oceans free of pollution; and to protect the ozone layer by reducing the use of HFCs and other ozone-depleting gases. But I haven't seen much enforcement, and everywhere we look things are getting worse. I am not impressed.

When it comes to climate change, the fast-track bill is silent. There is no mention of, let alone protection for, commitments the United States and other countries might make to cut carbon pollution.

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change is the main international agreement for dealing with climate change. The Senate ratified this treaty in 1992, and since then, under various administrations, the United States has taken a leading role under the framework to reach global accord and, particularly, to work to reach a global accord in Paris later this winter. The Paris accord is perhaps our last best hope to put the world on a path that avoids severe climate disruption, even climate catastrophe.

That fast-track bill and the Pacific trade bill ought to enable and support our trade partners to live up to their climate agreement. Those bills ought to protect countries that act to address climate change. In particular, they ought to protect them from the threat of trade sanctions or from corporate challenges seeking to undermine sovereign countries' climate laws.

These 21st century agreements on trade ought to match our 21st century commitments on climate, but they don't. Fast-track is silent on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and on climate change more broadly. Fast-track provides no protection for our own or any other country's climate commitments. And we have heard nothing to suggest the Pacific trade bill will be any better.

What we do know about the Pacific trade bill is not encouraging. The Pacific trade bill, in its agreement under negotiation as we see it now, includes the horrible investor-state dispute settlement mechanism, called ISDS, a mechanism that allows big multinational corporations and their investors to challenge a country's domestic rules and regulations—outside of that country's judicial process, outside of any traditional judicial process, outside of appeal, outside of traditional judicial baseline principles such as precedent.

Increasingly, these ISDS challenges are being turned against countries' environmental and public health standards. Fossil fuel companies such as Chevron and ExxonMobil have brought

hundreds of disputes against almost 100 governments when those governments' policies threaten corporate profits. In fact, more than 85 percent of the more than $3 billion awarded to corporations and investors in disputes have come from challenges against natural resource, energy, and environmental policies.

Last week, on the floor I compared the Big Tobacco playbook—that is the one that was found by a Federal court to be a civil racketeering enterprise—to the fossil fuel industry's scheme to undermine climate action in the United States.

The comparisons are self-evident. Well, the tobacco industry is in on the trade challenge game as well, challenging countries' antismoking measures under the guise of protecting free trade.

If a country wants new health or environmental rules, big multinationals can use this ISDS process to thwart them. They don't necessarily even have to bring the challenge. Just threatening to seek extrajudicial judgments in the millions or even billions of dollars from panels stacked with corporate lawyers can be enough to make countries stop protecting the health of their citizens. We have seen the polluters use these tools already. This is not conjecture. It is what is happening.

Why open U.S. climate regulations to this risk? Why put our commitment to climate action at the mercy of these sketchy panels? What will keep the fossil fuel industry from threatening smaller countries in Paris to discourage them from climate accords? Where are the safeguards? Why should we accept trade deals that do not keep safe from that kind of threat a country's legitimate efforts to control carbon pollution? Why give the polluters this club?

It is not news to Congress that the fossil fuel industry does not play fair; it plays rough. We see that every day. The fossil fuel industry has used Citizens United to beat and cajole the Republican Party in Congress into becoming the political arm of the fossil fuel industry. The party that brought us Theodore Roosevelt, the party that brought us the Environmental Protection Agency, the party of my predecessor, John Chafee, who is still revered across Rhode Island as an environmentalist, has now become the political arm of the fossil fuel industry. It is not its high point in history. It is a party that lines up behind climate denial.

If the fossil fuel industry is willing to impose its will that way on the Congress, why would we trust them with this ISDS mechanism to threaten and bully governments around the rest of the world?

A 21st-century trade deal ought to acknowledge the 21st-century reality of climate change. We have right now the technology and the ingenuity to address this problem and to boost our economy into the future. For the first time in years, we have international momentum to address this threat. But it does not make sense to act on climate change in Paris and undermine climate action in our trade deals. We need to wake up to that little problem, too.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF SALLY YATES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to share some thoughts on the nomination of Ms. Sally Yates to be Deputy Attorney General. That is the second in command at the U.S. Department of Justice. It is a very important position. She has had over the years a good background in general for us to consider that she would be able to handle that job in an effective way. She understands the system. She has been at the Department of Justice for a number of years. I have no concern with her personal integrity or work ethic or her desire to do well.

However, Congress and the executive branch are on a collision course here. A lot of our Members choose not to think sufficiently about it or consider the gravity of it, but I have to say that Congress needs to defend its institutional powers. We have certain powers we can use to defend constitutionally the responsibilities we have and to reject executive overreach—not many, but we have some real powers we can use.

Apparently, it is all right for the President to use all his powers and more. It is perfectly all right, I suggest, that we in the Senate use the powers we clearly and unequivocally and indisputably have.

I want to tell you how I see the situation with this nomination. I asked her directly at her confirmation hearing, as a member of the Judiciary committee, could she answer yes or no—did she think that the President's Executive amnesty is legal and constitutional. Basically, she said yes, she did. She answered that she has been ''serving as the Acting Deputy Attorney General of the Department of Justice. And the Department of Justice is currently litigating this matter.'' She further stated that ''the Department of Justice has filed pleadings with its position and I stand by those pleadings,'' which I suppose she should.

Two things about that. Historically, the Attorney General of the United States understands that their role is different from a lower official, but indeed they have to advise the President on matters of constitutional authority and tell the President no when a strong-willed President wants to do something that is not correct.

They are not a judicial officer; they are part of the executive branch. They should try to help the President achieve things the President wants to achieve as a matter of policy. I do not dispute that. But at some point, if the President is seeking to do clearly unconstitutional or illegal, they should tell the President so and not acquiesce, in my opinion. The honorable thing to do, as has been done in the past, is to resign. But if an Attorney General is firm and clear and stands in a firm position, then often the President will back down and avoid a constitutional crisis and keep our government going in the right way.

The Deputy Attorney General is the Department's second-ranking official and functions as its chief operating officer. The 25 components and 93 U.S. attorneys—I was a U.S. attorney for 12 years, 15 years at the Department of Justice; I am proud of that service and proud of the Department of Justice—they report directly to the Deputy, and 13 additional components report to the Deputy through the Associate Attorney General. So, on a daily basis, the Deputy Attorney General decides a broad range of legal, policy, and operational issues.

Ms. Yates, I suggest, is a high ranking official who holds a position—unlike a U.S. attorney or some section chief—who is involved in the policymaking of the Department of Justice. In addition to that, the litigation going on in Texas before Judge Andrew Hanen is under her direct supervision, and she is monitoring the lawyers who are advocating a position that is opposed by a majority of the State attorneys general of the United States. A majority of them have filed a lawsuit, and they contend that the President's Executive amnesty—an even more dramatic assertion of Executive power than his original amnesty in 2012—is contrary to the law and Constitution. She is direct supervisor over that litigation.

On April 7 of this year, Judge Andrew Hanen issued a blistering opinion in the litigation that is ongoing that the Justice Department attorneys had made ''multiple misrepresentations'' to the court ''both in writing and orally that no action would be taken pursuant to the 2014 DHS Directive until February 18, 2015.''

I would like to read some of the comments from the judge's opinion. Judges take this seriously; they are not just saying these things for fun.

Judge Hanen said this:

> Whether by ignorance, omission, purposeful misdirection, or because they were misled by their clients, the attorneys for the Government misrepresented the facts.

He didn't say that lightly. When U.S. attorneys and other Federal prosecutors appear in court, they have an absolute duty to tell the truth. It is a responsibility that every judge knows and every government attorney knows. When a government attorney goes into court and they are asked whether they are ready, they reply: The United States is ready, Your Honor. They have a duty to respond consistently with the integrity of the United States of America. We all know that.

In this case, the government lawyers asserted that:

No applications for the revised DACA would be accepted until the 18th of February, and that no action would be taken on any of those applications until March the 4th.

Regarding this, Judge Hanen said:

This representation was made even as the Government was in the process of granting over 100,000 three-year renewals under the revised DACA.

It goes on:

In response to this representation, counsel for the States agreed to a schedule more favorable to the Government, and the Court granted the Government's request not only to file a sur-reply, but also to have additional time to do so. The States now argue that they would have sought a temporary restraining order, but for the Government's misrepresentations. A review of the Chronology of Events, attached as an appendix to this Order, certainly lends credence to the States' claims.

That is a pretty serious allegation. Not only did they misrepresent key facts, but they used that misrepresentation to achieve a favorable schedule, which often in litigation is important.

The judge goes on to say:

The explanation by Defendants' counsel for their conduct after the fact is even more troublesome for the Court. Counsel told the Court during its latest hearing that she was unaware that these 2014 DACA amendments were at issue until she read the Court's February 16, 2015 Order of Temporary Injunction and Memorandum Opinion and Order. Counsel then claimed that the Government took ''prompt'' remedial action. This assertion is belied by the facts. Even if one were to assume that counsel was unaware that the 2014 DACA amendments in their entirety were at issue until reading this Court's February Opinion, the factual scenario still does not suggest candor on the part of the Government.

Government counsel have an absolute duty of candor to the court. That is a serious charge by the Federal judge.

It goes on:

The February Opinion was issued late in the evening on February 16, 2015 (based on the representation that ''nothing'' would happen on DAPA or revised DACA until at least February 18, 2015). As the February Opinion was finalized and filed at night, counsel could not have been expected to review it until the next day; yet, for the next two weeks, the Government did nothing to inform the Court of the 108,081 revised DACA approvals. Instead, less than a week later, on February 23, 2015, the Government filed a Motion to Stay and a Notice of Appeal. Despite having had almost a week to disclose the truth—or correct any omission, misunderstanding, confusion, or misrepresentation—the Government did not act promptly; instead it again did nothing. Surely, an advisory to this Court (or even to the Court of Appeals) could have been included in either document filed during this time period. Yet, counsel for the Government said nothing.

So the court goes on:

Mysteriously, what was included in the Government's February 23, 2015 Motion to Stay was a request that this Court rule on the Motion ''by the close of business on Wednesday, February 25. . . .''—in other words, within two days. Had the Court complied with this request, it would have cut off the States' right to file any kind of reply. If this Court had ruled according to the Government's requested schedule, it would have ruled without the Court or the States knowing that the Government had granted 108,081 applications pursuant to the revised DACA despite its multiple representations to the contrary.

The attorneys were telling the Court they had not granted any of these applications and had stopped it while, in fact, over 108,000 applications had been issued.

The court goes on to say:

While this Court is skeptical that the Government's attorneys could have reasonably believed that the DACA amendments contained in the 2014 DHS Directive were not at issue prior to the injunction hearing on January 15, 2015, this Court finds it even less conceivable that the Government could have thought so after the January 15, 2015 hearing, given the interplay between the Court and counsel at that hearing. Regardless, by their own admission, the Government's lawyers knew about it at least as of February 17, 2015. Yet, they stood silent. Even worse, they urged this Court to rule before disclosing that the Government had already issued 108,081 three-year renewals under the 2014 DACA amendments despite their statements to the contrary.

The judge goes on to say:

Another week passed after the Motion to Stay was filed and still the Government stood mute . . . Still, the Government's lawyers were silent . . . Finally, after waiting two weeks, and after the States had filed their reply, the Government lawyers filed their Advisory that same night at 6:57 p.m. CST. Thus, even under the most charitable interpretation of these circumstances, and based solely upon what counsel for the Government told the Court, the Government knew its representations had created ''confusion,'' but kept quiet about it for two weeks while simultaneously pressing this Court to rule on the merits of its motion. At the March 19, 2015 hearing, counsel for the Government repeatedly stated to the Court that they had acted ''promptly'' to clarify any ''confusion'' they may have caused. But the facts clearly show these statements to be disingenuous. The Government did anything but act ''promptly'' to clarify the Government-created ''confusion.''

The judge goes on to quote the rules of professional conduct:

The ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct . . . require a lawyer to act with complete candor in his or her dealings with the Court. Under these rules of conduct, a lawyer must be completely truthful and forthright in making representations to the Court. Fabrications, misstatements, half-truths, artful omissions, and the failure to correct misstatements may be acceptable, albeit lamentable, in other aspects of life; but in the courtroom, when an attorney knows that both the Court and the other side are relying on complete frankness, such conduct is unacceptable.

I don't think that is a little matter. I am just saying this nominee had those lawyers under her supervision at the time this occurred. We have had a lot of talk over the years from Democrats and Republicans about demanding higher standards of professionalism among government prosecutors and lawyers. I think that is a legitimate demand. We have had too many examples of failures.

Sometimes lawyers—I have seen it—for the government have been unfairly criticized. I don't think there is any dispute that the judge's findings in this case represent an accurate statement of the misrepresentations and disingenuousness of these attorneys.

Has any discipline been undertaken against them? I am not saying Ms. Yates knew this. I am just saying that if you are the responsible supervisor, shouldn't you take some action to deal with it, and to my knowledge, none has been taken, even at some point the Department of Justice suggested they did nothing wrong.

Basically, the Department of Justice has said the court is incorrect in its finding, which I don't think can be justified.

On May 7, 2015, the Department of Justice notified the court of an additional misrepresentation regarding approximately 2,000 individuals being granted three-year work authorizations subsequent to this opinion and in violation of the original court order.

OK. So you say, well, maybe she is not responsible for that, but I do believe the Deputy Attorney General—acting now—is responsible for taking action against attorneys who breached the proper standards of ethical conduct. But we are drifting too far, in my opinion, into a postmodern world, where rules don't seem to make much difference. You can just redefine the meaning of words and you can just say—once caught in some wrongdoing—well, we didn't mean it or that is not correct or the facts are different, when the facts show what the facts show. It is an unhealthy trend in this country, I think. It is particularly unacceptable in the Department of Justice. That was a great department. It has high standards. It is filled with many of the best lawyers of the highest integrity anywhere in the world, but sloppy work and disingenuousness cannot be acceptable. I believe the Department of Justice needs to do more, and the primary responsibility, it seems to me, is with the Deputy Attorney General.

Well, what about the fundamental problem of Congress's power to deal with a President who overreaches, a

President who makes law rather than enforces law? We learned in elementary school that Congress makes law and the President enforces law. The Chief Executive cannot make up law. He cannot issue decrees and then declare they are the law of the land. How fundamental is that?

Professor Jonathan Turley at George Washington University Law School is a constitutional expert and a supporter of President Obama. He testified before our Judiciary Committee, and other committees, a number of times over the years, mostly for the Democrats, I think—at least from the times I remember. This is what Professor Turley has warned Congress about.

I urge colleagues to understand what we are considering here. He said:

I believe the President has exceeded his brief. The president is required to faithfully execute the laws. He's not required to enforce all laws equally or commit the same resources through them. But I believe the President has crossed the constitutional line in some of these areas.

Here he is referring to the original DACA. He said:

This goes to the very heart of what is the Madisonian system. If a president can unilaterally change the meaning of laws in substantial ways or refuse to enforce them, it takes offline that very thing that stabilizes our system. I believe the members will loathe the day that they allow this to happen.

He is testifying before the House of Representatives and talking directly to Members of Congress. He said that you will loathe the day that you allowed this to happen.

He also said:

This will not be our last president. There will be more presidents who will claim the same authority.

He further said:

The problem of what the President is doing is that he is not simply posing a danger to the constitutional system; he is becoming the very danger the Constitution was designed to avoid: that is, the concentration of power in a single branch. This Newtonian orbit that the three branches exist in is a delicate one, but it is designed to prevent this type of concentration.

That is what Professor Turley said to the Members of the House of Representatives. He goes on to say:

We are creating a new system here, something that is not what was designed. We have this rising fourth branch in a system that is tripartite. The center of gravity is shifting, and that makes it unstable. And within that system, you have the rise of an uber presidency. There could be no greater danger for individual liberty, and I really think that the framers would be horrified by that shift because everything they've dedicated themselves to was creating this orbital balance, and we've lost it.

We need to listen to this. The President is issuing orders that nullify law, actually creating an entirely new system of immigration that Congress rejected. He proposed all of this, and Congress flatly refused to pass it. He then declares he has the power to do this system anyway, and he is doing it. This judge has finally stopped part of it for the moment.

Professor Turley is talking about deep constitutional questions and what our duty is here. It is not a question of what you believe about immigration or how you should believe the laws are to be written or enforced. We can debate that. But there should be unanimous agreement on both sides of the aisle that the President enforce the laws we have—the laws duly passed by Congress—and not create some new law and enforce them.

Mr. Turley goes on to say:

I believe that [Congress] is facing a critical crossroads in terms of its continued relevance in this process. What this body cannot become is a debating society where it can issue rules and laws that are either complied with or not complied with by the president. . . . [A] president cannot ignore an express statement on policy grounds. . . . Is this [Congress] truly the body that existed when it was formed? Does it have the same gravitational pull and authority that was given to it by the framers?

That is what Mr. Turley says. Then he looks directly at the Members of Congress and says:

You're the keepers of this authority. You took an oath to uphold it. And the framers assumed that you would have the institutional wherewithal, and, frankly, ambition to defend the turf that is the legislative branch.

I think that is a legitimate charge to the Members of Congress—House and Senate.

Professor Turley goes on to say:

The current passivity of Congress represents a crisis for members, crisis of faith for members willing to see a president assume legislative powers in exchange for insular policy gains. The short term insular victories achieved by this president will come at a prohibitive cost if the balance is not corrected. Constitutional authority is easy to lose in the transient shift to politics. It's far more difficult to regain. If a passion for the Constitution does not motivate members of Congress, perhaps a sense of self-preservation will be enough to unify members. President Obama will not be our last president. However, these acquired powers will be passed on to his successors. When that occurs, members may loathe the day that they remain silent as the power of government shifted so radically to the chief executive. The powerful personality that engendered this loyalty will be gone, but the powers will remain. We are now at the Constitutional tipping point of our system. If balance is to be reestablished, it must begin before this president leaves office, and that will likely require every possible means to reassert legislative authority.

What is our authority? How do we reassert power? I believe it is perfectly constitutionally appropriate for us to tell the President of the United States: We are not going to confirm your nominee for Deputy Attorney General of the United States, who is directly supervising the lawsuits, the litigation that is going on that undermines our power and undermines the constitutional authority of the people's branch.

We are not going to confirm them and allow them to continue to go to court every day and take a position directly contrary to the authority that has been given by the Constitution to the Congress. That is pretty simple. So we have that power. We can confirm or not confirm any nominee to any position. We absolutely should not abuse that power. We shouldn't attack people personally and attack their ethics just because we disagree with their policies.

I think Ms. Yates, as I said, is a responsible person, but she is the point person, the supervisor of a litigation that has gone awry in a number of ways in Texas and fundamentally is seeking to advance an unconstitutional power by the Chief Executive. I don't believe it is a little matter. I think it is a big matter. Therefore, I will not vote for her confirmation on that basis.

Some of our Members haven't thought this through yet, but sooner or later we are going to have to confront the stark question of how long can we remain effectively silent in the face of Presidential overreach.

Professor Turley, in January of this year testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee during the confirmation hearing for the Attorney General nominee, and added these words: ''If there is an alternative in unilateral executive action, the legislative process becomes purely optional and discretionary.''

In other words, if the Chief Executive can execute an alternative power to pass laws and execute policies he wants if they are contrary to Congress's will, then the legislative process becomes purely optional and discretionary. It has to be mandatory. It can't be that our power is optional.

He goes on to say:

The real meaning of a president claiming discretion to negate or change Federal law is the discretion to use or ignore the legislative process. No actor in a Madisonian system is given such discretion. All three branches are meant to be locked in a type of constitutional synchronous orbit—held stable by their countervailing gravitational pull. If one of those bodies shifts, the stability of the system is lost.

So the President does not have the power to ignore the legislative process, and we are going to regret this day if we remain silent on this issue.

I appreciate the opportunity to share this with my colleagues. I don't know if anybody is listening at this point. Certainly the American people were horrified by the Executive amnesty carried out by the President last year. He announced it before the election but held off until afterward. Still, there is no doubt in my mind that many of the people who went to the polls in November were voting for a rejection of this kind of Executive overreach. It was a message of this past election.

We took our seats in January, a new Congress is here, and Professor Turley has said we need to act and we are not

acting. Professor Turley has said we need to stand up to the Chief Executive, this Chief Executive while he is in office now, and if we don't, when we go to another election cycle, the powers he has aggrandized to himself will be claimed by the next President.

Truly so. That is a grim warning he has given us. I am ready and I think it is time for us to stand up and be clear about this.

So, regretfully, I feel compelled to carry out one of the powers Congress has clearly been given—the power to confirm or reject nominations for higher office. I believe we should reject the nomination for the Department of Justice Deputy Attorney General who is advocating and pursuing a lawsuit that goes against the constitutional powers of the Congress, and therefore I will be voting no on the nomination.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMTRAK TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to bring attention to the tragic Amtrak derailment that took at least 7 lives and caused over 140 injuries, including an Associated Press member from New Jersey, Jim Gaines of Plainsboro, NJ. Our thoughts and prayers are with the families of those who lost their lives. To those of us from New Jersey and those who live along the Northeast corridor, they are our neighbors, our friends, our relatives. They could be us. It hits especially close to home. I know, because I take Amtrak virtually every week back to New Jersey.

There was a period of time last night when I did not know the whereabouts of my son Rob, who was scheduled to be on Amtrak back to New York. But I later found out that he was on the next train immediately behind the one that derailed, and thankfully, he was safe. I am grateful for that. But others were not so lucky.

But luck should not be America's transportation policy. It is imperative that the cause of the derailment be fully investigated so that we can prevent tragedies such as these in the future. I have already been on the phone with Secretary of Transportation Anthony Fox and continue to monitor closely the situation.

I want to recognize the extraordinary work of our first responders. Once again, firefighters, police officers, and emergency responders showed us what bravery is all about. They ran to the crash site to save lives while others were running away. For that, we should all be grateful.

Now, we do not know what caused this accident. But we do know that we need to invest in 21st-century systems and equipment and stop relying on patchwork upgrades to old, rusted 19th century rail lines.

I travel Amtrak, as I said, virtually every week. I travel the Acela, which is supposed to be our high-speed rail. It is like shake, rattle, and roll. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have traveled in other countries in the world, such as Japan. They have a bullet train in which you virtually cannot feel anything while you are on the train, going at speeds far in excess of what we call high-speed rail.

Now, there are still many questions to which we do not know the answers. Was there human failure? Was there a mechanical failure or were there infrastructure issues or was it a combination of issues? What we do know is that our rail passengers deserve safe and modern infrastructure. New Jersey, for example, is at the heart of the Northeast corridor. It has long held a competitive advantage with some of the Nation's most modern highways, an extensive transit network, and some of the most significant freight corridors in the world at the confluence of some of the largest and busiest rail lines, interstates, and ports.

In a densely populated State such as New Jersey, the ability to move people and goods safely and efficiently is critical to our economy and critical to our quality of life. But, unfortunately, in recent years, New Jersey and the Nation as a whole have fallen behind. We have 20 years maximum—maximum—before the Hudson River tunnels are taken out of service. Twenty years may sound maybe to some of our young pages like a long time, but it is a flash of the eye. Think about what happens if we take either or both of those tunnels out of service without an alternative, tunnels that are absolutely essential to moving people and goods in the region that contributes $3.5 trillion to our Nation's economy—20 percent of the entire Nation's gross domestic product.

Nationwide, 65 percent of major roads in America are in poor condition. One in four bridges in our Nation needs significant repair. There is an $808 billion backlog in highway and bridge investment needs. On the transit side, there is an $86 billion backlog of transit maintenance needs—maintenance needs, not expanding, just maintaining that which we have.

It will take almost $19 billion a year through the year 2030 to bring our transit assets into good repair. These are just a handful of the statistics underscoring our Nation's failure to invest in our transportation network. But we have to get beyond looking at the numbers on a page. We have to talk about what Congress's failure to act means to the people we represent, to every community—every community, every commuter, every family, everyone who travels every day, and every construction worker looking for a job.

Failure to act means construction workers now face a 10-percent unemployment rate, and at a time when our infrastructure is crumbling around us, they will not get the work they need. It means a business cannot compete in a globalized economy because their goods cannot get to market in time. It means a working mother is stuck in traffic and cannot get home in time for dinner with her kids. In the very worst cases—cases such as the one we saw yesterday on Amtrak—it very well means that a loved one is lost in a senseless tragedy.

In Congress, we too often treat our infrastructure as if it is an academic exercise, as if it is numbers on a page that we adjust to score political points or balance a budget or make an argument about what types of transportation are worthy of our support. But that is not the real world. In the real world, the choices we make have an impact on people's lives, on their jobs, on their income. They have an impact on our Nation's ability to compete. They have an impact on the safety of Americans and America's ability to lead globally the economy in the world.

We in Congress are failing to recognize the real-world impacts of the choices we make about our transportation infrastructure. We have a passenger rail bill that expired in 2013. We have a highway trust fund on the brink of insolvency, with no plans—no plans—to fix it sustainably. We have a crowded and outdated aviation system that we refuse to adequately fund. We have failed to upgrade with presently available technologies that can reduce the number of failures. We have appropriations bills aiming to cut already-low funding levels of Amtrak, in particular, to meet an arbitrary budget cap for the sake of political points.

I cannot understand that. I cannot understand that. We are living off the greatest generation's investment in infrastructure in this country. We have done nothing to honor that investment, to sustain it or to build upon it. Yet nothing we are doing is aimed at fixing the problem. Our inaction comes with an extraordinarily high cost. So I can tell you, as the senior Democrat on the subcommittee on mass transit, I categorically reject the idea that we cannot afford to fix our transportation system.

The truth is, we cannot afford not to fix it. The Amtrak disaster last night is a tragic reminder that we have to act. We are reminded of the tragic consequences of inaction and the impact of inaction on the lives of workers and

families, on their lives and their ability to get to work and do their jobs with confidence that they will be safe.

So, as a member of the Finance Committee, and the ranking member of the transit subcommittee, I have been advocating that we act as soon as possible. We cannot keep pretending the problem is going to resolve itself if we just wait long enough. We simply cannot afford to wait. I hope that everyone in this Chamber—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike—will come together, will work together, and make real progress in building the future that we can be proud of.

We can start by putting politics aside to think about the safety of the American people, to think about the future, to think about America's competitiveness, and to find common ground to do whatever it takes to invest in America's railroads, ports, highways, and bridges, and to invest in our future.

So let's not wait until there is another tragic headline or to see the consequences of what flows, as people along the entire Northeast corridor are trying to figure out alternatives in the midst of a system that is now shut down for intercity travel—all the transit lines of States and regions within the Northeast corridor that depend upon using Amtrak lines to get to different destinations for their residents, to get people to one of the great hospitals along the Northeast corridor, to get people to their Nation's Capital to advocate with their government, to get people and the sales forces of companies to work, to get home.

Let's not wait until we have another tragedy to think about the consequences of our transportation system, what it means to the Nation, or until the next time when lives are lost. I think we can do much better. I have faith that hopefully this will be a crystalizing moment for us on this critical issue.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SALLY QUILLIAN YATES TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sally Quillian Yates, of Georgia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be up to 1 hour of debate, equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am delighted we have the confirmation of Sally Yates before the body. I have pushed for a vote for several weeks, and now I know we are finally going to confirm Sally Yates to be our next Deputy Attorney General of the United States. I think she will be easily confirmed. I know there has been a delay of several weeks getting her here, but I thank Senator ISAKSON, who worked so hard to get her before this body. It should not have taken this long. Ms. Yates was voted out of the Judiciary Committee with overwhelming bipartisan support almost 3 weeks ago. We are finally voting to confirm her today to serve as the second highest law enforcement office in our country, and it is long past due. This is the least we can do to honor law enforcement, as it is National Police Week.

The Deputy Attorney General is critical to the efficient functioning of the Department of Justice. The person serving in that position works diligently behind the scenes. The position requires someone who is of utmost competence, who prioritizes the Department above all else, and who executes the mission and vision of the Attorney General.

We are actually fortunate here. We will have an Attorney General and a Deputy Attorney General whose backgrounds are very similar—both have shown their ability as law enforcement officers, both have been prosecuting attorneys, and both have similar views, as we saw during the confirmation hearings, on all the major issues.

Sally Yates is an ideal person for this position, as those who know her can attest. She was born and raised in Atlanta, GA. She grew up seeing the justice system as a force for good. There was no need to look outside her home for an Atticus Finch to look up to because her family members lived that example. Her father, Kelly Quillian, was a judge on the Georgia Court of Appeals; her grandfather, Joseph Quillian, was a justice on the Georgia Supreme Court; and at a time when women did not fill the ranks of the legal system, her grandmother, Tabitha Quillian, became one of the first women to be admitted to the Georgia bar. Ms. Yates carried on that family tradition, becoming a top-notch lawyer who has prioritized public service above all else.

For more than 25 years, Sally Yates served as a prosecutor in the Office of the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia. For the past 5 years she has served as U.S. Attorney of that district, following her unanimous confirmation by the Senate in 2010.

Since January of this year, she has served as Acting Deputy Attorney General. I have been at briefings she has given to Members of the Senate. I have also been at briefings at the White House where she has briefed the President on issues before the country. She is an experienced and dedicated prosecutor with a well-deserved reputation for fairness, integrity, and toughness.

She is perhaps best known for her successful prosecutions of the Atlanta Olympics bomber, who pled guilty in exchange for a life sentence without parole; and for her prosecution and conviction of a former Atlanta mayor for tax evasion. However, if you were to ask her the most significant case she has taken on, she will tell you that it involved a pro bono representation when she was just out of law school.

As a junior associate at a law firm, Ms. Yates represented the first African-American family to own land in Barrow County, GA, in a property dispute. The family had obtained a deed to their property, but lacking trust in the court system, had failed to record their deed in a timely manner. As a result, when the adjoining property was sold, a dispute arose as to who owned part of the land. Ms. Yates filed suit to recover the family's property. After a 1-week trial—in which she helped convince a member of the ''Dixie Mafia'' to testify in court on behalf of the family—she was able to win the case before an all-white jury.

According to Ms. Yates, it was the most meaningful case of her career because it gave the African American family she represented a sense of trust in the judicial system that they previously lacked. This case represents who she is as an attorney: someone who uses the judicial system as a force for good.

It is also an example of why she will thrive as the Deputy Attorney General. While most people seek the spotlight by pursuing high-profile matters, Sally Yates devotes herself to the matters that are less glamorous, but just as important.

Ms. Yates also deserves praise for her dedication to sentencing reform and the clemency initiative begun by her predecessor, Jim Cole. It is encouraging to see that we will continue to have individuals in the Justice Department's leadership who understand the inequities in our criminal justice system's sentencing practices and the consequences of mass incarceration. As she made clear when she testified before the Judiciary Committee, sentencing reform is critical to ensure that we better allocate our limited law enforcement resources and to make our country safer. The clemency initiative is an important part of that process as well and I am glad that I have her commitment that it will be a priority.

Sally Yates has received strong bipartisan support for her nomination. Among the letters of support the Judiciary Committee has received are those

from Georgia's Republican Governor, Nathan Deal; Georgia's Republican Attorney General, Samuel Olens; and former Democratic Senator from Georgia, Sam Nunn. She also has the support of law enforcement and civil rights leaders.

At her nomination hearing, Ms. Yates was introduced by Congressman JOHN LEWIS, Senator PERDUE and Senator ISAKSON. As Senator ISAKSON noted when Ms. Yates was first nominated this past December, ''Sally Yates is an exceptionally skilled attorney with a strong record of public service and a well-qualified nominee to be Deputy Attorney General.'' Prior to his retirement, Senator Saxby Chambliss also spoke out in support of Ms. Yates' nomination.

Almost 3 weeks ago, her nomination was voted out of Committee with strong bipartisan support, so this nomination should not be an occasion for further partisanship. The responsibilities of the Deputy Attorney General are too important to the safety and security of all Americans to be held up any longer. The dedicated public servants at the Justice Department deserve a confirmed leader in this crucial position, and I know Sally Yates will serve with distinction as our next Deputy Attorney General of the United States. I thank her for her willingness to continue to serve this great Nation, and I want to publicly congratulate her on this well-deserved appointment.

TRIBUTE TO ERIC HOLDER

Mr. President, I want to talk about a different but related issue.

Two weeks ago, after 5 long months, Loretta Lynch was finally sworn in as the 83rd Attorney General of the United States. I know she is going to be an exceptional Attorney General, and she has an exceptional deputy in Sally Yates. But I want to speak here about the remarkable service of Eric Holder, who has just left as Attorney General.

Many don't realize that he came to the Justice Department as a 25-year-old law school graduate in 1976. He has served at nearly every level of the Department over the past four decades. I believe we owe him our gratitude for his commitment to public service.

I also know on a personal basis how much Marcelle and I appreciate the friendship we have with Eric and his wonderful wife, Sharon.

When Eric Holder's nomination was first announced in 2008, I said that we needed an Attorney General who, as Robert Jackson said 68 years ago, ''serves the law and not factual purposes, and who approaches his task with humility.'' Well, that is what I said we needed, and that is what we got. It is the kind of man Eric Holder is and the kind of Attorney General he has been. He understands our moral and legal obligation to protect the fundamental rights of all Americans and to respect the human rights of all people. His leadership over the past 6 years shows us that.

I was there when he was sworn in as the 82nd Attorney General. His family was there—his wife, mother, children, and others. Upon being sworn in, he immediately changed the tone of the Department. As he finished taking the oath, you heard this roar throughout the marbled and granite halls of the Department of Justice. The building literally shook with cheers. The dedicated professionals knew the Department was once again going to be dedicated to a nonpartisan search for justice for all Americans. These are highly professional and highly dedicated men and women appointed by both Republican and Democratic administrations, who set aside politics. They just want professionalism. And they knew, with Eric Holder, they would get it.

His decision to dismiss the charges brought during the Bush administration against former Senator Ted Stevens because of prosecutorial misconduct was a courageous decision. But, more importantly, it sent a strong message that misconduct would not be tolerated under his watch, and the Department would adhere to the highest ethical standards.

This sense of fairness and justice also led Eric to restore what he fondly refers to as the conscience of the Nation, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.

His work on voting rights is among the most important during his tenure, and in the last 6 years, he has had his work cut out for him. After the Supreme Court's disastrous decision in Shelby County v. Holder, where a narrow majority gutted the Voting Rights Act, the Attorney General recommitted the Justice Department to safeguarding the right to vote for every American. And that he did so at a time when these constitutional rights were under attack has been supremely important.

For Eric Holder, this cause is not new. It is as deep as his family roots, which include the work of his late sister-in-law Vivian Malone, Sharon's sister, who fought against segregation and for equal rights as a college student, seeking admittance to the University of Alabama in 1963. I know that Eric is deeply proud of her and of the countless brave men and women who fought for equal voting rights and civil rights for every American. Each generation has its trailblazers who contribute to our march toward equality. I and my family believe that history will count Eric Holder among those patriots.

Eric Holder did not simply look to correct the misguided practices of a previous administration. He sought to bring this Nation forward with an acute understanding that the fight for civil rights is not a single movement of five decades ago. The fight, as he knows, continues.

Attorney General Holder recognized that the constitutionality of the Defense of Marriage Act, which discriminated against Americans simply for whom they loved, could no longer be defended by the Justice Department. The Supreme Court's decision to strike down section 3 of DOMA vindicated his decision. Some argued that it was the Justice Department's duty and obligation to defend the constitutionality of that statute. But just as our country came to see separate as inherently unequal, I believe Attorney General Holder's decision will be further vindicated with time. Discrimination has no place in our laws. Rooting it out takes leadership—the kind of leadership Eric Holder is known for.

He also recognized the inequities in our criminal justice system and the consequences of mass incarceration. Our criminal justice system serves to imprison too many offenders for too long. This has resulted in our Federal prisons at nearly 40 percent overcapacity, consuming nearly one quarter of the Justice Department's budget. And this growth has been largely driven by our misplaced reliance on drug mandatory minimums. These mandatory minimums too often see no difference between drug couriers and drug kingpins.

Attorney General Holder's ''Smart on Crime'' Initiative, along with Congress's effort to reform our Nation's sentencing laws, has been an essential step toward addressing these problems. No Attorney General in our Nation's history has recognized the inequities of our criminal justice system more than Eric Holder. He has proven that addressing these inequities leads to a more effective system. In fact, with Eric Holder, as our Nation's chief law enforcement officer, last year—for the first time in 40 years—the overall crime rate and the overall incarceration rate declined together.

The Attorney General's commitment to fairness went well beyond sentencing reform. I look at the calm that he brought when he visited Ferguson, MO, in the midst of chaos and fear. He helped to bridge the distrust between law enforcement and the Ferguson community. He deserves praise for the Justice Department's investigation and reporting of the police department and the circumstances surrounding that shooting. These reports are scrupulously fair and they are fact-based. His work has made the city of Ferguson reassess its practices, but it has also provided a path forward for both law enforcement and the broader community alike.

Now, to go to one other point. I share Attorney General Holder's belief that we should not be afraid to prosecute terrorists in our Federal courts in accordance with the rule of law.

With Eric's leadership, we proved we could hold terrorists accountable by making them answer for their crimes in public, for the world to see. Since Attorney General Holder assumed office, the Department of Justice has secured over 180 terrorism-related convictions. This shows his dedication to upholding the rule of law, even under the most difficult of circumstances. That is arguably one of his most enduring legacies.

I know a number of people, including some on this floor, would stand up and say: Well, we should lock these terrorists up at Guantanamo. We are afraid to let them come to our country. We should not allow them here.

Instead, Eric Holder said: What are we afraid of? We have the finest criminal justice system in the world. Bring them here; let the rest of the world see what happens.

One by one, he did just that. They were each convicted, and they are all serving extremely difficult sentences. What he said is, we should not turn our backs on the values of America by locking them up in Guantanamo—a place so many of us feel should be closed. Let them come before our court system. Let's make sure they are adequately represented—both sides.

The list of his accomplishments goes on. The Attorney General's leadership ensured that the most vulnerable Americans are protected by the Justice Department, including those who have suffered from hate crimes, domestic violence, and human trafficking. He guided the Department's steadfast implementation of vital legislation which passed through Congress, including the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act and the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. These historic civil rights bills greatly expanded protections for the LGBT community, for rape victims, and for Native American domestic violence victims. As one who led the fight on many of these issues, I can tell my fellow Senators that it would have been impossible to pass them without Eric Holder's powerful commitment to protecting the most vulnerable among us.

I talked about how when he returned to the Justice Department in 2009, career attorneys lined the hallways to welcome back one of their own—cheers shook those walls. It had been a very difficult time for the Department. During the previous administration, there were scandals of politicized hiring, the decimating of the Civil Rights Division, the U.S. Attorney firing scandal, and the legal opinions defending the use of torture. But 6 years later, in his final day at the Department, those same professionals, appointed by both Republican and Democratic administrations, again lined the hallways in gratitude to Eric Holder for his work restoring integrity to the Department. Eric Holder restored the public's confidence in the Department. He leaves a Department that is now living up to its name, the Department of Justice.

I am thankful for his dedicated, unwavering service to our country. We have a better Department of Justice because of Eric Holder's leadership. We are a better nation because of Eric Holder.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am in support of Ms. Sally Quillian Yates, of Georgia, to be the next Deputy Attorney General of the United States.

Ms. Yates has been acting as Deputy Attorney General since January of this year and has a long and successful career in public service. Graduating from the University of Georgia School of Law in 1986, with honors of magna cum laude, she went on to spend more than 20 years ensuring our streets were safe and our rights were protected in the U.S. attorney's office in Georgia. Ms. Yates served as the chief of the fraud and public corruption section and was the lead prosecutor in the case against Eric Rudolph, the Olympic Park Bomber in Atlanta.

She was the first woman to serve as U.S. attorney in the Northern District of Georgia, confirmed by this body on March 10, 2010. Ms. Yates also served as vice chair of the Attorney General's Advisory Committee.

Ms. Yates has not been afraid to take on complex and challenging cases and has handled herself with professionalism and integrity. She is effective in problemsolving and provides reasonable and rational solutions. I am confident she will serve the American people with distinction and dedication. I look forward to working with her in my role as vice chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

AMTRAK TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, just a quick comment, if I may, about this tragedy that is now up to 7 deaths and about 150 people who were injured in this Amtrak derailment. There was a report out of the Wall Street Journal just a few minutes ago that apparently the train was going 100 miles per hour going into a curve and that the curve speed should have been 50 miles per hour. If that is the case, that would indicate the conductor would not have been aware of what was happening or was negligent in what was happening. But there is something we can do about that, and it is called positive train control. Indeed, this is an issue which is facing all of the railroads. The infrastructure is very expensive, and the question is, How much should it be delayed in the future because it is not ready to go?

Positive train control would—in places where there is potential danger or the potential of two trains colliding, there is automatic monitoring, and electronically it would change the speed of the train.

Interestingly, Amtrak in the Northeast corridor already has some of this positive train control on the tracks, but apparently it did not at this particular location, in which case, that begs the question, What do we need to do if this is ultimately, by the NTSB investigation, determined to be the cause?

One of the things this Senator would suggest is that we certainly do not want to cut Amtrak's budget. To the contrary, I would think we would want to increase Amtrak's budget. I am rounding numbers here, but Amtrak basically has about $3 billion in revenues, but they have about $4 billion in expenses. The difference is made up by the Federal Government. In the past, that difference has been about $1.4 billion. The House is considering legislation that would cut that down to $1.1 billion, when, in fact, Amtrak is asking for $2 billion.

Is the funding the only question? I do not think we will know until we get the NTSB investigation report. However, we should know this: Railroads and roads and bridges and other infrastructure are in desperate need of repair and enhancement and expansion, and that is going to take revenue.

Is this country going to allow itself to be considered a third-rate country in infrastructure? By the way, that is not even to speak about what infrastructure does when you build it, the number of jobs. If you talk to road builders, they will tell you that for every billion dollars, thousands of new jobs are created.

Confronting the safety issue is what we are focused on here with this terrible accident. Our heart goes out to the victims. But at the same time, we have to look to the future, and we have to get our heads out—our collective heads—of the sand and start producing the funding for infrastructure investment.

I think back to the time in the depths of the recession—as the Senator from Vermont will recognize—that we were going to do an economic stimulus bill. We tried to get increased infrastructure spending, and we were voted down in the stimulus bill. Here we are years later, out of the recession, the economy is returning, the jobs are increasing, but our infrastructure is still crumbling.

I speak about this as the ranking member of the commerce committee, and fortunately we have a chairman who feels the same way. Senator THUNE and I are going to be working on this as well as things I suggested a moment ago about positive train control to improve the safety of our traveling public.

Mr. President, I have one more thing I would like to say.

Mr. LEAHY. Is it on the pending business?

Mr. NELSON. It is not. Does the Senator want me to stop so he can talk about the Assistant Attorney General?

Mr. LEAHY. If we could.

Mr. NELSON. Of course.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, earlier I spoke praising Sally Yates. In my words on the floor, I also spoke about the senior Senator from Georgia, about all the help he has given on this. I want to make sure I also include the distinguished Presiding Officer, Senator PERDUE, who, under our rules, cannot speak from the chair, but I would note for the other Senators how his testimony was so supportive of Sally Yates, and also, in the committee on which he and I serve, he voted for Sally Yates. Thus, both he and his colleague, Senator ISAKSON, were extremely valuable in this. I do not want anybody to think I was not aware of their support. I would say to both Senators from Georgia that I am deeply appreciative.

I yield to the senior Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee and my dear friend Senator LEAHY for all his help and for his kind remarks. Sally Quillian Yates would not be before us if it were not for the Senator from Vermont. He has been great in the process.

I think it is fortuitous and it is a good omen that the junior Senator from Georgia is the Presiding Officer at a time when we will elect the Deputy Attorney General, Sally Quillian Yates, to her position.

Sally Quillian Yates is a human being I have known for almost 40 years. For 25 years, she has been the lead prosecutor in the Northern District of Georgia. She has been an equal opportunity prosecutor—she has prosecuted Democrats, Republicans, Independents, Olympic Park bombers, anybody who violated the public trust. Any abuse of power, Sally Yates has gone after them, and she has won. She is fair. She is smart. She is intelligent.

As a Georgia Bulldog—I realize the junior Senator is from Georgia Tech, so I am going to throw this in—as a Georgia Bulldog, she is what we call a double dog. She has her bachelor's degree and law degree from the University of Georgia and graduated magna cum laude from the University of Georgia Law School.

Sally Quillian Yates is a great Georgian who will become a great Deputy Attorney General of the United States of America. I commend her to each of our colleagues and ask the Senators to vote and send a unanimous vote for Sally Quillian Yates to be Deputy Attorney General.

The distinguished chairman of the committee is coming to the floor. Let me end my remarks by saying that Senator GRASSLEY has been of immeasurable help in ensuring that Sally Quillian Yates gets to this position. I thank the Senator for his support. Unless he has something to say, I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. No.

Mr. ISAKSON. I yield back my time and the remainder of the majority time.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if we have nobody here seeking recognition, we have a few minutes left, and I am perfectly willing to yield back that time also.

I do yield it back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Sally Quillian Yates, of Georgia, to be Deputy Attorney General?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Ex.]

YEAS—84

Alexander	Fischer	Mikulski
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Baldwin	Franken	Murphy
Barrasso	Gardner	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Graham	Paul
Booker	Grassley	Perdue
Boxer	Hatch	Peters
Brown	Heinrich	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Reed
Cantwell	Heller	Reid
Capito	Hirono	Roberts
Cardin	Hoeven	Rounds
Carper	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Schatz
Coats	Kaine	Schumer
Cochran	King	Scott
Collins	Kirk	Shaheen
Coons	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Corker	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Ernst	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—12

Blunt	Inhofe	Sessions
Boozman	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Moran	Sullivan
Crapo	Risch	Vitter

NOT VOTING—4

Casey	Sanders
Rubio	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning, I restated my commitment to working with Senators in a serious way to move our country ahead on trade in the economy of the 21st century. I said that we need to allow debate on this important issue to begin and that our colleagues across the aisle need to stop blocking us from doing so.

That is the view from our side, it is the view from the White House, and it is the view of serious people across the political spectrum. I have repeatedly stated my commitment to serious, bipartisan ways forward on this issue. Now, serious and bipartisan does not mean agreeing to impossible guarantees or swallowing poison pills designed to kill the legislation, but it does mean pursuing reasonable options that are actually designed to get a good policy result in the end.

That is why I have agreed to keep my party's significant concession of offering to process both TPA and TAA on the table. It is why I have said we could also consider other policies that Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN agree to. That is why I will keep my commitment to an open amendment process once we get on the bill.

Of course, our friends across the aisle say they also want a path forward on all four of the trade bills the Finance Committee passed. This isn't just an issue for our friends on the other side, but there is a great deal of support on our side for many of the things contained in these other bills. However, as a senior Senator in the Democratic leadership reminded us yesterday, we have to take some of these votes separately or else we will kill the underlying legislation.

So the plan I am about to offer will provide our Democratic colleagues with a sensible way forward without killing the bill.

The plan I am about to offer will allow the regular order on the trade bill, while also allowing Senators the

opportunity to take votes on the Customs and preferences bills in a way that will not imperil the increased American exports and American trade jobs that we need. We would then turn to the trade bill with TPA and TAA as the base bill and open the floor to amendments, as I have suggested all week. It is reasonable.

So I look forward to our friends across the aisle now joining with us to move forward on this issue in a serious way.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m., tomorrow, May 14, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 57, H.R. 1295, and Calendar No. 56, H.R. 644, en bloc; that the Hatch amendments at the desk, the text of which are S. 1267 and S. 1269, respectively, be considered and agreed to; that no further amendments be in order; and that at 12 noon the bills, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate then vote on passage of H.R. 1295, as amended, followed by a vote on passage of H.R. 644, as amended, with no intervening action or debate, and that there be a 60-affirmative-vote threshold needed for passage of each bill; and that if passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table. I further ask that following disposition of H.R. 644, the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 be agreed to, the motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 be agreed to, and that at 2 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314; further, that if cloture is invoked, the 30 hours of postcloture consideration under rule XXII be deemed expired at 10 p.m. on Thursday night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

First of all, I want to take just a very brief minute and express my appreciation to all my Democratic colleagues who have been understanding and vocal in their opinions as to what we should do to move forward. I also extend my appreciation to the Republican leadership, the majority leader, for having this suggestion to go forward. We have worked together the last 24 hours, and I think we have come up with something that is fair.

The bipartisan majority of the Finance Committee reported out four trade measures, fast-track, trade adjustment assistance, trade enforcement, and a bill expanding trade for Africa. Democrats want a path forward on all four parts of this legislation. Yesterday, we made it clear that we didn't accept merely a fast-track for new trade agreements. We also must enforce the trade agreements we make.

The proposal before us today will provide us that path forward. I look forward to consideration today and tomorrow of the trade enforcement package and the Africa bill. Once we proceed to the fast-track measure, the majority leader has offered an amendment process that in his words will be open, robust, and fair. I appreciate that offer.

This is a complex issue and one that deserves full and robust debate. Once we get on the trade bill, then we have to debate and vote on a number of amendments. So with that background and the understanding that we have on both sides, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. While I do not rise with the intention of objecting, may I propound a question to the majority leader?

Mr. REID. Why don't we get the approval first.

Mr. ISAKSON. I would prefer to propound the question first. Mr. Leader, as I understand it, the Africa bill and the trade enforcement bill will be in tandem together and not subject to amendment, and then we will go to TPA and TAA, which will be open to amendments; is that correct?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator from Georgia is correct.

Mr. ISAKSON. In that case, I will not object, but I ask unanimous consent that Senator COONS and I be able to make a 1-minute statement.

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, in the committee on the AGOA Act, we put in an amendment to ensure an in-cycle and out-of-cycle review of South African trade practices vis-à-vis poultry and other issues important to the United States. We would have offered an amendment on the floor had it been possible without this UC, but with this UC coming forward and not objecting, we have gotten permission to talk to Ambassador Froman, who has assured us he is willing to instigate an out-of-cycle review immediately or whenever necessary to review the trade practices of South Africa vis-à-vis poultry. I commend him on doing that and wanted to memorialize that in the RECORD.

I yield to Senator COONS for the purpose of confirmation.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague Senator ISAKSON of Georgia and express my shared concern that if we are going to proceed to a long-term renewal of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which provides duty-free, quota-free access to the U.S. markets to all of sub-Saharan Africa—which I support and have worked hard with the Senator from Georgia and many others to make possible—that we also ensure there is effective trade enforcement. This is a basic principle that underlies all the proceedings here today; that those of us who support free trade and global trade also support fair trade and effective enforcement.

As the good Senator from Georgia recently commented, we are acting in reliance upon a representation by the U.S. Trade Representative that there will be enforcement action taken, if appropriate, on access to markets in South Africa.

With that, I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the floor, I want to thank the Senate majority leader for working with us in a constructive fashion to make it possible for all of the vital parts of the trade package to be considered. I look forward to working closely with him.

Colleagues, I will say that what has been done through the cooperation of the majority leader and the minority leader is, in effect, to say that trade enforcement will be the first bill to be debated; and in doing so, it drives home yesterday's message of 13 protrade Democrats who together said robust enforcement of our trade laws is a prerequisite to a modern trade policy. In making this the first topic for debate, it is a long overdue recognition that vigorous trade enforcement has to be in the forefront, not in the rear, and a recognition that the 1990 NAFTA trade playbook is being set aside.

I am going to be brief at this point, but I would just like to give a little bit of history as to how we got to this point.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oregon yield for a moment?

Mr. WYDEN. I would be happy to.

Mr. BROWN. I want to thank Senator WYDEN for his work on the Customs bill that we will be debating, the bill to which he is referring, especially his amendment that we worked on, the prohibition of child labor, closing an 85-year loophole, if you will, allowing child labor in far too many cases, and we as a nation were allowing the importation of goods produced by child labor. I appreciate his support and Senator HATCH's support early in the process before the markup began on our ''level the playing field'' language, which is particularly important to a number of industries in this country, to make the playing field more level, as Senator WYDEN was saying and, third, the importance of currency. We know how many jobs we have lost in my State and all over the country because of what has happened with countries gaming the currency system. So I wanted to express my thanks to Senator WYDEN.

Mr. WYDEN. Before he leaves the floor, I want to thank Senator BROWN

for again and again putting in front of the committee and all Senators the importance of this issue. I just want to read a sentence from the paper yesterday that really puts a human face on this enforcement issue that Senator BROWN has so often come back to. A quote in the New York Times says: ''Candy makers want to preserve a loophole.''

Now, this is the loophole that was closed in the Customs bill. The article goes on to say that ''Candy makers want to preserve a loophole . . . that allows them to import African cocoa harvested by child labor.''

What Senator BROWN has said is without, in effect, this enforcement language, this vigorous enforcement language that is in the Customs bill, we would basically be back in yesteryear's policy, back in what we had for decades and decades, where youngsters would be exploited in this way.

So we are going to talk about trade here for a few days. I think colleagues and—certainly my colleagues on the Finance Committee know that I strongly support expanded trade. I look at the globe. There are going to be 1 billion middle-class people in the developing world in 2025. They are going to have a fair amount of money to spend. We want them to spend on the goods and services produced in the United States.

So we support expanding those opportunities, increasing those exports. The reality is expanding trade exports and enforcing the trade law are two sides of the same coin. Because what happens at home—I had community meetings in all of my counties, had several in the last couple of weeks. The first question that often comes up is a citizen will say: I hear there is talk about a new trade deal. Well, how about first enforcing the laws that are on the books?

That is why the group of 13 protrade Senators yesterday wanted to weigh in, right at the outset of this debate, talking about how important trade enforcement is to a policy that I call trade done right—trade down right, a modern trade policy. I am going to be brief in opening this discussion, but I want to spend a few minutes describing how we got to this place.

A few weeks ago, the Finance Committee met and passed a bipartisan package of four bills. These were more than a year in the making. The message I sought to send right at the outset was a message that would respond to all the people in this country who want to know if you are doing more than just going back to NAFTA. Those four bills suggest that this will be very different.

The first, the trade promotion bill, the TPA as it is called, helps rid our trade policies of excessive secrecy. The reason this is so important is the first thing people say is, whether it is in South Carolina or Oregon or anywhere else: What is all of this excessive secrecy about? If you believe strongly in trade and you want more of it, why would you want to have all of this needless secrecy that just makes people so convinced that you are kind of sort of hiding things? So we have made very dramatic changes in that area.

A second strengthens and expands the support system for our workers. It is known as trade adjustment assistance. This is to make sure that when there are changes in the private economy, changes that so often take place and cause workers to see positions they have had be affected, this is a section of trade policy that gives them a chance, almost a springboard, into another set of job opportunities.

The third would finally put, as I have said, trade enforcement into high gear so we can crack down on trade cheats and protect American workers and exports. The reality is trade enforcement is a jobs bill. It is protecting jobs. That is another reason it is so important.

The fourth, which has been touched on by our distinguished colleagues, the Senators from Georgia and Delaware, involves the trade preference programs that are so crucial to both our employers and developing countries. Taken together, the bills form a package of trade policies that are going to help our country create more high-skill, high-wage jobs in my State and across the land.

As I have said so often, if you wanted to explain what a modern trade policy is in a sentence, what you would say is: This is the kind of approach that helps us grow things in America, make things in America, add value to them in America, and then ship them somewhere, particularly if you look to that developing world where there are going to be, in just a few years, 1 billion middle-class consumers. That strikes me as a real economic shot in the arm that will be of long-term benefit to our people.

Now, with respect to enforcement, I want to take just a few minutes to talk about why I think this is an appropriate opening step in the legislative process. Now, I already talked about the 13, 14 protrade Democrats who got together yesterday and weighed in as a group. Why we did it is that trade enforcement in that particular bill, which is part of the initial debate here, is a jobs bill. It is a cornerstone of a new trade approach that is going to reject the status quo.

As the President said, to his credit, during the State of the Union Address, ''Past trade deals have not always lived up to the hype.'' My own view is a lot of that can be attributed to subpar trade enforcement. That, in my view, is because so many of the same old enforcement tools from the NAFTA era and decades prior just are not the right kind of tool to get the job done in 2015.

Our competitors overseas use shell companies, fraudulent records, and sophisticated schemes to play cat and mouse with U.S. Customs authorities. Our competitors overseas, in a number of instances, intimidate American firms into relocating factories or surrendering our intellectual property. Our competitors often spy on our companies and trade enforcers to steal secrets and block our efforts at holding them accountable.

To mask their activities, they hide their paper trails and engage in outright fraud. For a number of years, I chaired the trade subcommittee of the Finance Committee. I can tell you, these examples I have given of modern challenges is just touching the surface of what we found in our investigation. At one point, we set up a sting operation to try to catch people who were merchandise laundering.

Not only does our trade enforcement need to catch up to these schemes, we have to have a trade enforcement policy that stays ahead of the game. That is why the bipartisan enforcement package, the Customs package, will take enforcement up to a higher level. This bill raises the bar for all of our trade enforcers, whether it is the Customs agents at the border checking inbound shipments, the Commerce Department investigator looking into an unfair trade petition or the lawyer from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative following up on possible violations of trade agreements.

So I want to just quickly tick through a few of the major parts of this trade enforcement package. A proposal that I pushed for a number of years to include will help Customs crack down on foreign companies that try to get around the rules by hiding their identity and sending their products on hard-to-trace shipping routes.

Another will close a shameful loophole—a shameful loophole that Senator BROWN and I just talked about—that allows products made with forced and child labor to be sold in our country. A third will build what I call an unfair trade alert to help identify when American jobs and exports are under stress before the damage is done. With this early warning system in effect, you will have warning bells ringing earlier and more loudly than ever before when a country attempts to undercut an American industry like China recently tried with solar panels.

I think that is especially important, because when you are home and you are listening to companies and workers and organizations talk about trade enforcement, they say: You know, it just gets to us too late. By the time somebody back there in Washington, DC, is talking about enforcing the trade laws, the lights have gone out at the plant, the workers have had their lives shattered, and the community is feeling pain from one end to another.

So the point of the early warning system is we now have the kind of

technology and access to the kind of information that can set off these early warning signals. That is what the unfair trade alert provision is all about.

Fourth, for the first time in decades, the Congress would set out clear enforcement priorities with the focus on jobs and growth that will build real accountability and follow through in our trade enforcement system.

Finally, it includes a proposal from Senator BROWN that goes a long way toward ensuring that our trade enforcers use the full strength of our antidumping and countervailing duty laws to fight unfair tactics. I said months ago, repeatedly, making it very clear, when Chairman HATCH and I began working on this package, that strengthening trade law enforcement was at the very top of the list of my priorities.

I did, in starting all of those discussions and the debate, repeatedly come back to the fact that for those of us who are protrade, who think it is absolutely key for the kind of export-related jobs and growth that we need in this country, we have to shore up trade enforcement because it is not credible to say that you are pushing for a new trade agreement if people do not find it credible that you are going to enforce the laws that are already existing on the books and relate to the past trade agreements.

So strengthening trade enforcement has been at the top of my list of priorities for many, many years. The Finance Committee passed this enforcement measure with a voice vote. So that ought to indicate alone that this was not some topic of enormous controversy. We had votes on the trade promotion act, we had votes on the trade adjustment act. There was pretty vigorous debate on those—voice vote on the enforcement provision and the Customs package because it includes so much of what I think Members, actually on both sides of the trade debate, feel strongly about.

I have talked about why as a protrade Democrat I feel so strongly about enforcement. My colleague Senator BROWN speaks eloquently about another point of view, but he feels strongly about trade enforcement. So I am very pleased the Senate is on this bill, is beginning debate on this legislation. I am thoroughly committed to getting this legislation passed before we leave for the recess. No one can ever make guarantees, but I am sure going to pull out all the stops to do it.

I just want, as we close the opening of this debate, to thank both the majority leader and the minority leader for working with myself and Chairman HATCH and others to get us to this point. We had a bipartisan effort in the Finance Committee, and we are very pleased to see the distinguished Presiding Officer join us on the Finance Committee. We had a bipartisan package, as the distinguished Presiding Officer knows, in the Finance Committee, which passed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis.

Now, starting with this debate and with what is ahead of us, we have a chance to build on the bipartisan work that took place in the Finance Committee. It is very appropriate that we begin this discussion focusing on trade enforcement, as the 14 protrade Democrats did yesterday in making an announcement with respect to the importance of this topic. It is going to be a good debate.

The stakes are enormously high. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get this legislation passed and to get a bill to the President of the United States to sign.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have a concern. It is not about trade. Quite frankly, trade is one of the things we have done as a nation all along. We were free traders before we were a nation.

One of the grievances we had in the Declaration of Independence was the fact that King George was restricting our trade. We have always been individuals in a nation of trade.

My issue is particularly with this Preferences bill. Again, it is not about the protections in it; it is about the way we pay for it. Now, as odd as it sounds, while we are doing trade and while we are trying to engage in things, we can't lose track of this simple thing called deficit that is hanging out there as well.

We have basic rules on how we actually handle budget issues. For anything that we set out that is going to take several years to pay for, we have basic rules. Those rules include that it has to be deficit neutral in year 6 and it has to be deficit neutral in year 11.

The way that is set up and the reason that it is set up is so that you cannot game the system that way. You can't just backload the whole thing and say: We are going to be deficit neutral in the very last year, but every other year we are going to run up the bill and have some pretend pay-fors at the very end.

So the way this is set up is to have this basic gap. Halfway through, you are deficit neutral. At the other end of it, you are also deficit neutral. Well, this is what the Preferences bill does. The Preferences bill sets up this unique something called the corporate payment shift.

So this is how it works. Six years from now, every corporation that has $1 billion or more in assets has a 5¼-percent tax increase in year 6. In year 7, every one of those companies that has $1 billion or more in assets gets a 5¼-percent tax refund.

Let me run that by you again. This is set up, in the way the bill is written, so that 6 years from now taxes go up on every company—that is 2,000 companies in America that have $1 billion or more in assets—by 5¼ percent, and in the next year they get a refund of that same amount.

Can someone help me understand why every company in America has to gear up, change the way they do all their tax policies, pay an extra tax that year, and so that the next year they can get a refund? That is additional cost. That is additional expense—only to help this body circumvent the basic rules that we said we are going to abide by.

Now, in all likelihood, those companies won't actually do that 6 and 7 years from now because, in all likelihood, this body will come through and will waive the corporate tax shift because it is now not years 6 and 7. Now, it is years 7 and 8, and so it doesn't apply.

This is ridiculous. This is a problem—that this body is playing a game in how we are trying to actually accomplish a basic rule.

Now, if anyone can stand in this body and say that is a good idea—that we are going to raise taxes 6 years from now on all these companies and refund the same amount in the 7th year—if anyone can actually tell me that is a good idea, please do. All that this is set up to do is to be able to help us in our CBO scoring.

This is what I think we should do. Option No. 1 is to have a real pay-for—not have some pretend and say this is a deficit-neutral bill, when it is not a deficit-neutral bill.

We have a $3.7 trillion budget. I think we can find a real pay-for to be able to put it into this bill. If you are lacking for any of those, my office can give you many options that are real pay-fors rather than something fake in year 6 and year 7.

This is option No. 2. At least admit that this is not a deficit-neutral bill and that these pay-fors are fake. There is something that this body has called a budget point of order, and it should apply in this sense because this is not a real pay-for.

Now, I have had these conversations with staff behind the scenes and with individuals in this body, and I have been told the same thing over and over: This is how we always do it. In other words: You are a new guy here. You don't know this is how the game is played on the budget-neutral deficit, eliminating bills that really don't do that.

Yes, that is true. I am the new guy here, and I have heard this is an old practice—and it needs to go away, because no one can defend this.

How about this. How about next week I try to go get a car loan, and I try to negotiate with the car dealer for a 5-

year loan, and I tell him: I will pay all of my loan off year 4, but I want a full refund in year 5 for all that I have paid off.

Do you think I am going to get that car loan? No, I am not going to get that car loan because he is going to say: That is fake. And I will say: I have paid it off completely in year 5.

Yes, but we paid it all back in the next year.

We have to be able actually to have real accounting at the end of the day. This is not invisible money. This is debt that is being added. And with a $3.7 trillion budget, we can find real pay-fors.

This is a practice that has happened in this Congress and in previous Congresses that has to stop. We have the ability to do that.

I oppose this bill because it is not genuine in how we are actually paying for it. Saying that we pay for it in year 6 and refunding it in year 7 is not real, and we know it.

In the days ahead, I hope we can address this practice and not just eliminate it for this bill, but that we can eliminate it from ever being used again in any bill as a gimmick pay-for.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMTRAK TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today with a very heavy heart because of the horrific tragedy that occurred and is still unfolding right now.

Late last evening, an Amtrak train, train No. 188—a train I myself have traveled on—carrying 243 passengers and crew derailed in Philadelphia. It has been confirmed now that seven people have died, including Associated Press employee, husband, father of two, and Plainsboro, NJ, resident Jim Gaines. More than 200 people were injured. My deepest thoughts and prayers are with those who are suffering today.

I am so grateful for the work of the hundreds of first responders, Amtrak crew, doctors, nurses, and many others who quickly, courageously, and very professionally did their jobs and who no doubt saved lives. As we speak, the search through the wreckage for more people, living or dead, is still in process. All people have not been accounted for, and I hope and pray our brave first responders can soon account for everyone who was expected to have been on board.

The 243 people—including passengers and crew—many of whom boarded Amtrak regional train No. 188 just half a mile from where I stand right now—were headed to New York. They were on their way home, on their way to work, to see their husbands and their wives, their children, and their journey was horrifically interrupted when the train derailed around 9:30 p.m. in Philadelphia.

Since the incident, my staff and I have been in contact with Amtrak, the National Transportation Safety Board, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the Department of Transportation. The exact cause of the derailment is unknown, although speed was definitely a factor. We are in close contact with Amtrak officials and Federal investigators who are working quickly to identify exactly what happened to cause this disaster.

Amtrak train No. 188 was on a very familiar path. So many people take this route. The train that derailed was traveling on the Northeast corridor, which is one of the busiest corridors, a 457-mile rail corridor that is the most traveled in North America. It is a transportation lifeline, one of our main arteries connecting the people of Washington, DC, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. The Northeast corridor transports 750,000 passengers every day and moves a workforce that produces $50 billion each year toward our gross domestic product.

More people are traveling with Amtrak on the Northeast corridor than ever before. Just last year, 11.6 million passengers traveled the Northeast corridor. In New Jersey alone, 110 trains run daily along this route. New Jersey Transit works in cooperation with Amtrak to move trains along the Northeast corridor, where New Jersey Transit customers take 288,000 trips on the corridor each day and 63.6 million trips a year.

Yet, none of these numbers—none of them—are as important today as that number of 243, the number of people riding on and working on Amtrak train No. 188 last evening, or the 7 people who died. We are in a time of great sadness.

As the ranking member of the Senate subcommittee that has jurisdiction over rail safety, I want to also say that my colleagues and I have been working in the Senate to develop policies and implement new safety technologies that will improve rail safety and save lives, and we have been working diligently to finalize a draft of a passenger rail authorization bill.

Congress has not passed a passenger rail bill since 2008, and authorization for that bill expired in 2013. It is unacceptable that Congress has not acted to provide the needed improvements, investment, and long-term certainty for Amtrak, and I will work hard to make sure that we pass passenger rail, that it is a priority for this body.

In fact, today we had intended to introduce this bill authorizing funding and improvements to passenger rail in the United States. Today, that was our intention. However, in light of this tragic event, Senator WICKER and I have decided to monitor the incoming information and take this opportunity to evaluate what other actions might need to be taken as a part of the legislation.

I am proud of my colleagues who have worked so diligently to ensure we get this bill done, and I thank the leadership, Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON, for their support. If there is an action that needs to be taken to improve safety in the wake of this tragedy as we are finalizing this bill, I know we can work together to make it a reality.

That said, I must say I am disappointed in the direction of the House appropriations process, which risks starving Amtrak of vitally important funds at the very moment we need to be investing more in passenger rail and our country's crumbling infrastructure.

Failing to make the proper investments in our Nation's infrastructure is indeed crippling our competitiveness in a global economy. A 2012 Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco report estimated that every dollar invested in our national infrastructure increases economic output by at least $2. Failing to invest properly in infrastructure improvement is threatening the public's safety.

My thoughts and prayers are with the family, friends, and loved ones of the individuals who were killed or injured in last night's train derailment. We still aren't certain of the exact cause, but this incident is a searing reminder of the fragility of life. It is important that we also remember that we should do everything necessary to safeguard life, to make sure we have it and have it more abundantly.

Nothing can fix the damage that has been done to these families and their communities. We all grieve as a nation for the loss of life and pray for those injured, that they recover.

I say now that we must work tirelessly to prevent another tragedy like this from occurring and that we must do everything necessary so we as a nation can have a rail infrastructure and highways, roads, bridges—have an infrastructure as a whole that reflects the greatness of the people of our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an issue that,

by some estimates, has cost the United States as many as 5 million jobs, which is a lot of jobs, and that is the issue of currency manipulation.

We are going to have an opportunity, now that there is an agreement, to move forward on all of the issues related to trade, whether it is fast-track or helping workers or enforcement issues or the other pieces that will be in front of us. We will have an important opportunity to seriously move forward in a positive way for our manufacturers and for agriculture and for all those who are impacted by currency manipulation.

In fact, currency manipulation is the most significant 21st-century trade barrier that American businesses and workers face today and is the least enforced against. We take the least amount of action against currency manipulation, and yet it is the most significant 21st-century trade barrier. If we don't take meaningful action to address this issue, we stand to lose even more jobs at a time when our economy is desperately trying to recover.

Our workers are the best in the world, and we can compete with anybody—our businesses can compete with anybody as long as there is a level playing field and the rules are enforced. But we can't win when our trading partners cheat, and that is what is happening right now. When they manipulate their currency—when Japan does it, when China does it, when other countries do it—they are cheating.

A strong U.S. dollar against a weak foreign currency, particularly one that is artificially weak due to government manipulation, means foreign products are cheaper here and U.S. products are more expensive there. For example, one U.S. automaker estimates that the weak yen gives Japanese competitors anywhere from a $6,000 to $11,000 advantage on the price of a car, depending on the make and model. It is hard for our American carmakers to compete when they are effectively seeing a $6,000 to $11,000 higher sticker price—more expensive than Japanese vehicles not because of any other difference at all, just currency manipulation. That is a large difference that is based on currency manipulation. In fact, we have seen some numbers that—at some points in time, the entire profit on a vehicle will be from currency manipulation.

We keep hearing about opening Japan's markets to U.S. automakers. While that is fine and that sounds nice, it is really a red herring when we look at what is going on because Japan right now has zero percent tariffs on U.S. cars. So it is not the tariffs that are keeping out our cars; it is the complicated web of nontariff barriers that Japan uses to keep out American automobiles.

Beyond that, what is significant and what we have learned is there is little appetite for American cars in Japan. Last year, Ford's share of imports in Japan was 1.5 percent. Chevy was less than one-third of 1 percent. There were 13 times as many Rolls Royces imported into Japan last year than Buicks, but that is not because there were all kinds of Rolls Royces going into Japan. It is because there were only 11 Buicks, not 1,100, not 11,000—11.

One of the things that is interesting is that in Japan they buy Japanese vehicles. I wish in America we bought American-made vehicles. We would not be seeing as much of this challenge. It is a different culture there in terms of the pride of buying Japanese vehicles and, in fact, doing what they can to keep others out through nontariff trade barriers. Taking down the trade barriers is a good thing. I support it, but it is not enough. That is not what this is about when we are talking about the transpacific trade agreement and the worries of American automakers and other manufacturers as we do that. That is not the big challenge. It is not about just trade barriers, making life easier for the handful of Japanese consumers who are looking to buy an automobile from outside their country. Our manufacturers tell us that is not the main concern. It is not about competing in the United States or Japan; it is about competing everywhere else in the world. That is the problem.

Japan has a population of 120 million people, but Brazil has a population of 200 million people. India has a population of 1.2 billion people. In emerging markets, American-made vehicles are at a severe competitive disadvantage compared to vehicles produced in Japan or Korea, when those countries choose to manipulate their currency, which has happened many, many times.

We are competing, Japan is competing, and the United States is competing for those 1.2 billion customers. If they can artificially bring down their price $6,000, $7,000, $10,000 or more to sell into those areas, even though it is illegal in terms of the international community—they have signed up saying they will not do it. But if they are allowed to do it and if our trade agreements allow them to do it, it is not fair.

Why would we do that to American companies? Why would we do that to American workers? Why would we allow that kind of cheating to occur? That is what the amendment that Senator PORTMAN and I have is all about, that we will be offering and asking support for.

This is not an issue that only impacts the auto industry or other manufacturers. As everyone knows, I care deeply about agriculture, as the current ranking member and former chair of the agriculture committee. Agriculture is impacted by currency manipulation as well. As a competitive sector in the global economy, any practice that distorts the economy, disrupts trade, and threatens employment has an impact on U.S. farmers and ranchers as well.

Unfortunately, the language currently included in the TPA bill does not adequately address these issues, because if we are going to be effective around currency provisions, we have to make sure they are enforceable. There is some language there, but unlike other parts of the TPA, there is not language requiring that any provisions in a trade agreement be enforceable. That is why Senator PORTMAN and I have introduced an amendment to this bill—to the TPA bill—that simply adds clear language to require that any future trade deals must include enforceable currency provisions. Very importantly, the provisions will be consistent with existing International Monetary Fund commitments that all of these countries have made. They signed up saying they are not going to do currency manipulation, but we do not have enforcement to make sure it does not happen. Also, importantly, this does not affect domestic monetary policy.

I understand the arguments. I have great respect for our Secretary of the Treasury, whom I work with all the time, and 99 percent of the time we are singing the same song—not on this one and the same thing with the President, someone whom I admire deeply. I have to say this administration has done more than any other White House, I think, that I have worked with as a Senator or even in the House, to make sure we are enforcing our trade laws, taking trade actions, winning trade cases in the WTO. I am very grateful for that. But when it comes to currency, there has been a debate saying that somehow our Fed policy, quantitative easing—what we do inside our country is somehow impacted by the definitions of the IMF, which is not accurate. A country can say it is. Anybody can say anything, but it would not hold up because it is not accurate. We are talking about foreign transactions, the monetary policies of foreign competitors in the global economy.

I am very pleased that we have bipartisan support for our amendment. We are adding supporters all the time. Senator ROUNDS, Senator BURR, Senator CASEY, Senator SHAHEEN, and we have other Senators that will be joining us as well. We have growing support and understanding of how critical this is.

The inclusion of strong and enforceable currency provisions in our trade agreements make clear to our trading partners that this uncompetitive trade practice will no longer be accepted. We are not just going to talk about it. We talk a lot about it. We talk a lot about

this issue and the loss of American jobs because of currency manipulation. But by putting it in the core instructions for our negotiators as they walk into a trade negotiation, to have listed alongside critical provisions regarding labor laws and environment and intellectual property rights and human rights and other areas, to say currency manipulation, your policies around currency we believe are critically important in a global economy if we are going to compete on a level playing field and not continue to lose American jobs.

Some would call this amendment a poison pill to the TPA. That could not be further from the truth. It is absolutely possible. In fact, we have Members supporting our amendment who also support TPA, the underlying bill. They want to make sure it is a clear outline of the priorities and instructions for any negotiations.

I have not heard from a single one of my colleagues that he or she will oppose the bill because our amendment is not adopted. This is not a poison pill. What I do hear repeatedly, though, is that one of the principal justifications for granting the administration trade promotion authority, fast-track—a process where we can amend it, a simple majority vote—is that Congress sets forth its priorities in trade promotion authority.

We are laying out what is important for the people of our country, for our businesses, for our workers in trade negotiations. If that is the case, then how can something deemed appropriate, deemed a priority by all of us be a poison pill?

It is not our job to match our priorities with their negotiations. The negotiations are supposed to match our priorities. They are laid out in TPA. Otherwise, why do we give fast-track authority?

It is our responsibility on behalf of American businesses, American workers, and American communities to tell the administration what we expect them to fight for on behalf of the people of our country. We already insist on enforceable standards in other negotiating objectives. I support these, and I believe they should be as strong as possible, including issues around labor law, environment, and intellectual property rights. Why should currency manipulation be any different?

This is about Congress setting up the list of priorities for negotiating objectives, and then in return for that, we then allow a fast-track process where any final bill cannot be amended. If we are going to give up that authority, that power, I think we have a right to lay out the conditions under which we would do that.

If we lost 5 million jobs around the globe—5 million jobs because of currency manipulation coming predominantly from Asian countries that we are now negotiating with—we have a right to say we want that to stop. We expect there to be a strong, enforceable currency manipulation provision in any law we pass that then gives up our right to amend a trade agreement.

There is no way that I believe the entire transpacific agreement hinges on whether we include enforceable currency provisions. If that is true, it calls into question what else is in the agreement. Why are there TPP countries that are so concerned about enforceable standards—which, by the way, they have all signed up through the IMF as part of the global community—they have all signed that they will not do it. If the argument now is that they are not doing it, then why are people fighting so hard to keep this requirement out of TPA if they are so confident this will never occur again?

Our ability to address currency issues in trade agreements is not complicated, again, by our own domestic monetary policies, including quantitative easing. In fact, we specifically put in the amendment that it does not affect domestic monetary policies.

We have heard this over and over again. There has been confusion that has been spread. The IMF has rules about what is and what is not direct currency manipulation. They are clear rules. They are rules that all of the IMF countries have agreed to. They are rules that the United States has followed while they are doing quantitative easing. They are rules that Japan has flagrantly violated not once or twice but 376 times since 1991.

We are hearing that we do not need enforceable language as a negotiating objective in the fast-track bill because Japan is not manipulating the currency anymore. Well, 376 times they have chosen to do that. Once we pass this, there is nothing stopping them from making it 377. What stops them is if they know that Congress is giving direction to the negotiators to make sure there is enforceable provisions in the trade agreement.

Let's be clear. The United States is clearly following the rules with our domestic monetary policy. We are following the rules. Therefore, we would not be affected by this, and our amendment specifically references that. We are not talking about domestic policy. Other countries could say that. They would be wrong. They would have no legal standing to say it. You can say anything. But we do know this: Japan has flagrantly violated the rules of the IMF—that they signed on the dotted line to support—376 times since 1991. Adding enforceable currency provisions to a trade deal simply adds enforcement to the commitments that Japan and 187 other countries have already made as a part of the International Monetary Fund.

On that point, I appreciate the efforts this administration has made to engage on this issue with our trading partners both bilaterally and through multilateral forms such as the G–20 and the IMF. But, quite frankly, we have not seen enough meaningful progress despite, I am sure, our good efforts. The progress we have seen can be wiped out at a moment's notice and without any meaningful recourse if we do not require enforceable provisions in the fast-track law.

Then there is China. While they are not currently a party to the TPP, it is no secret they are interested in joining it down the road. While China's exchange rate may be up nearly 30 percent since 2010, the Treasury's own report to Congress released just last month concludes that China's currency remains significantly undervalued, which, by the way, is the reason we also need to make sure the Customs bill, which will be coming before us, maintains what we did in the Finance Committee. It should maintain the important legislation which Senator SCHUMER and Senator GRAHAM have been leading for years. I am proud to be a part of that, along with Senator BROWN and many others. We came together on a bipartisan basis to make sure that China, which is not involved in the negotiations right now, is also held accountable for currency manipulation.

These two issues are not mutually exclusive; they are part of the whole effort. If they are part of a negotiating agreement and it is TPP or any other one, we want to make sure our negotiators put this in the deal. If they are outside of it, we want to also make sure they cannot cheat. That is why both of these are very important policies, and I strongly support both of them in order to move forward in a comprehensive way on currency manipulation enforcement.

For too long, we have relied on handshake agreements and good-faith assurances from our trading partners around the world that they would adhere to the same standards we set for ourselves. For too long, we have seen our trading partners ignore their commitments by breaking the rules and leaving American workers and businesses at a competitive disadvantage. It is time for us to say enough is enough. We don't have to keep doing this to ourselves.

I am very pleased that we have taken a step forward in a couple of directions. I mentioned the Schumer bipartisan proposal which so many of us have worked on. That is a very important piece of this puzzle. The other piece of this puzzle is the Portman-Stabenow amendment. As I said, these are not mutually exclusive; they are complementary. I hope my colleagues will support both of them to demonstrate a serious commitment. It is not enough to support a policy in one bill and not support a similar policy in the other part of the picture here, the other bill.

If you support enforcing against currency manipulation—you either do or you don't. You do or you don't. We want to make sure we are doing it against those not part of the TPP negotiations and those who are. We want to make sure that they get signed into law and that they, in fact, are the law of the land. It is long past due that we take meaningful action on this issue.

I don't know how many times I have come to the floor since coming here in 2001 to speak about this and to be a part of this effort. It has always been bipartisan, and I am glad to see that. We need a strong, bipartisan vote on the Portman-Stabenow amendment. We have understood—those of us who represent manufacturing and agricultural States—that this is a critical piece that will help to level the playing field so our businesses, our farmers, our ranchers, and our workers have every opportunity to compete and win. I know they will. I don't have a doubt in my mind.

Our job is to make sure that there is fairness, that we have the best trade deals, that they are enforceable, and that we have the tools to enforce them, which is also in front of us with the Customs bill. We have to have all of it. We are in a global economy. Everybody is competing. Our job is to make sure we are exporting our products and not our jobs.

If we do not focus in a very serious, real way on addressing currency manipulation, we will, in fact, leave a giant loophole which those companies will drive right through and will allow them to continue cheating and taking our jobs. We can fix that, and I am hopeful my colleagues will join us on a bipartisan basis for a very strong vote so we can send a message to the administration that we are serious—including this as one of the instructions to them—as to what we expect to be in trade agreements going forward.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this week, I introduced a bipartisan resolution to commemorate National Police Week, which this year began on Monday, May 10, and ends on Saturday, May 16. Senator LEAHY, the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and 32 others have joined me as original cosponsors of this measure. The theme of this year's Police Week is ''Honoring Courage, Saluting Sacrifice.''

Police Week is dedicated to the brave men and women in blue who selflessly protect and serve our communities every day, every week, in every community all across the country. The week affords an opportunity to honor those who have made the ultimate sacrifice while striving to make our neighborhoods safer and more secure.

Events are scheduled in Washington, DC, this week not only to remember those officers who tragically lost their lives in the line of duty but also to honor outstanding acts of bravery and service by many others.

Tens of thousands of police officers, as well as their friends and family members, will gather in our Nation's Capital for these events, which include a candlelight vigil and a Police Unity Tour arrival ceremony, among other events.

On this day, the 34th Annual National Peace Officers Memorial Service takes place here on the Capitol grounds. This solemn service offers an opportunity for all of us to pay our respects to fallen officers and their families, communities, and law enforcement agencies that have been permanently altered because these officers paid the ultimate sacrifice. We owe these brave men and women our utmost respect and gratitude as we honor them on this important day.

A report by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund showed a 9-percent increase in the number of officers killed in the line of duty in 2014 compared to the previous year's fatalities. Gunfire was the leading cause of death among law enforcement officers last year, and ambushes were the leading circumstance of officer fatalities in these deaths, according to this report. The number of firearms-related deaths in 2014 represents a 24-percent increase over the previous year.

This is the fifth consecutive year that ambushes have been the No. 1 cause of felonious deaths of law enforcement officers, according to the National Sheriffs' Association. In my home State of Iowa, there have been nearly 200 line-of-duty deaths over many years. The fallen include numerous law enforcement personnel who were shot and killed or struck by vehicles while on duty.

At the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, the names of these Iowans and approximately 20,000 other men and women who have been killed in the line of duty throughout U.S. history are carved in the memorial's wall. Regrettably, 273 new names will be added to the rolls this week to depict the loss of a loved one who did not return home safely at the end of his or her duty.

Already, in 2015, we have witnessed 44 tragic deaths and senseless murders of our law enforcement protectors and our guardians of the peace. Just this past weekend, we all heard on television that Hattiesburg, MS, Police Department Officers Benjamin Deen and Liquori Tate were quickly and violently murdered during a traffic stop that was anything but routine. Our hearts go out to their families and the families of all who have lost their loved ones in the line of duty.

The men and women of law enforcement go to work shift after shift, frequently missing celebrations of birthdays, anniversaries, and holidays because they believe in serving something greater than themselves. The work of law enforcement is not a job; it is a calling to these people. That calling and those officers' devotion to duty merits our utmost respect and gratitude.

As I conclude, I call on all Americans this week to pause and contemplate the safety and security we all enjoy. We all must recognize that such peace is the result of sacrifices made by brave men and women of law enforcement.

I also wish to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for their overwhelming support of this year's resolution designating National Police Week, which this week passed the full Senate by unanimous consent.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we have all now heard the good news with regard to our ongoing efforts to advance U.S. trade policy. We are talking about trillions of dollars over the years. After a lot of discussion and back and forth, we have come to an agreement on a path forward. I am very happy to say that finally, at long last, common sense has prevailed.

On April 22, the Senate Finance Committee reported four separate trade bills—a bill to renew trade promotion authority, or TPA; another to reauthorize trade adjustment assistance, or TAA; a trade preferences bill; and a Customs and Enforcement bill.

Throughout the recent discussion on trade policy, the TPA bill has gotten most of the attention. That makes sense. After all, it is President Obama's top legislative priority. If we could get it passed, its impact would be felt immediately. And he is right on that, President Obama is right on this issue, and I am happy to help him get this through, if we can.

The TAA bill—the trade adjustment assistance bill—although I am not ecstatic to admit it, is part of the effort. We have known from the outset that in

order to ensure passage of TPA, that TAA must move along with it. That is a concession we were always willing to make, although most of us on the Republican side are not all that crazy about TAA and many will vote against it, including me. TAA is trade adjustment assistance, and that is what the union movement has insisted on. Democrats are unanimously in favor of it. Republicans are not ecstatic about it at all. In fact, we think it is a waste in many ways, but it is the price of doing business on TPA.

The path to the other two bills, the preferences bill and the Customs bill, has always been a bit more uncertain, but once again, we knew that from the beginning.

I am pleased to say that we have reached an agreement that will allow us to consider and hopefully pass all four of the Finance Committee trade bills in relatively short order. Under the agreement, the Senate will vote tomorrow on our Customs bill as well as our trade preferences bill. This will pave the way for another cloture vote on the motion to proceed to a vehicle to move TPA and TAA.

Although I am wary of counting my proverbial chickens before they are hatched—no pun intended—I expect we will get a strong bipartisan vote in favor of finally beginning the debate on these important bills, and we should.

This is, in my opinion, the best of all possible outcomes. This is what Republicans have been working toward all along—and, I might add, some courageous Democrats as well. While we could not and still cannot guarantee that all four bills will become law, we certainly want to see the Customs and preferences bills pass the Senate. I am a coauthor of both of those bills. They are high priorities for me. It was never my intention to let them wither on the legislative calendar. I was always going to do everything in my power to help move them forward. That is why at the Finance Committee markup I committed to work with my colleagues to try to get all four of these bills across the finish line. That is the agreement which was made, and as of right now, it appears we will be able to make good on that commitment on a much shorter timeline than I think any of us expected.

Yesterday was a difficult day. I think it was pretty obvious to any observer that I was more than a little frustrated. Today, I am very glad to see that my colleagues have recognized our desire to move all of these important bills and that they have agreed with us on a workable path forward. But now is not the time to celebrate. While this agreement solves a temporary procedural issue, now is when the real work begins.

As I mentioned yesterday, it has been years—decades even—since we have had a real debate over U.S. trade policy here on the Senate floor, and I am quite certain we have a spirited debate ahead of us. I am looking forward to a fair and open discussion of all of these important issues. It is high time we let this debate move forward. Indeed, it is what the American people deserve.

I am glad we now have a pathway forward. This is something into which the President has put an awful lot of effort. He has an excellent Trade Representative in Michael Froman, one of the best Trade Representatives we could possibly have, a very bright man. He has worked very hard on these trade deals. They won't come to fruition until we pass trade promotion authority. Keep in mind that is the procedural mechanism which will enable the administration to get final approvals by these 11 countries in Asia and the 28 countries in Europe, plus ours.

This is very important, and I for one am very pleased that we have been able to get this through the Senate Finance Committee. That couldn't have happened without the help of Democrats on the other side and in particular Senator WYDEN. We did part ways in this fiasco that occurred, but hopefully we are back together now.

All I can say is that this is one of the most important bills in this President's tenure, and it is a bill that could benefit every State in this Union and especially my State of Utah, where we did $7 billion in foreign trade last year alone. For a State our size—3 million people—that is pretty good, but I expect us to do a lot better under trade promotion authority.

Hopefully, the final agreements that are made in TPP and TTIP will be agreements that everybody can agree will help our country move forward. It will help us to have greater relations with other countries throughout the world. It will help us to encourage our own industries to be improve and be the best in the world and will be one of those approaches that literally will shape the world at large.

TPA is an important bill. I hope we can pass it. I believe we will. As I have said, I am not a fan of the TAA bill and never will be, but we understand why that has to pass as well—because the bipartisan coalition that supports it would probably not permit trade promotion authority without it.

All I can say is that I have faith that we have arrived and resolved this impasse, and I hope that in the coming days we will be able to pass trade promotion authority and really put this country back on the trade path which it really deserves to be on and on which the rest of the world will be pleased to have us, where we can have greater cooperation and greater friendships and greater feelings throughout the world than we have right now.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, as this body moves to consider trade legislation, it is our obligation to make sure that our existing and future trade laws are enforced and that we are looking out for those hurt by our trade agreements.

Nearly everyone who supports these agreements—conservatives, Republicans, Democrats—nearly everyone who supports these agreements, even the most vocal cheerleaders for free trade, such as the Wall Street Journal editorial board, all admit that trade agreements create winners and losers.

So if this body is going to vote for a new trade agreement, if the President is going to insist that we pass a new trade agreement, it is up to all of us that when there are winners and losers, we take care of the losers. If people lose their jobs because of a trade agreement passed by Congress, because of a trade agreement pushed and negotiated by the White House and ultimately ratified by Congress, approved by Congress, it is up to us to take care of those people who lost their jobs because of what we do; that is, to make sure they get the training and support they need, whether they are 30 years old, 40 years old or 55 years old, to find new careers. We owe it to American companies, and we owe it to American workers to make sure the laws we make are enforced and that they create a more level playing field.

We cannot have trade promotion without trade enforcement. That is why the provisions contained in the Customs bill are so important.

Let me go through three provisions—probably the most salient, probably the most important provisions in the Customs bill.

Now, go back a few weeks, and in the Finance Committee we worked on four bills. We worked on the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and it passed overwhelmingly—no opposition.

We worked on the Customs bill that had a number of trade enforcement provisions. Those are the three I will talk about in a moment—the three major provisions.

We also passed training adjustment assistance, where workers who lose jobs because of trade agreements get help from the Federal Government, because we made these decisions here that ultimately cost them their jobs.

And fourth is trade promotion authority, so-called fast-track.

What this Senate did yesterday, when Senator MCCONNELL tried to bring up just trade adjustment assistance and fast-track to the floor, is that the Senate said no—a denial of cloture—because so many of us wanted to

make sure that we didn't leave the trade enforcement behind. You simply shouldn't send a trade agreement to the President's desk—or trade negotiating authority to the President's desk—without helping those workers who lose their jobs, without provisions to enforce trade laws.

Let me talk about the three. First, there is currency. For trade to work, all parties have to play by the same rules. We must protect American workers and American companies from foreign governments that artificially manipulate their currencies. This puts U.S. exports at a serious disadvantage and results in artificially cheap imports here at home.

So in other words, when a Chinese company, benefiting from manipulation of currency, sells a product into the United States, they can sell it 15, 20 or 25 percent less expensively—more cheaply—because of their currency advantage. Because they have cheated on currency, they can sell it more cheaply than it would cost otherwise, which undercuts our businesses' ability to compete.

Conversely, when American producers try to sell something in China, it has a 15-percent, 20-percent or 25-percent add on the price, almost like a tariff. It is not really a tariff. It is really a currency advantage that the Chinese have created that makes our goods not particularly sellable when trying to compete with Chinese goods.

China's currency manipulation has been a problem for years, resulting in artificially expensive American imports to China and artificially cheap Chinese exports to the United States. It is not only China. The Peterson Institute for International Economics estimates at least 10 other countries engage in these practices—many of them mimicking what China does.

This puts our American manufacturers at a serious disadvantage. Currency manipulations already cost our Nation up to 5 million jobs. It continues to be a drag on Ohio's economy and on our Nation's economy. Diplomatic efforts to address this cheating simply haven't worked, and we will continue to lose jobs if we don't take action.

This is a problem under Presidents of both parties. We have been asking for currency legislation for over a decade—with President Bush, who opposed it; with President Obama, who opposes it. That doesn't mean we shouldn't do that.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that addressing currency manipulation could support the creation of up to 5.8 million jobs and reduce our trade deficit by at least $200 billion. This provision contained in the bill before us today would clarify that current countervailing duty law can address currency undervaluation. It would make it clear that the Department of Commerce cannot refuse to investigate a subsidy allegation based on the single fact that a subsidy is available in other circumstances, in addition to export. American businesses have been put at a disadvantage for too long, and it has hurt American workers. Now is the time to crack down on currency manipulation.

Issue No. 2 is leveling the playing field. This year I introduced the Leveling the Playing Field Act, which was included in the Customs bill we are debating. It would strengthen enforcement of our trade laws. It would give U.S. companies the tools they need to fight back against unfair and illegal trade practices. It would restore strength to antidumping and countervailing duty statutes. It would allow industry to petition the Commerce Department and the International Trade Commission when foreign companies are breaking the rules.

It has been a particular problem in the steel industry. The domestic rebar industry, making steel reinforcement bars—the rebar used in highways, bridges, and roadways—is operating at only 60 percent, an historic low, due to foreign dumping. I met today with a rebar steel manufacturer from Cincinnati to talk about this. He has been involved in trade disputes with Turkey and other countries.

Finished steel imports grew 36 percent last year. In the first quarter of this year, finished steel imports are up another 35 percent. Imports of these finished steel products have captured 34 percent of the U.S. market as of March 2015.

An Economic Policy Institute report shows that the American steel industry risks long-term damage, including putting more than half a million steel-related jobs at risk, nearly 34,000 in my State, unless the U.S. Government fully enforces its trade remedy rules. We know that when foreign steel is dumped illegally in our country, American workers pay the price.

Leveling the Playing Field—title V of the Customs bill, that section that was amended that was put in the bill prior to markup—is critical to all American companies facing a flood of imports. It would restore strength to U.S. trade remedy laws to ensure that our American workers and our companies are treated fairly.

The last issue is child labor. This bill includes a provision to end an embarrassing, shameful, disgusting loophole in our trade laws. It would close an outdated, 85-year-old loophole that allows some goods made with either forced or child labor—unbelievably, for 85 years we have allowed this—to be imported into the United States. It would strike language in section 307 of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that provides an exception to our prohibition on the importation of goods that are made with forced labor.

This loophole, called the consumptive demand loophole—that sounds not nearly as bad as the child labor loophole—allows goods made with forced labor, including child labor, to be imported into the country if there isn't enough domestic supply to meet domestic demand.

This exception was included in Smoot-Hawley in 1930, before the United States passed a law banning child labor. That is how outdated this provision is. So when this provision was adopted, child labor was still legal. We banned child labor, but we have let this loophole stand to allow the importing of goods produced by child labor for 85 years. The Fair Labor Standards Act, which outlawed child labor in the United States, was signed into law in 1938, and yet this loophole still stands.

The United States has ratified the International Labor Organization Convention 182 against the worst forms of child labor. We have ratified the International Labor Organization Convention 138 on the minimum age of work. We have passed laws against child labor in Congress and in State legislatures. We are a strong partner in international efforts to eradicate child labor. Yet, the consumptive demand loophole—child labor, forced labor—allows those products produced in that fashion to come into the United States. We have allowed the consumptive demand loophole to stay on the books.

Since the 1990s, there have been valiant efforts by some of my colleagues to fix this. I want to acknowledge Senator Harkin for his efforts. He has since retired, at the beginning of this year. Senator SANDERS, the junior Senator from Vermont, has been involved in this issue for a long time.

Child labor is never OK. We are talking about children being forced to work in deplorable conditions, often under extreme duress. There is never—never a justification for that. And there is no compromise on this issue. No product made with forced labor should be allowed to come into the country, period. End of discussion. It is immoral. It is imperative to fix this, and we can fix this. The Senate should not remain silent on this issue. Now is the time to shut the door on this ugly chapter of U.S. law. We do it by passing the Customs bill today.

All these provisions were added to the bill with strong bipartisan support in the Committee on Finance. It is imperative they make it to the President's desk. If we are going to continue to pursue an aggressive trade promotion agenda, we must combine it with equally strong trade enforcement language. Without enforcement, we are willfully stacking the deck for our foreign competitors and against American businesses and American workers. We see what happens when steel mills close. We see what happens when manufacturers close their doors because they can't compete with artificially cheap imports.

Trade agreements and trade law without enforcement amount to no free trade at all. They amount to lawlessness. Without proper trade enforcement, American producers who play by the rules will continue to be undersold by foreign producers who are cheating the market. We can't leave our companies and our workers with no recourse against unfair, illegal business practices. That is why the Customs bill is so important. That is why the currency provisions, the level-the-playing-field title V provision, and the ban on child labor are so very important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor to talk a little about the customs legislation that is now before us. As my colleague from Ohio just talked about, there are some very important provisions in this legislation that help to ensure that, yes, while we are expanding exports, we are also ensuring we have a more level playing field for our workers and our farmers.

My State of Ohio is a State where we like exports. We have about 25 percent of our factory jobs there because of exports. But we want to be sure we are getting a fair shake. Working with Senator BROWN and others, we put together some great provisions that are going to be part of this customs legislation. I am hopeful we can get this passed. It is part of the Customs bill as it passed in the Committee on Finance, but I am also hopeful it will be in whatever provision goes over to the House and also is signed by the President into law.

Growing exports, of course, is a top priority—I hope it is a top priority for everybody here in the Chamber—and therefore trade-opening agreements are a good idea because we want to knock down barriers for our farmers and our workers, who are doing everything we have asked them to do to be more competitive and yet still face unfair trade overseas. So we want to knock down those barriers. Some are tariff barriers and some are nontariff barriers.

Where we have a trade agreement, we tend to export a lot more. Only about 10 percent of the world has a trade agreement with the United States. We don't have trade agreements with Europe or Japan or with China. But in that 10 percent of the global economy, we send 47 percent of our exports. So, yes, trade agreements are important to open up markets for us.

Ninety-five percent of consumers live outside our borders, so we want to sell to them. By the way, when we don't continue to sell to them and expand that, what happens is other countries come in and take our markets, and therefore our economy becomes weaker and we lose jobs here in this country. That is what is happening right now. For the last 7 years, we haven't been able to negotiate agreements because we have not had this promotion authority to be able to knock down barriers to trade. So that is important.

But, colleagues, while we do that, we also have to be darn sure this level playing field occurs because otherwise we are not giving our workers and our farmers a fair shake. That is where we ought to be with a balanced approach—opening up more markets to our exports but also ensuring that trade is fair. There are a lot of ways to do that, and in this legislation before us we really help to keep our competitors' feet to the fire to make sure they are playing by the rules. One is with regard to trade enforcement cases. There is language in here that makes it easier for American companies to seek the relief they deserve when another country is selling products into the United States unfairly because they subsidize the product illegally or because they sell it at below their cost, which is called dumping.

There are a lot of companies in Ohio that have had the opportunity to go to the International Trade Administration to seek remedy and some help, but often they find that it is so difficult to show they are injured, by the time they get help, it is too late. So what this legislation does is it says that when we have these trade cases, we want to have the ability to actually make our case and in a timely manner get some kind of relief. Otherwise, why do we have these laws? If you can't get timely relief, sometimes you find yourself so far underwater you can't get back on your feet. That is why I am really excited about passing this Customs bill, because if we do that, we will put in place a better way for companies to go to their government and to seek the relief their workers deserve and to get it in a timely manner so it can really help them.

I was recently in northwest Ohio meeting with steelworkers to discuss one of these cases that has to do with Chinese tires coming into the United States. These particular workers were at Cooper Tire in Findlay, OH, which, by the way, just marked 100 years in business. We want them to be in business another 100 years, but they are having a tough time because they can't compete with tires being sold at below their cost. In response to the concerns they raised with me, I sent a letter to the Secretary of Commerce and called on the administration to vigorously investigate this case and to stand up for United Steelworkers in northwest Ohio.

We now have a trade enforcement case we are working on involving the uncoated paper product made in Chillicothe, OH, at Glatfelter. Again, these are United Steelworker workers who are just asking for a fair shake. They want us to be sure that the paper being sent into the United States from other countries is being fairly traded and not illegally subsidized and not sold at below cost or dumped.

So the tire case and the paper case are two examples where the material injury standard would really matter.

This is an important time for us because in Ohio we have a lot of other cases too. In 2014, we had a couple of important trade victories. Last year, I worked with Senator BROWN to support Ohio pipe and tube workers in Cleveland and the Mahoning Valley who are manufacturing parts to support the energy renaissance taking place in our State and around the country. I visited these pipe and tube manufacturers and met with the workers.

By the way, these workers are doing a great job. Again, they have made concessions to be more competitive. The companies have put a big investment in their training and a big investment in technology, and they can compete if there is a level playing field, and they can win in the international competition.

We won two trade enforcement cases just last year, among others against China, where they were illegally underselling and subsidizing their products. These victories brought some relief for Ohio pipe and tube makers and again gave us a chance to get back on our feet.

We had another win just last month with regard to extending those tariffs to ensure we do have this more level playing field. That followed trade enforcement wins I supported for workers who manufacture hot rolled steel at ArcelorMittal in Cleveland; AK Steel in Middletown; washing machines at Whirlpool in Clyde, OH; and rebar at the Nucor plant in Marion, OH, but also rebar made elsewhere, including Byer Steel in Cincinnati. I visited both of those plants and talked to the workers. They are working hard. They understand they have to compete. They understand it is a global marketplace. They are willing to compete, but they want to be sure it is on a level playing field, and if we do pass this legislation, it will help them in terms of getting that.

Again, I don't think it is fair for American companies to see products coming in here that are being subsidized and undersold and yet they are not able to get the relief they need. So I am hopeful we will be able to pass this legislation as part of the customs law that is going to come before the Senate. That material injury standard is what it ought to be to ensure that, although companies now have access to seek this remedy, that they can actually get the relief they need by having this relief provided more quickly and having the standard be one that can be met by American companies and workers who are being hit with these unfair trade practices.

I am pleased this effort is supported by a lot of manufacturers all around the country. Today, I met with the fasteners from Ohio. These are the folks in Ohio who makes the nuts and bolts and so on. They are interested in this case because, again, they see the ability for them to get a remedy when they need it. It is also supported by US Steel, Timken Steel, Nucor Steel, United Steelworkers, and others. Again, it is a classic example of working together to help protect workers and jobs in places such as Ohio.

By the way, I hope it will pass as part of the Customs bill, but, again, I hope it is also made part of whatever legislation goes over to the House and to the President for his signature, and that may well be the legislation that includes trade promotion authority.

I am also pleased that this Customs bill includes a measure that protects American workers and manufacturers called the ENFORCE Act. It is also part of this package of bills that is in the customs legislation. I have supported and cosponsored this bipartisan bill with Senator WYDEN since it was introduced back in 2011. I have been proud to be the lead Republican on this legislation because, just as I talked about how that bipartisan bill with Senator BROWN on the material injury standard is so important, we have to be sure that once we win a trade case, countries don't use diversion to go around whatever provisions are put in place.

Let me give an example. Sometimes a case is won against one country, but then they evade those higher tariffs by moving the production to another country, and they do it precisely because the trade case has been won. It is kind of hard to keep up with that, and that is why this legislation allows the administration to go after this issue of customs evasion. Sometimes companies are spending millions of dollars a year fighting these evasion schemes. A lot of time and effort is put into it.

It is extremely concerning that these goods continue to illegally enter the country through illegal transshipment and falsified country-of-origin labeling, sometimes undervalued invoices to pay less for duties, and sometimes misclassifying goods so they can slip through our customs without being subject to tariffs.

Let me give an example of this. Workers in Ohio produce prestressed concrete steel wire strand, called PC strand. It is one of our big products in Ohio. We are proud to produce it. It is actually made from carbon wire rod that is used to compress concrete structural members to allow them to withstand very heavy loads. This would be for let's say bridges, parking garages, and certain concrete foundations.

There are 250 workers at American Spring Wire in Bedford, OH, and I visited them and talked to them. They are very interested in this provision because it helps them. Along with two other producers, they were a petitioner in a successful trade case against China a couple of years ago.

As a result of that action, both antidumping duties and also countervailing duties were put in place. Why? Because this product was coming in illegally subsidized and it was dumped—in other words, sold at below cost. So they went through the right process and were able to get these tariffs in place as it related to China; however, Chinese traders began to approach U.S. producers and importers with proposals even before the case ended to circumvent this so that the trade orders that would be in place with regard to China would be circumvented by sending this product through a third country, where this strand would be relabeled and possibly repackaged to reflect a different country of origin. By doing so, these antidumping and countervailing duties would be avoided.

And once these trade orders against PC strand were entered, Malaysia did indeed become a new source—a significant new source of imports through use of this transshipment approach.

So that is what this legislation goes after. It says, look, when you do this—these kinds of schemes, the U.S. Government is required to investigate these cases, and requires Customs to make a preliminary determination when they have suspicion of this happening. This is a big step forward. Again, it is going to help companies, not just successfully go through the process and the great cost of winning one of these cases but actually having it mean something to them and their workers by ensuring companies don't evade it by going to a third country.

Another way we can support American jobs that is in this customs legislation is called the miscellaneous tariffs bill. I am pleased it includes a bipartisan bill that I coauthored. I authored this bill with Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL of Missouri. I thank her, and I also thank a couple of other cosponsors who have been very helpful in getting this legislation into the Customs bill and getting it onto the floor of the Senate. That includes Senator BURR of North Carolina and Senator TOOMEY of Pennsylvania.

Senator TOOMEY has been very helpful, because under the old way, if we dealt with miscellaneous tariff bills, it was really considered an earmark because it was sort of a rifleshot, where individual Members would take up the cause. He has been very helpful in bringing that issue to the fore and ensuring that under our legislation we are not going to have earmarks. In fact, we are going to be able to have the International Trade Commission be involved to determine what the merits of the cases are, not individual Members of Congress. That is very important to me. Senator BURR has been very helpful to kind of bring the textile interests to bear here, to ensure that as we are looking at this issue of miscellaneous tariff bills, we are ensuring that the textile industry is protected as are our other manufacturers.

The miscellaneous tariff bill is interesting. This is for extension of miscellaneous tariffs that suspend or lower tariffs on a product that is an input to a manufacturing facility in the United States, where there is no available product in the United States of America.

Right now we are paying tariffs on products coming in here where there is no competition in America. If we can, through these miscellaneous tariff bills, either reduce or eliminate these duties, it will be less costly for our manufacturers to compete around the world and less costly for our consumers. So this is a good thing for our economy. It is something we ought to be promoting, and I thank our leadership for getting this into the customs legislation. Let's deal with this MTB issue.

By the way, the old legislation expired back in January of 2013—January of 2013. Since that time, American manufacturers and consumers have been paying a much higher import duty, which is essentially higher taxes, than they should have to pay. That means they can't put money into raising wages, increasing benefits for American workers, and maintaining our competitiveness.

There is a recent study out showing the failure to pass this MTB legislation has resulted in a tax hike on U.S. manufacturers of $748 million—an economic loss of $1.8 billion over the past several years.

This legislation is backed by the National Association of Manufacturers, along with 185 associations and companies that urge us to quickly act on this, including 8 of those companies and associations in my home State of Ohio. So this is a reform bill that immediately restarts this MTB process later this year, resolves these earmark concerns that we had previously, and allows us to preserve Congress's traditional and constitutional role in trade policy. It is the right balance. I am excited it is in this Customs bill, along with the other provisions I talked about.

Next week, I plan to talk more about another issue. It is not in the customs legislation, but it will be in the legislation debate regarding trade promotion authority.

We talked earlier about the importance of expanding exports through trade promotion authority but also ensuring we had this level playing field. Part of the level playing field is ensuring that countries do not manipulate their currency, which takes away so

many of the benefits of a trade agreement. Chairman Volcker of the Fed has said something I think that is interesting in this regard. He has said that in five minutes, exchange rates can wipe out what it took trade negotiators ten years to accomplish.

We will talk more about this next week as we talk about trade promotion authority, because I do intend to offer an amendment that is targeted, that is not going to be a poison pill in any respect because I think it will actually help us get more votes for trade, which is an important thing, and it is also something that, frankly, does not affect the TPP countries immediately because none of them are violating the provisions of the IMF—International Monetary Fund—which is what we use for our definition of currency manipulation, but they have in the past, and we don't want them to in the future. We don't want them to take away the very benefits that American workers and farmers get from these trade agreements.

I appreciate the time today to talk about this customs legislation. I am excited to have it on the floor tomorrow and have the chance to vote on all these very important enforcement provisions, to ensure that our workers and our farmers are getting a fair shake.

Then, next week, I hope we will have the opportunity to take up trade promotion authority and move that forward, again, in a way to ensure that we are lowering these barriers overseas for our farmers, our workers, our service providers, so we can access those 95 percent of consumers who are outside of our borders and send more stuff stamped ''Made in America'' all around the world, adding jobs in Ohio and America.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, yesterday, I voted in opposition to cloture on fast-track trade promotion authority.

This was a difficult vote for me. Maryland is pulled in two directions on this issue. On one side Maryland's agricultural industries, such as poultry on the Eastern Shore and the Port of Baltimore, where they believe this trade deal will bring economic benefits for the State. On the other side, I have constituents in Dundalk who don't have a steel industry anymore and wonder why Congress didn't do more to protect them from the effects of trade.

Let me be very clear on one point. I support trade. I encourage trade. Trade is very important to my State. Maryland workers can compete successfully in a global marketplace if they are given a level playing field. That is why I support expansion of fair trade.

In the past, I have supported bilateral trade agreements. We have leverage in those situations and can get strong, enforceable labor and environmental provisions into those agreements to improve living standards and stop child labor in sweatshops. But I have always been suspicious of multilateral agreements like NAFTA. I have seen too many of these big deals fail to deliver the promises of new jobs and businesses.

Why is the role of Congress so important? To make sure the American people get a good deal. I am ready to support trade agreements that are good for America, agreements that are good for workers and good for the environment. Congress should consider trade legislation and amendments using the same procedures we use to consider other legislation.

We should use the leverage of our trade agreements to ensure fair competition. That means workers in other countries should have the right to organize into unions. Without the strength of collective bargaining, their wages will always be below ours. They should also have worker safety protection and retirement and health care benefits.

We should use the leverage of our trade agreements to encourage countries to respect the basic human rights of their citizens. Everyone deserves the right to live in a healthy, clean, unpolluted environment, and every worker should be guaranteed their fundamental rights at work.

When considering trade deals, I also have to consider the impact on my State of Maryland. I am a blue-collar Senator. My heart and soul lies with blue-collar America. I spent most of my life in a blue-collar neighborhood. My mother and father owned a neighborhood grocery store. When Bethlehem Steel went on strike, my dad gave those workers credit. My career and public service is one of deep commitment to working-class people. In the last decade, working people have faced the loss of jobs, lower wages, a reduced standard of living, and a shrinking manufacturing base.

I believe that a renewal of fast-track negotiating authority means more Americans will lose their jobs in the name of free trade. More people will get TAA benefits, but more people will need them.

Proponents of fast-track say it is inevitable that there will be winners and losers. The problem is America's workers and their families always seem to be the losers. They lose their jobs. If they keep their jobs or find new jobs, they lose the wage rates they have earned. I have said before that I don't want to put American jobs on a fast-track to Mexico or a slow boat to China.

I had to base my decision on the facts and what I know to be true in my State. I have to be with my constituents who have felt repeatedly betrayed by the trade deals. I voted to stand up for American workers and consumers. I voted to stand up for the right and responsibility of Congress to fully consider trade agreements. That is why I voted against cloture on fast-track.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF JOE DUNN

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I wish to honor Cascade County Deputy Sheriff Joe Dunn, a dedicated public servant who died in the line of duty on August 14, 2014.

On behalf of all Montanans, I thank Deputy Dunn for his service to our Nation and his community of Great Falls, MT.

Before enlisting to serve and protect his neighbors as a deputy sheriff, Joe Dunn served our Nation in the U.S. Marine Corps and deployed to the battlefields of Afghanistan.

Upon returning to Montana, Deputy Dunn married the love of his life, Robynn, and they had two children Joey and Shiloh, who were the center of his universe.

Deputy Dunn's deep commitment to Jesus and love for his family were the guiding principles in which he lived his life.

Montana's leaders have permanently honored the life and service of Deputy Dunn by naming an eight mile stretch of Interstate 15 outside of Great Falls, MT the Joseph J. Dunn Memorial Highway.

On May 15, 2015, Peace Officers Memorial Day, Deputy Dunn's name will be enshrined forever alongside 273 other brave peace officers who were killed in the line of duty.

During his lifetime of service, Deputy Dunn always went beyond the call of duty to ensure the safety of those he served, often working the evening shift and long hours away from his family.

Deputy Dunn always put others above himself, and he is the kind of leader every Montanan can be proud of.

Everyone who knew Deputy Dunn has been touched by his commitment to serve others, and his passion for making his community a better place to call home.

But above all, Joe Dunn was a family man and regardless of the length of his shift or the difficulty of his day, his top priority was being a father.

Today as a body, we offer our deepest thoughts and prayers to his family: Robynn, Joey, and Shiloh.

The State of Montana and this country are endlessly grateful for his service.

CONGRATULATING LIEUTENANT COLONEL HENRY BUTTELMANN

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate Lt. Col. Henry Buttelmann on receiving the Congressional Gold Medal, honoring his role as an American Fighter Ace during the Korean and Vietnam wars. American Fighter Aces are pilots who shot down five or more enemy planes in aerial combat during time of war. It gives me great pleasure to honor Lieutenant Colonel Buttelmann for his bravery and his accomplishments while serving the United States of America.

Lieutenant Colonel Buttelmann is credited with seven confirmed air victories, five of which were during a short 12-day period. He was the youngest American Fighter Ace of the Korean war and flew a North American F–86 Sabre when he earned his Ace status. From 1948 to 1950, Lieutenant Colonel Buttelmann attended the University of Bridgeport, serving as a private in the 514th Troop Carrier Group with the Air National Guard. After graduating from Big Springs Air Force Base in Texas, he received advanced gunnery training at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. He was then sent to serve in the Korean war beginning December of 1952 and earned his Ace status on June 30, 1953. After his service in the Korean war, Lieutenant Colonel Buttelmann returned to Nellis Air Force Base for instructor duty. He then served in the Vietnam war, logging 286 combat missions during his tours. His service to our country is invaluable.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Lieutenant Colonel Buttelmann for his courageous contributions to the United States of America. His service to his country and his bravery earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. His legacy as an American Fighter Ace will continue on for years to come.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation, but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. Lieutenant Colonel Buttelmann's sacrifice warrants only the greatest respect and care in return.

Lieutenant Colonel Buttelmann displayed true dedication to his trade, loyalty to defending his country, and full commitment to excellence as an American Fighter Ace. I am both humbled and honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lt. Col. Henry Buttelmann for all of his achievements. I wish him well in all of his future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING CAPTAIN (DR.) CLAYTON K. GROSS

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate Captain (Dr.) Clayton K. Gross on receiving the Congressional Gold Medal, honoring his role as an American Fighter Ace during World War II. American Fighter Aces are pilots who shot down five or more enemy planes in aerial combat during time of war. It gives me great pleasure to honor Captain Gross for his achievements and his bravery in serving the United States of America.

Captain Gross is credited with six and a half confirmed air victories and even shot down a Messerschmitt 262, the world's first operational jet fighter. He flew a North American P–51 Mustang he named ''Live Bait'' when he earned his Ace status. Captain Gross is a founding member of the American Fighter Aces Association and served as president of the organization from 1978 to 1979. He was also one of four former fighter pilots, representing all American Fighter Aces, present when President Barack Obama signed the American Fighter Aces Congressional Gold Medal Act. Captain Gross's dedication to his country and to his fellow American Fighter Aces is invaluable.

Captain Gross's service to the United States of America earns him a place among the heroes who have so valiantly defended our freedom. I offer my greatest appreciation to Captain Gross for his courageous contributions to this great Nation. His legacy as an American Fighter Ace will continue on for years to come.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. Captain Gross's sacrifice warrants only the greatest respect and care in return.

During his service, Captain Gross demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the American Fighter Aces. His accolade is well deserved. I am both humbled and honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Captain Clayton Kelly Gross for all of his accomplishments. I wish him well in all of his future endeavors.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL KEVIN S. COOK

● Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I take this occasion to honor Rear Admiral Kevin S. Cook of the U.S. Coast Guard for his 36 years of dedicated service to our country. He is a man who, throughout his career, has led from the front, and our Nation has benefited greatly from his efforts.

A native of Freehold, NJ, Rear Admiral Cook earned his bachelor of science degree in ocean engineering and his commission from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in 1979. Rear Admiral Cook spent his early years in the service afloat on ''work boats,'' the Coast Guard's black hull/aids to navigation fleet. He served as a deck watch officer on the Coast Guard Cutter *Madrona*, as Executive Officer on the Coast Guard Cutter *Bittersweet*, and as commanding officer of the Coast Guard Cutter *Cowslip*.

After his afloat career, Rear Admiral Cook developed proficiency in the Coast Guard's marine safety missions. His first operational ashore tour was at Marine Safety Office Hampton Roads. He was later assigned as executive officer and, subsequently, commanding officer of Marine Safety Office Houston-Galveston—the position he held at the time of the September 11, 2001, attacks. Under his leadership, the Marine Safety Office Houston-Galveston developed integrated tactics, techniques, and procedures to ensure the safety of the ports under its purview. In the years immediately following 9/11, Rear Admiral Cook directed homeland security operations while commanding the Regional Task Unit covering waters from Freeport, TX, to Lake Charles, LA. He carefully balanced safety and security with the need to facilitate commerce in the largest petrochemical complex in the United States. He executed these duties without any substantial disruption to the waterways or the more than 150 facilities that comprise the Port of Houston. His work established the foundation for Coast Guard maritime security operations today.

Rear Admiral Cook also spent time developing policy for the Coast Guard and the international maritime community. He was an engineer for, and later the Chief of, the Coast Guard's hazardous materials division. He also served as the director of prevention policy, where he was responsible for many of the Coast Guard's Marine Safety, Security, and Stewardship missions affecting waterways management, domestic and international shipping, recreational and fishing boats, and port facilities throughout the Nation. During this tour, our Nation would once again need Rear Admiral Cook's leadership and, as before, he would answer that call, serving as the

national incident commander's representative to BP headquarters for oversight of well containment activities during the 2010 Deep Water Horizon response. His specialty knowledge and incident response expertise was instrumental to the management of the first-ever designated Spill of National Significance, SONS, in U.S. history.

Rear Admiral Cook later served as deputy commander of the Atlantic area in Portsmouth, VA, overseeing operations spanning five Coast Guard districts and 40 States, from the Rocky Mountains to the Arabian Gulf.

Rear Admiral Cook presently serves as the commander of the Eighth Coast Guard District. Headquartered in New Orleans, the Eighth District is responsible for Coast Guard operations spanning 26 States, from North Dakota to Brownsville, TX; more than 1,200 miles of Gulf of Mexico shoreline from South Padre Island to the Florida Panhandle; and more than 10,300 miles of inland waterways, including the entire lengths of the Mississippi, Ohio, Missouri, Illinois, and Tennessee river systems. It also oversees more than 179,000-square-miles of the Gulf of Mexico and the associated oil and gas exploration activities that occur on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Unique to the Eighth Coast Guard District are the wide and varied missions carried out daily across the gulf and heartland of America. Rear Admiral Cook has provided strategic vision and critical operational support to ensure that the nearly 10,000 Active Duty, Reserve, Civilian, and Auxiliary members under his charge have the necessary tools and direction to protect some of our Nation's busiest ports and waterways. In fact, the Eighth District oversees 17 of the top 40 busiest U.S. ports in terms of gross tonnage shipped annually—ports such as Houston, Lake Charles, Corpus Christi, New Orleans, and Mobile that are vital to our Nation's economic prosperity. The Eighth District's boundaries also contain the majority of our Nation's river systems, which facilitate the movement of 880 million tons of cargo annually via towboat and barge traffic. His responsibilities stretch 200 miles from shore into the Gulf of Mexico, where there are more than 6,500 oil and gas wells, over 100 mobile offshore drilling units, and approximately 30,000 people working on the Outer Continental Shelf every day. This is a vast area to command, but Rear Admiral Kevin Cook does so admirably.

A lifelong learner, Rear Admiral Cook has taken advantage of every opportunity to improve himself for the betterment of the Coast Guard and his community. He earned a master of science degree in chemical engineering from Princeton University, and he is a 1999 graduate of the U.S. Army War College. He later served a 1-year appointment as the Coast Guard fellow to the chief of naval operations strategic studies group. Rear Admiral Cook has earned numerous military honors, including the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Coast Guard Commendation Medal, and the Coast Guard Achievement Medal.

Rear Admiral Cook is a Coast Guardsman, but that is not all he is. He is husband to Kristen, and, together, they are the proud parents of three grown children: Erin, a second-grade teacher at Rosa Parks Elementary school in Woodbridge, VA; Peter, a technician at a TV station in Winter Park, FL; and Megan, who followed in her father's footsteps and serves as a lieutenant junior grade on the Coast Guard Cutter *Juniper* in Newport, RI.

This week, Rear Admiral Kevin Cook will leave his post in New Orleans and retire after 36 years of exemplary service to the Coast Guard and our Nation. Including his Coast Guard Academy time, Rear Admiral Cook has served our Nation for 40 years. Just as he has stood the watch and has been ''Semper Paratus . . . Always Ready'' during his career, I am sure that he is ready for the next phase of his life. The Coast Guard will carry on, as will his service legacy, through the men and women who he has led and mentored for the past four decades.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in thanking Rear Admiral Cook for his distinguished service and, in Coast Guard tradition, wish him fair winds and following seas.●

REMEMBERING FRANK HENDERSON

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to honor the life of Frank Henderson, an outstanding Idaho leader who will be missed greatly.

Frank personified public service. He served our Nation in the U.S. Army 33rd Division during World War II. He served our State and his district in the Idaho State Legislature for five terms. He served Kootenai County as Kootenai County commissioner, and he served his community as mayor of Post Falls. Frank was a newsman by trade who attended the University of Idaho and began his career in journalism as a reporter for the Chicago Herald American newspaper. He worked as a marketing executive before returning to Idaho in 1976 and becoming the owner and publisher of the Post Falls Tribune.

Frank was a humble man who did not crave the spotlight. Throughout his career and life, he was a focused, organized, direct, driven, and solution-oriented leader. Frank worked hard, and utilized his ability to work well with others to make progress and deliver many significant achievements. These included drawing in and retaining businesses and jobs in Idaho, building the infrastructure to sustain economic expansion, and eliminating impediments to job growth.

He recognized the value of consensus building and the strength of a diversity of experiences and abilities. Diversification was central to his economic development efforts. Frank promoted a diversity of industry and local educational opportunities to support those industries and grow jobs. He wanted to make sure Idahoans had access to a broad spectrum of job opportunities, and he worked diligently to draw those industries to Idaho while assisting businesses already in Idaho with remaining competitive.

It is no surprise that Frank's talents and achievements have been widely recognized. He was inducted into the Idaho Hall of Fame in 2014 and received many other recognitions for his work in furthering economic development and in support of seniors, veterans, the Boy Scouts of America, and others. Frank received a Presidential Lifetime Achievement Award for Volunteerism.

Frank was so dedicated that he worked well into what would be many people's retirement years to make improvements for Idahoans. We have much to thank Frank Henderson for, including his example of effective leadership, his tenacity in seeing projects through to completion, and his focus on strengthening Idaho. I express my deep condolences to Frank's wife, Betty Ann, his children and their families, and his many other friends and loved ones.●

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION 50TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, this spring, we celebrate the 50th anniversary of President Johnson signing legislation to establish the Appalachian Regional Commission, ARC.

The ARC represents a unique partnership between Federal, State and local government in 13 Appalachian States with the aim to address persistent poverty in Appalachian regions. In Virginia, 25 counties and 8 cities are part of that region. Since its inception, the Appalachian Regional Commission has worked to combat problems such as poor health, limited transportation infrastructure, and the digital divide. Over the past 50 years, ARC has funded projects that assisted in the reduction of distressed communities in the Commonwealth by providing assistance for water and wastewater projects, encouraging the adoption of advanced technologies such as broadband service, and supporting the development of community leaders and entrepreneurs. ARC has also recognized the importance of economic development that encourages tourism to help create communities where people want to live, work and visit.

In 1960, 43.2 percent of people lived in poverty in Virginia's Appalachian Region. That number has decreased to

18.6 percent today. In 1970, 28 percent of homes lacked complete plumbing. Today, that number has been reduced to 4 percent. This progress exemplifies ARC's steadfast commitment toward achieving its objective to increase job opportunities and per capita income, strengthen the capacity of Appalachia's citizens to compete in the global economy, improve the region's infrastructure, and build the Appalachian Development Highway System, ADHS.

Great strides have been made in Virginia's Appalachian Region, but more work remains. I am proud to have signed a letter to the chairman and ranking member on Appropriations requesting fiscal year 2016 ARC funding at the President's budget request of $93 million. This critical work must continue until the 25 million Americans who live in the Appalachian Regions are helped out of poverty and can achieve socioeconomic parity with the Nation.

With the Appalachian Regional Commission's continued work and determination, I am confident that the region will continue toward economic progress, growth, and development.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13611 OF MAY 16, 2012, WITH RESPECT TO YEMEN—PM 16

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012, with respect to Yemen is to continue in effect beyond May 16, 2015.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Yemen and others continue to threaten Yemen's peace, security, and stability, including by obstructing the implementation of the agreement of November 23, 2011, between the Government of Yemen and those in opposition to it, which provided for a peaceful transition of power that meets the legitimate demands and aspirations of the Yemeni people for change, and by obstructing the political process in Yemen. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13611 with respect to Yemen.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 13, 2015.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:37 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 665. An act to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 1124. An act to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 606. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

H.R. 723. An act to provide Capitol-flown flags to the immediate family of fire fighters, law enforcement officers, members of rescue squads or ambulance crews, and public safety officers who are killed in the line of duty.

H.R. 1732. An act to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2146. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 254. Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable James Claude Wright, Jr., a former Representative from the State of Texas.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 3:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office''.

H.R. 1075. An act to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the ''Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry''.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 723. An act to provide Capitol-flown flags to the immediate family of fire fighters, law enforcement officers, members of rescue squads or ambulance crews, and public safety officers who are killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H.R. 2146. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–1581. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations .

EC–1582. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Exemptions From Preparation Pursuant to an Unsuspended and Unrevoked License'' ((RIN0579–AD66) (Docket No. APHIS–2011–0048)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1583. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of fifteen (15) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1584. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Homeownership Counseling Organizations Lists and High-Cost Mortgage Counseling Interpretive Rule'' (RIN3170–AA52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1585. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1586. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of

the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, with respect to the Central African Republic; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1587. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Turkey; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1588. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1589. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress on Federal Government Energy Management and Conservation Programs, Fiscal Year 2013''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1590. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress identifying the 9–1–1 capabilities of the multi-line telephone system in use by all federal agencies in all federal buildings and properties; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1591. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Corrections to the North American Free Trade Agreement Uniform Regulations'' (RIN1515–AE04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1592. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period December 1, 2014, through January 31, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1593. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report certifying for fiscal year 2015 that no United Nations agency or United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1594. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–103); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1595. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–021); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1596. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–139); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1597. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–031); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1598. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015–0036–2015–0050); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1599. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Bruce A. Litchfield, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1600. A communication from the Deputy Director, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Organ Procurement and Transplantation: Implementation of the HIV Organ Policy Equity Act'' (RIN0906–AB05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1601. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Examination of the District's Reserve Fund Policies''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1602. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–50, ''Pre-K Student Discipline Amendment Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1603. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's annual report concerning military assistance and military exports; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1604. A communication from the Regulatory Coordinator, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustments to Limitations on Designated School Official Assignment and Study by F–2 and M–2 Nonimmigrants'' (RIN1653–AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1605. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–51, ''Health Benefit Exchange Authority Financial Sustainability Amendment Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance:

Report to accompany S. 1269, An original bill to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–45).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1313. A bill to expand eligibility for reimbursement for smoking cessation services to include copayments for such services paid after fiscal year 2009 by covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program who are eligible for Medicare; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1314. A bill to establish an interim rule for the operation of small unmanned aircraft for commercial purposes and their safe integration into the national airspace system; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEE, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1315. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1316. A bill to provide for the retention and future use of certain land in Point Spencer, Alaska, to support the mission of the Coast Guard, to convey certain land in Point Spencer to the Bering Straits Native Corporation, to convey certain land in Point Spencer to the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1317. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a lifetime income disclosure; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1318. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of maritime navigation and prevention of nuclear terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1319. A bill to validate final patent number 27–2005–0081, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1320. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to reform the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1321. A bill to expand benefits to the families of public safety officers who suffer fatal climate-related injuries sustained in the line of duty and proximately resulting in death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1322. A bill to amend the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 to ensure that student data handled by private companies is protected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1323. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration to disclose certain return information related to identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1324. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1325. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community based outpatient clinic in Newark, Ohio, as the Daniel L. Kinnard Department of Veterans Affairs Community Based Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 1326. A bill to amend certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1327. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1328. A bill to authorize a national grant program for on-the-job training; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 1329. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1330. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sexual orientation or gender identity when extending credit; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1331. A bill to help enhance commerce through improved seasonal forecasts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1332. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to protect against foodborne illnesses, provide enhanced notification of recalled meat, poultry, eggs, and related food products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1333. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1334. A bill to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1335. A bill to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1336. A bill to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Auckland on November 14, 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1337. A bill to reform the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 33

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 33, a bill to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran, and for other purposes.

S. 280

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 280, a bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

S. 298

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

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 and title 38, United States Code, to require the provision of chiropractic care and services to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers and to expand access to such care and services, and for other purposes.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 440

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 440, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 608

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 608, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 683

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Oregon

(Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 683, a bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 704

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 711

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 711, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Service Health Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 713

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 713, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to make Hispanic-serving institutions eligible for technical and financial assistance for the establishment of preservation training and degree programs.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 860, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 883

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 883, a bill to facilitate the reestablishment of domestic, critical mineral designation, assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, workforce, education, and research capabilities in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 968

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 1013

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1013, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes.

S. 1162

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1162, a bill to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1238

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1238, a bill to provide for an accounting of total United States contributions to the United Nations.

S. 1305

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1305, a bill to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 1329. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, this bill has a complex backstory, but it serves a simple purpose: To allow a small day care facility in Virginia to undertake routine repairs and maintenance.

For more than 20 years, the Plains Area Day Care Center in Broadway, VA, has served children from moderate-income families in Rockingham County. This facility sits on a 3-acre parcel that was once Federal land before the National Park Service conveyed it to Rockingham County in 1989 under the Federal Lands to Parks Program. The county in turn leases this land to the center for $1 per year, with a contract that runs through the year 2027.

The center is in need of repairs and maintenance, including a new roof. However, it has had difficulty in securing private financing for these activities because of the complex land ownership structure—Federal land conveyed conditionally to a county and leased to a private company. Due to Virginia's status as a ''Dillon Rule'' State, Rockingham County cannot execute a loan either.

This bill would specify that the 1989 land conveyance is transferred in fee simple, with no further use restrictions. I appreciate the goal of the Federal Lands to Parks Program to preserve land as open space, particularly after having overseen the preservation

of 400,000 acres of open space in Virginia during my time as Governor of the Commonwealth. There are no plans to develop the open space on this site, only to fix the day care center building—a former Forest Service garage that has been on the site since before its transfer from Federal ownership.

This is a small modification that simply removes unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles and allows the day care center to continue doing what it has been doing for 25 years. My Virginia colleague Congressman BOB GOODLATTE has introduced companion legislation in the House of Representatives, and I am pleased to join him in this common-sense, bipartisan effort.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1222. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1223. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1295, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1224. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 644, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1225. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 10, supporting the designation of the year of 2015 as the ''International Year of Soils'' and supporting locally led soil conservation.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1222. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), insert the following:

(7) PROHIBITION ON TRADE AGREEMENTS THAT AFFECT IMMIGRATION LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act or in any trade agreement subject to this Act shall alter or affect any law, regulation, or policy relating to immigration.

(B) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) that includes any provision that alters or affects any law, regulation, or policy relating to immigration.

SA 1223. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1295, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost six-fold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''11 succeeding'' and inserting ''21 succeeding''; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2015'' and inserting ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2025'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.''.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol ''D'' in the ''Special'' subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol ''A'' or ''A*'' in the ''Special'' subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''If the President'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.''.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.''.

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

''(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

''(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

''(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

''(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

''(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

''(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

''(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

''(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

''(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

''(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

''(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

''(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.''.

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ''for men and women'' after ''rights''.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as ''AGOA utilization strategies'');

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest'' and inserting '', through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have''; and

(B) by striking ''and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States'' and inserting '', complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''20'' and inserting ''30''; and

(B) by inserting after ''from those countries'' the following: '', particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) COORDINATION.—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.''.

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have a expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) TERMINATION.—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''beneficiary sub-Saharan African country'' means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''sub-Saharan African country'' has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking ''July 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2017''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013, and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1),

shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COVERED ARTICLE.—The term ''covered article'' means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) ENTER; ENTRY.—The terms ''enter'' and ''entry'' include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.''.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''October 1'' for ''July 1'' each place such date appears.

(b) ARTICLE DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. TRAVEL GOODS.

Section 503(b)(1)(E) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)(E)) is amended by striking ''handbags, luggage, flat goods,''.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

''(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking ''succeeding 11 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''; and

(II) by striking ''December 19, 2018'' and inserting ''December 19, 2025''.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''11 succeeding 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking ''11 succeeding 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2020'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 401. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking ''For the purposes of subheadings'' and all that follows through ''6211.20.15'' and inserting ''For purposes of this chapter'';

(B) by striking ''garments classifiable in those subheadings'' and inserting ''a garment''; and

(C) by striking ''D 3600-81'' and inserting ''D 3779–81''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

''3. (a) For purposes of this chapter, the term 'recreational performance outerwear' means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with 5 or more of the following features:

''(i) Insulation for cold weather protection.

''(ii) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

''(iii) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

''(iv) Venting, not including grommet(s).

''(v) Articulated elbows or knees.

''(vi) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

''(vii) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

''(viii) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

''(ix) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

''(x) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

''(xi) Odor control technology.

The term 'recreational performance outerwear' does not include occupational outerwear.

''(b) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

''(i) The term 'treated with plastics' refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

''(ii) The term 'sealed seams' means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

''(iii) The term 'critically sealed seams' means—

''(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

''(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

''(iv) The term 'insulation for cold weather protection' means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

''(v) The term 'venting' refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

''(vi) The term 'articulated elbows or knees' refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

''(vii) The term 'reinforcement' refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

''(viii) The term 'weatherproof closure' means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

''(ix) The term 'multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar' means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

''(x) The terms 'adjustable powder skirt' and 'inner protective skirt' refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

''(xi) The term 'arm gusset' means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

''(xii) The term 'radial arm movement' refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

''(xiii) The term 'odor control technology' means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

''(xiv) The term 'occupational outerwear' means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

''(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as 'recreational performance outerwear'.

''(d) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.''.

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
	6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.12.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6201.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	’’.

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6201.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	’’.

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%
		Other:			
	6201.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%

	6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6201.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	

	Other:				
6201.93.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	Other:				
6201.93.30	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	
		Other:				
	6201.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	''.

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
	6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.12.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	’’.

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	’’

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
		Other:			
	6202.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight or silk or silk waste	Free		35%

	6202.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	''.

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6202.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%	
	6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.40	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.45	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	’’.

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6202.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	’’.

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
	6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
	6203.41.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	’’.

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.20	Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	’’.

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				

6203.43.15	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	Other:				
6203.43.25	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	Other:				
6203.43.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	Other:				
6203.43.35	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%	
6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	''.

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.49 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6203.49	Of other textile materials:				
	6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				
		Of artificial fibers:				
	6203.49.10	Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%	
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:				

6203.49.15	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%		
6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%		
6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%		
6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%		''.

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%		
		Other:					
	6204.61.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%		
	6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%		''.

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%		
		Other:					
	6204.62.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%		
		Other:					
	6204.62.20	Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%		
		Other:					

	6204.62.30	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	
	6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	''.

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.63.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				
	6204.63.12	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.30	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	

6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	''.

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6204.69	Of other textile materials:			
	6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
		Other:			
		Of artificial fibers:			
	6204.69.10	Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:			
	6204.69.20	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%
	6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
		Of silk or silk waste:			
	6204.69.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%
	6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
	6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35% ''.

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.40.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
		Other:				
	6210.40.30	Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	’’.

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
		Other:				
	6210.50.30	Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	’’.

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6211.32	Of cotton:				
	6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
	6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	’’.

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

‘‘	6211.33	Of man-made fibers:				
	6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.4% (OM)	76%	

	6211.33.10	Other	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.4% (OM)	76%	''.

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6211.39.10	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM)	58.5%	
	6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	''.

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6211.42	Of cotton:				
	6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	
	6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	''.

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
	6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	

6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	''.

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				
	6211.49.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	''.

SEC. 402. DUTY TREATMENT OF SPECIALIZED ATHLETIC FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF SPECIALIZED ATHLETIC FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

''6. For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'specialized athletic footwear' includes footwear (other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1 or Additional U.S. Note 2) that is designed to be worn chiefly for sports or athletic purposes, hiking shoes, trekking shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over $24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.''.

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR SPECIALIZED ATHLETIC FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

''	6402.91.42	Specialized athletic footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	''.

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

''	6402.99.32	Specialized athletic footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P) 1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	''.

(c) STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall—

(1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

SEC. 601. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2024'' and inserting ''July 7, 2025''.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2021'' and inserting ''June 30, 2025''.

SEC. 602. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than $1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 5.25 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 603. IMPROVED INFORMATION REPORTING ON UNREPORTED AND UNDERREPORTED FINANCIAL ACCOUNTS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF MINIMUM INTEREST REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6049(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''aggregating $10 or more'' each place it appears.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subparagraph (C) of section 6049(d)(5) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''which involves the payment of $10 or more of interest'', and

(B) by striking ''IN THE CASE OF TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING $10 OR MORE'' in the heading.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns filed after December 31, 2015.

(b) REPORTING OF NON-INTEREST BEARING DEPOSITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 6049 the following new section:

''SEC. 6049A. RETURNS REGARDING NON-INTEREST BEARING DEPOSITS.

''(a) REQUIREMENT OF REPORTING.—Every person who holds a reportable deposit during any calendar year shall make a return according to the forms or regulations prescribed by the Secretary, setting forth the name and address of the person for whom such deposit was held.

''(b) REPORTABLE DEPOSIT.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'reportable deposit' means—

''(A) any amount on deposit with—

''(i) a person carrying on a banking business,

''(ii) a mutual savings bank, a savings and loan association, a building and loan association, a cooperative bank, a homestead association, a credit union, an industrial loan association or bank, or any similar organization,

''(iii) a broker (as defined in section 6045(c)), or

''(iv) any other person provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, or

''(B) to the extent provided by the Secretary in regulations, any amount held by an insurance company, an investment company (as defined in section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940), or held in other pooled funds or trusts.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include—

''(A) any amount with respect to which a report is made under section 6049,

''(B) any amount on deposit with or held by a natural person,

''(C) except to the extent provided in regulations, any amount—

''(i) held with respect to a person described in section 6049(b)(4),

''(ii) with respect to which section 6049(b)(5) would apply if a payment were made with respect to such amount, or

''(iii) on deposit with or held by a person described in section 6049(b)(2)(C), or

''(D) any amount for which the Secretary determines there is already sufficient reporting.

''(c) STATEMENTS TO BE FURNISHED TO PERSONS WITH RESPECT TO WHOM INFORMATION IS REQUIRED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Every person required to make a return under subsection (a) shall furnish to each person whose name is required to be set forth in such return a written statement showing—

''(A) the name, address, and phone number of the information contact of the person required to make such return, and

''(B) the reportable account with respect to which such return was made.

''(2) TIME AND FORM OF STATEMENT.—The written statement under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be furnished at a time and in a manner similar to the time and manner that statements are required to be filed under section 6049(c)(2), and

''(B) shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe by regulations.

''(d) PERSON.—For purposes of this section, the term 'person', when referring to the person for whom a deposit is held, includes any governmental unit and any agency or instrumentality thereof and any international organization and any agency or instrumentality thereof.''.

(2) ASSESSABLE PENALTIES.—

(A) FAILURE TO FILE RETURN.—Subparagraph (B) of section 6724(d)(1) of such Code is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (xxiv), by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (xxv) and inserting ''or'', and by inserting after clause (xxv) the following new clause:

''(xxvi) section 6049A(a) (relating to returns regarding non-interest bearing deposits), and''.

(B) FAILURE TO FILE PAYEE STATEMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 6724(d) of such Code is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (GG), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (HH) and inserting '', or'', and by inserting after subparagraph (HH) the following new subparagraph:

''(II) section 6049A(c) (relating to returns regarding non-interest bearing deposits).''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of section for subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 6049 the following new item:

''Sec. 6049A. Returns regarding non-interest bearing deposits.''.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns filed after December 31, 2015.

SA 1224. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 644, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AUTOMATED COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT.—The term ''Automated Commercial Environment'' means the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 13031(f)(4) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)).

(2) COMMISSIONER.—The term ''Commissioner'' means the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(3) CUSTOMS AND TRADE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ''customs and trade laws of the United States'' includes the following:

(A) The Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1202 et seq.).

(B) Section 249 of the Revised Statutes (19 U.S.C. 3).

(C) Section 2 of the Act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1453, chapter 251; 19 U.S.C. 6).

(D) The Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2071 et seq.).

(E) Section 13031 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c).

(F) Section 251 of the Revised Statutes (19 U.S.C. 66).

(G) Section 1 of the Act of June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 817, chapter 617; 19 U.S.C. 68).

(H) The Foreign Trade Zones Act (19 U.S.C. 81a et seq.).

(I) Section 1 of the Act of March 2, 1911 (36 Stat. 965, chapter 191; 19 U.S.C. 198).

(J) The Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2102 et seq.).

(K) The Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

(L) The North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.).

(M) The Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

(N) The Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(O) The Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(P) The African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(Q) The Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–570; 100 Stat. 3207–79).

(R) The Customs and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–382; 104 Stat. 629).

(S) The Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–410; 92 Stat. 888).

(T) The Trade Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–210; 116 Stat. 933).

(U) The Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.).

(V) The Act of March 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 374, chapter 266; 19 U.S.C. 2077 et seq.).

(W) The Act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1263, chapter 566).

(X) Any other provision of law implementing a trade agreement.

(Y) Any other provision of law vesting customs revenue functions in the Secretary of the Treasury.

(Z) Any other provision of law relating to trade facilitation or trade enforcement that is administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection on behalf of any Federal agency that is required to participate in the International Trade Data System.

(AA) Any other provision of customs or trade law administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(4) PRIVATE SECTOR ENTITY.—The term ''private sector entity'' means—

(A) an importer;

(B) an exporter;

(C) a forwarder;

(D) an air, sea, or land carrier or shipper;

(E) a contract logistics provider;

(F) a customs broker; or

(G) any other person (other than an employee of a government) affected by the implementation of the customs and trade laws of the United States.

(5) TRADE ENFORCEMENT.—The term ''trade enforcement'' means the enforcement of the customs and trade laws of the United States.

(6) TRADE FACILITATION.—The term ''trade facilitation'' refers to policies and activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to facilitating the movement of merchandise into and out of the United States in a manner that complies with the customs and trade laws of the United States.

TITLE I—TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 101. IMPROVING PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to advance the security, trade enforcement, and trade facilitation missions of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Commissioner shall ensure that partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection established before the date of the enactment of this Act, such as the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism established under subtitle B of title II of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 961 et seq.), and partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection established after such date of enactment, provide trade benefits to private sector entities that meet the requirements for participation in those programs established by the Commissioner under this section.

(b) ELEMENTS.—In developing and operating partnership programs under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall—

(1) consult with private sector entities, the public, and other Federal agencies when appropriate, to ensure that participants in those programs receive commercially significant and measurable trade benefits, including providing preclearance of merchandise for qualified persons that demonstrate the highest levels of compliance with the customs and trade laws of the United States, regulations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other requirements the Commissioner determines to be necessary;

(2) ensure an integrated and transparent system of trade benefits and compliance requirements for all partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(3) consider consolidating partnership programs in situations in which doing so would support the objectives of such programs, increase participation in such programs, enhance the trade benefits provided to participants in such programs, and enhance the allocation of the resources of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(4) coordinate with the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and other Federal agencies with authority to detain and release merchandise entering the United States—

(A) to ensure coordination in the release of such merchandise through the Automated Commercial Environment, or its predecessor, and the International Trade Data System;

(B) to ensure that the partnership programs of those agencies are compatible with the partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(C) to develop criteria for authorizing the release, on an expedited basis, of merchandise for which documentation is required from one or more of those agencies to clear or license the merchandise for entry into the United States; and

(D) to create pathways, within and among the appropriate Federal agencies, for qualified persons that demonstrate the highest levels of compliance to receive immediate clearance absent information that a transaction may pose a national security or compliance threat; and

(5) ensure that trade benefits are provided to participants in partnership programs.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and December 31 of each year thereafter, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) identifies each partnership program referred to in subsection (a);

(2) for each such program, identifies—

(A) the requirements for participants in the program;

(B) the commercially significant and measurable trade benefits provided to participants in the program;

(C) the number of participants in the program; and

(D) in the case of a program that provides for participation at multiple tiers, the number of participants at each such tier;

(3) identifies the number of participants enrolled in more than one such partnership program;

(4) assesses the effectiveness of each such partnership program in advancing the security, trade enforcement, and trade facilitation missions of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, based on historical developments, the level of participation in the program, and the evolution of benefits provided to participants in the program;

(5) summarizes the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to work with other Federal agencies with authority to detain and release merchandise entering the United States to ensure that partnership programs of those agencies are compatible with partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(6) summarizes criteria developed with those agencies for authorizing the release, on an expedited basis, of merchandise for which documentation is required from one or more of those agencies to clear or license the merchandise for entry into the United States;

(7) summarizes the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to work with private sector entities and the public to develop and improve partnership programs referred to in subsection (a);

(8) describes measures taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to make private sector entities aware of the trade benefits available to participants in such programs; and

(9) summarizes the plans, targets, and goals of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to such programs for the 2 years following the submission of the report.

SEC. 102. REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the effectiveness of trade enforcement activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the use of resources, results of audits and verifications, targeting, organization, and training of personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(2) a description of trade enforcement activities to address undervaluation, transshipment, legitimacy of entities making entry, protection of revenues, fraud prevention and detection, and penalties, including intentional misclassification, inadequate bonding, and other misrepresentations; and

(3) a description of trade enforcement activities with respect to the priority trade issues described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act, including—

(A) methodologies used in such enforcement activities, such as targeting;

(B) recommendations for improving such enforcement activities; and

(C) a description of the implementation of previous recommendations for improving such enforcement activities.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 103. PRIORITIES AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR CUSTOMS MODERNIZATION, TRADE FACILITATION, AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS.

(a) PRIORITIES AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner, in consultation with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, shall establish priorities and performance standards to measure the development and levels of achievement of the customs modernization, trade facilitation, and trade enforcement functions and programs described in subsection (b).

(2) MINIMUM PRIORITIES AND STANDARDS.—Such priorities and performance standards shall, at a minimum, include priorities and standards relating to efficiency, outcome, output, and other types of applicable measures.

(b) FUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS DESCRIBED.—The functions and programs referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The Automated Commercial Environment.

(2) Each of the priority trade issues described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act.

(3) The Centers of Excellence and Expertise described in section 110 of this Act.

(4) Drawback for exported merchandise under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313), as amended by section 906 of this Act.

(5) Transactions relating to imported merchandise in bond.

(6) Collection of countervailing duties assessed under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and antidumping duties assessed under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.).

(7) The expedited clearance of cargo.

(8) The issuance of regulations and rulings.

(9) The issuance of Regulatory Audit Reports.

(c) CONSULTATIONS AND NOTIFICATION.—

(1) CONSULTATIONS.—The consultations required by subsection (a)(1) shall occur, at a minimum, on an annual basis.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The Commissioner shall notify the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of any changes to the priorities referred to in subsection (a) not later than 30 days before such changes are to take effect.

SEC. 104. EDUCATIONAL SEMINARS TO IMPROVE EFFORTS TO CLASSIFY AND APPRAISE IMPORTED ARTICLES, TO IMPROVE TRADE ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS, AND TO OTHERWISE FACILITATE LEGITIMATE INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Commissioner and the Director shall establish and carry out on a fiscal year basis educational seminars to—

(A) improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel to classify and appraise articles imported into the United States in accordance with the customs and trade laws of the United States;

(B) improve the trade enforcement efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

(C) otherwise improve the ability and effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel to facilitate legitimate international trade.

(b) CONTENT.—

(1) CLASSIFYING AND APPRAISING IMPORTED ARTICLES.—In carrying out subsection (a)(1)(A), the Commissioner, the Director, and interested parties in the private sector selected under subsection (c) shall provide instruction and related instructional materials at each educational seminar under this section to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and, as appropriate, to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel on the following:

(A) Conducting a physical inspection of an article imported into the United States, including testing of samples of the article, to determine if the article is mislabeled in the manifest or other accompanying documentation.

(B) Reviewing the manifest and other accompanying documentation of an article imported into the United States to determine if the country of origin of the article listed in the manifest or other accompanying documentation is accurate.

(C) Customs valuation.

(D) Industry supply chains and other related matters as determined to be appropriate by the Commissioner.

(2) TRADE ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS.—In carrying out subsection (a)(1)(B), the Commissioner, the Director, and interested parties in the private sector selected under subsection (c) shall provide instruction and related instructional materials at each educational seminar under this section to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel and, as appropriate, to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel to identify opportunities to enhance enforcement of the following:

(A) Collection of countervailing duties assessed under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and antidumping duties assessed under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.).

(B) Addressing evasion of duties on imports of textiles.

(C) Protection of intellectual property rights.

(D) Enforcement of child labor laws.

(3) APPROVAL OF COMMISSIONER AND DIRECTOR.—The instruction and related instructional materials at each educational seminar under this section shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioner and the Director.

(c) SELECTION PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall establish a process to solicit, evaluate, and select interested parties in the private sector for purposes of assisting in providing instruction and related instructional materials described in subsection (b) at each educational seminar under this section.

(2) CRITERIA.—The Commissioner shall evaluate and select interested parties in the private sector under the process established under paragraph (1) based on—

(A) availability and usefulness;

(B) the volume, value, and incidence of mislabeling or misidentification of origin of imported articles; and

(C) other appropriate criteria established by the Commissioner.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Commissioner and the Director shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the process established under paragraph (1) and the criteria established under paragraph (2).

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall give due consideration to carrying out an educational seminar under this section in whole or in part to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel to enforce a countervailing or antidumping duty order issued under section 706 or 736 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671e or 1673e) upon the request of a petitioner in an action underlying such countervailing or antidumping duty order.

(2) INTERESTED PARTY.—A petitioner described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as an interested party in the private sector for purposes of the requirements of this section.

(e) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—The Commissioner and the Director shall establish performance standards to measure the development and level of achievement of educational seminars under this section.

(f) REPORTING.—Beginning September 30, 2016, the Commissioner and the Director shall submit to the Committee of Finance of the Senate and the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives an annual report on the effectiveness of educational seminars under this section.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(2) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'' means the customs territory of the United States, as defined in General Note 2 to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(3) U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL.—The term ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel'' means import specialists, auditors, and other appropriate employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(4) U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.—The term ''U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel'' means Homeland Security Investigations Directorate personnel and other appropriate employees of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 105. JOINT STRATEGIC PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall jointly develop and submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, a joint strategic plan.

(b) CONTENTS.—The joint strategic plan required under this section shall be comprised of a comprehensive multi-year plan for trade enforcement and trade facilitation, and shall include—

(1) a summary of actions taken during the 2-year period preceding the submission of the plan to improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation, including a description and analysis of specific performance measures to evaluate the progress of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement in meeting each such responsibility;

(2) a statement of objectives and plans for further improving trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(3) a specific identification of the priority trade issues described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act, that can be addressed in order to enhance trade enforcement and trade facilitation, and a description of strategies and plans for addressing each such issue, including—

(A) a description of the targeting methodologies used for enforcement activities with respect to each such issue;

(B) recommendations for improving such enforcement activities; and

(C) a description of the implementation of previous recommendations for improving such enforcement activities;

(4) a description of efforts made to improve consultation and coordination among and within Federal agencies, and in particular between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, regarding trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(5) a description of the training that has occurred to date within U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation, including training under section 104 of this Act;

(6) a description of efforts to work with the World Customs Organization and other international organizations, in consultation with other Federal agencies as appropriate, with respect to enhancing trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(7) a description of U.S. Customs and Border Protection organizational benchmarks for optimizing staffing and wait times at ports of entry;

(8) a specific identification of any domestic or international best practices that may further improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation;

(9) any legislative recommendations to further improve trade enforcement and trade facilitation; and

(10) a description of efforts made to improve consultation and coordination with the private sector to enhance trade enforcement and trade facilitation.

(c) CONSULTATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In developing the joint strategic plan required under this section, the Commissioner and the Director shall consult with—

(A) appropriate officials from the relevant Federal agencies, including—

(i) the Department of the Treasury;

(ii) the Department of Agriculture;

(iii) the Department of Commerce;

(iv) the Department of Justice;

(v) the Department of the Interior;

(vi) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(vii) the Food and Drug Administration;

(viii) the Consumer Product Safety Commission; and

(ix) the Office of the United States Trade Representative; and

(B) the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established by section 109 of this Act.

(2) OTHER CONSULTATIONS.—In developing the joint strategic plan required under this section, the Commissioner and the Director shall seek to consult with—

(A) appropriate officials from relevant foreign law enforcement agencies and international organizations, including the World Customs Organization; and

(B) interested parties in the private sector.

(d) FORM OF PLAN.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 106. AUTOMATED COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 13031(f)(4)(B) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2003 through 2005'' and inserting ''2016 through 2018'';

(2) by striking ''such amounts as are available in that Account'' and inserting ''not less than $153,736,000''; and

(3) by striking ''for the development'' and inserting ''to complete the development and implementation''.

(b) REPORT.—Section 311(b)(3) of the Customs Border Security Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 2075 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report detailing—

''(i) U.S. Customs and Border Protection's incorporation of all core trade processing capabilities, including cargo release, entry summary, cargo manifest, cargo financial data, and export data elements into the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 13031(f)(4) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)) not later than September 30, 2016, to conform with the admissibility criteria of agencies participating in the International Trade Data System identified pursuant to section 411(d)(4)(A)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930;

''(ii) U.S. Customs and Border Protection's remaining priorities for processing entry summary data elements, cargo manifest data elements, cargo financial data elements, and export elements in the Automated Commercial Environment computer system, and the objectives and plans for implementing these remaining priorities;

''(iii) the components of the National Customs Automation Program specified in subsection (a)(2) of section 411 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that have not been implemented; and

''(iv) any additional components of the National Customs Automation Program initiated by the Commissioner to complete the development, establishment, and implementation of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system.

''(B) UPDATE OF REPORTS.—Not later than September 30, 2017, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives an updated report addressing each of the matters referred to in subparagraph (A), and—

''(i) evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system; and

''(ii) detailing the percentage of trade processed in the Automated Commercial Environment every month since September 30, 2016.''.

(c) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report—

(1) assessing the progress of other Federal agencies in accessing and utilizing the Automated Commercial Environment; and

(2) assessing the potential cost savings to the United States Government and importers and exporters and the potential benefits to enforcement of the customs and trade laws of the United States if the elements identified in clauses (i) through (iv) of section 311(b)(3)(A) of the Customs Border Security Act of 2002, as amended by subsection (b) of this section, are implemented.

SEC. 107. INTERNATIONAL TRADE DATA SYSTEM.

(a) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE.—Section 411(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1411(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (5) through (8), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall work with the head of each agency participating in the ITDS and the Interagency Steering Committee to ensure that each agency—

''(i) develops and maintains the necessary information technology infrastructure to support the operation of the ITDS and to submit all data to the ITDS electronically;

''(ii) enters into a memorandum of understanding, or takes such other action as is necessary, to provide for the information sharing between the agency and U.S. Customs and Border Protection necessary for the operation and maintenance of the ITDS;

''(iii) not later than June 30, 2016, identifies and transmits to the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection the admissibility criteria and data elements required by the agency to authorize the release of cargo by U.S. Customs and Border Protection for incorporation into the operational functionality of the Automated Commercial Environment computer system authorized under section 13031(f)(4) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(4)); and

''(iv) not later than December 31, 2016, utilizes the ITDS as the primary means of receiving from users the standard set of data and other relevant documentation, exclusive of applications for permits, licenses, or certifications required for the release of imported cargo and clearance of cargo for export.

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require any action to be taken that would compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation or national security.''; and

(3) in paragraph (8), as redesignated, by striking ''section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note)'' and inserting ''section 109 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 108. CONSULTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO MUTUAL RECOGNITION ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) CONSULTATIONS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to any proposed mutual recognition arrangement or similar agreement between the United States and a foreign government providing for mutual recognition of supply chain security programs and customs revenue functions, shall consult—

(1) not later than 30 days before initiating negotiations to enter into any such arrangement or similar agreement, with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

(2) not later than 30 days before entering into any such arrangement or similar agreement, with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(b) NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVE.—It shall be a negotiating objective of the United States in

any negotiation for a mutual recognition arrangement with a foreign country on partnership programs, such as the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism established under subtitle B of title II of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 961 et seq.), to seek to ensure the compatibility of the partnership programs of that country with the partnership programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to enhance trade facilitation and trade enforcement.

SEC. 109. COMMERCIAL CUSTOMS OPERATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly establish a Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ''Advisory Committee'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall be comprised of—

(A) 20 individuals appointed under paragraph (2);

(B) the Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy of the Department of the Treasury and the Commissioner, who shall jointly co-chair meetings of the Advisory Committee; and

(C) the Assistant Secretary for Policy and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security, who shall serve as deputy co-chairs of meetings of the Advisory Committee.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly appoint 20 individuals from the private sector to the Advisory Committee.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In making appointments under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall appoint members—

(i) to ensure that the membership of the Advisory Committee is representative of the individuals and firms affected by the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

(ii) without regard to political affiliation.

(C) TERMS.—Each individual appointed to the Advisory Committee under this paragraph shall be appointed for a term of not more than 3 years, and may be reappointed to subsequent terms, but may not serve more than 2 terms sequentially.

(3) TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security may transfer members serving on the Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations of the United States Customs Service established under section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to the Advisory Committee established under subsection (a).

(c) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee established under subsection (a) shall—

(1) advise the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security on all matters involving the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including advising with respect to significant changes that are proposed with respect to regulations, policies, or practices of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(2) provide recommendations to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security on improvements to the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(3) collaborate in developing the agenda for Advisory Committee meetings; and

(4) perform such other functions relating to the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection as prescribed by law or as the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security jointly direct.

(d) MEETINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security, or at the call of not less than two-thirds of the membership of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee shall meet at least 4 times each calendar year.

(2) OPEN MEETINGS.—Notwithstanding section 10(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), the Advisory Committee meetings shall be open to the public unless the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that the meeting will include matters the disclosure of which would compromise the development of policies, priorities, or negotiating objectives or positions that could impact the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection or the operations or investigations of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2016, and annually thereafter, the Advisory Committee shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) describes the activities of the Advisory Committee during the preceding fiscal year; and

(2) sets forth any recommendations of the Advisory Committee regarding the commercial operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(f) TERMINATION.—Section 14(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.; relating to the termination of advisory committees) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date on which the Advisory Committee is established under subsection (a), section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) is repealed.

(2) REFERENCE.—Any reference in law to the Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations of the United States Customs Service established under section 9503(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) made on or after the date on which the Advisory Committee is established under subsection (a), shall be deemed a reference to the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established under subsection (a).

SEC. 110. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AND EXPERTISE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall, in consultation with the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established by section 109 of this Act, develop and implement Centers of Excellence and Expertise throughout U.S. Customs and Border Protection that—

(1) enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States by consistently enforcing the laws and regulations of the United States at all ports of entry of the United States and by facilitating the flow of legitimate trade through increasing industry-based knowledge;

(2) improve enforcement efforts, including enforcement of priority trade issues described in subparagraph (B)(ii) of section 2(d)(3) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act, in specific industry sectors through the application of targeting information from the Commercial Targeting Division established under subparagraph (A) of such section 2(d)(3) and from other means of verification;

(3) build upon the expertise of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in particular industry operations, supply chains, and compliance requirements;

(4) promote the uniform implementation at each port of entry of the United States of policies and regulations relating to imports;

(5) centralize the trade enforcement and trade facilitation efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(6) formalize an account-based approach to apply, as the Commissioner determines appropriate, to the importation of merchandise into the United States;

(7) foster partnerships though the expansion of trade programs and other trusted partner programs;

(8) develop applicable performance measurements to meet internal efficiency and effectiveness goals; and

(9) whenever feasible, facilitate a more efficient flow of information between Federal agencies.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report describing—

(1) the scope, functions, and structure of each Center of Excellence and Expertise developed and implemented under subsection (a);

(2) the effectiveness of each such Center of Excellence and Expertise in improving enforcement efforts, including enforcement of priority trade issues, and facilitating legitimate trade;

(3) the quantitative and qualitative benefits of each such Center of Excellence and Expertise to the trade community, including through fostering partnerships through the expansion of trade programs such as the Importer Self Assessment program and other trusted partner programs;

(4) all applicable performance measurements with respect to each such Center of Excellence and Expertise, including performance measures with respect to meeting internal efficiency and effectiveness goals;

(5) the performance of each such Center of Excellence and Expertise in increasing the accuracy and completeness of data with respect to international trade and facilitating a more efficient flow of information between Federal agencies; and

(6) any planned changes in the number, scope, functions or any other aspect of the Centers of Excellence and Expertise developed and implemented under subsection (a).

SEC. 111. COMMERCIAL TARGETING DIVISION AND NATIONAL TARGETING AND ANALYSIS GROUPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) COMMERCIAL TARGETING DIVISION AND NATIONAL TARGETING AND ANALYSIS GROUPS.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMERCIAL TARGETING DIVISION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish and maintain within the Office of International Trade a Commercial Targeting Division.

''(ii) COMPOSITION.—The Commercial Targeting Division shall be composed of—

''(I) headquarters personnel led by an Executive Director, who shall report to the Assistant Commissioner for Trade; and

''(II) individual National Targeting and Analysis Groups, each led by a Director who shall report to the Executive Director of the Commercial Targeting Division.

''(iii) DUTIES.—The Commercial Targeting Division shall be dedicated—

''(I) to the development and conduct of commercial risk assessment targeting with respect to cargo destined for the United States in accordance with subparagraph (C); and

''(II) to issuing Trade Alerts described in subparagraph (D).

''(B) NATIONAL TARGETING AND ANALYSIS GROUPS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A National Targeting and Analysis Group referred to in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) shall, at a minimum, be established for each priority trade issue described in clause (ii).

''(ii) PRIORITY TRADE ISSUES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The priority trade issues described in this clause are the following:

''(aa) Agriculture programs.

''(bb) Antidumping and countervailing duties.

''(cc) Import safety.

''(dd) Intellectual property rights.

''(ee) Revenue.

''(ff) Textiles and wearing apparel.

''(gg) Trade agreements and preference programs.

''(II) MODIFICATION.—The Commissioner is authorized to establish new priority trade issues and eliminate, consolidate, or otherwise modify the priority trade issues described in this paragraph if the Commissioner—

''(aa) determines it necessary and appropriate to do so;

''(bb) submits to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a summary of proposals to consolidate, eliminate, or otherwise modify existing priority trade issues not later than 60 days before such changes are to take effect; and

''(cc) submits to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a summary of proposals to establish new priority trade issues not later than 30 days after such changes are to take effect.

''(iii) DUTIES.—The duties of each National Targeting and Analysis Group shall include—

''(I) directing the trade enforcement and compliance assessment activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection that relate to the Group's priority trade issue;

''(II) facilitating, promoting, and coordinating cooperation and the exchange of information between U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and other relevant Federal departments and agencies regarding the Group's priority trade issue; and

''(III) serving as the primary liaison between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the public regarding United States Government activities regarding the Group's priority trade issue, including—

''(aa) providing for receipt and transmission to the appropriate U.S. Customs and Border Protection office of allegations from interested parties in the private sector of violations of customs and trade laws of the United States of merchandise relating to the priority trade issue;

''(bb) obtaining information from the appropriate U.S. Customs and Border Protection office on the status of any activities resulting from the submission of any such allegation, including any decision not to pursue the allegation, and providing any such information to each interested party in the private sector that submitted the allegation every 90 days after the allegation was received by U.S. Customs and Border Protection unless providing such information would compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation; and

''(cc) notifying on a timely basis each interested party in the private sector that submitted such allegation of any civil or criminal actions taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or other Federal department or agency resulting from the allegation.

''(C) COMMERCIAL RISK ASSESSMENT TARGETING.—In carrying out its duties with respect to commercial risk assessment targeting, the Commercial Targeting Division shall—

''(i) establish targeted risk assessment methodologies and standards—

''(I) for evaluating the risk that cargo destined for the United States may violate the customs and trade laws of the United States, particularly those laws applicable to merchandise subject to the priority trade issues described in subparagraph (B)(ii); and

''(II) for issuing, as appropriate, Trade Alerts described in subparagraph (D); and

''(ii) to the extent practicable and otherwise authorized by law, use, to administer the methodologies and standards established under clause (i)—

''(I) publicly available information;

''(II) information available from the Automated Commercial System, the Automated Commercial Environment computer system, the Automated Targeting System, the Automated Export System, the International Trade Data System, the TECS (formerly known as the 'Treasury Enforcement Communications System'), the case management system of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and any successor systems; and

''(III) information made available to the Commercial Targeting Division, including information provided by private sector entities.

''(D) TRADE ALERTS.—

''(i) ISSUANCE.—Based upon the application of the targeted risk assessment methodologies and standards established under subparagraph (C), the Executive Director of the Commercial Targeting Division and the Directors of the National Targeting and Analysis Groups may issue Trade Alerts to directors of United States ports of entry directing further inspection, or physical examination or testing, of specific merchandise to ensure compliance with all applicable customs and trade laws and regulations administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

''(ii) DETERMINATIONS NOT TO IMPLEMENT TRADE ALERTS.—The director of a United States port of entry may determine not to conduct further inspections, or physical examination or testing, pursuant to a Trade Alert issued under clause (i) if the director—

''(I) finds that such a determination is justified by security interests; and

''(II) notifies the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations and the Assistant Commissioner of International Trade of U.S. Customs and Border Protection of the determination and the reasons for the determination not later than 48 hours after making the determination.

''(iii) SUMMARY OF DETERMINATIONS NOT TO IMPLEMENT.—The Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall—

''(I) compile an annual public summary of all determinations by directors of United States ports of entry under clause (ii) and the reasons for those determinations;

''(II) conduct an evaluation of the utilization of Trade Alerts issued under clause (i); and

''(III) submit the summary to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives not later than December 31 of each year.

''(iv) INSPECTION DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term 'inspection' means the comprehensive evaluation process used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, other than physical examination or testing, to permit the entry of merchandise into the United States, or the clearance of merchandise for transportation in bond through the United States, for purposes of—

''(I) assessing duties;

''(II) identifying restricted or prohibited items; and

''(III) ensuring compliance with all applicable customs and trade laws and regulations administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.''.

(b) USE OF TRADE DATA FOR COMMERCIAL ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES.—Section 343(a)(3)(F) of the Trade Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(F) The information collected pursuant to the regulations shall be used exclusively for ensuring cargo safety and security, preventing smuggling, and commercial risk assessment targeting, and shall not be used for any commercial enforcement purposes, including for determining merchandise entry. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, nothing in this section shall be treated as amending, repealing, or otherwise modifying title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930 or regulations prescribed thereunder.''.

SEC. 112. REPORT ON OVERSIGHT OF REVENUE PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31, 2016, and not later than March 31 of each second year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report assessing, with respect to the period covered by the report, as specified in subsection (b), the following:

(1) The effectiveness of the measures taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to protection of revenue, including—

(A) the collection of countervailing duties assessed under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and antidumping duties assessed under subtitle B of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673 et seq.);

(B) the assessment, collection, and mitigation of commercial fines and penalties;

(C) the use of bonds, including continuous and single transaction bonds, to secure that revenue; and

(D) the adequacy of the policies of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to the monitoring and tracking of merchandise transported in bond and collecting duties, as appropriate.

(2) The effectiveness of actions taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to measure accountability and performance with respect to protection of revenue.

(3) The number and outcome of investigations instituted by U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to the underpayment of duties.

(4) The effectiveness of training with respect to the collection of duties provided for personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(b) PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall cover the period of 2 fiscal years ending on September 30 of the calendar year preceding the submission of the report.

SEC. 113. REPORT ON SECURITY AND REVENUE MEASURES WITH RESPECT TO MERCHANDISE TRANSPORTED IN BOND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on efforts undertaken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to ensure the secure transportation of merchandise in bond through the United States and the collection of revenue owed upon the entry of such merchandise into the United States for consumption.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall include, for the fiscal year preceding the submission of the report, information on—

(1) the overall number of entries of merchandise for transportation in bond through the United States;

(2) the ports at which merchandise arrives in the United States for transportation in bond and at which records of the arrival of such merchandise are generated;

(3) the average time taken to reconcile such records with the records at the final destination of the merchandise in the United States to demonstrate that the merchandise reaches its final destination or is reexported;

(4) the average time taken to transport merchandise in bond from the port at which the merchandise arrives in the United States to its final destination in the United States;

(5) the total amount of duties, taxes, and fees owed with respect to shipments of merchandise transported in bond and the total amount of such duties, taxes, and fees paid;

(6) the total number of notifications by carriers of merchandise being transported in bond that the destination of the merchandise has changed; and

(7) the number of entries that remain unreconciled.

SEC. 114. IMPORTER OF RECORD PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish an importer of record program to assign and maintain importer of record numbers.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that, as part of the importer of record program, U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(1) develops criteria that importers must meet in order to obtain an importer of record number, including—

(A) criteria to ensure sufficient information is collected to allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to verify the existence of the importer requesting the importer of record number;

(B) criteria to ensure sufficient information is collected to allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to identify linkages or other affiliations between importers that are requesting or have been assigned importer of record numbers; and

(C) criteria to ensure sufficient information is collected to allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to identify changes in address and corporate structure of importers;

(2) provides a process by which importers are assigned importer of record numbers;

(3) maintains a centralized database of importer of record numbers, including a history of importer of record numbers associated with each importer, and the information described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1);

(4) evaluates and maintains the accuracy of the database if such information changes; and

(5) takes measures to ensure that duplicate importer of record numbers are not issued.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the importer of record program established under subsection (a).

(d) NUMBER DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''number'', with respect to an importer of record, means a filing identification number described in section 24.5 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation) that fully supports the requirements of subsection (b) with respect to the collection and maintenance of information.

SEC. 115. ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW IMPORTER PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall establish a new importer program that directs U.S. Customs and Border Protection to adjust bond amounts for new importers based on the level of risk assessed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection for protection of revenue of the Federal Government.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Commissioner shall ensure that, as part of the new importer program established under subsection (a), U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(1) develops risk-based criteria for determining which importers are considered to be new importers for the purposes of this subsection;

(2) develops risk assessment guidelines for new importers to determine if and to what extent—

(A) to adjust bond amounts of imported products of new importers; and

(B) to increase screening of imported products of new importers;

(3) develops procedures to ensure increased oversight of imported products of new importers relating to the enforcement of the priority trade issues described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of section 2(d) of the Act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1381, chapter 348; 19 U.S.C. 2072(d)), as added by section 111(a) of this Act;

(4) develops procedures to ensure increased oversight of imported products of new importers by Centers of Excellence and Expertise established under section 110 of this Act; and

(5) establishes a centralized database of new importers to ensure accuracy of information that is required to be provided by new importers to U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

TITLE II—IMPORT HEALTH AND SAFETY

SEC. 201. INTERAGENCY IMPORT SAFETY WORKING GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an interagency Import Safety Working Group.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The interagency Import Safety Working Group shall consist of the following officials or their designees:

(1) The Secretary of Homeland Security, who shall serve as the Chair.

(2) The Secretary of Health and Human Services, who shall serve as the Vice Chair.

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury.

(4) The Secretary of Commerce.

(5) The Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) The United States Trade Representative.

(7) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(8) The Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

(9) The Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(10) The Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

(11) The Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(12) The head of any other Federal agency designated by the President to participate in the interagency Import Safety Working Group, as appropriate.

(c) DUTIES.—The duties of the interagency Import Safety Working Group shall include—

(1) consulting on the development of the joint import safety rapid response plan required by section 202 of this Act;

(2) periodically evaluating the adequacy of the plans, practices, and resources of the Federal Government dedicated to ensuring the safety of merchandise imported in the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise, including—

(A) minimizing the duplication of efforts among agencies the heads of which are members of the interagency Import Safety Working Group and ensuring the compatibility of the policies and regulations of those agencies; and

(B) recommending additional administrative actions, as appropriate, designed to ensure the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise and considering the impact of those actions on private sector entities;

(3) reviewing the engagement and cooperation of foreign governments and foreign manufacturers in facilitating the inspection and certification, as appropriate, of such merchandise to be imported into the United States and the facilities producing such merchandise to ensure the safety of the merchandise and the expeditious entry of the merchandise into the United States;

(4) identifying best practices, in consultation with private sector entities as appropriate, to assist United States importers in taking all appropriate steps to ensure the safety of merchandise imported into the United States, including with respect to—

(A) the inspection of manufacturing facilities in foreign countries;

(B) the inspection of merchandise destined for the United States before exportation from a foreign country or before distribution in the United States; and

(C) the protection of the international supply chain (as defined in section 2 of the Security and Accountability For Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 901));

(5) identifying best practices to assist Federal, State, and local governments and agencies, and port authorities, to improve communication and coordination among such agencies and authorities with respect to ensuring the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise; and

(6) otherwise identifying appropriate steps to increase the accountability of United States importers and the engagement of foreign government agencies with respect to ensuring the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise.

SEC. 202. JOINT IMPORT SAFETY RAPID RESPONSE PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the interagency Import Safety Working Group, shall develop a plan (to be known as the ''joint import safety rapid response plan'') that sets forth protocols and defines practices for U.S. Customs and Border Protection to use—

(1) in taking action in response to, and coordinating Federal responses to, an incident in which cargo destined for or merchandise entering the United States has been identified as posing a threat to the health or safety of consumers in the United States; and

(2) in recovering from or mitigating the effects of actions and responses to an incident described in paragraph (1).

(b) CONTENTS.—The joint import safety rapid response plan shall address—

(1) the statutory and regulatory authorities and responsibilities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other Federal agencies in responding to an incident described in subsection (a)(1);

(2) the protocols and practices to be used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection when taking action in response to, and coordinating Federal responses to, such an incident;

(3) the measures to be taken by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other Federal agencies in recovering from or mitigating the effects of actions taken in response to such an incident after the incident to ensure the resumption of the entry of merchandise into the United States; and

(4) exercises that U.S. Customs and Border Protection may conduct in conjunction with Federal, State, and local agencies, and private sector entities, to simulate responses to such an incident.

(c) UPDATES OF PLAN.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall review and update the joint import safety rapid response plan, as appropriate, after conducting exercises under subsection (d).

(d) IMPORT HEALTH AND SAFETY EXERCISES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Commissioner shall periodically engage in the exercises referred to in subsection (b)(4), in conjunction with Federal, State, and local agencies and private sector entities, as appropriate, to test and evaluate the protocols and practices identified in the joint import safety rapid response plan at United States ports of entry.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXERCISES.—In conducting exercises under paragraph (1), the Secretary and the Commissioner shall—

(A) make allowance for the resources, needs, and constraints of United States ports of entry of different sizes in representative geographic locations across the United States;

(B) base evaluations on current risk assessments of merchandise entering the United States at representative United States ports of entry located across the United States;

(C) ensure that such exercises are conducted in a manner consistent with the National Incident Management System, the National Response Plan, the National Infrastructure Protection Plan, the National Preparedness Guidelines, the Maritime Transportation System Security Plan, and other such national initiatives of the Department of Homeland Security, as appropriate; and

(D) develop metrics with respect to the resumption of the entry of merchandise into the United States after an incident described in subsection (a)(1).

(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR TESTING AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary and the Commissioner shall ensure that the testing and evaluation carried out in conducting exercises under paragraph (1)—

(A) are performed using clear and objective performance measures; and

(B) result in the identification of specific recommendations or best practices for responding to an incident described in subsection (a)(1).

(4) DISSEMINATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary and the Commissioner shall—

(A) share the recommendations or best practices identified under paragraph (3)(B) among the members of the interagency Import Safety Working Group and with, as appropriate—

(i) State, local, and tribal governments;

(ii) foreign governments; and

(iii) private sector entities; and

(B) use such recommendations and best practices to update the joint import safety rapid response plan.

SEC. 203. TRAINING.

The Commissioner shall ensure that personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection assigned to United States ports of entry are trained to effectively administer the provisions of this title and to otherwise assist in ensuring the safety of merchandise imported into the United States and the expeditious entry of such merchandise.

TITLE III—IMPORT-RELATED PROTECTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

SEC. 301. DEFINITION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

In this title, the term ''intellectual property rights'' refers to copyrights, trademarks, and other forms of intellectual property rights that are enforced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 302. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION RELATED TO TRADE ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting after section 628 (19 U.S.C. 1628) the following new section:

''SEC. 628A. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION RELATED TO TRADE ENFORCEMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (c) and (d), if the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection suspects that merchandise is being imported into the United States in violation of section 526 of this Act or section 602, 1201(a)(2), or 1201(b)(1) of title 17, United States Code, and determines that the examination or testing of the merchandise by a person described in subsection (b) would assist the Commissioner in determining if the merchandise is being imported in violation of that section, the Commissioner, to permit the person to conduct the examination and testing—

''(1) shall provide to the person information that appears on the merchandise and its packaging and labels, including unredacted images of the merchandise and its packaging and labels; and

''(2) may, subject to any applicable bonding requirements, provide to the person unredacted samples of the merchandise.

''(b) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person described in this subsection is—

''(1) in the case of merchandise suspected of being imported in violation of section 526, the owner of the trademark suspected of being copied or simulated by the merchandise;

''(2) in the case of merchandise suspected of being imported in violation of section 602 of title 17, United States Code, the owner of the copyright suspected of being infringed by the merchandise;

''(3) in the case of merchandise suspected of being primarily designed or produced for the purpose of circumventing a technological measure that effectively controls access to a work protected under that title, and being imported in violation of section 1201(a)(2) of that title, the owner of a copyright in the work; and

''(4) in the case of merchandise suspected of being primarily designed or produced for the purpose of circumventing protection afforded by a technological measure that effectively protects a right of an owner of a copyright in a work or a portion of a work, and being imported in violation of section 1201(b)(1) of that title, the owner of the copyright.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Subsection (a) applies only with respect to merchandise suspected of infringing a trademark or copyright that is recorded with U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

''(d) EXCEPTION.—The Commissioner may not provide under subsection (a) information, photographs, or samples to a person described in subsection (b) if providing such information, photographs, or samples would compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation or national security.''.

(b) TERMINATION OF PREVIOUS AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of section 818(g) of Public Law 112–81 (125 Stat. 1496), paragraph (1) of that section shall have no force or effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 303. SEIZURE OF CIRCUMVENTION DEVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 596(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1595a(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''or'';

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) U.S. Customs and Border Protection determines it is a technology, product, service, device, component, or part thereof the importation of which is prohibited under subsection (a)(2) or (b)(1) of section 1201 of title 17, United States Code.''.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF PERSONS INJURED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 30 business days after seizing merchandise pursuant to subparagraph (G) of section 596(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by subsection (a), the Commissioner shall provide to any person identified under paragraph (2) information regarding the merchandise seized that is equivalent to information provided to copyright owners under regulations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for merchandise seized for violation of the copyright laws.

(2) PERSONS TO BE PROVIDED INFORMATION.—Any person injured by the violation of (a)(2) or (b)(1) of section 1201 of title 17, United States Code, that resulted in the seizure of the merchandise shall be provided information under paragraph (1), if that person is included on a list maintained by the Commissioner that is revised annually through publication in the Federal Register.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations establishing procedures that implement this subsection.

SEC. 304. ENFORCEMENT BY U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OF WORKS FOR WHICH COPYRIGHT REGISTRATION IS PENDING.

Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of Homeland Security shall authorize a process pursuant to which the Commissioner shall enforce a copyright for which the owner has submitted an application for registration under title 17, United States Code, with the United States Copyright Office, to the same extent and in the same manner as if the copyright were registered with the Copyright Office, including by sharing information, images, and samples of merchandise suspected of infringing the copyright under section 628A of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 302.

SEC. 305. NATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS COORDINATION CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) establish within U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement a National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center; and

(2) appoint an Assistant Director to head the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center.

(b) DUTIES.—The Assistant Director of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center shall—

(1) coordinate the investigation of sources of merchandise that infringe intellectual property rights to identify organizations and individuals that produce, smuggle, or distribute such merchandise;

(2) conduct and coordinate training with other domestic and international law enforcement agencies on investigative best practices—

(A) to develop and expand the capability of such agencies to enforce intellectual property rights; and

(B) to develop metrics to assess whether the training improved enforcement of intellectual property rights;

(3) coordinate, with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, activities conducted by the United States to prevent the importation or exportation of merchandise that infringes intellectual property rights;

(4) support the international interdiction of merchandise destined for the United States that infringes intellectual property rights;

(5) collect and integrate information regarding infringement of intellectual property rights from domestic and international law enforcement agencies and other non-Federal sources;

(6) develop a means to receive and organize information regarding infringement of intellectual property rights from such agencies and other sources;

(7) disseminate information regarding infringement of intellectual property rights to other Federal agencies, as appropriate;

(8) develop and implement risk-based alert systems, in coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, to improve the targeting of persons that repeatedly infringe intellectual property rights;

(9) coordinate with the offices of United States attorneys in order to develop expertise in, and assist with the investigation and prosecution of, crimes relating to the infringement of intellectual property rights; and

(10) carry out such other duties as the Secretary of Homeland Security may assign.

(c) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—In carrying out the duties described in subsection (b), the Assistant Director of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center shall coordinate with—

(1) U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(2) the Food and Drug Administration;

(3) the Department of Justice;

(4) the Department of Commerce, including the United States Patent and Trademark Office;

(5) the United States Postal Inspection Service;

(6) the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(7) any Federal, State, local, or international law enforcement agencies that the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement considers appropriate; and

(8) any other entities that the Director considers appropriate.

(d) PRIVATE SECTOR OUTREACH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Director of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center shall work with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other Federal agencies to conduct outreach to private sector entities in order to determine trends in and methods of infringing intellectual property rights.

(2) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Assistant Director shall share information and best practices with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights with private sector entities, as appropriate, in order to coordinate public and private sector efforts to combat the infringement of intellectual property rights.

SEC. 306. JOINT STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall include in the joint strategic plan required by section 105 of this Act—

(1) a description of the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to enforce intellectual property rights;

(2) a list of the 10 United States ports of entry at which U.S. Customs and Border Protection has seized the most merchandise, both by volume and by value, that infringes intellectual property rights during the most recent 2-year period for which data are available; and

(3) a recommendation for the optimal allocation of personnel, resources, and technology to ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement are adequately enforcing intellectual property rights.

SEC. 307. PERSONNEL DEDICATED TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) PERSONNEL OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.—The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall ensure that sufficient personnel are assigned throughout U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, respectively, who have responsibility for preventing the importation into the United States of merchandise that infringes intellectual property rights.

(b) STAFFING OF NATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS COORDINATION CENTER.—The Commissioner shall—

(1) assign not fewer than 3 full-time employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center established under section 305 of this Act; and

(2) ensure that sufficient personnel are assigned to United States ports of entry to carry out the directives of the Center.

SEC. 308. TRAINING WITH RESPECT TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) TRAINING.—The Commissioner shall ensure that officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection are trained to effectively detect and identify merchandise destined for the United States that infringes intellectual property rights, including through the use of technologies identified under subsection (c).

(b) CONSULTATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.—The Commissioner shall consult with private sector entities to better identify opportunities for collaboration between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and such entities with respect to training for officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in enforcing intellectual property rights.

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES.—In consultation with private sector entities, the Commissioner shall identify—

(1) technologies with the cost-effective capability to detect and identify merchandise at United States ports of entry that infringes intellectual property rights; and

(2) cost-effective programs for training officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to use such technologies.

(d) DONATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY.—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall prescribe regulations to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection to receive donations of hardware, software, equipment, and similar technologies, and to accept training and other support services, from private sector entities, for the purpose of enforcing intellectual property rights.

SEC. 309. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) COOPERATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall coordinate with the competent law enforcement and customs authorities of foreign countries, including by sharing information relevant to enforcement actions, to enhance the efforts of the United States and such authorities to enforce intellectual property rights.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide technical assistance to competent law enforcement and customs authorities of foreign countries to enhance the ability of such authorities to enforce intellectual property rights.

(c) INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION.—The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall lead interagency efforts to collaborate with law enforcement and customs authorities of foreign countries to enforce intellectual property rights.

SEC. 310. REPORT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT.

Not later than June 30, 2016, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall jointly submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report that contains the following:

(1) With respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights, the following:

(A) The number of referrals from U.S. Customs and Border Protection to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement relating to infringement of intellectual property rights during the preceding year.

(B) The number of investigations relating to the infringement of intellectual property rights referred by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to a United States attorney for prosecution and the United States attorneys to which those investigations were referred.

(C) The number of such investigations accepted by each such United States attorney and the status or outcome of each such investigation.

(D) The number of such investigations that resulted in the imposition of civil or criminal penalties.

(E) A description of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to improve the success rates of investigations and prosecutions relating to the infringement of intellectual property rights.

(2) An estimate of the average time required by the Office of International Trade of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to respond to a request from port personnel for advice with respect to whether merchandise detained by U.S. Customs and Border Protection infringed intellectual property rights, distinguished by types of intellectual property rights infringed.

(3) A summary of the outreach efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement with respect to—

(A) the interdiction and investigation of, and the sharing of information between those agencies and other Federal agencies to prevent the infringement of intellectual property rights;

(B) collaboration with private sector entities—

(i) to identify trends in the infringement of, and technologies that infringe, intellectual property rights;

(ii) to identify opportunities for enhanced training of officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

(iii) to develop best practices to enforce intellectual property rights; and

(C) coordination with foreign governments and international organizations with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights.

(4) A summary of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to address the challenges with respect to the enforcement of intellectual property rights presented by Internet commerce and the transit of small packages and an identification of the volume, value, and type of merchandise seized for infringing intellectual property rights as a result of such efforts.

(5) A summary of training relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights conducted under section 308 of this Act and expenditures for such training.

SEC. 311. INFORMATION FOR TRAVELERS REGARDING VIOLATIONS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop and carry out an educational campaign to inform travelers entering or leaving the United States about the legal, economic, and public health and safety implications of acquiring merchandise that infringes intellectual property rights outside the United States and importing such merchandise into the United States in violation of United States law.

(b) DECLARATION FORMS.—The Commissioner shall ensure that all versions of Declaration Form 6059B of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or a successor form, including any electronic equivalent of Declaration Form 6059B or a successor form, printed or displayed on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act include a written warning to inform travelers arriving in the United States that importation of merchandise into the United States that infringes intellectual property rights may subject travelers to civil or criminal penalties and may pose serious risks to safety or health.

TITLE IV—EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Enforcing Orders and Reducing Customs Evasion Act of 2015''.

SEC. 402. PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATING CLAIMS OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting after section 516A (19 U.S.C. 1516a) the following:

''SEC. 517. PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATING CLAIMS OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.—The term 'administering authority' has the meaning given that term in section 771(1).

''(2) COMMISSIONER.—The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection, acting pursuant to the delegation by the Secretary of the Treasury of the authority of the Secretary with respect to customs revenue functions (as defined in section 415 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 215)).

''(3) COVERED MERCHANDISE.—The term 'covered merchandise' means merchandise that is subject to—

''(A) an antidumping duty order issued under section 736;

''(B) a finding issued under the Antidumping Act, 1921; or

''(C) a countervailing duty order issued under section 706.

''(4) ENTER; ENTRY.—The terms 'enter' and 'entry' refer to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse for consumption, of merchandise in the customs territory of the United States.

''(5) EVASION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term 'evasion' refers to entering covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of any document or electronically transmitted data or information, written or oral statement, or act that is material and false, or any omission that is material, and that results in any cash deposit or other security or any amount of applicable antidumping or countervailing duties being reduced or not being applied with respect to the merchandise.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR CLERICAL ERROR.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term 'evasion' does not include entering covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of—

''(I) a document or electronically transmitted data or information, written or oral statement, or act that is false as a result of a clerical error; or

''(II) an omission that results from a clerical error.

''(ii) PATTERNS OF NEGLIGENT CONDUCT.—If the Commissioner determines that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of a clerical error referred to in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) and that the clerical error is part of a pattern of negligent conduct on the part of that person, the Commissioner may determine, notwithstanding clause (i), that the person has entered such covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

''(iii) ELECTRONIC REPETITION OF ERRORS.—For purposes of clause (ii), the mere nonintentional repetition by an electronic system of an initial clerical error does not constitute a pattern of negligent conduct.

''(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A determination by the Commissioner that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of a clerical error referred to in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) rather than through evasion shall not be construed to excuse that person from the payment of any duties applicable to the merchandise.

''(6) INTERESTED PARTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'interested party' means—

''(i) a manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler in the United States of a domestic like product;

''(ii) a certified union or recognized union or group of workers that is representative of an industry engaged in the manufacture, production, or wholesale in the United States of a domestic like product;

''(iii) a trade or business association a majority of whose members manufacture, produce, or wholesale a domestic like product in the United States;

''(iv) an association, a majority of whose members is composed of interested parties described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) with respect to a domestic like product; and

''(v) if the covered merchandise is a processed agricultural product, as defined in section 771(4)(E), a coalition or trade association that is representative of either—

''(I) processors;

''(II) processors and producers; or

''(III) processors and growers,

but this clause shall cease to have effect if the United States Trade Representative notifies the administering authority and the Commission that the application of this clause is inconsistent with the international obligations of the United States.

''(B) DOMESTIC LIKE PRODUCT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'domestic like product' means a product that is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, covered merchandise.

''(b) INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 10 business days after receiving an allegation described in paragraph (2) or a referral described in paragraph (3), the Commissioner shall initiate an investigation if the Commissioner determines that the information provided in the allegation or the referral, as the case may be, reasonably suggests that covered merchandise has been entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

''(2) ALLEGATION DESCRIBED.—An allegation described in this paragraph is an allegation that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion that is—

''(A) filed with the Commissioner by an interested party; and

''(B) accompanied by information reasonably available to the party that filed the allegation.

''(3) REFERRAL DESCRIBED.—A referral described in this paragraph is information submitted to the Commissioner by any other Federal agency, including the Department of Commerce or the United States International Trade Commission, that reasonably suggests that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

''(4) CONSOLIDATION OF ALLEGATIONS AND REFERRALS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner may consolidate multiple allegations described in

paragraph (2) and referrals described in paragraph (3) into a single investigation if the Commissioner determines it is appropriate to do so.

''(B) EFFECT ON TIMING REQUIREMENTS.—If the Commissioner consolidates multiple allegations or referrals into a single investigation under subparagraph (A), the date on which the Commissioner receives the first such allegation or referral shall be used for purposes of the requirement under paragraph (1) with respect to the timing of the initiation of the investigation.

''(5) INFORMATION-SHARING TO PROTECT HEALTH AND SAFETY.—If, during the course of conducting an investigation under paragraph (1) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner has reason to suspect that such covered merchandise may pose a health or safety risk to consumers, the Commissioner shall provide, as appropriate, information to the appropriate Federal agencies for purposes of mitigating the risk.

''(6) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADVICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon request, the Commissioner shall provide technical assistance and advice to eligible small businesses to enable such businesses to prepare and submit allegations described in paragraph (2), except that the Commissioner may deny assistance if the Commissioner concludes that the allegation, if submitted, would not lead to the initiation of an investigation under this subsection or any other action to address the allegation.

''(B) ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS DEFINED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term 'eligible small business' means any business concern that the Commissioner determines, due to its small size, has neither adequate internal resources nor the financial ability to obtain qualified outside assistance in preparing and filing allegations described in paragraph (2).

''(ii) NON-REVIEWABILITY.—The determination of the Commissioner regarding whether a business concern is an eligible small business for purposes of this paragraph is not reviewable by any other agency or by any court.

''(c) DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 calendar days after the date on which the Commissioner initiates an investigation under subsection (b) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner shall make a determination, based on substantial evidence, with respect to whether such covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

''(2) AUTHORITY TO COLLECT AND VERIFY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—In making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner may collect such additional information as is necessary to make the determination through such methods as the Commissioner considers appropriate, including by—

''(A) issuing a questionnaire with respect to such covered merchandise to—

''(i) an interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise;

''(ii) a person alleged to have entered such covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

''(iii) a person that is a foreign producer or exporter of such covered merchandise; or

''(iv) the government of a country from which such covered merchandise was exported; and

''(B) conducting verifications, including on-site verifications, of any relevant information.

''(3) ADVERSE INFERENCE.—If the Commissioner finds that a party or person described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of paragraph (2)(A) has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of the party or person's ability to comply with a request for information, the Commissioner may, in making a determination under paragraph (1), use an inference that is adverse to the interests of that party or person in selecting from among the facts otherwise available to make the determination.

''(4) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 5 business days after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner—

''(A) shall provide to each interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise a notification of the determination and may, in addition, include an explanation of the basis for the determination; and

''(B) may provide to importers, in such manner as the Commissioner determines appropriate, information discovered in the investigation that the Commissioner determines will help educate importers with respect to importing merchandise into the customs territory of the United States in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

''(d) EFFECT OF DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commissioner makes a determination under subsection (c) that covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, the Commissioner shall—

''(A)(i) suspend the liquidation of unliquidated entries of such covered merchandise that are subject to the determination and that enter on or after the date of the initiation of the investigation under subsection (b) with respect to such covered merchandise and on or before the date of the determination; or

''(ii) if the Commissioner has already suspended the liquidation of such entries pursuant to subsection (e)(1), continue to suspend the liquidation of such entries;

''(B) pursuant to the Commissioner's authority under section 504(b)—

''(i) extend the period for liquidating unliquidated entries of such covered merchandise that are subject to the determination and that entered before the date of the initiation of the investigation; or

''(ii) if the Commissioner has already extended the period for liquidating such entries pursuant to subsection (e)(1), continue to extend the period for liquidating such entries;

''(C) notify the administering authority of the determination and request that the administering authority—

''(i) identify the applicable antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rates for entries described in subparagraphs (A) and (B); or

''(ii) if no such assessment rate for such an entry is available at the time, identify the applicable cash deposit rate to be applied to the entry, with the applicable antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rate to be provided as soon as that rate becomes available;

''(D) require the posting of cash deposits and assess duties on entries described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) in accordance with the instructions received from the administering authority under paragraph (2); and

''(E) take such additional enforcement measures as the Commissioner determines appropriate, such as—

''(i) initiating proceedings under section 592 or 596;

''(ii) implementing, in consultation with the relevant Federal agencies, rule sets or modifications to rules sets for identifying, particularly through the Automated Targeting System and the Automated Commercial Environment authorized under section 13031(f) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)), importers, other parties, and merchandise that may be associated with evasion;

''(iii) requiring, with respect to merchandise for which the importer has repeatedly provided incomplete or erroneous entry summary information in connection with determinations of evasion, the importer to deposit estimated duties at the time of entry; and

''(iv) referring the record in whole or in part to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement for civil or criminal investigation.

''(2) COOPERATION OF ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving a notification from the Commissioner under paragraph (1)(C), the administering authority shall promptly provide to the Commissioner the applicable cash deposit rates and antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rates and any necessary liquidation instructions.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR CASES IN WHICH THE PRODUCER OR EXPORTER IS UNKNOWN.—If the Commissioner and the administering authority are unable to determine the producer or exporter of the merchandise with respect to which a notification is made under paragraph (1)(C), the administering authority shall identify, as the applicable cash deposit rate or antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rate, the cash deposit or duty (as the case may be) in the highest amount applicable to any producer or exporter, including the 'all-others' rate of the merchandise subject to an antidumping order or countervailing duty order under section 736 or 706, respectively, or a finding issued under the Antidumping Act, 1921, or any administrative review conducted under section 751.

''(e) INTERIM MEASURES.—Not later than 90 calendar days after initiating an investigation under subsection (b) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner shall decide based on the investigation if there is a reasonable suspicion that such covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion and, if the Commissioner decides there is such a reasonable suspicion, the Commissioner shall—

''(1) suspend the liquidation of each unliquidated entry of such covered merchandise that entered on or after the date of the initiation of the investigation;

''(2) pursuant to the Commissioner's authority under section 504(b), extend the period for liquidating each unliquidated entry of such covered merchandise that entered before the date of the initiation of the investigation; and

''(3) pursuant to the Commissioner's authority under section 623, take such additional measures as the Commissioner determines necessary to protect the revenue of the United States, including requiring a single transaction bond or additional security or the posting of a cash deposit with respect to such covered merchandise.

''(f) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 business days after the Commissioner makes a

determination under subsection (c) with respect to whether covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, a person determined to have entered such covered merchandise through evasion or an interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise may file an appeal with the Commissioner for de novo review of the determination.

''(2) TIMELINE FOR REVIEW.—Not later than 60 business days after an appeal of a determination is filed under paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall complete the review of the determination.

''(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 business days after the Commissioner completes a review under subsection (f) of a determination under subsection (c) with respect to whether covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, a person determined to have entered such covered merchandise through evasion or an interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise may commence a civil action in the United States Court of International Trade by filing concurrently a summons and complaint contesting any factual findings or legal conclusions upon which the determination is based.

''(2) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In a civil action under this subsection, the court shall hold unlawful any determination, finding, or conclusion found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO OTHER CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS.—No determination under subsection (c) or action taken by the Commissioner pursuant to this section shall be construed to limit the authority to carry out, or the scope of, any other proceeding or investigation pursuant to any other provision of Federal or State law, including sections 592 and 596.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1581(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or 517'' after ''516A''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to implement the amendments made by this section.

(e) APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

SEC. 403. ANNUAL REPORT ON PREVENTION AND INVESTIGATION OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 15 of each calendar year that begins on or after the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the efforts being taken to prevent and investigate the entry of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) for the calendar year preceding the submission of the report—

(A) a summary of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and investigate the entry of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

(B) the number of allegations of evasion received under subsection (b) of section 517 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 402 of this Act, and the number of such allegations resulting in investigations by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or any other agency;

(C) a summary of investigations initiated under subsection (b) of such section 517, including—

(i) the number and nature of the investigations initiated, conducted, and completed; and

(ii) the resolution of each completed investigation;

(D) the number of investigations initiated under that subsection not completed during the time provided for making determinations under subsection (c) of such section 517 and an explanation for why the investigations could not be completed on time;

(E) the amount of additional duties that were determined to be owed as a result of such investigations, the amount of such duties that were collected, and, for any such duties not collected, a description of the reasons those duties were not collected;

(F) with respect to each such investigation that led to the imposition of a penalty, the amount of the penalty;

(G) an identification of the countries of origin of covered merchandise determined under subsection (c) of such section 517 to be entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

(H) the amount of antidumping and countervailing duties collected as a result of any investigations or other actions by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or any other agency;

(I) a description of the allocation of personnel and other resources of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to prevent and investigate evasion, including any assessments conducted regarding the allocation of such personnel and resources; and

(J) a description of training conducted to increase expertise and effectiveness in the prevention and investigation of evasion; and

(2) a description of processes and procedures of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and investigate evasion, including—

(A) the specific guidelines, policies, and practices used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to ensure that allegations of evasion are promptly evaluated and acted upon in a timely manner;

(B) an evaluation of the efficacy of those guidelines, policies, and practices;

(C) an identification of any changes since the last report required by this section, if any, that have materially improved or reduced the effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in preventing and investigating evasion;

(D) a description of the development and implementation of policies for the application of single entry and continuous bonds for entries of covered merchandise to sufficiently protect the collection of antidumping and countervailing duties commensurate with the level of risk of not collecting those duties;

(E) a description of the processes and procedures for increased cooperation and information sharing with the Department of Commerce, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and any other relevant Federal agencies to prevent and investigate evasion; and

(F) an identification of any recommended policy changes for other Federal agencies or legislative changes to improve the effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in preventing and investigating evasion.

(c) PUBLIC SUMMARY.—The Commissioner shall make available to the public a summary of the report required by subsection (a) that includes, at a minimum—

(1) a description of the type of merchandise with respect to which investigations were initiated under subsection (b) of section 517 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 402 of this Act;

(2) the amount of additional duties determined to be owed as a result of such investigations and the amount of such duties that were collected;

(3) an identification of the countries of origin of covered merchandise determined under subsection (c) of such section 517 to be entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion; and

(4) a description of the types of measures used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and investigate evasion.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''covered merchandise'' and ''evasion'' have the meanings given those terms in section 517(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 402 of this Act.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

SEC. 501. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO COOPERATE WITH A REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN A PROCEEDING.

Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(B) by striking ''ADVERSE INFERENCES.—If'' and inserting the following: ''ADVERSE INFERENCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If'';

(C) by striking ''under this title, may use'' and inserting the following: ''under this title—

''(A) may use''; and

(D) by striking ''facts otherwise available. Such adverse inference may include'' and inserting the following: ''facts otherwise available; and

''(B) is not required to determine, or make any adjustments to, a countervailable subsidy rate or weighted average dumping margin based on any assumptions about information the interested party would have provided if the interested party had complied with the request for information.

''(2) POTENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR ADVERSE INFERENCES.—An adverse inference under paragraph (1)(A) may include'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—When the'' and inserting the following: ''CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The administrative authority and the Commission shall not be required to corroborate any dumping margin or countervailing duty applied in a separate segment of the same proceeding.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) SUBSIDY RATES AND DUMPING MARGINS IN ADVERSE INFERENCE DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority uses an inference that is adverse to the interests of a party under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority may—

''(A) in the case of a countervailing duty proceeding—

''(i) use a countervailable subsidy rate applied for the same or similar program in a countervailing duty proceeding involving the same country, or

''(ii) if there is no same or similar program, use a countervailable subsidy rate for a subsidy program from a proceeding that the administering authority considers reasonable to use, and

''(B) in the case of an antidumping duty proceeding, use any dumping margin from any segment of the proceeding under the applicable antidumping order.

''(2) DISCRETION TO APPLY HIGHEST RATE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the administering authority may apply any of the countervailable subsidy rates or dumping margins specified under that paragraph, including the highest such rate or margin, based on the evaluation by the administering authority of the situation that resulted in the administering authority using an adverse inference in selecting among the facts otherwise available.

''(3) NO OBLIGATION TO MAKE CERTAIN ESTIMATES OR ADDRESS CERTAIN CLAIMS.—If the administering authority uses an adverse inference under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority is not required, for purposes of subsection (c) or for any other purpose—

''(A) to estimate what the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin would have been if the interested party found to have failed to cooperate under subsection (b)(1) had cooperated, or

''(B) to demonstrate that the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin used by the administering authority reflects an alleged commercial reality of the interested party.''.

SEC. 502. DEFINITION OF MATERIAL INJURY.

(a) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES.—Section 771(7) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(J) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY.—The Commission shall not determine that there is no material injury or threat of material injury to an industry in the United States merely because that industry is profitable or because the performance of that industry has recently improved.''.

(b) EVALUATION OF IMPACT ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IN DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL INJURY.—Subclause (I) of section 771(7)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

''(I) actual and potential decline in output, sales, market share, gross profits, operating profits, net profits, ability to service debt, productivity, return on investments, return on assets, and utilization of capacity,''.

(c) CAPTIVE PRODUCTION.—Section 771(7)(C)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking the comma and inserting '', and'';

(2) in subclause (II), by striking '', and'' and inserting a comma; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 503. PARTICULAR MARKET SITUATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF ORDINARY COURSE OF TRADE.—Section 771(15) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(15)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) Situations in which the administering authority determines that the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison with the export price or constructed export price.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF NORMAL VALUE.—Section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking ''in such other country.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTED VALUE.—Section 773(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''business'' and inserting ''trade''; and

(2) By striking the flush text at the end and inserting the following:

''For purposes of paragraph (1), if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology. For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost of materials shall be determined without regard to any internal tax in the exporting country imposed on such materials or their disposition that is remitted or refunded upon exportation of the subject merchandise produced from such materials.''.

SEC. 504. DISTORTION OF PRICES OR COSTS.

(a) INVESTIGATION OF BELOW-COST SALES.—Section 773(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE OR SUSPECT.—

''(i) REVIEW.—In a review conducted under section 751 involving a specific exporter, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that are less than the cost of production of the product if the administering authority disregarded some or all of the exporter's sales pursuant to paragraph (1) in the investigation or, if a review has been completed, in the most recently completed review.

''(ii) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—In an investigation initiated under section 732 or a review conducted under section 751, the administering authority shall request information necessary to calculate the constructed value and cost of production under subsections (e) and (f) to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the cost of production of the product.''.

(b) PRICES AND COSTS IN NONMARKET ECONOMIES.—Section 773(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) DISCRETION TO DISREGARD CERTAIN PRICE OR COST VALUES.—In valuing the factors of production under paragraph (1) for the subject merchandise, the administering authority may disregard price or cost values without further investigation if the administering authority has determined that broadly available export subsidies existed or particular instances of subsidization occurred with respect to those price or cost values or if those price or cost values were subject to an antidumping order.''.

SEC. 505. REDUCTION IN BURDEN ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTARY RESPONDENTS.

Section 782(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677m(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and by moving such clauses, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking ''INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—In'' and inserting the following: ''INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In'';

(4) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), to read as follows:

''(B) the number of exporters or producers subject to the investigation or review is not so large that any additional individual examination of such exporters or producers would be unduly burdensome to the administering authority and inhibit the timely completion of the investigation or review.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DETERMINATION OF UNDULY BURDENSOME.—In determining if an individual examination under paragraph (1)(B) would be unduly burdensome, the administering authority may consider the following:

''(A) The complexity of the issues or information presented in the proceeding, including questionnaires and any responses thereto.

''(B) Any prior experience of the administering authority in the same or similar proceeding.

''(C) The total number of investigations under subtitle A or B and reviews under section 751 being conducted by the administering authority as of the date of the determination.

''(D) Such other factors relating to the timely completion of each such investigation and review as the administering authority considers appropriate.''.

SEC. 506. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL TRADE ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION

Subtitle A—Trade Enforcement

SEC. 601. TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 310 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2420) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 310. TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.

''(a) TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORT.—

''(1) TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES CONSULTATIONS.—Not later than May 31 of each calendar year that begins after the date of

the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the United States Trade Representative (in this section referred to as the 'Trade Representative') shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives with respect to the prioritization of acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments that raise concerns with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, or otherwise create or maintain barriers to United States goods, services, or investment.

''(2) IDENTIFICATION OF TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.—In identifying acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments as trade enforcement priorities under this subsection, the United States Trade Representative shall focus on those acts, policies, and practices the elimination of which is likely to have the most significant potential to increase United States economic growth, and take into account all relevant factors, including—

''(A) the economic significance of any potential inconsistency between an obligation assumed by a foreign government pursuant to a trade agreement to which both the foreign government and the United States are parties and the acts, policies, or practices of that government;

''(B) the impact of the acts, policies, or practices of a foreign government on maintaining and creating United States jobs and productive capacity;

''(C) the major barriers and trade distorting practices described in the most recent National Trade Estimate required under section 181(b);

''(D) the major barriers and trade distorting practices described in other relevant reports addressing international trade and investment barriers prepared by a Federal agency or congressional commission during the 12 months preceding the date of the most recent report under paragraph (3);

''(E) a foreign government's compliance with its obligations under any trade agreements to which both the foreign government and the United States are parties;

''(F) the implications of a foreign government's procurement plans and policies; and

''(G) the international competitive position and export potential of United States products and services.

''(3) REPORT ON TRADE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS TAKEN TO ADDRESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 31 of each calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, the Trade Representative shall report to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments identified as trade enforcement priorities based on the consultations under paragraph (1) and the criteria set forth in paragraph (2).

''(B) REPORT IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—The Trade Representative shall include, when reporting under subparagraph (A) in any calendar year after the calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, a description of actions taken to address any acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments identified as trade enforcement priorities under this subsection in the calendar year preceding that report and, as relevant, any year before that calendar year.

''(b) SEMIANNUAL ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the same time as the reporting under subsection (a)(3), and not later than January 31 of each following year, the Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives with respect to the identification, prioritization, investigation, and resolution of acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments of concern with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, or that otherwise create or maintain trade barriers.

''(2) ACTS, POLICIES, OR PRACTICES OF CONCERN.—The semiannual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address acts, policies, or practices of foreign governments that raise concerns with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, or otherwise create or maintain trade barriers, including—

''(A) engagement with relevant trading partners;

''(B) strategies for addressing such concerns;

''(C) availability and deployment of resources to be used in the investigation or resolution of such concerns;

''(D) the merits of any potential dispute resolution proceeding under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party relating to such concerns; and

''(E) any other aspects of such concerns.

''(3) ACTIVE INVESTIGATIONS.—The semiannual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address acts, policies, or practices that the Trade Representative is actively investigating with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, including—

''(A) strategies for addressing concerns raised by such acts, policies, or practices;

''(B) any relevant timeline with respect to investigation of such acts, policies, or practices;

''(C) the merits of any potential dispute resolution proceeding under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party with respect to such acts, policies, or practices;

''(D) barriers to the advancement of the investigation of such acts, policies, or practices; and

''(E) any other matters relating to the investigation of such acts, policies, or practices.

''(4) ONGOING ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—The semiannual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address all ongoing enforcement actions taken by or against the United States with respect to obligations under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party, including—

''(A) any relevant timeline with respect to such actions;

''(B) the merits of such actions;

''(C) any prospective implementation actions;

''(D) potential implications for any law or regulation of the United States;

''(E) potential implications for United States stakeholders, domestic competitors, and exporters; and

''(F) other issues relating to such actions.

''(5) ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES.—The semiannual enforcement consultations required by paragraph (1) shall address the availability and deployment of enforcement resources, resource constraints on monitoring and enforcement activities, and strategies to address those constraints, including the use of available resources of other Federal agencies to enhance monitoring and enforcement capabilities.

''(c) INVESTIGATION AND RESOLUTION.—In the case of any acts, policies, or practices of a foreign government identified as a trade enforcement priority under subsection (a), the Trade Representative shall, not later than the date of the first semiannual enforcement consultations held under subsection (b) after the identification of the priority, take appropriate action to address that priority, including—

''(1) engagement with the foreign government to resolve concerns raised by such acts, policies, or practices;

''(2) initiation of an investigation under section 302(b)(1) with respect to such acts, policies, or practices;

''(3) initiation of negotiations for a bilateral agreement that provides for resolution of concerns raised by such acts, policies, or practices; or

''(4) initiation of dispute settlement proceedings under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party with respect to such acts, policies, or practices.

''(d) ENFORCEMENT NOTIFICATIONS AND CONSULTATION.—

''(1) INITIATION OF ENFORCEMENT ACTION.—The Trade Representative shall notify and consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in advance of initiation of any formal trade dispute by or against the United States taken in regard to an obligation under the WTO Agreements or any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party. With respect to a formal trade dispute against the United States, if advance notification and consultation are not possible, the Trade Representative shall notify and consult at the earliest practicable opportunity after initiation of the dispute.

''(2) CIRCULATION OF REPORTS.—The Trade Representative shall notify and consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in advance of the announced or anticipated circulation of any report of a dispute settlement panel or the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization or of a dispute settlement panel under any other trade agreement to which the United States is a party with respect to a formal trade dispute by or against the United States.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) WTO.—The term 'WTO' means the World Trade Organization.

''(2) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term 'WTO Agreement' has the meaning given that term in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)).

''(3) WTO AGREEMENTS.—The term 'WTO Agreements' means the WTO Agreement and agreements annexed to that Agreement.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by striking the item relating to section 310 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 310. Trade enforcement priorities.''.

SEC. 602. EXERCISE OF WTO AUTHORIZATION TO SUSPEND CONCESSIONS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS UNDER TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 306 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2416) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) EXERCISE OF WTO AUTHORIZATION TO SUSPEND CONCESSIONS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS.—If—

''(1) action has terminated pursuant to section 307(c),

''(2) the petitioner or any representative of the domestic industry that would benefit from reinstatement of action has submitted to the Trade Representative a written request for reinstatement of action, and

''(3) the Trade Representative has completed the requirements of subsection (d) and section 307(c)(3),

the Trade Representative may at any time determine to take action under section 301(c) to exercise an authorization to suspend concessions or other obligations under Article 22 of the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16))).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 1 of title III of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 301(c)(1) (19 U.S.C. 2411(c)(1)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or section 306(c)'' after ''subsection (a) or (b)'';

(2) in section 306(b) (19 U.S.C. 2416(b)), in the subsection heading, by striking ''FURTHER ACTION'' and inserting ''ACTION ON THE BASIS OF MONITORING'';

(3) in section 306(d) (19 U.S.C. 2416(d)), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by inserting ''or (c)'' after ''subsection (b)''; and

(4) in section 307(c)(3) (19 U.S.C. 2417(c)(3)), by inserting ''or if a request is submitted to the Trade Representative under 306(c)(2) to reinstate action,'' after ''under section 301,''.

SEC. 603. TRADE MONITORING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 205. TRADE MONITORING.

''(a) MONITORING TOOL FOR IMPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the United States International Trade Commission shall make available on a website of the Commission an import monitoring tool to allow the public access to data on the volume and value of goods imported into the United States for the purpose of assessing whether such data has changed with respect to such goods over a period of time.

''(2) DATA DESCRIBED.—For purposes of the monitoring tool under paragraph (1), the Commission shall use data compiled by the Department of Commerce and such other government data as the Commission considers appropriate.

''(3) PERIODS OF TIME.—The Commission shall ensure that data accessed through the monitoring tool under paragraph (1) includes data for the most recent quarter for which such data are available and previous quarters as the Commission considers practicable.

''(b) MONITORING REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and not less frequently than quarterly thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall publish on a website of the Department of Commerce, and notify the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of the availability of, a monitoring report on changes in the volume and value of trade with respect to imports and exports of goods categorized based on the 6-digit subheading number of the goods under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States during the most recent quarter for which such data are available and previous quarters as the Secretary considers practicable.

''(2) REQUESTS FOR COMMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall solicit through the Federal Register public comment on the monitoring reports described in paragraph (1).

''(c) SUNSET.—The requirements under this section terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 204 the following:

''Sec. 205. Trade monitoring.''.

SEC. 604. ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERAGENCY TRADE ENFORCEMENT CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title I of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 142. INTERAGENCY TRADE ENFORCEMENT CENTER.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER.—There is established in the Office of the United States Trade Representative an Interagency Trade Enforcement Center (in this section referred to as the 'Center').

''(b) FUNCTIONS OF CENTER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall—

''(A) serve as the primary forum within the Federal Government for the Office of the United States Trade Representative and other agencies to coordinate the enforcement of United States trade rights under international trade agreements and the enforcement of United States trade remedy laws;

''(B) coordinate among the Office of the United States Trade Representative and other agencies with responsibilities relating to trade the exchange of information related to potential violations of international trade agreements by foreign trading partners of the United States; and

''(C) conduct outreach to United States workers, businesses, and other interested persons to foster greater participation in the identification and reduction or elimination of foreign trade barriers and unfair foreign trade practices.

''(2) COORDINATION OF TRADE ENFORCEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall coordinate matters relating to the enforcement of United States trade rights under international trade agreements and the enforcement of United States trade remedy laws among the Office of the United States Trade Representative and the following agencies:

''(i) The Department of State.

''(ii) The Department of the Treasury.

''(iii) The Department of Justice.

''(iv) The Department of Agriculture.

''(v) The Department of Commerce.

''(vi) The Department of Homeland Security.

''(vii) Such other agencies as the President, or the United States Trade Representative, may designate.

''(B) CONSULTATIONS ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.—In matters relating to the enforcement of United States trade rights involving intellectual property rights, the Center shall consult with the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator appointed pursuant to section 301 of the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 8111).

''(c) PERSONNEL.—

''(1) DIRECTOR.—The head of the Center shall be the Director, who shall—

''(A) be appointed by the United States Trade Representative from among full-time senior-level officials of the Office of the United States Trade Representative; and

''(B) report to the Trade Representative.

''(2) DEPUTY DIRECTOR.—There shall be in the Center a Deputy Director, who shall—

''(A) be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce from among full-time senior-level officials of the Department of Commerce and detailed to the Center; and

''(B) report directly to the Director.

''(3) ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES.—The agencies specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) may, in consultation with the Director, detail or assign their employees to the Center without reimbursement to support the functions of the Center.

''(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Funding and administrative support for the Center shall be provided by the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the actions taken by the Center in the preceding year with respect to the enforcement of United States trade rights under international trade agreements and the enforcement of United States trade remedy laws.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The term 'United States trade remedy laws' means the following:

''(A) Chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).

''(B) Chapter 1 of title III of that Act (19 U.S.C. 2411 et seq.).

''(C) Sections 406 and 421 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 2436 and 2451).

''(D) Sections 332 and 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332 and 1337).

''(E) Investigations initiated by the administering authority (as defined in section 771 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1677)) under title VII of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.).

''(F) Section 281 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3571).

''(2) UNITED STATES TRADE RIGHTS.—The term 'United States trade rights' means any right, benefit, or advantage to which the United States is entitled under an international trade agreement and that could be effectuated through the use of a dispute settlement proceeding.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 141 the following:

''Sec. 142. Interagency Trade Enforcement Center.''.

SEC. 605. ESTABLISHMENT OF CHIEF MANUFACTURING NEGOTIATOR.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—Section 141(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) There shall be in the Office 3 Deputy United States Trade Representatives, one Chief Agricultural Negotiator, and one Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, who shall all be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. As an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, any nomination of a Deputy United States Trade Representative, the Chief Agricultural

Negotiator, or the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, and referred to a committee, shall be referred to the Committee on Finance. Each Deputy United States Trade Representative, the Chief Agricultural Negotiator, and the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator shall hold office at the pleasure of the President and shall have the rank of Ambassador.''.

(b) FUNCTIONS OF POSITION.—Section 141(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(c)) is amended—

(1) by moving paragraph (5) 2 ems to the left; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(6)(A) The principal function of the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator shall be to conduct trade negotiations and to enforce trade agreements relating to United States manufacturing products and services. The Chief Manufacturing Negotiator shall be a vigorous advocate on behalf of United States manufacturing interests and shall perform such other functions as the United States Trade Representative may direct.

''(B) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, and annually thereafter, the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the actions taken by the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator in the preceding year.''.

(c) COMPENSATION.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Chief Agricultural Negotiator.'' and inserting the following:

''Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.

''Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 141(e) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''5314'' and inserting ''5315''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the maximum rate of pay for grade GS–18, as provided in section 5332'' and inserting ''the maximum rate of pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule in section 5315''.

SEC. 606. ENFORCEMENT UNDER TITLE III OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACTS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES RELATING TO THE ENVIRONMENT.

Section 301(d)(3)(B) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411(d)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in clause (iii)(V), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) constitutes a persistent pattern of conduct by the government of the foreign country under which that government—

''(I) fails to effectively enforce the environmental laws of the foreign country,

''(II) waives or otherwise derogates from the environmental laws of the foreign country or weakens the protections afforded by such laws,

''(III) fails to provide for judicial or administrative proceedings giving access to remedies for violations of the environmental laws of the foreign country,

''(IV) fails to provide appropriate and effective sanctions or remedies for violations of the environmental laws of the foreign country, or

''(V) fails to effectively enforce environmental commitments under agreements to which the foreign country and the United States are a party.''.

SEC. 607. TRADE ENFORCEMENT TRUST FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the Trade Enforcement Trust Fund (in this section referred to as the ''Trust Fund''), consisting of amounts transferred to the Trust Fund under subsection (b) and any amounts that may be credited to the Trust Fund under subsection (c).

(b) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Trust Fund, from the general fund of the Treasury, for each fiscal year that begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, an amount equal to $15,000,000 (or a lesser amount as required pursuant to paragraph (2)) of the antidumping duties and countervailing duties received in the Treasury for such fiscal year.

(2) LIMITATION.—The total amount in the Trust Fund at any time may not exceed $30,000,000.

(3) FREQUENCY OF TRANSFERS; ADJUSTMENTS.—

(A) FREQUENCY OF TRANSFERS.—The Secretary shall transfer amounts required to be transferred to the Trust Fund under paragraph (1) not less frequently than quarterly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Trust Fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary.

(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall make proper adjustments in amounts subsequently transferred to the Trust Fund to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred to the Trust Fund.

(c) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—The Secretary shall invest such portion of the Trust Fund as is not required to meet current withdrawals in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

(2) INTEREST AND PROCEEDS.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in Trust Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Trust Fund.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS FROM TRUST FUND.—

(1) ENFORCEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative may use the amounts in the Trust fund to carry out any of the following:

(A) To seek to enforce the provisions of and commitments and obligations under the WTO Agreements and free trade agreements to which the United States is a party and resolve any actions by foreign countries that are inconsistent with those provisions, commitments, and obligations.

(B) To monitor the implementation by foreign countries of the provisions of and commitments and obligations under free trade agreements to which the United States is a party for purposes of systematically assessing, identifying, investigating, or initiating steps to address inconsistencies with those provisions, commitments, and obligations.

(C) To thoroughly investigate and respond to petitions under section 302 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2412) requesting that action be taken under section 301 of such Act (19 U.S.C. 2411).

(2) IMPLEMENTATION ASSISTANCE AND CAPACITY BUILDING.—The United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of Labor, and such heads of other Federal agencies as the President considers appropriate may use the amounts in the Trust Fund to carry out any of the following:

(A) To ensure capacity-building efforts undertaken by the United States pursuant to any free trade agreement to which the United States is a party prioritize and give special attention to the timely, consistent, and robust implementation of the intellectual property, labor, and environmental commitments and obligations of any party to that free trade agreement.

(B) To ensure capacity-building efforts undertaken by the United States pursuant to any such free trade agreement are self-sustaining and promote local ownership.

(C) To ensure capacity-building efforts undertaken by the United States pursuant to any such free trade agreement include performance indicators against which the progress and obstacles for the implementation of commitments and obligations described in subparagraph (A) can be identified and assessed within a meaningful time frame.

(D) To monitor and evaluate the capacity-building efforts of the United States under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

(3) LIMITATION.—Amounts made available in the Trust Fund may not be used for negotiations for any free trade agreement to be entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the entry into force of any free trade agreement entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of Labor, and any other head of a Federal agency who has used amounts in the Trust Fund in connection with that agreement, shall each submit to Congress a report on the actions taken by that official under subsection (d) in connection with that agreement.

(f) COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study that includes the following:

(A) A comprehensive analysis of the trade enforcement expenditures of each Federal agency with responsibilities relating to trade that specifies, with respect to each such Federal agency—

(i) the amounts appropriated for trade enforcement; and

(ii) the number of full-time employees carrying out activities relating to trade enforcement.

(B) Recommendations on the additional employees and resources that each such Federal agency may need to effectively enforce the free trade agreements to which the United States is a party.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ANTIDUMPING DUTY.—The term ''antidumping duty'' means an antidumping duty imposed under section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673).

(2) COUNTERVAILING DUTY.—The term ''countervailing duty'' means a countervailing duty imposed under section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671).

(3) WTO.—The term ''WTO'' means the World Trade Organization.

(4) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term ''WTO Agreement'' has the meaning given that

term in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)).

(5) WTO AGREEMENTS.—The term ''WTO Agreements'' means the WTO Agreement and agreements annexed to that Agreement.

SEC. 608. HONEY TRANSSHIPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall direct appropriate personnel and resources of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to address concerns that honey is being imported into the United States in violation of the customs and trade laws of the United States.

(b) COUNTRY OF ORIGIN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall compile a database of the individual characteristics of honey produced in foreign countries to facilitate the verification of country of origin markings of imported honey.

(2) ENGAGEMENT WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.—The Commissioner shall seek to engage the customs agencies of foreign governments for assistance in compiling the database described in paragraph (1).

(3) CONSULTATION WITH INDUSTRY.—In compiling the database described in paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall consult with entities in the honey industry regarding the development of industry standards for honey identification.

(4) CONSULTATION WITH FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.—In compiling the database described in paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall consult with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) describes and assesses the limitations in the existing analysis capabilities of laboratories with respect to determining the country of origin of honey samples or the percentage of honey contained in a sample; and

(2) includes any recommendations of the Commissioner for improving such capabilities.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Commissioner of Food and Drugs should promptly establish a national standard of identity for honey for the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection to use to ensure that imports of honey are—

(1) classified accurately for purposes of assessing duties; and

(2) denied entry into the United States if such imports pose a threat to the health or safety of consumers in the United States.

SEC. 609. INCLUSION OF INTEREST IN CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS OF ANTIDUMPING DUTIES AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall deposit all interest described in subsection (c) into the special account established under section 754(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675c(e)) (repealed by subtitle F of title VII of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–171; 120 Stat. 154)) for inclusion in distributions described in subsection (b) made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) DISTRIBUTIONS DESCRIBED.—Distributions described in this subsection are distributions of antidumping duties and countervailing duties assessed on or after October 1, 2000, that are made under section 754 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675c) (repealed by subtitle F of title VII of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–171; 120 Stat. 154)), with respect to entries of merchandise—

(1) made on or before September 30, 2007; and

(2) that were, in accordance with section 822 of the Claims Resolution Act of 2010 (19 U.S.C. 1675c note), unliquidated, not in litigation, and not under an order of liquidation from the Department of Commerce on December 8, 2010.

(c) INTEREST DESCRIBED.—

(1) INTEREST REALIZED.—Interest described in this subsection is interest earned on antidumping duties or countervailing duties distributed as described in subsection (b) that is realized through application of a payment received on or after October 1, 2014, by U.S. Customs and Border Protection under, or in connection with—

(A) a customs bond pursuant to a court order or judgment entered as a result of a civil action filed by the Federal Government against the surety from which the payment was obtained for the purpose of collecting duties or interest owed with respect to an entry; or

(B) a settlement for any such bond if the settlement was executed after the Federal Government filed a civil action described in subparagraph (A).

(2) TYPES OF INTEREST.—Interest described in paragraph (1) includes the following:

(A) Interest accrued under section 778 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677g).

(B) Interest accrued under section 505(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1505(d)).

(C) Equitable interest under common law or interest under section 963 of the Revised Statutes (19 U.S.C. 580) awarded by a court against a surety under its bond for late payment of antidumping duties, countervailing duties, or interest described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ANTIDUMPING DUTIES.—The term ''antidumping duties'' means antidumping duties imposed under section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673) or under the Antidumping Act, 1921 (title II of the Act of May 27, 1921; 42 Stat. 11, chapter 14).

(2) COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.—The term ''countervailing duties'' means countervailing duties imposed under section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671).

SEC. 610. ILLICITLY IMPORTED, EXPORTED, OR TRAFFICKED CULTURAL PROPERTY, ARCHAEOLOGICAL OR ETHNOLOGICAL MATERIALS, AND FISH, WILDLIFE, AND PLANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall ensure that appropriate personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as the case may be, are trained in the detection, identification, detention, seizure, and forfeiture of cultural property, archaeological or ethnological materials, and fish, wildlife, and plants, the importation, exportation, or trafficking of which violates the laws of the United States.

(b) TRAINING.—The Commissioner and the Director are authorized to accept training and other support services from experts outside of the Federal Government with respect to the detection, identification, detention, seizure, and forfeiture of cultural property, archaeological or ethnological materials, or fish, wildlife, and plants described in subsection (a).

Subtitle B—Intellectual Property Rights Protection

SEC. 611. ESTABLISHMENT OF CHIEF INNOVATION AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 141 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), as amended by section 605(a) of this Act—

(A) by striking ''and one Chief Manufacturing Negotiator'' and inserting ''one Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, and one Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator'';

(B) by striking ''or the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator'' and inserting ''the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, or the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator''; and

(C) by striking ''and the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator'' and inserting ''the Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, and the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator''; and

(2) in subsection (c), as amended by section 605(b) of this Act, by adding at the end the following:

''(7) The principal functions of the Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator shall be to conduct trade negotiations and to enforce trade agreements relating to United States intellectual property and to take appropriate actions to address acts, policies, and practices of foreign governments that have a significant adverse impact on the value of United States innovation. The Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator shall be a vigorous advocate on behalf of United States innovation and intellectual property interests. The Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator shall perform such other functions as the United States Trade Representative may direct.''.

(b) COMPENSATION.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 605(c) of this Act, is further amended by inserting after ''Chief Manufacturing Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.'' the following:

''Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative.''.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the appointment of the first Chief Innovation and Intellectual Property Negotiator pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended by subsection (a), and annually thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report describing in detail—

(1) enforcement actions taken by the Trade Representative during the year preceding the submission of the report to ensure the protection of United States innovation and intellectual property interests; and

(2) other actions taken by the Trade Representative to advance United States innovation and intellectual property interests.

SEC. 612. MEASURES RELATING TO COUNTRIES THAT DENY ADEQUATE PROTECTION FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) INCLUSION OF COUNTRIES THAT DENY ADEQUATE PROTECTION OF TRADE SECRETS.—Section 182(d)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242(d)(2)) is amended by inserting '', trade secrets,'' after ''copyrights''.

(b) SPECIAL RULES FOR COUNTRIES ON THE PRIORITY WATCH LIST OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 182 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242) is amended by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

''(g) SPECIAL RULES FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES ON THE PRIORITY WATCH LIST.—

''(1) ACTION PLANS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Trade Representative submits the National Trade Estimate

under section 181(b), the Trade Representative shall develop an action plan described in subparagraph (C) with respect to each foreign country described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) FOREIGN COUNTRY DESCRIBED.—The Trade Representative shall develop an action plan pursuant to subparagraph (A) with respect to each foreign country that—

''(i) the Trade Representative has identified for placement on the priority watch list; and

''(ii) has remained on such list for at least 1 year.

''(C) ACTION PLAN DESCRIBED.—An action plan developed pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall contain the benchmarks described in subparagraph (D) and be designed to assist the foreign country—

''(i) to achieve—

''(I) adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights; and

''(II) fair and equitable market access for United States persons that rely upon intellectual property protection; or

''(ii) to make significant progress toward achieving the goals described in clause (i).

''(D) BENCHMARKS DESCRIBED.—The benchmarks contained in an action plan developed pursuant to subparagraph (A) are such legislative, institutional, enforcement, or other actions as the Trade Representative determines to be necessary for the foreign country to achieve the goals described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (C).

''(2) FAILURE TO MEET ACTION PLAN BENCHMARKS.—If, 1 year after the date on which an action plan is developed under paragraph (1)(A), the President, in consultation with the Trade Representative, determines that the foreign country to which the action plan applies has not substantially complied with the benchmarks described in paragraph (1)(D), the President may take appropriate action with respect to the foreign country.

''(3) PRIORITY WATCH LIST DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'priority watch list' means the priority watch list established by the Trade Representative.

''(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Trade Representative submits the National Trade Estimate under section 181(b), the Trade Representative shall transmit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on actions taken under this section during the 12 months preceding such report, and the reasons for such actions, including—

''(1) any foreign countries identified under subsection (a);

''(2) a description of progress made in achieving improved intellectual property protection and market access for persons relying on intellectual property rights; and

''(3) a description of the action plans developed under subsection (g) and any actions taken by foreign countries under such plans.''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the United States Trade Representative such sums as may be necessary to provide assistance to any developing country to which an action plan applies under section 182(g) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended by paragraph (1), to facilitate the efforts of the developing country to comply with the benchmarks contained in the action plan. Such assistance may include capacity building, activities designed to increase awareness of intellectual property rights, and training for officials responsible for enforcing intellectual property rights in the developing country.

(B) DEVELOPING COUNTRY DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ''developing country'' means a country classified by the World Bank as having a low-income or lower-middle-income economy.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting the authority of the President or the United States Trade Representative to develop action plans other than action plans described in section 182(g) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended by paragraph (1), or to take any action otherwise authorized by law in response to the failure of a foreign country to provide adequate and effective protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights.

TITLE VII—CURRENCY MANIPULATION

Subtitle A—Investigation of Currency Undervaluation

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Currency Undervaluation Investigation Act''.

SEC. 702. INVESTIGATION OR REVIEW OF CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION UNDER COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAW.

Subsection (c) of section 702 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671a(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION.—For purposes of a countervailing duty investigation under this subtitle in which the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A) are affirmative, or a review under subtitle C with respect to a countervailing duty order, the administering authority shall initiate an investigation to determine whether currency undervaluation by the government of a country or any public entity within the territory of a country is providing, directly or indirectly, a countervailable subsidy, if—

''(A) a petition filed by an interested party (described in subparagraph (C), (D), (E), (F), or (G) of section 771(9)) alleges the elements necessary for the imposition of the duty imposed by section 701(a); and

''(B) the petition is accompanied by information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting those allegations.''.

SEC. 703. BENEFIT CALCULATION METHODOLOGY WITH RESPECT TO CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION.

Section 771 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(37) CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION BENEFIT.—

''(A) CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION BENEFIT.—For purposes of a countervailing duty investigation under subtitle A, or a review under subtitle C with respect to a countervailing duty order, the following shall apply:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority determines to investigate whether currency undervaluation provides a countervailable subsidy, the administering authority shall determine whether there is a benefit to the recipient of that subsidy and measure such benefit by comparing the simple average of the real exchange rates derived from application of the macroeconomic-balance approach and the equilibrium-real-exchange-rate approach to the official daily exchange rate identified by the administering authority.

''(ii) RELIANCE ON DATA.—In making the determination under clause (i), the administering authority shall rely upon data that are publicly available, reliable, and compiled and maintained by the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank, or other international organizations or national governments if data from the International Monetary Fund or World Bank are not available.

''(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) MACROECONOMIC-BALANCE APPROACH.—The term 'macroeconomic-balance approach' means a methodology under which the level of undervaluation of the real effective exchange rate of the currency of the exporting country is defined as the change in the real effective exchange rate needed to achieve equilibrium in the balance of payments of the exporting country, as such methodology is described in the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund's Consultative Group on Exchange Rate Issues, if available.

''(ii) EQUILIBRIUM-REAL-EXCHANGE-RATE APPROACH.—The term 'equilibrium-real-exchange-rate approach' means a methodology under which the level of undervaluation of the real effective exchange rate of the currency of the exporting country is defined as the difference between the observed real effective exchange rate and the real effective exchange rate, as such methodology is described in the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund's Consultative Group on Exchange Rate Issues, if available.

''(iii) REAL EXCHANGE RATES.—The term 'real exchange rates' means the bilateral exchange rates derived from converting the trade-weighted multilateral exchange rates yielded by the macroeconomic-balance approach and the equilibrium-real-exchange-rate approach into real bilateral terms.''.

SEC. 704. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF SPECIFICITY WITH RESPECT TO EXPORT SUBSIDY.

Section 771(5A)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(5A)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The fact that a subsidy may also be provided in circumstances that do not involve export shall not, for that reason alone, mean that the subsidy cannot be considered contingent upon export performance.''.

SEC. 705. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this subtitle shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

SEC. 706. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this subtitle apply to countervailing duty investigations initiated under subtitle A of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) and reviews initiated under subtitle C of title VII of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1675 et seq.)—

(1) before the date of the enactment of this Act, if the investigation or review is pending a final determination as of such date of enactment; and

(2) on or after such date of enactment.

Subtitle B—Engagement on Currency Exchange Rate and Economic Policies

SEC. 711. ENHANCEMENT OF ENGAGEMENT ON CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES WITH CERTAIN MAJOR TRADING PARTNERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) MAJOR TRADING PARTNER REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the macroeconomic and currency exchange rate policies of each country that is a major trading partner of the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain—

(i) for each country that is a major trading partner of the United States—

(I) that country's bilateral trade balance with the United States;

(II) that country's current account balance as a percentage of its gross domestic product;

(III) the change in that country's current account balance as a percentage of its gross domestic product during the 3-year period preceding the submission of the report;

(IV) that country's foreign exchange reserves as a percentage of its short-term debt; and

(V) that country's foreign exchange reserves as a percentage of its gross domestic product; and

(ii) an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and exchange rate policies for each country—

(I) that is a major trading partner of the United States;

(II) the currency of which is persistently and substantially undervalued;

(III) that has—

(aa) a significant bilateral trade surplus with the United States; and

(bb) a material global current account surplus; and

(IV) that has engaged in persistent one-sided intervention in the foreign exchange market.

(B) ENHANCED ANALYSIS.—Each enhanced analysis under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall include, for each country with respect to which an analysis is made under that subparagraph—

(i) a description of developments in the currency markets of that country, including, to the greatest extent feasible, developments with respect to currency interventions;

(ii) a description of trends in the real effective exchange rate of the currency of that country and in the degree of undervaluation of that currency;

(iii) an analysis of changes in the capital controls and trade restrictions of that country; and

(iv) patterns in the reserve accumulation of that country.

(b) ENGAGEMENT ON EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the President, through the Secretary, shall commence enhanced bilateral engagement with each country for which an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and currency exchange rate policies is included in the report submitted under subsection (a), in order to—

(A) urge implementation of policies to address the causes of the undervaluation of its currency, its bilateral trade surplus with the United States, and its material global current account surplus, including undervaluation and surpluses relating to exchange rate management;

(B) express the concern of the United States with respect to the adverse trade and economic effects of that undervaluation and those surpluses;

(C) develop measurable objectives for addressing that undervaluation and those surpluses; and

(D) advise that country of the ability of the President to take action under subsection (c).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may determine not to enhance bilateral engagement with a country under paragraph (1) for which an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and exchange rate policies is included in the report submitted under subsection (a) if the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes how the currency and other macroeconomic policies of that country are addressing the undervaluation and surpluses specified in paragraph (1)(A) with respect to that country, including undervaluation and surpluses relating to exchange rate management.

(c) REMEDIAL ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, on the date that is one year after the commencement of enhanced bilateral engagement by the President with respect to a country under subsection (b)(1), the country has failed to adopt appropriate policies to correct the undervaluation and surpluses described in subsection (b)(1)(A) with respect to that country, the President may take one or more of the following actions:

(A) Prohibit the Overseas Private Investment Corporation from approving any new financing (including any insurance, reinsurance, or guarantee) with respect to a project located in that country on and after such date.

(B) Except as provided in paragraph (2), and pursuant to paragraph (3), prohibit the Federal Government from procuring, or entering into any contract for the procurement of, goods or services from that country on and after such date.

(C) Instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to call for additional rigorous surveillance of the macroeconomic and exchange rate policies of that country and, as appropriate, formal consultations on findings of currency manipulation.

(D) Instruct the United States Trade Representative to take into account, in consultation with the Secretary, in assessing whether to enter into a bilateral or regional trade agreement with that country or to initiate or participate in negotiations with respect to a bilateral or regional trade agreement with that country, the extent to which that country has failed to adopt appropriate policies to correct the undervaluation and surpluses described in subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The President may not apply a prohibition under paragraph (1)(B) with respect to a country that is a party to the Agreement on Government Procurement or a free trade agreement to which the United States is a party.

(3) CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—Before applying a prohibition under paragraph (1)(B), the President shall consult with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to determine whether such prohibition would subject the taxpayers of the United States to unreasonable cost.

(B) CONGRESS.—The President shall consult with the appropriate committees of Congress with respect to any action the President takes under paragraph (1)(B), including whether the President has consulted as required under subparagraph (A).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT.—The term ''Agreement on Government Procurement'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(17)).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(3) COUNTRY.—The term ''country'' means a foreign country, dependent territory, or possession of a foreign country, and may include an association of 2 or more foreign countries, dependent territories, or possessions of countries into a customs union outside the United States.

(4) REAL EFFECTIVE EXCHANGE RATE.—The term ''real effective exchange rate'' means a weighted average of bilateral exchange rates, expressed in price-adjusted terms.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 712. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE RATE POLICY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established an Advisory Committee on International Exchange Rate Policy (in this section referred to as the ''Committee'').

(2) DUTIES.—The Committee shall be responsible for advising the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the impact of international exchange rates and financial policies on the economy of the United States.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall be composed of 9 members as follows, none of whom shall be employees of the Federal Government:

(A) Three members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon the recommendation of the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(B) Three members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives upon the recommendation of the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(C) Three members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members shall be selected under paragraph (1) on the basis of their objectivity and demonstrated expertise in finance, economics, or currency exchange.

(3) TERMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Members shall be appointed for a term of 2 years or until the Committee terminates.

(B) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member may be reappointed to the Committee for additional terms.

(4) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) DURATION OF COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act unless renewed by the President for a subsequent 2-year period.

(2) CONTINUED RENEWAL.—The President may continue to renew the Committee for successive 2-year periods by taking appropriate action to renew the Committee prior to the date on which the Committee would otherwise terminate.

(d) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall hold not less than 2 meetings each calendar year.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall elect from among its members a chairperson for a term of 2 years or until the Committee terminates.

(2) REELECTION; SUBSEQUENT TERMS.—A chairperson of the Committee may be reelected chairperson but is ineligible to serve consecutive terms as chairperson.

(f) STAFF.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Committee such staff, information, personnel, administrative

services, and assistance as the Committee may reasonably require to carry out the activities of the Committee.

(g) APPLICATION OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the Committee.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Meetings of the Committee shall be exempt from the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of section 10 and section 11 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (relating to open meetings, public notice, public participation, and public availability of documents), whenever and to the extent it is determined by the President or the Secretary of the Treasury that such meetings will be concerned with matters the disclosure of which—

(A) would seriously compromise the development by the Government of the United States of monetary or financial policy; or

(B) is likely to—

(i) lead to significant financial speculation in currencies, securities, or commodities; or

(ii) significantly endanger the stability of any financial institution.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury for each fiscal year in which the Committee is in effect $1,000,000 to carry out this section.

TITLE VIII—PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2015''.

SEC. 802. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE NEED FOR A MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) As of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States imposes duties on imported goods for which there is no domestic availability or insufficient domestic availability.

(2) The imposition of duties on such goods creates artificial distortions in the economy of the United States that negatively affect United States manufacturers and consumers.

(3) It is in the interests of the United States to update the Harmonized Tariff Schedule every 3 years to eliminate such artificial distortions by suspending or reducing duties on such goods.

(4) The manufacturing competitiveness of the United States around the world will be enhanced if Congress regularly and predictably updates the Harmonized Tariff Schedule to suspend or reduce duties on such goods.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, to remove the competitive disadvantage to United States manufactures and consumers resulting from an outdated Harmonized Tariff Schedule and to promote the competitiveness of United States manufacturers, Congress should consider a miscellaneous tariff bill not later than 180 days after the United States International Trade Commission and the Department of Commerce issue reports on proposed duty suspensions and reductions under this title.

SEC. 803. PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to establish a process by the appropriate congressional committees, in conjunction with the Commission pursuant to its authorities under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332), for the submission and consideration of proposed duty suspensions and reductions.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than October 15, 2015, and October 15, 2018, the appropriate congressional committees shall establish and, on the same day, publish on their respective publicly available Internet websites a process—

(1) to provide for the submission and consideration of legislation containing proposed duty suspensions and reductions in a manner that, to the maximum extent practicable, is consistent with the requirements described in subsection (c); and

(2) to include in a miscellaneous tariff bill those duty suspensions and reductions that meet the requirements of this title.

(c) REQUIREMENTS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) INITIATION.—Not later than October 15, 2015, and October 15, 2018, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission a notice requesting members of the public to submit to the Commission during the 60-day period beginning on the date of such publication—

(A) proposed duty suspensions and reductions; and

(B) Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions.

(2) REVIEW.—

(A) COMMISSION SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—As soon as practicable after the expiration of the 60-day period specified in paragraph (1), but not later than 15 days after the expiration of such 60-day period, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the proposed duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(A) and the Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(B).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF PROPOSED DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS.—Not later than 15 days after the expiration of the 60-day period specified in paragraph (1), the Commission shall publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission the proposed duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(A) and the Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(B).

(C) COMMISSION REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of publication of the proposed duty suspensions and reductions under subparagraph (B), the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each proposed duty suspension or reduction submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(1) or paragraph (1)(A) that contains the following information:

(i) A determination of whether or not domestic production of the article that is the subject of the proposed duty suspension or reduction exists and, if such production exists, whether or not a domestic producer of the article objects to the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(ii) Any technical changes to the article description that are necessary for purposes of administration when articles are presented for importation.

(iii) The amount of tariff revenue that would no longer be collected if the proposed duty suspension or reduction takes effect.

(iv) A determination of whether or not the proposed duty suspension or reduction is available to any person that imports the article that is the subject of the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(3) PROCEDURES.—The Commission shall prescribe and publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission procedures for complying with the requirements of this subsection.

(4) AUTHORITIES DESCRIBED.—The Commission shall carry out this subsection pursuant to its authorities under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332).

(d) DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of publication of the proposed duty suspensions and reductions under subsection (c)(2)(B), the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each proposed duty suspension and reduction submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(1) or (c)(1)(A) that includes the following information:

(1) A determination of whether or not domestic production of the article that is the subject of the proposed duty suspension or reduction exists and, if such production exists, whether or not a domestic producer of the article objects to the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(2) Any technical changes to the article description that are necessary for purposes of administration when articles are presented for importation.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A proposed duty suspension or reduction submitted under this section by a Member of Congress shall receive treatment no more favorable than the treatment received by a proposed duty suspension or reduction submitted under this section by a member of the public.

SEC. 804. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1, 2018, and May 1, 2020, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the effects on the United States economy of temporary duty suspensions and reductions enacted pursuant to this title, including a broad assessment of the economic effects of such duty suspensions and reductions on producers, purchasers, and consumers in the United States, using case studies describing such effects on selected industries or by type of article as available data permit.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall also solicit and append to the report required under subsection (a) recommendations with respect to those domestic industry sectors or specific domestic industries that might benefit from permanent duty suspensions and reductions or elimination of duties, either through a unilateral action of the United States or though negotiations for reciprocal tariff agreements, with a particular focus on inequities created by tariff inversions.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 805. JUDICIAL REVIEW PRECLUDED.

The exercise of functions under this title shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. 806. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the United States International Trade Commission.

(3) COMMISSION DISCLOSURE FORM.—The term ''Commission disclosure form'' means, with respect to a proposed duty suspension or reduction, a document submitted by a member of the public to the Commission that contains the following:

(A) The contact information for any known importers of the article to which the proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(B) A certification by the member of the public that the proposed duty suspension or reduction is available to any person importing the article to which the proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(4) DOMESTIC PRODUCER.—The term ''domestic producer'' means a person that demonstrates production, or imminent production, in the United States of an article that is identical to, or like or directly competitive with, an article to which a proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(5) DUTY SUSPENSION OR REDUCTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''duty suspension or reduction'' means an amendment to subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that—

(i)(I) extends an existing temporary duty suspension or reduction of duty on an article under that subchapter; or

(II) provides for a new temporary duty suspension or reduction of duty on an article under that subchapter; and

(ii) otherwise meets the requirements described in subparagraph (B).

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—A duty suspension or reduction meets the requirements described in this subparagraph if—

(i) the duty suspension or reduction can be administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(ii) the estimated loss in revenue to the United States from the duty suspension or reduction does not exceed $500,000 in a calendar year during which the duty suspension or reduction would be in effect, as determined by the Congressional Budget Office; and

(iii) the duty suspension or reduction is available to any person importing the article that is the subject of the duty suspension or reduction.

(6) MEMBER OF CONGRESS.—The term ''Member of Congress'' means a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress.

(7) MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL.—The term ''miscellaneous tariff bill'' means a bill of either House of Congress that contains only—

(A) duty suspensions and reductions that—

(i) meet the applicable requirements for—

(I) consideration of duty suspensions and reductions described in section 803; or

(II) any other process required under the Rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate; and

(ii) are not the subject of an objection because such duty suspensions and reductions do not comply with the requirements of this title from—

(I) a Member of Congress; or

(II) a domestic producer, as contained in comments submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, the Commission, or the Department of Commerce under section 803; and

(B) provisions included in bills introduced in the House of Representatives or the Senate pursuant to a process described in subparagraph (A)(i)(II) that correct an error in the text or administration of a provision of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. DE MINIMIS VALUE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Modernizing international customs is critical for United States businesses of all sizes, consumers in the United States, and the economic growth of the United States.

(2) Higher thresholds for the value of articles that may be entered informally and free of duty provide significant economic benefits to businesses and consumers in the United States and the economy of the United States through costs savings and reductions in trade transaction costs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Trade Representative should encourage other countries, through bilateral, regional, and multilateral fora, to establish commercially meaningful de minimis values for express and postal shipments that are exempt from customs duties and taxes and from certain entry documentation requirements, as appropriate.

(c) DE MINIMIS VALUE.—Section 321(a)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2)(C)) is amended by striking ''$200'' and inserting ''$800''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 902. CONSULTATION ON TRADE AND CUSTOMS REVENUE FUNCTIONS.

Section 401(c) of the Safety and Accountability for Every Port Act (6 U.S.C. 115(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''on Department policies and actions that have'' and inserting ''not later than 30 days after proposing, and not later than 30 days before finalizing, any Department policies, initiatives, or actions that will have''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''not later than 30 days prior to the finalization of'' and inserting ''not later than 60 days before proposing, and not later than 60 days before finalizing,''.

SEC. 903. PENALTIES FOR CUSTOMS BROKERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 641(d)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1641(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) has been convicted of committing or conspiring to commit an act of terrorism described in section 2332b of title 18, United States Code.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 641 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1641) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the Customs Service'' each place it appears and inserting ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection'';

(2) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking ''The Customs Service'' and inserting ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection''; and

(3) in subsection (g)(2)(B), by striking ''Secretary's notice'' and inserting ''notice under subparagraph (A)''.

SEC. 904. AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 98 OF THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) ARTICLES EXPORTED AND RETURNED, ADVANCED OR IMPROVED ABROAD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—U.S. Note 3 to subchapter II of chapter 98 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f)(1) For purposes of subheadings 9802.00.40 and 9802.00.50, fungible articles exported from the United States for the purposes described in such subheadings—

''(A) may be commingled; and

''(B) the origin, value, and classification of such articles may be accounted for using an inventory management method.

''(2) If a person chooses to use an inventory management method under this paragraph with respect to fungible articles, the person shall use the same inventory management method for any other articles with respect to which the person claims fungibility under this paragraph.

''(3) For the purposes of this paragraph—

''(A) the term 'fungible articles' means merchandise or articles that, for commercial purposes, are identical or interchangeable in all situations; and

''(B) the term 'inventory management method' means any method for managing inventory that is based on generally accepted accounting principles.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection applies to articles classifiable under subheading 9802.00.40 or 9802.00.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO RETURNED PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The article description for heading 9801.00.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting after ''exported'' the following: '', or any other products when returned within 3 years after having been exported''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) applies to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROPERTY RETURNED TO THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 98 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new heading:

''	9801.00.11	United States Government property, returned to the United States without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any means while abroad, entered by the United States Government or a contractor to the United States Government, and certified by the importer as United States Government property	Free					''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) applies to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 905. EXEMPTION FROM DUTY OF RESIDUE OF BULK CARGO CONTAINED IN INSTRUMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC PREVIOUSLY EXPORTED FROM THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—General Note 3(e) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (v), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (vi), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (vi) (as so amended) the following new subparagraph:

''(vii) residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic previously exported from the United States,''; and

(4) by adding at the end of the flush text following subparagraph (vii) (as so added) the following: ''For purposes of subparagraph (vii) of this paragraph: The term 'residue' means material of bulk cargo that remains in an instrument of international traffic after the bulk cargo is removed, with a quantity, by weight or volume, not exceeding 7 percent of the bulk cargo, and with no or de minimis value. The term 'bulk cargo' means cargo that is unpackaged and is in either solid, liquid, or gaseous form. The term 'instruments of international traffic' means containers or holders, capable of and suitable for repeated use, such as lift vans, cargo vans, shipping tanks, skids, pallets, caul boards, and cores for textile fabrics, arriving (whether loaded or empty) in use or to be used in the shipment of merchandise in international traffic, and any additional articles or classes of articles that the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection designates as instruments of international traffic.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic that are imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after such date of enactment and that previously have been exported from the United States.

SEC. 906. DRAWBACK AND REFUNDS.

(a) ARTICLES MADE FROM IMPORTED MERCHANDISE.—Section 313(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(a)) is amended by striking ''the full amount of the duties paid upon the merchandise so used shall be refunded as drawback, less 1 per centum of such duties, except that such'' and inserting ''an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (l) shall be refunded as drawback, except that''.

(b) SUBSTITUTION FOR DRAWBACK PURPOSES.—Section 313(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''If imported'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If imported'';

(2) by striking ''and any other merchandise (whether imported or domestic) of the same kind and quality are'' and inserting ''or merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise is'';

(3) by striking ''three years'' and inserting ''5 years'';

(4) by striking ''the receipt of such imported merchandise by the manufacturer or producer of such articles'' and inserting ''the date of importation of such imported merchandise'';

(5) by inserting ''or articles classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such articles,'' after ''any such articles,'';

(6) by striking ''an amount of drawback equal to'' and all that follows through the end period and inserting ''an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (l), but only if those articles have not been used prior to such exportation or destruction.''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF MERCHANDISE.—

''(A) MANUFACTURERS AND PRODUCERS.—Drawback shall be allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to an article manufactured or produced using imported merchandise or other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise only if the manufacturer or producer of the article received such imported merchandise or such other merchandise, directly or indirectly, from the importer.

''(B) EXPORTERS AND DESTROYERS.—Drawback shall be allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to a manufactured or produced article that is exported or destroyed only if the exporter or destroyer received that article or an article classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as that article, directly or indirectly, from the manufacturer or producer.

''(C) EVIDENCE OF TRANSFER.—Transfers of merchandise under subparagraph (A) and transfers of articles under subparagraph (B) may be evidenced by business records kept in the normal course of business and no additional certificates of transfer or manufacture shall be required.

''(3) SUBMISSION OF BILL OF MATERIALS OR FORMULA.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Drawback shall be allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to an article manufactured or produced using imported merchandise or other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise only if the person making the drawback claim submits with the claim a bill of materials or formula identifying the merchandise and article by the 8-digit HTS subheading number and the quantity of the merchandise.

''(B) BILL OF MATERIALS AND FORMULA DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the terms 'bill of materials' and 'formula' mean records kept in the normal course of business that identify each component incorporated into a manufactured or produced article or that identify the quantity of each element, material, chemical, mixture, or other substance incorporated into a manufactured article.

''(4) SPECIAL RULE FOR SOUGHT CHEMICAL ELEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a sought chemical element may be—

''(i) considered imported merchandise, or merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise, used in the manufacture or production of an article as described in paragraph (1); and

''(ii) substituted for source material containing that sought chemical element, without regard to whether the sought chemical element and the source material are classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number, and apportioned quantitatively, as appropriate.

''(B) SOUGHT CHEMICAL ELEMENT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'sought chemical element' means an element listed in the Periodic Table of Elements that is imported into the United States or a chemical compound consisting of those elements, either separately in elemental form or contained in source material.''.

(c) MERCHANDISE NOT CONFORMING TO SAMPLE OR SPECIFICATIONS.—Section 313(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking ''under a certificate of delivery'' each place it appears;

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking ''3'' and inserting ''5''; and

(ii) by striking ''the Customs Service'' and inserting ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection''; and

(C) in the flush text at the end, by striking ''the full amount of the duties paid upon such merchandise, less 1 percent,'' and inserting ''an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (l)'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the Customs Service'' and inserting ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection''; and

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) EVIDENCE OF TRANSFERS.—Transfers of merchandise under paragraph (1) may be evidenced by business records kept in the normal course of business and no additional certificates of transfer shall be required.''.

(d) PROOF OF EXPORTATION.—Section 313(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) PROOF OF EXPORTATION.—A person claiming drawback under this section based on the exportation of an article shall provide proof of the exportation of the article. Such proof of exportation—

''(1) shall establish fully the date and fact of exportation and the identity of the exporter; and

''(2) may be established through the use of records kept in the normal course of business or through an electronic export system of the United States Government, as determined by the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection.''.

(e) UNUSED MERCHANDISE DRAWBACK.—Section 313(j) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''3-year'' and inserting ''5-year''; and

(ii) by inserting ''and before the drawback claim is filed'' after ''the date of importation''; and

(B) in the flush text at the end, by striking ''99 percent of the amount of each duty, tax, or fee so paid'' and inserting ''an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (l)'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (4), (5), and (6)'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''commercially interchangeable with'' and inserting ''classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as'';

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''3-year'' and inserting ''5-year''; and

(ii) by inserting ''and before the drawback claim is filed'' after ''the imported merchandise'';

(D) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

''(II) received the imported merchandise, other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such

imported merchandise, or any combination of such imported merchandise and such other merchandise, directly or indirectly from the person who imported and paid any duties, taxes, and fees imposed under Federal law upon importation or entry and due on the imported merchandise (and any such transferred merchandise, regardless of its origin, will be treated as the imported merchandise and any retained merchandise will be treated as domestic merchandise);''; and

(E) in the flush text at the end—

(i) by striking ''the amount of each such duty, tax, and fee'' and all that follows through ''99 percent of that duty, tax, or fee'' and inserting ''an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (l) shall be refunded as drawback''; and

(ii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), drawback shall be allowed under this paragraph with respect to wine if the imported wine and the exported wine are of the same color and the price variation between the imported wine and the exported wine does not exceed 50 percent. Transfers of merchandise may be evidenced by business records kept in the normal course of business and no additional certificates of transfer shall be required.'';

(3) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ''the commercially interchangeable merchandise'' and inserting ''merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) For purposes of paragraph (2) and except as provided in subparagraph (B), merchandise may not be substituted for imported merchandise for drawback purposes based on the 8-digit HTS subheading number if the article description for the 8-digit HTS subheading number under which the imported merchandise is classified begins with the term 'other'.

''(B) In cases described in subparagraph (A), merchandise may be substituted for imported merchandise for drawback purposes if—

''(i) the other merchandise and such imported merchandise are classifiable under the same 10-digit HTS statistical reporting number; and

''(ii) the article description for that 10-digit HTS statistical reporting number does not begin with the term 'other'.

''(6)(A) For purposes of paragraph (2), a drawback claimant may use the first 8 digits of the 10-digit Schedule B number for merchandise or an article to determine if the merchandise or article is classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as the imported merchandise, without regard to whether the Schedule B number corresponds to more than one 8-digit HTS subheading number.

''(B) In this paragraph, the term 'Schedule B' means the Department of Commerce Schedule B, Statistical Classification of Domestic and Foreign Commodities Exported from the United States.''.

(f) LIABILITY FOR DRAWBACK CLAIMS.—Section 313(k) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(k)) is amended to read as follows:

''(k) LIABILITY FOR DRAWBACK CLAIMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person making a claim for drawback under this section shall be liable for the full amount of the drawback claimed.

''(2) LIABILITY OF IMPORTERS.—An importer shall be liable for any drawback claim made by another person with respect to merchandise imported by the importer in an amount equal to the lesser of—

''(A) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that the person claimed with respect to the imported merchandise; or

''(B) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that the importer authorized the other person to claim with respect to the imported merchandise.

''(3) JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY.—Persons described in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be jointly and severally liable for the amount described in paragraph (2).''.

(g) REGULATIONS.—Section 313(l) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(l)) is amended to read as follows:

''(l) REGULATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Allowance of the privileges provided for in this section shall be subject to compliance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

''(2) CALCULATION OF DRAWBACK.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (or, if later, the effective date provided for in section 906(q)(2)(B) of that Act), the Secretary shall prescribe regulations for determining the calculation of amounts refunded as drawback under this section.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations required by subparagraph (A) for determining the calculation of amounts refunded as drawback under this section shall provide for a refund of 99 percent of the duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise, except that where there is substitution of the merchandise or article, then—

''(i) in the case of an article that is exported, the amount of the refund shall be equal to 99 percent of the lesser of—

''(I) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise; or

''(II) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that would apply to the exported article if the exported article were imported; and

''(ii) in the case of an article that is destroyed, the amount of the refund shall be an amount that is—

''(I) equal to 99 percent of the lesser of—

''(aa) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees paid with respect to the imported merchandise; and

''(bb) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees that would apply to the destroyed article if the destroyed article were imported; and

''(II) reduced by the value of materials recovered during destruction as provided in subsection (x).

''(3) STATUS REPORTS ON REGULATIONS.—Not later than the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, and annually thereafter until the regulations required by paragraph (2) are final, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the status of those regulations.''.

(h) SUBSTITUTION OF FINISHED PETROLEUM DERIVATIVES.—Section 313(p) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(p)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States'' each place it appears and inserting ''HTS''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii)(III), by striking '', as so certified in a certificate of delivery or certificate of manufacture and delivery''; and

(B) in the flush text at the end—

(i) by striking '', as so designated on the certificate of delivery or certificate of manufacture and delivery''; and

(ii) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''The party transferring the merchandise shall maintain records kept in the normal course of business to demonstrate the transfer.''.

(i) PACKAGING MATERIAL.—Section 313(q) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(q)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''of 99 percent of any duty, tax, or fee imposed under Federal law on such imported material'' and inserting ''in an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (l)'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''of 99 percent of any duty, tax, or fee imposed under Federal law on the imported or substituted merchandise used to manufacture or produce such material'' and inserting ''in an amount calculated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (l)''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''they contain'' and inserting ''it contains''.

(j) FILING OF DRAWBACK CLAIMS.—Section 313(r) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(r)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''A drawback entry shall be filed or applied for, as applicable, not later than 5 years after the date on which merchandise on which drawback is claimed was imported.'';

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''3-year'' and inserting ''5-year''; and

(C) in the third sentence, by striking ''the Customs Service'' and inserting ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection'';

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''The Customs Service'' and inserting ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection'';

(ii) in clauses (i) and (ii), by striking ''the Customs Service'' each place it appears and inserting ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection''; and

(iii) in clause (ii)(I), by striking ''3-year'' and inserting ''5-year''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the periods of time for retaining records set forth in subsection (t) of this section and'' and inserting ''the period of time for retaining records set forth in''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) All drawback claims filed on and after the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (or, if later, the effective date provided for in section 906(q)(2)(B) of that Act) shall be filed electronically.''.

(k) DESIGNATION OF MERCHANDISE BY SUCCESSOR.—Section 313(s) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(s)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) subject to paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (j), imported merchandise, other merchandise classifiable under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as such imported merchandise, or any combination of such imported merchandise and such other merchandise, that the predecessor received, before the date of succession, from the person who imported and paid any duties, taxes, and fees due on the imported merchandise;''; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''certifies that'' and all that follows and inserting ''certifies that the transferred merchandise was not and will not be claimed by the predecessor.''.

(l) DRAWBACK CERTIFICATES.—Section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313) is amended by striking subsection (t).

(m) DRAWBACK FOR RECOVERED MATERIALS.—Section 313(x) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(x)) is amended by striking ''and (c)'' and inserting ''(c), and (j)''.

(n) DEFINITIONS.—Section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) DIRECTLY.—The term 'directly' means a transfer of merchandise or an article from one person to another person without any intermediate transfer.

''(2) HTS.—The term 'HTS' means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

''(3) INDIRECTLY.—The term 'indirectly' means a transfer of merchandise or an article from one person to another person with one or more intermediate transfers.''.

(o) RECORDKEEPING.—Section 508(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1508(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''3rd'' and inserting ''5th''; and

(2) by striking ''payment'' and inserting ''liquidation''.

(p) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the issuance of the regulations required by subsection (l)(2) of section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by subsection (g), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the modernization of drawback and refunds under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) include the following:

(A) An assessment of the modernization of drawback and refunds under section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this section.

(B) A description of drawback claims that were permissible before the effective date provided for in subsection (q) that are not permissible after that effective date and an identification of industries most affected.

(C) A description of drawback claims that were not permissible before the effective date provided for in subsection (q) that are permissible after that effective date and an identification of industries most affected.

(q) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) except as provided in paragraphs (2)(B) and (3), apply to drawback claims filed on or after the date that is 2 years after such date of enactment.

(2) REPORTING OF OPERABILITY OF AUTOMATED COMMERCIAL ENVIRONMENT COMPUTER SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 2 years after such date of enactment, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report on—

(i) the date on which the Automated Commercial Environment will be ready to process drawback claims; and

(ii) the date on which the Automated Export System will be ready to accept proof of exportation under subsection (i) of section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by subsection (d).

(B) DELAY OF EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Secretary indicates in the report required by subparagraph (A) that the Automated Commercial Environment will not be ready to process drawback claims by the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the amendments made by this section shall apply to drawback claims filed on and after the date on which the Secretary certifies that the Automated Commercial Environment is ready to process drawback claims.

(3) TRANSITION RULE.—During the one-year period beginning on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act (or, if later, the effective date provided for in paragraph (2)(B)), a person may elect to file a claim for drawback under—

(A) section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this section; or

(B) section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 907. INCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION IN SUBMISSION OF NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.

Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) When the President submits to the Senate for its advice and consent a nomination of an individual for appointment as a Deputy United States Trade Representative under paragraph (2), the President shall include in that submission information on the country, regional offices, and functions of the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to which that individual will have responsibility.''.

SEC. 908. BIENNIAL REPORTS REGARDING COMPETITIVENESS ISSUES FACING THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY AND COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS FOR CERTAIN KEY UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States International Trade Commission shall conduct a series of investigations, and submit a report on each such investigation in accordance with subsection (c), regarding competitiveness issues facing the economy of the United States and competitive conditions for certain key United States industries.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall include, to the extent practicable, the following:

(A) A detailed assessment of competitiveness issues facing the economy of the United States, over the 10-year period beginning on the date on which the report is submitted, that includes—

(i) projections, over that 10-year period, of economic measures, such as measures relating to production in the United States and United States trade, for the economy of the United States and for key United States industries, based on ongoing trends in the economy of the United States and global economies and incorporating estimates from prominent United States, foreign, multinational, and private sector organizations; and

(ii) a description of factors that drive economic growth, such as domestic productivity, the United States workforce, foreign demand for United States goods and services, and industry-specific developments.

(B) A detailed assessment of a key United States industry or key United States industries that, to the extent practicable—

(i) identifies with respect to each such industry the principal factors driving competitiveness as of the date on which the report is submitted; and

(ii) describes, with respect to each such industry, the structure of the global industry, its market characteristics, current industry trends, relevant policies and programs of foreign governments, and principal factors affecting future competitiveness.

(2) SELECTION OF KEY UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting assessments required under paragraph (1)(B), the Commission shall, to the extent practicable, select a different key United States industry or different key United States industries for purposes of each report required by subsection (a).

(B) CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS.—The Commission shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives before selecting the key United States industry or key United States industries for purposes of each report required by subsection (a).

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 15, 2017, and every 2 years thereafter through 2025, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the most recent investigation conducted under subsection (a).

(2) EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.—The Commission may, after consultation with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, submit a report under paragraph (1) later than the date required by that paragraph.

(3) CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION.—A report submitted under paragraph (1) shall not include any confidential business information unless—

(A) the party that submitted the confidential business information to the Commission had notice, at the time of submission, that the information would be released by the Commission; or

(B) that party consents to the release of the information.

(d) KEY UNITED STATES INDUSTRY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''key United States industry'' means a goods or services industry that—

(1) contributes significantly to United States economic activity and trade; or

(2) is a potential growth area for the United States and global markets.

SEC. 909. REPORT ON CERTAIN U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after entering into an agreement under a program specified in subsection (b), and annually thereafter until the termination of the program, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of the development of the program.

(2) A description of the type of entity with which U.S. Customs and Border Protection entered into the agreement and the amount that entity reimbursed U.S. Customs and Border Protection under the agreement.

(3) An identification of the type of port of entry to which the agreement relates and an assessment of how the agreement provides economic benefits at the port of entry.

(4) A description of the services provided by U.S. Customs and Border Protection under the agreement during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(5) The amount of fees collected under the agreement during that year.

(6) A detailed accounting of how the fees collected under the agreement have been spent during that year.

(7) A summary of any complaints or criticism received by U.S. Customs and Border Protection during that year regarding the agreement.

(8) An assessment of the compliance of the entity described in paragraph (2) with the terms of the agreement.

(9) Recommendations with respect to how activities conducted pursuant to the agreement could function more effectively or better produce economic benefits.

(10) A summary of the benefits to and challenges faced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the entity described in paragraph (2) under the agreement.

(b) PROGRAM SPECIFIED.—A program specified in this subsection is—

(1) the program for entering into reimbursable fee agreements for the provision of U.S. Customs and Border Protection services established by section 560 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113–6; 127 Stat. 378); or

(2) the pilot program authorizing U.S. Customs and Border Protection to enter into partnerships with private sector and government entities at ports of entry established by section 559 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (division F of Public Law 113–76; 6 U.S.C. 211 note).

SEC. 910. CHARTER FLIGHTS.

Section 13031(e)(1) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1) Notwithstanding section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1451) or any other provision of law (other than paragraph (2))'' and inserting the following:

''(1)(A) Notwithstanding section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1451) or any other provision of law (other than subparagraph (B) and paragraph (2))''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) An appropriate officer of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may assign a sufficient number of employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (if available) to perform services described in clause (ii) for a charter air carrier (as defined in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code) for a charter flight arriving after normal operating hours at an airport that is an established port of entry serviced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, notwithstanding that overtime funds for those services are not available, if the charter air carrier—

''(I) not later than 4 hours before the flight arrives, specifically requests that such services be provided; and

''(II) pays any overtime fees incurred in connection with such services.

''(ii) Services described in this clause are customs services for passengers and their baggage or any other such service that could lawfully be performed during regular hours of operation.''.

SEC. 911. AMENDMENT TO TARIFF ACT OF 1930 TO REQUIRE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN MARKING OF CERTAIN CASTINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''MANHOLE RINGS OR FRAMES, COVERS, AND ASSEMBLIES THEREOF'' and inserting ''CASTINGS'';

(2) by inserting ''inlet frames, tree and trench grates, lampposts, lamppost bases, cast utility poles, bollards, hydrants, utility boxes,'' before ''manhole rings,''; and

(3) by adding at the end before the period the following: ''in a location such that it will remain visible after installation''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to the importation of castings described in such amendments on or after the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 912. ELIMINATION OF CONSUMPTIVE DEMAND EXCEPTION TO PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION OF GOODS MADE WITH CONVICT LABOR, FORCED LABOR, OR INDENTURED LABOR; REPORT.

(a) ELIMINATION OF CONSUMPTIVE DEMAND EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) is amended by striking ''The provisions of this section'' and all that follows through ''of the United States.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date that is 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on compliance with section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) that includes the following:

(1) The number of instances in which merchandise was denied entry pursuant to that section during the 1-year period preceding the submission of the report.

(2) A description of the merchandise denied entry pursuant to that section.

(3) Such other information as the Commissioner considers appropriate with respect to monitoring and enforcing compliance with that section.

SEC. 913. IMPROVED COLLECTION AND USE OF LABOR MARKET INFORMATION.

Section 1137 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b–7) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''(including the occupational information under subsection (g))'' after ''paragraph (3) of this subsection''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''employers (as defined'' and inserting ''subject to subsection (g), employers (as defined''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g)(1) Beginning January 1, 2017, each quarterly wage report required to be submitted by an employer under subsection (a)(3) shall include such occupational information with respect to each employee of the employer that permits the classification of such employees into occupational categories as found in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system.

''(2) The State agency receiving the occupational information described in paragraph (1) shall make such information available to the Secretary of Labor pursuant to procedures established by the Secretary of Labor.

''(3)(A) The Secretary of Labor shall make occupational information submitted under paragraph (2) available to other State and Federal agencies, including the United States Census Bureau, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and other State and Federal research agencies.

''(B) Disclosure of occupational information under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the agency having safeguards in place that meet the requirements under paragraph (4).

''(4) The Secretary of Labor shall establish and implement safeguards for the dissemination and, subject to paragraph (5), the use of occupational information received under this subsection.

''(5) Occupational information received under this subsection shall only be used to classify employees into occupational categories as found in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system and to analyze and evaluate occupations in order to improve the labor market for workers and industries.

''(6) The Secretary of Labor shall establish procedures to verify the accuracy of information received under paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 914. STATEMENTS OF POLICY WITH RESPECT TO ISRAEL.

Congress—

(1) supports the strengthening of United States-Israel economic cooperation and recognizes the tremendous strategic, economic, and technological value of cooperation with Israel;

(2) recognizes the benefit of cooperation with Israel to United States companies, including by improving United States competitiveness in global markets;

(3) recognizes the importance of trade and commercial relations to the pursuit and sustainability of peace, and supports efforts to bring together the United States, Israel, the Palestinian territories, and others in enhanced commerce;

(4) opposes politically motivated actions that penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel such as boycotts, divestment or sanctions;

(5) notes that the boycott, divestment, and sanctioning of Israel by governments, governmental bodies, quasi-governmental bodies, international organizations, and other such entities is contrary to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) principle of nondiscrimination;

(6) encourages the inclusion of politically motivated actions that penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel such as boycotts, divestment from, or sanctions against Israel as a topic of discussion at the U.S.-Israel Joint Economic Development Group (JEDG) and other areas to support the strengthening of the United States-Israel commercial relationship and combat any commercial discrimination against Israel;

(7) supports efforts to prevent investigations or prosecutions by governments or international organizations of United States persons on the sole basis of such persons doing business with Israel, with Israeli entities, or in territories controlled by Israel; and

(8) supports States of the United States examining a company's promotion or compliance with unsanctioned boycotts, divestment from, or sanctions against Israel as part of its consideration in awarding grants and contracts and supports the divestment of State assets from companies that support or promote actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel.

TITLE X—OFFSETS

SEC. 1001. REVOCATION OR DENIAL OF PASSPORT IN CASE OF CERTAIN UNPAID TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter D of chapter 75 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 7345. REVOCATION OR DENIAL OF PASSPORT IN CASE OF CERTAIN TAX DELINQUENCIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary receives certification by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that any individual has a seriously delinquent tax debt in an amount in excess of $50,000, the Secretary shall transmit such certification to the Secretary of State for action with respect to denial, revocation, or limitation of a passport pursuant to section 1001(d) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

''(b) SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBT.—For purposes of this section, the term 'seriously delinquent tax debt' means an outstanding debt under this title for which a notice of lien has been filed in public records pursuant to section 6323 or a notice of levy has been filed pursuant to section 6331, except that such term does not include—

''(1) a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or 7122, and

''(2) a debt with respect to which collection is suspended because a collection due process hearing under section 6330, or relief under subsection (b), (c), or (f) of section 6015, is requested or pending.

''(c) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—In the case of a calendar year beginning after 2016, the dollar amount in subsection (a) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

If any amount as adjusted under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next highest multiple of $1,000.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter D of chapter 75 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 7345. Revocation or denial of passport in case of certain tax delinquencies.''.

(c) AUTHORITY FOR INFORMATION SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (l) of section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(23) DISCLOSURE OF RETURN INFORMATION TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PURPOSES OF PASSPORT REVOCATION UNDER SECTION 7345.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, upon receiving a certification described in section 7345, disclose to the Secretary of State return information with respect to a taxpayer who has a seriously delinquent tax debt described in such section. Such return information shall be limited to—

''(i) the taxpayer identity information with respect to such taxpayer, and

''(ii) the amount of such seriously delinquent tax debt.

''(B) RESTRICTION ON DISCLOSURE.—Return information disclosed under subparagraph (A) may be used by officers and employees of the Department of State for the purposes of, and to the extent necessary in, carrying out the requirements of section 1001(d) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (4) of section 6103(p) of such Code is amended by striking ''or (22)'' each place it appears in subparagraph (F)(ii) and in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting ''(22), or (23)''.

(d) AUTHORITY TO DENY OR REVOKE PASSPORT.—

(1) DENIAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), upon receiving a certification described in section 7345 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State shall not issue a passport to any individual who has a seriously delinquent tax debt described in such section.

(B) EMERGENCY AND HUMANITARIAN SITUATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State may issue a passport, in emergency circumstances or for humanitarian reasons, to an individual described in such subparagraph.

(2) REVOCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may revoke a passport previously issued to any individual described in paragraph (1)(A).

(B) LIMITATION FOR RETURN TO UNITED STATES.—If the Secretary of State decides to revoke a passport under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State, before revocation, may—

(i) limit a previously issued passport only for return travel to the United States; or

(ii) issue a limited passport that only permits return travel to the United States.

(3) HOLD HARMLESS.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State shall not be liable to an individual for any action with respect to a certification by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under section 7345 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(e) REVOCATION OR DENIAL OF PASSPORT IN CASE OF INDIVIDUAL WITHOUT SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBER.—

(1) DENIAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), upon receiving an application for a passport from an individual that either—

(i) does not include the social security account number issued to that individual, or

(ii) includes an incorrect or invalid social security number willfully, intentionally, negligently, or recklessly provided by such individual,

the Secretary of State is authorized to deny such application and is authorized to not issue a passport to the individual.

(B) EMERGENCY AND HUMANITARIAN SITUATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State may issue a passport, in emergency circumstances or for humanitarian reasons, to an individual described in subparagraph (A).

(2) REVOCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may revoke a passport previously issued to any individual described in paragraph (1)(A).

(B) LIMITATION FOR RETURN TO UNITED STATES.—If the Secretary of State decides to revoke a passport under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State, before revocation, may—

(i) limit a previously issued passport only for return travel to the United States; or

(ii) issue a limited passport that only permits return travel to the United States.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of, and amendments made by, this section shall take effect on January 1, 2016.

SEC. 1002. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 8, 2025, and ending on July 28, 2025.''.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended—

(1) by striking ''For the period'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—For the period''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) ADDITIONAL PERIOD.—For the period beginning on July 1, 2025, and ending on July 14, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

''(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting '0.3464' for '0.21'; and

''(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting '0.3464' for '0.21'.''.

SA 1225. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 10, supporting the designation of the year of 2015 as the ''International Year of Soils'' and supporting locally led soil conservation; as follows:

On page 2, line 13, insert ''voluntary'' before ''landowner participation''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 13, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 13, 2015, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Safeguarding American Interests in the East and South China Seas.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 13, 2015, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Securing the Border: Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology Force Multipliers.''

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 13, 2015, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized

to meet during the session of the Senate on May 13, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Protecting the Constitutional Right to Counsel for Indigents Charged with Misdemeanors.''

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 13, 2015, at 3 p.m. in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kevin Rosenbaum, the detailee on the Senate Committee on Finance; Andrew Rollo, detailee on the Senate Committee on Finance; Sahra Su, a fellow to the Senate Committee on Finance; and Kenneth Schmidt, clerk to the Senate Committee on Finance, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the Congress.

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

SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF THE YEAR OF 2015 AS THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF SOILS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 10.

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

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) supporting the designation of the year of 2015 as the ''International Year of Soils'' and supporting locally led soil conservation.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Lee amendment at the desk be agreed to, the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 1225) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify the support of Congress for voluntary landowner participation in certain conservation programs)

On page 2, line 13, insert ''voluntary'' before ''landowner participation''.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 10

Whereas many of the international partners of the United States are designating 2015 as the ''International Year of Soils'';

Whereas soil is vitally important for food security and essential ecosystem functions;

Whereas soil conservation efforts in the United States are often locally led;

Whereas 2015 also marks the 80th anniversary of the signing of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590a et seq.) on April 27, 1935;

Whereas soils, as the foundation for agricultural production, essential ecosystem functions, and food security, are key to sustaining life on Earth;

Whereas soils and the science of soils contribute to improved water quality, food safety and security, healthy ecosystems, and human health; and

Whereas soil, plant, animal, and human health are intricately linked: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) supports the designation of 2015 as the ''International Year of Soils'';

(2) encourages the public to participate in activities that celebrate the importance of soils to the current and future well-being of the United States; and

(3) supports conservation of the soils of the United States, through—

(A) partnership with local soil and water conservation districts; and

(B) voluntary landowner participation in—

(i) the conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.);

(ii) the environmental quality incentives program established under chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.);

(iii) the conservation stewardship program established under subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838D et seq.);

(iv) the agricultural conservation easement program established under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865 et seq.);

(v) the regional conservation partnership program established under subtitle I of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871 et seq.); and

(vi) the small watershed rehabilitation program established under section 14 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012).

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy: the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN of New Hampshire (Committee on Appropriations) and the Honorable BENJAMIN CARDIN of Maryland (At Large).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to section 1295b(h) of title 46 App., United States Code, appointis the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: the Honorable GARY C. PETERS Michigan (At Large) and the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ of Hawaii (Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101–595, and further amended by Public Law 113–281, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: the Honorable MARIA CANTWELL of Washington and the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: the Honorable TOM UDALL of New Mexico (Committee on Appropriations) and the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO (Committee on Armed Services).

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 14; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 57, H.R. 1295, and Calendar No. 56, H.R. 644, en bloc, under the previous order; further, that the time from 10 a.m. until noon be equally divided in the usual form; finally, that the time following the votes in relation to H.R. 1295 and H.R. 644 until the cloture vote at 2 p.m. also be equally divided in the usual form.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:37 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 14, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 13, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SALLY QUILLIAN YATES, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, May 13, 2015*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 13, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT J. DOLD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

POLICE MEMORIAL WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, police officers are the barrier between good and evil. They do society's dirty work. They are the fence between the law and the lawless. These men and women in uniform are our Nation's peace officers. Every day, peace officers rush into chaos and toward crime that everyone else is running away from. And every day, these officers risk their lives for the rest of us.

When New York Police Officer Brian Moore set out for patrol on Saturday, May 2, he did not know that would be his last day on patrol. Officer Moore and fellow Officer Erik Jansen were driving in Queens, New York, that evening when they saw someone who was obviously suspicious, so they did what they should do. They went up to that individual to check out what was going on.

Officer Moore drove up behind the suspicious individual and asked him this question: ''Do you have something in your waist?'' Allegedly, the callous criminal, Mr. Speaker, coldly replied: ''Yeah, I've got something in my pocket,'' and he pulled out a gun and fired three shots into Officer Moore's patrol car, killing Officer Moore. The soulless criminal then fled in the darkness of the night.

Officer Moore was rushed to the hospital, where he spent 2 days before he died. He was 25 years of age when he was killed. He was young, bright, and committed to the badge that he wore over his heart.

In his short career, Officer Moore received two exceptional police service commendations. Police Commissioner Bill Bratton of the New York Police Department noted, ''They don't give those medals out easily. He worked very hard for those.'' Officer Moore earned those two medals in less than 5 years. He was an exceptional police officer, even at a very young age.

Being a peace officer wasn't a job for Officer Moore; it was a cause. It was in his blood. He was the son, nephew, and cousin of New York police officers, and the job had deep roots in the Moore family. Officer Moore lived with his father, a retired police officer. He was meant for the uniform, and he was killed because of the uniform. It is an absolute tragedy that his young life was stolen from not only his family, but the police department and the community that he honorably served and protected.

Last Monday, as Officer Moore's body was transferred from a Queens hospital, the ambulance drove by a thin blue line of peace officers who stood in silent salute, paying their respects to Officer Moore.

Peace officers, Mr. Speaker, are the first to respond to the call for help when someone is in trouble. That is who they call. The police are the first and last line of defense between criminals and citizens. And it is somewhat ironic, Mr. Speaker, that our society counts on police officers to protect their communities, to protect their property, and restore order, yet they are targeted and criticized when they try to do their job to protect the rest of us.

We thank the peace officers who, in spite of this, continue to protect and serve neighborhoods. As long as criminals are on our streets and in our neighborhoods refusing to follow society's law, peace officers are absolutely necessary.

As a country, we should mourn the loss of all those in law enforcement who devote their life's work to restoring order in our community. Since Officer Moore's murder on May 2, two other peace officers were murdered in Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, this week is National Police Week. This Friday, right here on the west side of the Capitol, the families of 126 peace officers killed in the line of duty last year, as well as the families of those from previous years, will gather. They will be surrounded by thousands of peace officers from all over the country and by citizens showing their respect during National Police Week.

Of the 126 killed last year, which is a 24 percent increase from the previous year, 11 of those who were killed were from Texas. And here is the rollcall of the fallen:

Mark Uland Kelley of the Trinity University Police Department.

Detective Charles Dinwiddie of the Killeen Police Department.

Sergeant Paul A. Buckles of the Potter County Sheriff's Office.

Chief of Police Lee Dixon of the Little River-Academy Police Department.

Chief of Police Michael Pimentel of the Elmendorf Police Department.

Border Patrol Agent Tyler R. Robledo.

Senior Deputy Jessica Laura Hollis of the Travis County Sheriff's Office.

Sergeant Michael Lee Naylor of the Midland County Sheriff's Office.

Deputy Sheriff Jesse Valdez, III, of the Harris County Sheriff's Office.

Constable Robert Parker White of the El Paso County Constable's Office.

Sergeant Alejandro ''Alex'' Martinez of the Willacy County Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Speaker, all of these officers died because they were wearing the badge. As a former prosecutor and a former judge, I have known a lot of police officers. I have known some who have been killed in the line of duty. They, like Officer Moore, represent the best of America.

This week, other police officers throughout the country will be wearing the black cloth of sacrifice over their badge or their star, showing respect for those who have fallen in the line of duty in this country.

So we thank the families of the fallen. We thank the fallen for what they have done. We thank all of those who still protect and serve America. They are the best we have.

And that is just the way it is.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as the clock ticks down, May 31—18 calendar days and 6 legislative days away—is the expiration of the latest of now 24 short-term extensions that are testimony to Congress' inability to face up to America's transportation challenges.

As I predicted last summer, States around the country are now cutting back on their summer construction projects because Congress has not met its responsibility for the transportation partnership.

Why is it that five States have been able to raise the gas tax this year, 19 States have raised transportation revenues in the previous 2 years, and we in Congress are confused and in disarray? We have to think of elaborate mechanisms to enact short-term patches and not give America the certainty of a big, bold 6-year transportation reauthorization the country needs.

Maybe it is because we never listened to the strong voices with real experience about those needs. It is past time to have that broad perspective.

Maybe if we had 2 days of honest-to-goodness hearings like legislative bodies do in the States, like we used to do in Congress, it wouldn't be so hard.

What if we invited Richard Trumka, the president of the AFL–CIO, and Tom Donohue, the president of the U.S. Chamber, who don't usually agree on much of anything, but do on this? Or, former Kansas Governor Bill Graves, who is not just president of the American Trucking Associations but was a Republican Governor who raised the gas tax not once, but twice.

What if we invited former Mayor Bloomberg, Governor Schwarzenegger, and former Governor Ed Rendell? What if we brought in the head of American Road & Transportation Builders Association, Dr. Pete Ruane? The electrical contractors are in town this week. They could tell us. I have got a great constituent, Ted Aadland, who used to be chair of AGC.

There are countless people, government leaders, and legislative leaders who have stepped up and met their responsibility, all expecting that Congress would do its part.

These experts, leaders, and politicians know what the problem is. They fashion solutions. And they are willing to give the politicians in Congress cover to do something that appears hard only in the abstract.

There is broad consensus for the same solution that was advocated by Ronald Reagan, who in 1982 raised the gas tax. Or, Dwight Eisenhower, who helped establish the gas tax for the modern transportation system. It is hard only because we don't do our job.

The leaders who say the gas tax is off the table never explained why it is off the table and, more important, have not allowed the experts and advocates from around the country to come and make the case.

Republicans took control 55 months ago, and we have not had a single hearing on transportation finance before the Ways and Means Committee. Not one hearing. Maybe if the Ways and Means Committee would do its job, not with a carefully scripted, selected couple of witnesses that reaffirm somebody's biases, but the people who actually head the organizations that do this work, that understand the need, that have helped States around the country meet their responsibilities, maybe we could act. I suspect after 2 full days of hearings, the American public and the rest of Congress would get the message.

It doesn't have to be this hard. Show some courage, show some vision, show some action. Maybe then we won't have a 25th short-term extension. What country became great building its infrastructure 9 months at a time? Maybe we could finally enact a 6-year robust reauthorization that would solve this problem for the current administration and the next and put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family wage jobs.

Let's end this hopeless charade that somehow it is too hard for Congress to do what happens in New Hampshire, South Dakota, Georgia, Wyoming, Utah, and Iowa. Let's get a grip, people, and do our job and listen to the experts.

No more evasion, gimmicks, and short-term extensions. Raise the gas tax, put those hundreds of thousands of people to work rebuilding and renewing America. Make our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

STANDING FOR LIFE—WE MUST NOT REMAIN SILENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves.

As I consider the current state of our Nation's debate about abortion, I am a bit puzzled when I hear the word ''health care'' in discussing such a topic.

Unlike procedures for common ailments that would be typically associated with the term ''health care,'' abortion has as its very object the taking of a human life. The term ''abortion'' forces the question: What—or, better said, who—is being terminated? Without a doubt, it is clear that abortion ends the life of these little human beings.

Many will want to discuss health care today, but I ask: Who is responsible for the health care of the baby? Who among us is assigned to protect this most precious life?

Each baby bears the unique imprint of our Creator, with goodness, truth, and beauty to offer the world. Yet these children will never be able to grow, play, dream, and reach their full God-given potential.

My wife, a nurse practitioner, and I faced a very unexpected pregnancy in our late thirties. After the shock wore off, we embraced the idea of a new little girl who would be part of our family. In fact, I have decided to bring a picture of her today.

I have a great screen shot of the ultrasound 3 months into the pregnancy. Interestingly enough, we never referred to her as fetus number three. We called her Anna Claire. Just like any of you, parent or grandparent, we all take great pride in displaying new life.

Please allow me to make this clear. I don't speak ill of or despise anyone who has made a fateful but very difficult decision. As a former minister, I have seen the anguish and the hurt both before and after what can be an excruciating process.

Yet today, we are faced with an historic decision that has nothing to do with trade or with budgets but, rather, has everything to do with life. In this moment, we have the opportunity to address something that many countries have already outlawed.

Though many of us would prefer legislation that would go even further, this bill would impose a simple restriction that follows naturally and universally shared rules of humanity and compassion. To that end, H.R. 36 protects the unborn child from being aborted after 20 weeks of gestation.

Medical science tells us that the baby fights for survival in a second or third trimester abortion. He or she recoils in pain at the poison intended to stop their heart and the clamps used to dismember their tiny little body. We cannot deny this evidence. We must not look the other way.

While we show compassion to mothers who are facing difficult decisions, we must also protect the babies who are surely counted among the ''least of these.'' Who will be their voice? God forbid if we don't speak out.

Martin Luther King, Jr., said:

''Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.''

□ 1015

When this final page of human story is turned, what will we have done to embrace justice, to love mercy, and be a voice for those who have none?

The American people have grown weary of the rhetoric in D.C. Attention and being aware is good, but there comes a time when we have to move from the awareness stage to the action steps. Today is that time.

I urge my friends on both sides of this Chamber to break the silence, to stand up for life, and support H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

BUDGET CUTS FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, MomsRising, a national grassroots organization of moms, delivered a petition signed by more than 25,000 moms from all across the country urging this Congress not to cut SNAP in the fiscal year 2016 budget.

Every Member of this House received the petition signed by moms in their districts. Today, that petition has grown to nearly 50,000 signatures, and it keeps on growing. This is just the latest petition from MomsRising urging Congress to prioritize children in the budget and protect SNAP from cuts and other structural changes.

I want to share one of the stories from a mom. Monique from Ohio writes:

> I was raised to always work and so was my husband. We have tried to instill this in our daughter, even going so far as to work opposite shifts and have family babysit if there was an overlap. When my husband was laid off 2 years ago and then couldn't find work, I tried my best to keep us floating on just my income, walking to work because I didn't have the bus fare, often having $20 or less after paying the bills to feed my family for a week.
>
> I resisted getting on welfare, having been raised never to take a handout. My pastor was the one who pointed out that I had already paid for that right through my taxes over several decades.
>
> Since signing up for SNAP benefits, I can feed my family filling, nutritious meals again. Of course, my husband is still looking for work, and that will pick up the slack again if he gets work, and once he finds it, we will happily forego the benefits again. Until then, all I can say is thank God and the government for having a safety net in place.

Unfortunately, Monique's story is not unique, but it shows that, without SNAP, her family would have been much worse off during these tough times.

One in five children in the United States experiences hunger. Without the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, that number would sadly be much higher. Already, nearly half of all SNAP participants are children under the age of 18—nearly half, Mr. Speaker.

This is despite the fact that SNAP households with children have high work rates. Families with children who are working continue to earn so little that they still qualify for SNAP, and they will struggle to put food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, we know that hunger can lead to a myriad of negative outcomes for children. From health problems and compromised immune systems, to poor nutrition, to an inability to concentrate and succeed in school, childhood hunger means kids suffer.

Despite these sobering statistics, the Republican budget resolutions passed by the House and Senate made draconian cuts to SNAP and other critical programs to help poor children and their families.

The budget conference report only makes these cuts worse. It builds upon the $125 billion cut to SNAP in the House budget. To achieve a cut of that magnitude by block granting the program and capping its allotment means that States would be forced to cut benefits or cut eligible individuals and families off the program. There are simply no good choices. In short, it would make hunger worse in America, much worse.

Mr. Speaker, SNAP is one of the only remaining basic protections for the very poor. For many of the poorest Americans, SNAP is the only form of income assistance they receive. SNAP provides food benefits to low-income Americans at a very basic level. SNAP benefits are already too low. They average less than $1.40 per person, per meal. We should not be balancing the Federal budget on the backs of the poor and working families. We should not be making childhood hunger worse in America.

I commend MomsRising for their leadership and for taking action to protect SNAP and ensure that all children have access to healthy, nutritious foods.

Later today, MomsRising will start a Twitterstorm under the #missionpossible to highlight how building a strong economy for women, families, and the Nation is mission possible with policies to protect SNAP, promote healthy nutrition, guarantee paid sick days, require equal pay for equal work, and make child care more affordable. These are economic security priorities that boost our families and our economy.

As the old adage goes, ''Mother knows best.'' We should listen to our moms, especially as we gather only a few days after Mother's Day. We should be strengthening families' economic security, and we should be working to end hunger now, not making it worse.

PROTECTING THE UNBORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of all those who founded this Nation and dreamed of what America could someday be and for the sake of all those since then who have died in darkness so America could walk in the light of freedom, it is so very important for those of us who are privileged to be Members of this Congress to pause from time to time and remind ourselves of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation said:

> The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.

The phrase in the Fifth Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says:

> No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

The 14th Amendment says:

> No State shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights, especially those who cannot protect themselves, is why we are all here; yet today, Mr. Speaker, a great shadow looms over America because more than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia or Federal protection of any kind in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and it is the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States today.

Almost every other civilized nation on this Earth, Mr. Speaker, protects pain-capable unborn babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting them; yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.

Mr. Speaker, it seems we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the crimes of past generations; yet we often become staggeringly blind when it comes to facing and rejecting the worst of atrocities in our own time. It is a heartbreaking thought.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the winds of change are indeed now beginning to blow and that the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America because today—today—we are poised to pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisting of words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, this bill is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their little, pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand. Ultimately, it is one all humane

Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this is a vote all of us will remember the rest of our lives, and it will be considered in the annals of history and, I believe, in the councils of eternity itself. It shouldn't be such a hard vote.

Protecting little, pain-capable unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue; it is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family.

It is time to open our eyes and allow our consciences to catch up with our technology. It is time for the Members of the United States Congress to open our eyes and our souls, to remember that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are all here.

It is time for all Americans, Mr. Speaker, to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little, pain-capable unborn children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President came to Oregon last week, and he has taken to insults and misstatements of fact in order to get his trade promotion authority bill done, the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

He said, ''Number four, critics warn that parts of this deal would undermine American regulation, food safety, worker safety, even financial regulations. They are making this stuff up''—great applause from his audience. ''This is not true. No trade agreement is going to force us to change our laws.''

Well, the President has sort of a technical point there. He is a lawyer. They can't force us to change our laws. They can just make us pay to have them, and it has happened.

Mexican fishermen were paid by the U.S. Government to not kill dolphins because we had adopted a dolphin-safe label for tuna. We had to pay damages to Mexico because of their foregone profit because we wouldn't let them kill the dolphins.

Mexican trucks wanted to come into the U.S. Well, they don't meet our standards—kind of a problem, Mexican trucks rumbling around the U.S. with drivers that don't meet our standards, but they won a judgment under these same provisions.

Nope, he is right. They couldn't make us change the laws. They just imposed a whole range of punitive tariffs, politically targeted against people like me who had imposed the Mexican trucks, then-Speaker PELOSI, and others; and the U.S. relented.

Now, they didn't make us change our laws. We volunteered to do it after they imposed massive and unfair tariffs on Mexican goods.

But it works both ways. It has been great for America. There is a U.S. mining company that just won a judgment against Nova Scotia. They wanted to put a huge pit mine on the Bay of Fundy, destroy the fisheries' resource for their pit mine. They were denied. They won a judgment against the government of Nova Scotia and Canada.

Now, Nova Scotia and Canada don't have to change their laws. They can pay this country $300 million of damages because they can't destroy the fishery with their pit mine.

Now, the President is a smart guy, went to Harvard, but I consulted a little bit higher and smarter authority. Last night, I was at a dinner with Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel Prize winning economist. He was on the Obama economic team when NAFTA was adopted.

He said we made a huge mistake. We did not understand that this ISDS was creating a regulatory taking in a special court available only to corporations. We didn't know that, and it opened the door on chapter 11 in NAFTA. He says Obama is opening the door all the way and putting full force behind those provisions in this legislation.

Bottom line, what he said? People will die. People will die because of this provision in the TPP. It is a huge win for the pharmaceutical industry. They get to wipe out the formularies in those countries, both developing and developed countries who are part of the TPP, which lowers drug prices. They will not be allowed under this agreement, and they can go to a secret tribunal to get damages if those countries won't revoke them.

It will wipe out access to generics in developing countries who are part of this agreement. That means AIDS drugs and other things that they can't afford, no longer generic—people will die.

□ 1030

Now, these are people overseas. Maybe we shouldn't care so much. I do. But others might not; it is all about profits.

But ultimately, it is going to come home because a U.S.-based pharmaceutical company can open a subsidiary in any one of those countries, and it can go to a secret trade tribunal and it can challenge our reduced drug prices for veterans, which the pharmaceutical industry would really love to undo. That is billions of dollars of profits foregone every year because our veterans get the lowest price for drugs. Under this trade agreement, ultimately, that will be challenged, and in all probability, we will lose.

Now, the President is right: we won't have to repeal the law that gets the lowest-priced drugs for our veterans. We will just have to pay the pharmaceutical industry billions of dollars a year to continue to give our vets the drugs at a lower price so we can provide more care for more veterans.

This trade agreement, unfortunately, is what those of us who are critics say it is. It is built upon the faulty foundation of past trade agreements, including Korea.

The special trade representative to the President—also dissembling a little bit—comes to caucuses: ''It is unbelievable. We have got 20,000 more cars into Korea last year. This thing is a success.''

I said, ''Oh, Mr. Ambassador, how many more Korean cars came in last year as a result of the agreement?''

''Oh, I don't have that number.''

Well, of course he didn't have the number. Well, he knows the number. It is 461,000.

So we got 20,000 cars into Korea; they got 461,000 more into the U.S. That means a net loss of 441,000 cars. That is a heck of a lot of jobs lost in the auto industry.

This was a great day yesterday when the Senate slowed them down a little bit, and as the American people learn more, we will stop them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate National Police Week, when we recognize the service and sacrifice of the brave men and women who have lost their lives in the line of duty while serving to protect us.

National Police Week began in 1962, when President John F. Kennedy signed a proclamation designating May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that falls as Police Week.

The memorial service began in 1982 as a gathering in Senate Park of approximately 120 survivors and supporters of law enforcement. Decades later, National Police Week has grown to a series of events which attracts thousands of survivors and law enforcement officers to our Nation's Capital each year. National Police Week draws in between 25,000 and 40,000 participants.

The National Peace Officers' Memorial Service, which is sponsored by the Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police, is one in a series of events which includes the candlelight vigil, which is sponsored by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, and seminars sponsored by Concerns of Police Survivors.

The attendees come from departments throughout the United States as

well as from agencies throughout the world. This provides a unique opportunity to meet others who share a common brotherhood.

Our police force all around America plays an essential role in our communities, putting their lives on the line every day to protect us.

Just last week, in my home State of New York, a member of the NYPD, 25-year-old Brian Moore from Long Island, was killed in the line of duty. I would like to take this opportunity to speak for so many fellow Long Islanders who want his family to know that Brian remains in our thoughts and our prayers during this very difficult time.

Marc Mogil, a Floridian and former New Yorker, recently wrote to me very passionately, defending the law enforcement community, stating in part: ''Police officers merit our unwavering appreciation and support as loyal Americans and our awareness of the traditional and touching parting words almost always used amongst them: 'stay safe.' ''

It is my strongly held belief that no child should grow up fearing or lacking respect for law enforcement. And for those who consider themselves to be protesters, who resort to violence and stealing and burning down a church-run senior center, you lose any shot of moral high ground when you resort to those tactics. It is so unfortunate that today, in our society, we have this antipolice culture, with people acting with unjustified acts of violence against our police force.

Our police serve and protect us to keep our communities and citizens safe. This week, we honor them for their acts of selfless courage and leadership in our community.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, last night, America witnessed a tragic accident that occurred when the Amtrak train going from Washington, D.C., to New York derailed outside of Philadelphia. We mourn the loss of lives and those that were injured, and our thoughts and prayers go to the families who were involved in that tragic accident last night. And while we do not know the cause of that accident, we do know that America desperately needs to invest in its infrastructure.

Yes, this week is National Infrastructure Week, and we have 6 legislative days left to fund America's national transportation system—6 days. For 2 years, we have been kicking this can down the road, and I suspect we will find some temporary means of funding before the end of this month. However, America needs a long-term means of investing in its infrastructure, a long-term means that will allow for 5 years of planning for investments in our roads, our bridges, in our transit systems, in our railway systems, and in our water infrastructure.

We are experiencing a terrible drought out in California, and it is long overdue that we invest in California and in America's water systems.

So as we acknowledge this week being National Infrastructure Week, it is important that we remember that it is long overdue that Congress come together in a bipartisan fashion to provide long-term funding that will allow long-term planning to provide the same kinds of investments that our parents and our grandparents made in this country years ago that we are living off of today.

THE HMONG VETERANS' SERVICE RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. COSTA. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the service of Hmong and Lao Americans who fought for the United States during the Vietnam war.

The Central Intelligence Agency in the 1960s covertly trained Hmong men and women in Laos, and the Hmong special guerilla unit was formed, otherwise known as the SGU. They directed them in the compact to support U.S. forces.

These indigenous forces conducted direct missions against communists, fighting side-by-side American soldiers and saving countless American lives. That is why President Ford, in 1975, signed an executive order granting these Hmong soldiers and their families the ability to gain access as permanent residents for their service to our country if they could make it to America, and many of them did.

More than 100,000 Hmong soldiers made the ultimate sacrifice. Today, approximately 6,000 of those veterans are still with us.

To honor and to recognize the service of these brave veterans, the gentleman from California, Congressman PAUL COOK, and I will be reintroducing a bipartisan piece of legislation, the Hmong Veterans' Service Recognition Act. This legislation would allow the burial of these Hmong veterans who live here today and their families in national cemeteries, like the San Joaquin Valley National Cemetery in Merced County.

This recognition is long overdue. We granted it to Filipino soldiers who fought side-by-side with American soldiers in World War II.

I hope my colleagues will support this legislation to ensure that those Hmong veterans and their families receive the proper recognition by providing them the burial rights that they have earned. Again, it is long overdue. There are less than 6,000 of them that are still alive today in America. I think it is appropriate that we finally honor them.

IN DEFENSE OF LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue that I care deeply about: protecting unborn babies.

Later today, this body will vote on H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation should not be controversial. It simply protects unborn babies that a preponderance of scientific evidence has proven can feel pain. We are talking about the sixth month of pregnancy.

This bill is an important step in protecting the unborn. I am a proud cosponsor. I look forward to casting my vote in favor of the legislation later today.

Recently, a group of students at West Virginia University made news for courageously speaking out in defense of life at an abortion clinic near Morgantown. I know firsthand that it is not always politically correct to stand for your values, but we should never back down from protecting the unborn.

I applaud these brave WVU students for their actions. Their willingness to stand for life reminds me of my days at Dartmouth College, when I served as the president of the Dartmouth Coalition for Life. I remember standing in the cafeteria and handing out educational materials about protecting the unborn and the development of life. While I may not have won any popularity contest by standing up for my beliefs that life is precious and abortion is wrong, I sure got my fellow students thinking about the pro-life issue.

My pro-life commitment was cemented even further when I became a father. I have three children. And actually today, my youngest daughter turns 7 months old.

I am pleased to represent the State of West Virginia, where the pro-life movement is thriving, and the rights of the unborn are being restored. In fact, just this past February, our West Virginia State Legislature passed our own Pain-Capable Unborn Protection Act by wide bipartisan margins.

In the State Senate of West Virginia, the exact same bill banning abortion after 20 weeks passed the State Senate of West Virginia by a vote of 29–5, with 11 of 16 Democrat State senators in my State—that is 68 percent of the Democrats—voting for the bill. In the West Virginia State House of Delegates, the vote was 88–12; again, with two-thirds of State house members that are Democrats voting for the bill. This is a bipartisan issue.

I am hopeful today that a strong bipartisan majority in this Chamber will follow the example of my home State of West Virginia and pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act so

these protections are extended to unborn babies in every State in the United States.

I am honored to also be the lead cosponsor of the Life at Conception Act, which simply clarifies that human life begins at conception.

There is no question that we, in the pro-life community, have our work cut out for us. President Obama and most Democrats in Congress refuse to protect life at any stage.

One of the best examples of how out of touch the other side on this abortion issue came just a few weeks ago across the aisle in the Senate, where Democrats were willing to block a bill aimed at protecting victims of human trafficking simply because it included a provision that prohibited taxpayer funding of abortion. They are the extremists on this issue.

Look at President Obama, himself. In 2008, when he was running for President and he was in a debate against JOHN MCCAIN in the Saddleback Church forum moderated by Rick Warren, the moderator asked President Obama when life began, and the President's response was: ''Whether you're looking at it from a theological perspective or a scientific perspective, answering that question with specificity, you know, is above my pay grade.''

The President of the United States said it is above his pay grade to say when human life begins. That is a shame.

When I ran for Congress, I made the commitment to the people of the Second District of West Virginia that I would do everything in my power to defend the unborn. I continue to be guided by my faith, my values, my education, and my constituents on this issue. I look forward to working with my colleagues to defend the innocent and give a voice to the voiceless unborn babies.

□ 1045

THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN CONSERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass the bipartisan Delaware River Basin Conservation Act. Next to me is a beautiful photograph of the University of Delaware crew team rowing along the Christina River, a tributary within the Delaware River Basin. This site is just outside the city of Wilmington, Delaware's largest city, just south of the thriving riverfront development and the Amtrak station. It was taken by one of my constituents, Mark Atkins. Along with Mark, more than 200 Delawareans over the past 3 weeks sent my offices photographs that demonstrate the importance of the Delaware River Basin to each of them.

We received lots of beautiful photographs all along the river and bay, from upstate New York along the Pennsylvania and New Jersey side down to the bottom of the basin in the Delaware on both sides of the Delaware River and Bay.

These photographs tell the story of the basin as a home to wildlife—thriving wildlife—in a very well populated area, as a spot for recreation like these rowers here in the photograph, and as a place to enjoy natural beauty. It is truly a beautiful part of our great country. This photo contest we have used to draw support, interest, and attention to our effort. I even did a little dance step which was caught on YouTube by my staff to promote this initiative.

The Delaware River Basin covers over 12,500 square miles from Delaware to upstate New York. It is home to more than 8 million people, and the basin provides drinking water to over 15 million people inside and outside the basin. This watershed is not only culturally and ecologically important, but it drives the economy of this important region in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the Delaware River Basin Conservation Act would encourage restoration and protection of the basin through competitive grants and public-private partnerships. We expect lots of partnerships among local governments up and down all those States and nongovernmental agencies like Ducks Unlimited, the Delaware Nature Society, and many others.

This legislation has cosponsors from both sides of the aisle and every State in the basin—eight Democrats and nine Republicans. When you consider the difficulties we have had in this Congress getting bipartisan support of any bill, that speaks to the importance of the basin and to this bill. I want to thank each of those cosponsors for their support. I look forward to working with them.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I am asking Congress to pass this legislation and protect and preserve the Delaware River Basin so Americans from New York State to the great State of Delaware can continue enjoying it for many generations to come.

ENCOURAGING FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AT WEST IREDELL HIGH SCHOOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, each year, more than 600,000 students across all 50 States play the SIFMA Foundation's celebrated Stock Market Game, an online simulation of the global capital markets. The program introduces students to economics, investing, and personal finance in order to prepare them for financially independent futures.

Last week, I had the privilege of visiting West Iredell High School in Statesville, North Carolina, where students in Ms. Brooke Campbell's personal finance class were wrapping up participation in the 12th annual Capitol Hill Challenge.

The Capitol Hill Challenge matches Members of Congress with students, teachers, and schools competing in the Stock Market Game. The 10 teams with the highest-ranked portfolios at the end of the competition win a trip to Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, for 14 weeks, nine teams from West Iredell managed a hypothetical $100,000 online portfolio and invested in real stocks, bonds, and mutual funds. Unfortunately, no one from the school finished in the top 10, but when the final results were tabulated at the end of the competition, five of the teams increased the value of their online portfolio. For high school students with little to no experience investing, that is a significant accomplishment.

Four of the teams at West Iredell finished with less money than when they started. However, they lost less than $3,400 combined. As I said to the students, even great investors like Warren Buffett aren't bulletproof when it comes to the stock market. They may call him the Oracle of Omaha, but even Warren Buffett gets it wrong sometimes. These students made an admirable effort and learned important lessons about the volatility of investing.

During the visit, Mr. Speaker, I also participated in a simulation with students about the realities of money. Everyone was assigned a job and a salary with which to develop a budget and make purchases. This former educator was a teacher making $60,000 a year, a scenario that definitely hit close to home.

As part of the simulation, students had to purchase a new door for their house. If they paid cash for the door, they discovered it would cost only $300. However, if they bought the door on credit with the terms and conditions offered, they would pay nearly $800 for the same door. Students learned important lessons about how interest is a double-edged sword. When you invest your money, it gains interest. When you buy on credit, you pay interest.

West Iredell High School and Ms. Campbell are doing these students a great service by teaching them the importance of financial literacy and ensuring they have a strong financial education. It is my belief the lessons they are learning in the classroom will lead to careful and thoughtful decisionmaking in the real world.

THE APPROACHING MEDICAID CLIFF IN PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I sent a letter to President Obama regarding an approaching problem that is unique to Puerto Rico and the other U.S. territories and that can be called the Medicaid funding cliff. This morning, I rise to advise my colleagues about this cliff, which each territory will reach by 2019 and which Puerto Rico could reach by 2018 or even 2017.

My goal is to ensure that Federal officials have advance notice of the problem so we can begin working together now on a fair, thoughtful, and bipartisan plan to address this problem before it arrives. Timely action is critical. Inaction would be unacceptable from a moral and public policy perspective.

Let me outline the problem. The territories are treated unequally under Medicaid, which is funded in part by the Federal Government and in part by each State or territory government. In the States and D.C., Medicaid is an individual entitlement, meaning there is no limit on the amount of funding the Federal Government will provide so long as the State in question provides its share of matching funds. The Federal contribution, known as FMAP, can range from 50 percent in the case of the wealthiest States to 83 percent in the poorest States.

By contrast, Mr. Speaker, there is an annual ceiling on Federal funding for the Medicaid program in each territory. When I took office in 2009, Puerto Rico—home to 3.5 million American citizens—was subject to a ceiling of $280 million a year and had the minimum statutory FMAP of 50 percent. Indeed, because of the annual ceiling, our true FMAP was less than 20 percent a year. Puerto Rico was spending more than $1.4 billion in territory funds each year to provide healthcare services to about 1.2 million low-income beneficiaries and receiving only $280 million from the Federal Government.

To place this in context, consider Mississippi, which has a 73 percent FMAP. In 2014, Mississippi—home to fewer people than Puerto Rico—paid $1.3 billion in State funds and received $3.6 billion in Federal funds. Or take Oregon with a 63 percent FMAP which paid $1.8 billion in State funds and received $5 billion in Federal funds. Again, Puerto Rico was receiving just $280 million a year.

The Affordable Care Act provided a total of $7.3 billion in additional Medicaid funding for the five territories, with Puerto Rico receiving $6.3 billion of that amount. Each territory's FMAP was also increased from 50 percent to 55 percent. The result is that, instead of receiving about $300 million a year from the Federal Government, Puerto Rico now draws down about $1.1 billion to $1.3 billion annually.

That is a major increase, and I can not adequately express how hard we had to fight for it. But let me be clear. Our funding is nowhere close to State-like treatment and remains deeply inequitable.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this additional Medicaid funding for the territories expires at the end of fiscal year 2019—the only coverage provision in the law that sunsets in this manner. The Puerto Rico Government has less than $3.6 billion of its $6.3 billion in funding remaining. This is the cliff. It is coming, one way or another; it is just a question of whether it will arrive in 2017, 2018, or 2019. If this pool of funding is not replenished, Puerto Rico will go back to receiving less than $400 million a year.

In the coming months, I will continue to brief Federal officials on this subject. I will explain how inaction will deepen the current health, migration, and fiscal crisis in Puerto Rico, and why action is not only in Puerto Rico's interest, but also in the national interest. In short, I will fight as hard to continue this essential funding as I fought to obtain it in the first place.

IN RECOGNITION OF PETER SHIPMAN, CRAFTSMAN FOR THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Peter Shipman and his many accomplishments for this great institution and his community. He is one of the many unsung champions of this body who kept the House running over the course of his career.

Peter began his career for the United States House of Representatives on November 1, 1979, shortly after graduating from VCU with a degree in arts, specializing in furniture making and design.

Peter soon established himself as a highly regarded craftsman among a shop of senior cabinetmakers. As his passion and talent for his craft became apparent, he soon earned the role of producing more high-profile projects.

Peter's drive for perfection, creativity, and attention to unique details were second to none. Many of his coworkers still are using his techniques today. From the time he became shop foreman until his retirement, Peter had a hand in the design of most of the pieces of newly constructed furniture built by the craftsmen in the Cabinet Shop. His hard work and dedication to his craft and to this House earned him the much sought-after job of shop foreman in 2001 and, indeed, manager of the shop in 2007.

Upon his retirement in 2012, Peter was asked about his proudest accomplishments during his service here in the United States House of Representatives. Peter said he was ''proudest of the individuals who have made up the Cabinet Shop, Finishing Shop, Drapery, Upholstery and Carpet Shops, and my association with all past and present individuals who have been part of these groups. Sincerely this is my proudest achievement.''

A small sample of the projects that Peter was involved with includes the construction of the Speaker's Chair, Madam Speaker. He also designed and managed the construction of the podiums that we are using here on the House floor, the sideboard for Speaker Gingrich, the hand-painted hummingbird desk for Speaker Foley, and the display cabinets for Leader Bob Michel.

Examples of Peter's superior talents, along with his loyalty to this House, will live on for many years in the Capitol and in the House Office Buildings. His artistic approach to furniture design added a special touch that few craftsmen possess. He was truly dedicated to his art and the talented individuals whom he mentored along the way.

Madam Speaker, he will surely be missed by his peers who knew and loved him as well as by the entire House community. Peter is survived by his wife, Jennifer; their son, Walker; stepson, Derek; brother, Tourne; and sisters, Carie, Airlie, and Mellick. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and his colleagues who continue his tradition of beautiful craftsmanship today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 59 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAULSEN) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Larry Kendrick, Archer's Chapel United Methodist Church, Brownsville, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Father God, we place before Your throne of grace this day the United States of America and its government.

Father, in Your Word, we are told that You reprove leaders for our sakes so that we may live a quiet and a peaceable life in godliness and honesty.

O God, as You anointed leaders and called prophets of old, lead us to recognize our true representatives and authentic leaders, men and women who

love Your people, who walk with and among them, who feel their pain and share their joys, who dream their dreams and strive to help them achieve their common goal.

In Your spirit, empower us to serve Your people, to bring praise and glory to Your name.

We believe today that the hearts of these leaders are in Your hands, and their decisions will be divinely directed of the Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTENGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND LARRY KENDRICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the pastor who gave our opening prayer this morning, Brother Larry Kendrick, who preaches at my home church, Archer's Chapel United Methodist Church in Frog Jump, Tennessee.

I just want to tell him how much we appreciate his service to the kingdom. His wife and daughter, Karen and Vicki, are here with him also—and their service to God's kingdom—and we wish them the best.

God always be with you. Thank you for coming today and opening us up with prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING AN UNSUNG HERO

(Mr. BOST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, sometimes, a tragedy has to happen for us to recognize unsung heroes.

On Monday, I received word that Lowell Ensel had passed away. Lowell was an intern here in our D.C. office for the past 3 months. His passing was sudden; it was unexpected, and it was painful to our entire office family.

He was just 20 years old; but, while Lowell's years have been short, his reach was very long. That was reflected when over 200 students attended a vigil earlier this week at the University of Maryland.

Lowell's love of life had a big impact on our office as well. He handled every project we gave him with a positive attitude and a smile on his face.

I offer my thoughts and prayers to Lowell's parents, Ellen and Fendwick, as well as his extended family and countless friends during this time of suffering, as difficult as it is.

To my colleagues, I know that each one of you have special people like Lowell in your office. These are young people who work long hours for little or no pay because they want to make a difference in this country.

In honor of Lowell, please take a moment and thank these unsung heroes that work in our offices every day.

FUNDING THE VA IS A SACRED RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, recently, I met with two veterans and their families who traveled to Buffalo for medical treatment. Initially, I thought they were receiving care at our highly-regarded VA hospital, but in fact, they were brought to Buffalo by Operation Backbone, an organization that works with private doctors to provide specialty care that is not available within the VA system.

The families expressed frustration that they could not obtain through the VA the highly specialized and efficient care they were receiving in Buffalo. It was not until Operation Backbone arranged their treatments and the Buffalo Sabres hockey team facilitated recovery that these men received the care they needed.

I commend Operation Backbone and the Buffalo Sabres for their commitment to our veterans, but their work is necessary only because Congress is failing in its responsibility to these men and women. When we ask our servicemembers to put their bodies on the line, we incur a moral obligation to get them the best possible care when injury occurs.

Last year, Congress provided funding for the VA to hire more physician specialists. It was a good first step, but making sure the VA has the resources to care for our veterans is a sacred responsibility that will require our attention this year and for many years to come.

SOUTH CAROLINA HEROES ON THE HONOR FLIGHT TO WASHINGTON

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I was especially grateful to meet the Honor Flight members from South Carolina during their trip to Washington. These World War II and Korean war veterans are heroes for their honorable service in defense of American families.

I appreciate the Honor Flight network, coordinated by Bill Dukes, for enabling these veterans the opportunity to visit the memorials built to honor their service and sacrifices.

I was privileged to visit with Medal of Honor recipient Corporal Kyle Carpenter, a constituent and resident of Lexington, whose service and heroic actions in the United States Marine Corps during Operation Enduring Freedom saved the lives of countless Americans.

I have no doubt that, because of Corporal Carpenter's service, American families are more secure. Thank you, Kyle. And I thank all of the Honor Flight veterans who are visiting today, and thank all the veterans and military families in South Carolina and across our Nation for your dedication to America.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President by his actions should never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy to the family of Lowell Ensel.

RECOGNIZING MAY 2015 AS STROKE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight my introduction of H. Res. 256, a resolution to recognize May 2015 as Stroke Awareness Month.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly stand here today because of our Nation's commitment to greater awareness about stroke and funding to find treatments for stroke survivors.

Stroke is the fifth leading cause of death in the United States, killing nearly 130,000 Americans per year. On average, someone in the United States has a stroke every 40 seconds, while one American dies of stroke every 4 minutes.

In light of these sobering statistics, I am reintroducing my resolution recognizing May as Stroke Awareness Month. This resolution strives to enhance public awareness, urges continued coordination and cooperation between researchers and families, and advocates for improved treatment for individuals who suffer stroke.

Mr. Speaker, together, we can combat this devastating illness and work together toward long-term solutions to prevent and treat and improve the lives of those suffering from strokes.

I am a stroke survivor, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing May as Stroke Awareness Month.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which would restrict the practice of abortion after the sixth month of an unborn child's life.

Today marks the second anniversary of the conviction of Dr. Kermit Gosnell of Pennsylvania, who ran a late-term abortion mill in Philadelphia. Despite media silence about the case, we were able to learn that Dr. Gosnell regularly delivered third-trimester babies and then snipped their spinal cords, their necks, with scissors.

He used unclean instruments, spreading infections among the women he treated, hospitalizing many of them, if he even allowed an ambulance to be called. Most of his victims were poor. One mother, a Ms. Mongar, died in the process.

It seems that some Members of this body want to regulate things like lightbulbs and rainwater and farm dust, but leave women helpless before the Dr. Gosnells of the world, late-term abortionists driven by profit, undeterred by the painful death of countless innocent lives.

We must protect these women and children by passing the bill.

WE ARE STARVING OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the majority has found a new way to keep from funding a long-term surface transportation bill within 6 days: keep passing short-term patches. As a result, we are starving the Nation's infrastructure.

Twenty-three States are so desperate that they have either raised their State gas taxes or are in the process; still, the states are screaming for Congress to have the guts to do the same. State gas taxes were meant to partner with the Federal tax. States can't do it alone. The States have shown that the public understands the gas tax is a user fee.

The roads, bridges, and transit America most needs can't even be started with short-term patch funding. The people are leading us to their roads and bridges.

It is time we followed, Mr. Speaker.

HONORING CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG POLICE OFFICERS HARLAN PROCTOR, ASHLEY BROWN, AND SCOTT EVETT

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Officers Harlan Proctor, Ashley Brown, and Scott Evett, three officers who serve and protect our community.

In the aftermath of a recent tragic domestic violence homicide and arson, Officer Proctor was assigned to drive the victim's children to the police station and listened attentively as the children discussed losing everything, including an 8-year-old's favorite dress.

Officers Proctor, Brown, and Evett thoughtfully contacted Target to track down that favorite dress and, with donations from these officers and Target, were able to provide clothes, toys, and gift cards to help the family recover in this distressing time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in thanking Officers Proctor, Evett, and Brown for their humble act of service and to thank all of the brave and dedicated police officers across the United States who put their lives on the line to protect each and every one of us every day and still make time to perform thoughtful acts of kindness in our communities.

May God bless them.

□ 1215

HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT TRUST FUND

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to offer my condolences to everyone who was affected by the derailment of Amtrak train 188 yesterday. The victims and their loved ones are in our thoughts and prayers today.

This week, Mr. Speaker, is National Infrastructure Week. I rise today to underscore the importance of a long-term reauthorization for the highway and transit trust fund so we can address the urgent responsibility to repair and rebuild our roads, bridges, ports, and transit systems.

There are just 6 legislative days remaining until the expiration of the highway trust fund. We are putting at risk 6,000 infrastructure projects and more than 600,000 jobs.

The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials estimates that my home State of Rhode Island could lose $200 million in Federal funding, $3 million in Federal transit funding, and 1,689 jobs, and 40 infrastructure projects are at risk.

Some on the other side of the aisle have suggested that we should pass another short-term patch rather than a long-term solution to the highway trust fund. If we are serious about rebuilding our economy, we need to be able to move goods, services, and information to compete in the 21st century.

It is critical that we pass a long-term reauthorization of the highway trust fund that provides the resources we need to rebuild our crumbling bridges, roads, and schools and helps create good-paying jobs for hard-working Americans. Our constituents deserve nothing less, and our economic recovery requires this.

INTRODUCING THE TREAT AND REDUCE OBESITY ACT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, with one in four seniors in America afflicted with obesity at a price of $50 billion a year to Medicare, it is apparent that any attempts to put Medicare on a sound financial path must deal with this disease. That is why I am introducing the Treat and Reduce Obesity Act. The bill removes the exclusion for Medicare part D for covering drugs that treat and reduce obesity and makes more treatment options available for our seniors.

When Medicare part D was created in 2006, there were no widely accepted FDA-approved obesity drugs on the market, so they were declared exempt

from coverage. However, with significant medical advances, a number of FDA-approved weight loss drugs are now available, and our Medicare rules should reflect that.

Mr. Speaker, obesity is responsible for nearly 20 percent of the increase in our health care spending over the last two decades, and it is time we take action to target, treat, and reduce obesity.

HONORING PRINCIPAL MICHAEL P. O'MALLEY

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the achievements of an extraordinary educator from my district. Michael O'Malley will retire next month after 40 years of service, 30 of which he spent as a social studies teacher and soccer coach before becoming principal at Newfound Regional High School in Bristol, New Hampshire.

Under his leadership, the school has been named the New Hampshire Secondary School of Excellence in 2010, and the State Association of Secondary School Principals twice honored Mr. O'Malley as an ''outstanding role model.'' Even Education Week took notice, recognizing the school for its accomplishments under Mr. O'Malley's guidance.

Mr. O'Malley has made a difference beyond Newfound High School as well, through his work with the New England Association of Schools and Colleges and the Center for Secondary School Redesign.

Every student deserves a principal like Mr. O'Malley, one who is passionate about learning and committed to building relationships with students, while maintaining a focus on educational innovation at the same time.

As we continue our efforts to increase access to high-quality education, let's look to educators like Mr. O'Malley as examples of what dedicated schoolteachers can accomplish.

REFUNDABLE CHILD TAX CREDIT ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION REFORM ACT

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that a majority of Americans oppose Obama's amnesty, and I have been fighting against it from day one. As part of my ongoing effort to combat Obama's amnesty, I am reintroducing my bill to stop illegals from claiming the refundable child tax credit.

Right now, the IRS does not require Social Security numbers for this credit. The inspector general said that as a result, illegals can get thousands of dollars from the IRS. It is no surprise that it also encourages more illegals to come here. To stop this, my bill requires individuals to provide their Social Security number if they want to claim the tax credit.

Last year, the House passed this measure, which was estimated to save taxpayers $24.5 billion. This is a commonsense bill Americans want, need, and deserve. Let's get it done.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD ACT

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Act.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Another painful piece of legislation inflicted on the women of this country by people who don't believe we are smart enough or moral enough to make our own life-changing decisions.

You want to talk about pain? Let's talk about the agony of a woman who is raped and again violated by unnecessary government intrusion. Or what about the suffering of a woman and her family, knowing that her pregnancy will end in tragedy because her doctor would be sent to jail for saving her life?

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Police Week.

Every day law enforcement officials put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe. Sadly, in my district, Tarpon Springs Police Officer Charles ''Charlie K'' Kondek was shot and killed right before Christmas as he patrolled the streets on the midnight shift, while the rest of us slept securely in our homes.

Police officers don't have a typical day. On average, an officer dies in the line of duty every 58 hours—150 deaths per year.

This week and every day, we should be thankful for the good that police officers do for our communities. Let's never forget the sacrifices of Officer Kondek and others who have fallen in the line of duty, and let's be thankful for those who keep our communities safe. God bless them.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE MOTHER'S DAY REPORT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, another Mother's Day has come and gone, and millions of Americans took time out to express their gratitude to their mothers for all the wonderful things they do. But some still have an outdated picture in their minds of their mothers spending all their time home baking cookies when, more typically, American mothers are at a job bringing home the bacon.

According to a Mother's Day report produced by the Joint Economic Committee, the typical American family has changed dramatically over the last 50 years, and fewer than one in five families match the old stereotype of the father at the job and the mom at home. Today, fully 70 percent of mothers are in the labor force because they have to be in the labor force to provide for their families.

Our lives have changed dramatically, but our public policies haven't kept pace with these changes. For instance, the United States and Papua New Guinea are the only two countries in the world—the only two in the world—that do not provide paid leave for the birth of a child.

So before another Mother's Day rolls around, let's give mothers something they really want: policies that allow them to hold well-paying jobs so that they can help provide for their families.

HONORING OFFICER STEPHEN ARKELL

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Granite State hero and fallen police officer Stephen Arkell of Brentwood New Hampshire.

This time last year, the State of New Hampshire lost a true Granite State hero. During this time of great sadness, we remember and celebrate the life of not only a tremendous police officer, but also a father, brother, master carpenter, coach, and friend.

Arkell devoted his life to protecting our families and our communities, and ultimately died in the line of duty while responding to a domestic violence dispute.

As his family, friends, neighbors, and fellow police officers knew, Arkell was really one of a kind. The bravery and compassion he demonstrated during his 15 years of service are not—and will not—be forgotten.

It takes a remarkable individual like Stephen Arkell to risk his life daily to keep us safe and protect us from harm. So let us take a moment today and pause, reflect, and celebrate the life and valor of Officer Arkell. He put his life on the line to protect the Granite State, and we are forever grateful.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to really speak to the American people.

First, let me say that I join my colleagues in standing, again, on Wednesday to ask to bring the girls back and to ask that the dastardly group of Boko Haram be brought to justice immediately and that they cease their violence in Nigeria.

I also stand today to ask the incredible question: How can we put on the floor of the House H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which is merely a disregard, disrespect for the Constitution and a woman's right to choice. I look forward to a vigorous debate, standing on the side of the Constitution.

But as I look today, I also realize that more of Congress' work is not done. While we are dealing with violating women's rights, we are not dealing with the highway trust fund bill.

In my own county of Harris, there are 3,616 bridges, and 1,559 of them are deficient. Our citizens are driving over bridges that are destroying the economy, destroying their cars, and stopping them from moving about the community in the way that they should. Mothers and fathers and car-poolers and workers are trying to get to work. The total deficiency is 43 percent.

When are we going to get a long-term infrastructure bill? When are we going to stand up as Americans and not Republicans and Democrats? Democrats want to stand up with Americans to pass a long-term infrastructure bill.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which is expected to be voted on later today. This legislation, which is based on substantial scientific evidence, establishes Federal legal protection for unborn children at 20 weeks, with limited exceptions in the case of rape or incest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this to be one of the human rights issues of our day. It has been scientifically proven that the unborn feel pain at 20 weeks and are, in many cases, capable of living outside of the womb. I remain greatly concerned that the United States of America continues to be one of the few countries in the world that allows for abortions this far into pregnancy.

This commonsense legislation, which is supported by 60 percent of all Americans, seeks to correct this injustice. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 36, and I urge my colleagues to join me and vote to protect the lives of the unborn.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I held a press conference at a bridge in Perth Amboy, in my district, to highlight the dire need to renew the highway trust fund before it expires at the end of this month. This bridge, like thousands of other bridges and roads throughout the country, is in dire need of repair.

And let me be as clear as I can be: unless Republicans in Congress join with Democrats in our commitment to invest in our Nation's infrastructure, not only will our roads and bridges continue to deteriorate, jobs will be lost, and the economy will suffer.

Ever since Republicans took control of the House in January 2011, they have shown neglect and indifference towards the Nation's infrastructure needs. In fact, since Republicans assumed the majority in January 2011, the Republican-led Ways and Means Committee has not held a single hearing on financing options for the highway trust fund. All this, despite the U.S. being ranked 16th in quality of infrastructure, behind Switzerland, the United Arab Emirates, Japan, and others, according to the World Economic Forum; and the country received a D-plus from civil engineers for our infrastructure nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues in Congress to quickly extend the highway trust fund. We only have another 6 legislative days. Jobs, economic strength, and the safety and health of our transportation system are at stake.

□ 1230

CALLING FOR A LONG-TERM TRANSPORTATION FUNDING BILL TO FIX OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate national Infrastructure Week here in this country, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to work with us to develop a sensible, long-term solution to fix this trust fund and put an end to our infrastructure crisis.

We need reliable roads, highways, and bridges to keep our economy moving, and for almost 60 years we have depended on the highway trust fund to make necessary repairs to our Nation's deteriorating infrastructure. However, the gas tax hasn't been raised in 20 years and no longer generates enough revenue to meet our needs.

The highway trust fund faces a serious and immediate funding shortage. The deadline to fix this is just weeks away—just 6 legislative days. So unless we act now, construction projects across the country will come to a standstill, putting the jobs of 600,000 American workers on the line. Paving our highways and keeping our bridges safe and reliable is one of the most basic jobs of Congress. We have until May 31 to figure this out. Failing is not an option.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF NICK PELLAR, EAGLE SCOUT

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Nick Pellar. Nick is an Eagle Scout in Troop 13 and is a senior at New Trier High School in north suburban Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Boy Scouts of America is the Nation's largest and most prominent values-based youth development organization. The Boy Scouts provide a program for young people that builds character, trains them in the responsibilities of participating in citizenship, and develops personal fitness.

Nick embodies all of these ideals and more. Mr. Speaker, Nick recently earned his 140th merit badge. That means not only does Nick have every single badge available, he actually has earned seven more than you can get today. As Scouts go into the program today, there are only 133 available merit badges. As merit badges are added, some are taken off. He has actually earned 140 merit badges.

Eagle Scouts, Mr. Speaker, are some of the top 4 percent of Scouts across the country. Nick's accomplishments put him among the top handful of Eagle Scouts in the entire Nation.

He is so incredibly accomplished for a young man of his age, and this achievement demonstrates his personal dedication and moral fortitude. Mr. Speaker, I have known Nick personally for many years, and I am incredibly proud of this awesome accomplishment. Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincere congratulations to Nick and wish him the best as he starts college this fall at my alma mater, Denison University.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my unwavering support for the Export-Import Bank of the United States and its chairman, Fred Hochberg.

In fiscal year 2014 alone, the Ex-Im Bank supported approximately $107 million in Nebraska exports. As the bank looks to extend its charter through the end of 2022, Chairman Hochberg graciously accepted my invitation to come to Omaha, where he recently sat down with several of the Nebraska firms which work hand-in-hand with the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to express my support for the many Nebraska firms who work for the bank. Among these are Chief Industries of Kearney, Nebraska, which manufactures grain storage systems and employs 245 full-time workers. For the last 15 years, Chief Industries has worked with the bank to increase its export sales by 1,000 percent. That's right, 1,000 percent. It is this kind of success story which makes clear the significant contribution which the Ex-Im Bank makes to our Nation's economy.

Among these contributions are the 1.3 million American jobs the bank has helped create since 2009, while reducing the Federal deficit alone by $7 billion over the last 20 years.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, it has been over a year since the Chibok girls were stolen from their families by Boko Haram. Today I have asked my fellow Congresswomen to join me in wearing red on Wednesdays. Wear red in solidarity with the mothers and sisters who fear their stolen daughters and sisters have been sexually assaulted and sold into slavery.

Soldiers are beginning to capture abandoned Nigerian women and girls. So far, not one is a Chibok schoolgirl. So we will continue our advocacy.

This week, Madam Speaker, I have also asked the gentlemen of Congress to join us in wearing red on Wednesdays. Wear red in solidarity with the fathers and brothers who fear their daughters and sisters are being physically abused and have been married off against their will.

Until they have returned, we will continue to wear red on Wednesdays in solidarity with their families. We will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls, tweet, tweet, tweet #joinrepwilson.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, today I rise against H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which should be called the Painful and Oppressive to Women Act.

In January, women of the Republican Conference were so appalled by H.R. 36 they blocked it from coming to the floor. Four months later it is back. Shameful.

Madam Speaker, the changes Republicans have made to this legislation are mere smokescreens and have done nothing to alleviate the burdens placed on women who are already grappling with the hard decision of whether or not to terminate a pregnancy.

H.R. 36 poses grave dangers to women. And the American people will not be fooled. Women's health and personal decisions should be between a woman, her family, and her doctor, not a male-dominated Congress.

Most abortions take place before 21 weeks, so many women who have abortions later in pregnancy do so because of medical complications and other barriers to access.

H.R. 36 would harm women in need and increase obstacles to obtaining safe and legal abortions. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation. It is really bad.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 13, 2015 at 9:45 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1075.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2048, USA FREEDOM ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 255 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 255

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of May 14, 2015, or May 15, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman

from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 255 provides for general debate for H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016; provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act; and provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act.

The rule before us today provides for general debate for H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, also known as the NDAA. The NDAA, which has passed Congress and has been enacted for over 50 years in a row, is a vital exercise each year in providing for the common defense, one of our most profound constitutional responsibilities.

The NDAA includes over $600 billion in important national security funding, providing resources to each of our four military branches, our nuclear deterrent, and related agencies. The legislation fully funds the President's request for funding for our warfighters overseas and includes important steps to advance Department of Defense acquisition policies to ensure we are saving taxpayer dollars and stretching our precious defense dollars as far as possible.

H.R. 1735 also includes provisions improving military readiness, strengthening our cyber warfare defenses, and holding the line on keeping terrorists in cells at Guantanamo Bay, not in our States or back on the battlefield.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act which addresses critical national security investigation concerns while making much-needed changes to protect the privacy of Americans.

H.R. 2048 prohibits explicitly the bulk collection of all records under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, the FISA pen register authority, and National Security Letter statutes. This provision prevents government overreach by ending the indiscriminate collection of records that violates the privacy of all Americans.

Madam Speaker, this bill also improves transparency, making significant FISA interpretations available to the public and requiring the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence to disclose how they use these national security authorities.

Finally, the USA FREEDOM Act ensures that national security is strengthened by closing loopholes that prevented tracking of foreign terrorists, narrowly defining which records the Federal Government may obtain, and enhancing investigations of international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

□ 1245

Madam Speaker, I share the concern that our colleagues across the aisle have about the return of the young women taken by Boko Haram and salute their wearing red today and your wearing red today. However, Madam Speaker, I chose to wear pink today because we are dealing with a very sensitive issue about unborn children.

Today's rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This is important legislation for the House to consider, particularly this week, 2 years after the conviction of Philadelphia-based late-term abortionist Kermit Gosnell, who was found guilty of first degree murder in the case of three babies born alive in his clinic.

He killed these children using a procedure he called ''snipping,'' which involved Gosnell inserting a pair of scissors into the baby's neck and cutting its spinal cord, a procedure that was reportedly routine.

A neonatologist testified to the grand jury that one of the babies, known as Baby Boy A, spent his few moments of life in excruciating pain. Late-term abortions are agonizingly painful, and they are happening all too often in our Nation. Americans have been asking how different those abortions are from Gosnell's ''snipping.'' Thankfully, they know the answer to those questions and support protecting these nearly fully developed lives.

A March 2013 poll conducted by The Polling Company found that 64 percent of the public supports a law prohibiting an abortion after 20 weeks when an unborn baby can feel pain. Supporters included 63 percent of women and 47 percent of those who identified themselves as pro-choice.

That finding was not an outlier; it is representative of the public's true beliefs. According to a 2013 Gallup poll, 64 percent of Americans support prohibiting second trimester abortions, and 80 percent support prohibiting third trimester abortions.

Even The Huffington Post found in 2013 that 59 percent of Americans support limiting abortions after 20 weeks; and Cosmopolitan magazine, not known for its traditional values, had an article recently all about the impact of smoking by pregnant women on their ''unborn babies.'' They weren't blobs of tissue or even fetuses, but ''unborn children.''

Those unborn children can feel pain, which is why they are provided anesthesia when surgery is performed on them in the womb. They can even survive outside the womb, with The New York Times reporting just last week on a study that The New England Journal of Medicine published that found that 25 percent of children born prematurely at the stage of pregnancy covered by this legislation survive.

There are countless stories—no longer so uncommon we would call them miracles—of children surviving and thriving, such as Micah Pickering, who was born right at the stage when this legislation would protect other children in the womb and is now a ''spunky almost 3-year-old,'' according to his mother.

The legislation we consider today, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, is carefully written to advance the consensus of a majority of Americans that these late-term abortions should cease.

In order to maintain that consensus, the bill includes provisions allowing abortions in cases of rape or where the life of the mother is in danger. It also provides strong protections for minors who have been sexually assaulted, stopping abortionists from ignoring child abuse that enters their facility.

Most importantly, it protects the lives of well-developed, pain-capable children who could well survive outside the womb. America is one of only seven nations that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks, which includes such well-known human rights leaders as North Korea, China, and Vietnam. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would finally put an end to that.

Madam Speaker, I commend this rule and the underlying bills to my colleagues for their support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding me the time.

I rise today frustrated and angry by the state of affairs in the United States. Last night, an Amtrak train derailed which was traveling over the busiest track in the Nation. That tragedy killed at least six and injured more than 200 who were hospitalized, just days before the highway trust fund is about to expire. Republicans will spend billions of dollars in this bill on war, but let the roads and rails and bridges rot.

Thirty-eight billion dollars was concealed in a very clever way in the Defense bill under the OCO account because it does not affect the budget cap; but what are we going to do about the busiest corridor in the United States? Nothing—as a matter of fact, according to Politico, on this very day, the Republicans in the Appropriations Committee, on a 21–29 vote, defeated an amendment offered by the ranking member, DAVID PRICE, that would have significantly boosted funding for several transportation programs, including Amtrak, the very day after this.

The Baltimore Sun tells us that the operations advisory commission for the Northeast corridor says that the estimation for loss of service on the corridor for a single day would cost $100 million in travel delays and lost productivity.

Six people have died; 200 were hospitalized. Add the medical cost on all of that. It will only take a week or a little bit more to use up the entire account for the amount of money the Appropriations Committee is willing to put into Amtrak.

As we look at that, what we do here—saving money and cutting out and dropping everything—has to be the costs that are borne outside by people with their medical costs by the delay by being unable to get the goods and things to market. If I have ever seen a case of pennywise and dollar foolish, this one is it.

Moreover than that, that isn't even our discussion today. What I really want to talk about here is that the majority's priorities are so misplaced that they cannot even govern this body in an organized way.

Today, under this single rule—one rule—we will consider a 20-week abortion ban, which is unconstitutional, and we know it, but they are going to do it anyway; we will consider bulk data collection under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act; and then we will also do the general debate for the National Defense Authorization Act. We have an hour to do this rule to talk about those. These bills have no commonality at all, and there is no need at all to entwine them in a single rule.

The rule is called a grab bag rule that governs the floor debate for two or more unrelated pieces of legislation. Debate in this Chamber suffers when many unrelated bills are crammed into a single rule. It is legislative malpractice, Madam Speaker, practiced here all the time and getting worse term after term.

Under this procedure, arguments for and against multiple measures are interspersed, which leads to disjointed, fragmented, and confusing debates. Furthermore, each bill does not get its due consideration, which harms not only the Rules Committee, but the House of Representatives, and, above all, the American people; but the most egregious use of our time is prioritizing attacking women's health over everything else that is going on in the country.

This majority has introduced yet another 20-week abortion ban that prohibits abortions after 20 weeks based on a widely disputed scientific claim that a fetus can feel pain at that point in time in a pregnancy, but this is not the first time we have seen this bill. It is not even the first time we have seen it in this Congress, which is only 5 months old.

Just weeks ago, on the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark ruling on Roe v. Wade, the majority prepared to bring this bill to the floor, but it was so odious, the provision in it so offensive, that even women in the majority's own party balked and rebelled against their leadership. The uproar was so loud that, in the middle of the night, the majority pulled the bill from the floor.

The first version was bad enough. It included abortion exceptions for rape and incest only to reported cases of rape. Within 48 hours, a woman had to go to report that to law enforcement, or she could not be eligible for an abortion. The new bill is worse because it says that she has to have 48 hours of counseling, but she can't get it at the hospital where the abortion would be done, so she has to go from pillar to post.

The most odious thing that they have done is the unmitigated cruelty to the victims of incest. They put an age limit on it. Can you imagine that? It is unbelievable.

I know that this bill will not go anywhere. I doubt the Senate will even take it up. It is simply something to appease people who believe anything that they hear about this, such as there is abortion on demand. There is not.

Third trimester abortions are all medically necessary, as one of my colleagues mentioned this morning. If you haven't talked to any of those women, you don't know what they have been through. In almost every one of those cases, they desperately want that baby, but sometimes, they have no brains. Sometimes, they are born with no organs. They are unable to survive.

Many times, there is a case of a woman who can preserve her reproductive system so that she can have more children. How incredibly cruel it is that we want to take that decision away from the woman and her doctor—whomever she wants to consult, but certainly scientific laws ought to apply—and put it in the hands of legislators.

Maybe we should decide who should have gall bladder operations, or maybe we should decide whether broken legs should be treated; we are all-seeing here. What happened here today is disgustingly cruel, as I said before.

The Supreme Court has long held that a woman has the unequivocal right to choose abortion care until the point of fetal viability, which is largely accepted by the scientific community to be 24 weeks.

A 20-week abortion ban brazenly challenges the Supreme Court's standards and deliberately attempts to push the law earlier and earlier into a woman's pregnancy because that is the number one issue, and we have been told that.

When I started working on this issue four decades ago, I surely thought, by now, we would not decide whether or not a woman can make a decision about her own health.

How awful it is that, just less than a week after Mother's Day, when we all are reminded how brilliant and how wonderful they were, how farseeing, how great in their judgment, but we decide that every other woman in the country has not the ability to make decisions for herself.

Enough of these insults, enough of practicing medicine without a license, let's get to the business at hand and fix the rotting infrastructure in the United States of America and make it safe for our fellow citizens to get to work.

The idea that all those people are wounded and hurt today and died because we failed to keep up the tracks in the United States of America, which was known worldwide for its infrastructure and now spends barely a pittance on trying to maintain those old tracks—and the mayor of New York had just said he has bridges in New York that are over 100 years old.

I have the same thing in my district. I have bridges over the Erie Canal. Fire trucks can't even go over them and haven't been able to for the last decade.

But, no, we are not going to talk about that. We are going to talk about making women do what we want them to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Probably throughout the day, we will be setting the record straight on things my colleague has said. Victims of rape can get counseling from a hospital that performs abortion; but most egregiously, Madam Speaker, the arguments raised across the aisle about incest are astounding.

Let me be clear. If a woman is sexually assaulted and that leads to a pregnancy, there is a rape exception in this legislation that applies, regardless of the family status of her aggressor or the age of the victim.

□ 1300

As the legislation includes an exception for all women who are sexually assaulted, those across the aisle who raise incest appear to believe we should provide special exemptions under Federal law to individuals in consensual incestuous relationships. That boggles the mind. This objection is a shameful distraction from the important debate we are having about protecting well-developed, unborn children from being ripped apart in the womb.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate the work of my colleague from North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, 2 years ago today, America was awakened to the horrors

of the abortion industry as abortionist Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murdering three innocent, newborn infants in his filthy abortion complex, and one of his former employees reported nearly 100 other living babies who were also murdered.

Gosnell cut the spines of crying 5-month-old babies who survived his first attempts to kill them, and our human dignity makes it impossible to ignore that image. He further brutalized the mothers—killing two of them by drug overdose; with filthy, unsanitary instruments; and by perforating their wombs and bowels.

It is no less painful for babies to have their spines snipped before birth than by Gosnell after birth. By 5 months, if not before, babies can feel pain—intense pain. It is simply barbaric to allow Gosnell or anyone else to rip these babies apart, limb by limb, whether they are in or out of their mothers' wombs.

That is why we must take a stand today to protect the defenseless unborn and pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend for her work on this bill that shows she is strong and protective of women.

Madam Speaker, I want to speak about where this bill started.

The District of Columbia was the stalking horse for H.R. 7 until women's groups and I protested vigorously.

Sorry, colleagues.

We may have chased the majority from the D.C. 20-week abortion bill only to see them now target all of the Nation's women with an even worse bill. However, not even the Republican majority can overrule the Roe v. Wade holding that H.R. 36 is unconstitutional for lowering the Court's as well as scientific findings on when a fetus becomes viable.

H.R. 36 focuses on a previability fetus, but it excludes any protection for the health of the woman involved. Shamefully, even traumatized rape victims are punished further by steps that require that they virtually prove they were raped before they can get an abortion.

My colleagues, now is the time to oppose H.R. 36. The Supreme Court already has.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, this is a very commonsense bill, H.R. 36, which is being presented by my colleague Mr. FRANKS from Arizona.

Why do we have to do this? I am going to tell you something.

It is because scientific evidence now shows that unborn babies can feel pain by 20 weeks postfertilization and, likely, even earlier. It is because a late-term abortion is an excruciatingly painful and inhumane act against children who are waiting to be born and against their mothers. It is because women who terminate pregnancies at 20 weeks are 35 times more likely to die from abortion than they are in the first trimester, and they are 91 times more likely to die from abortion at 21 weeks or beyond. It is because, after 5 months into a pregnancy, the baby is undeniably a living, growing human, and the government's first duty is to protect innocent life. It is because, overwhelmingly, most Americans—and I am talking about men and women, young and old—support legislation to protect these innocent people. It is because the hideous case of Kermit Gosnell in Philadelphia is a brutal reminder of what can occur without this type of legislation in place.

H.R. 36 would federally ban almost all abortions from being performed beyond the 20th week of pregnancy with exceptions for instances of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is at stake.

I want to tell my colleagues to just think of how little effort it would be today to take their voting cards out, to put them in the machine, and to press on the green button. By doing that, they are saying ''yes'' to protecting the most vulnerable people in our society from going through unbelievable amounts of pain.

Isn't it amazing that, in America's House, we have to pass legislation to protect the most innocent life? This is incredible that we have to even come forward and debate this. My goodness. This is just so intuitive of who we are, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as human beings. We have to protect the unborn because they cannot protect themselves. Vote ''yes'' on this today. Let's make sure that our children are not subjected to this pain and that their mothers are not subjected to the same pain and to the resulting loss of life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, in 6 days, the highway trust fund expires. So what is Congress spending its time doing today? Of course, it is debating a bill that will limit a woman's access to a safe and legal medical procedure and that will place politicians in a place they should never be—between a woman and her doctor. Ask your mother, your sister, your daughter, your wife, or your neighbor, and she will tell you that women don't need politicians' interference when making their own healthcare decisions. Yet here we are again today, debating a bill that does just that.

Everybody remembers that this bill was pulled from the floor in January because it was so extreme, but, today, the bill that is on the floor is even worse than the bill that they pulled in January.

H.R. 36 is particularly harmful to victims of rape and incest. Women who have had unbelievable trauma would be effectively forced to get permission before they could seek the medical treatment that they needed to regain some control over their bodies, their health, and their safety. They would have to jump through complex and punitive legal hoops before they could have the procedures that they need. Therefore, somebody who has been victimized once would end up being victimized again by our government.

Let's be clear. The new provisions in this law include a number of burdensome requirements on rape and incest victims:

First, there is a waiting period of 48 hours for an adult rape survivor;

Second, there is a requirement that a minor who is a victim of rape or incest would give written proof after 20 weeks that she reported the crime to law enforcement or to a government agency. A minor who is a victim of incest has to do this. There is language that specifies that the counseling or medical treatment described above may not be from a health center that provides abortion services. So let's say she goes to her doctor, and she gets counseling, but someone else in that medical practice provides abortion. She is out of luck. If she doesn't thread that needle, too bad. She can't get it.

Perhaps the most outrageous thing about this bill, though, is the fundamental disrespect that it shows to women. It assumes that women will just wake up in this country after 20 weeks of pregnancy, decide to have abortions, and then lie about being victims of rape or incest. That view is just wrong, and it is offensive to women.

By the way, as Ms. SLAUGHTER mentioned, this bill is patently unconstitutional, and even if it didn't get vetoed by the President, it would be struck down by the Supreme Court. I suggest that we vote ''no'' now and that we respect women's ability to make their own health decisions.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the claim that minors have to report to law enforcement is false. They do not need to report anything to law enforcement. The law provides that the abortionist must report to social services or to law enforcement to ensure that they do not let child abuse that comes to their attention continue unchecked.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, this is a bill that is protecting babies who can survive outside the womb. These are babies who can feel pain. Knowing that this institution won't stand up for

those vulnerable children in our society is a sad day for this institution.

I have seven children. This is my sixth. This is MariV. This picture was taken with the two of us the day she was born. She is now 5 years old, and she is gregarious, awesome, fun—the most beautiful joy in our family. The way the law stands today is that, the day before this picture was taken, it would have been legal to have aborted MariV.

I want to talk about women's rights. This is a little girl. This is a little baby girl who will one day grow up to be a woman. Let's stand up and protect this little girl, not the day that she was born only, but also the day that she was in the womb. Let's protect her from the pain of abortion, from the silent screams of those babies who were aborted in the womb who aren't heard because they don't have voices in this institution defending them.

Madam Speaker, I listen to the floor debate day after day, whether in this Chamber or on C–SPAN, and I hear the other side talk about how they fight for the forgotten, how they fight for the defenseless, how they fight for the voiceless, and they pound their chests, and they stomp their feet. You don't have anyone in our society that is more defenseless than these little babies.

I believe in life at conception. I know my colleagues are not going to agree with me on that, but can't we come together as an institution and say that we are going to stand with little babies who feel pain? that we are going to stand with little babies who can survive outside the womb—ones who don't have lobbyists, who don't have money, who can't rally, who can't offer contributions to one's campaign? Don't we stand with those little babies?

If you stand with the defenseless, with the voiceless, you have to stand with little babies. Don't talk to me about cruelty in our bill when you look at little babies being dismembered and feeling excruciating pain. If we can't stand to defend these children, what do we stand for in this institution? What do we stand for in America if we can't stand up for the most defenseless and voiceless among us?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I want to just correct my friend from North Carolina, who said that nothing has to be reported to law enforcement.

It reads: if pregnancy is the result of rape against a minor or incest against a minor and if the rape or incest has been reported to either, one, a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse or, two, law enforcement.

I hope my colleague stands corrected.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank my colleague from New York.

Madam Speaker and Members, I am just so perplexed by our willingness every time an abortion issue is brought up that we don the equivalent of a white coat, that we believe that we are doctors in this august body, that we should be making decisions on behalf of women who are pregnant and on behalf of their spouses and of their physicians, and that we know better than everyone else. If we had women in America who saw their doctors as frequently as we talk about their health on the House floor, boy, they would have a lot of access to doctors.

Four months ago, this bill was taken up, and many of the women in the Republican caucus thought it went too far, so it has been amended a little bit, and now they think it doesn't go too far. Let me tell you what ''too far'' is.

First of all, remember that only 1.5 percent of abortions take place after 20 weeks. They take place for a lot of personal and profoundly physical reasons, and the decision is made by the physician in conjunction with the pregnant woman and her family. What in the heck are we doing putting our noses in their lives?

□ 1315

It is constitutional, Members; it is legal in this country to have an abortion.

Now, rape. If you are raped, and it is after 20 weeks, you have to go to a law enforcement officer or you have to have mental health services.

Now, let me remind you, of the sexual assaults that take place in the military, 81 percent of them are never reported. When you are raped, the last thing you want to do is relive that experience, to be victimized again because you are so offended and feel so violated. And now we are going to say, whether you are 17 or 19, you are going to have to go report this to law enforcement or you are going to have to go to a mental health officer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the additional time.

Beyond that, we are saying if there is an anomaly and your fetus is not going to be able to survive as an infant outside the womb that you are going to have to carry that to term.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me say this: I have had two abortions. One was at 10 weeks, when the fetus no longer had a heartbeat, and I was told, Well, you are going to have to wait a few days before you have that D&C. A D&C is an abortion. I said, I can't. I am in so much pain. I have just lost this baby that I wanted, and you are going to make me carry around a dead fetus for 2 days? I finally got that D&C in time. At 17 weeks, I lost another baby. It was an extraordinarily painful experience. It was an abortion.

Women who go through these experiences go through them with so much pain and anguish, and here we are as Members of this body, trying to don another white coat. I think we should put the speculums down. I think we should stop playing doctor.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I believe that all human life is worth protecting. Each of us are here today because we all stand for something greater. We believe that all human life is precious. We believe that each life is worth living, that life deserves respect and protection, and every human being has equal worth and dignity. That is why everybody matters. That is why everyone counts.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act protects life, empowers women, and will save lives. This legislation represents the will of the American people. Over 60 percent of Americans support protecting unborn children after 20 weeks.

A critical component of this legislation ensures that women receive counseling or medical care for a traumatic event that precipitated her pregnancy prior to obtaining an abortion. Because the pain of an abortion is felt by both mother and child, a woman who feels that abortion is her only option over halfway through her pregnancy deserves medical treatment and emotional assistance beyond what can be provided by an abortionist.

We have a responsibility, as the elected body representing our constituents, to protect the most vulnerable among us and ensure that women facing unwanted pregnancies do not face judgment or condemnation but have positive support structures and access to health care to help them through their pregnancies. This bill protects life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of our former colleagues, Barney Frank from Massachusetts, made one of the most telling statements, I think, that many of the people who are speaking today obviously, by their actions, believe that life begins at conception but ends at birth, because these are often the very same people who refuse to fund schools, who cut back on food stamps, who pay no attention to children who grow up under unseemly, unsanitary, and dreadful conditions, who take away from their parents the unemployment insurance on which they might be able to live and keep the children together.

That callous disregard of the living makes the piety of the statement of how they love life a little bit odd. You have to practice that for the living as

well. The children and the neglected in this country, the rates are becoming appalling. The number of children who live under the poverty line in America, who suffer every day, frankly, who get the only food they get often at school, if they are able to get there, should really somehow soften the hearts of all the people who want to make sure that every fetus is born.

Nobody has to have an abortion, but for women who need it for medical reasons and are protected by the Constitution and make that decision—and how awful it is—and I have to echo what Ms. SPEIER said and what I said earlier, the idea that Members of the House of Representatives or any other legal body—I have been in three. Many have usually carried this debate and decided what women should do, but in the three legislatures I have been in, I have seen people with no medical experience of any sort, never talk to anybody who was in the position, but I also do know people who change their minds when their daughters perhaps got into a position where they had to make that decision or not.

So, for heaven's sakes, let's examine really what we do here in this House of Representatives. As you say what you are going to do, tell me that you are going to make sure that children are fed, that you are going to make sure that children are housed decently, that you are going to make sure that they are able to afford their education, and that the health care they are going to need is going to be there for them so they have the opportunity to grow up into a healthy, strong American that you are talking about, because the actions belie it.

I will never forget the pain that we suffered in here while doing away with the unemployment insurance. People lost their homes, gave up almost everything. In some cases they sent their children to live with relatives. We can't divorce this debate today from that reality in America.

Go visit in your districts some of the children who live that way. Go into some of the poor areas and see what their housing is like. See what kind of nutrition that they have, and then it makes it much more palatable, I think, to understand that real point of view. But isn't a piece a whole piece, and what it really comes down to is that once people are born in this country that we are our brother's keeper, and Hillary Clinton was absolutely right: it does take a village to raise a child. Do your part on that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, 2 years ago today Pennsylvania abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murder, conspiracy to kill, and involuntary manslaughter and sentenced to life imprisonment.

Even though the news of Gosnell's child slaughter was largely suppressed by the mainstream media, many of my colleagues may remember that Dr. Gosnell operated a large Philadelphia abortion clinic where women died and countless babies were dismembered or chemically destroyed, often by having their spinal cord snipped, all gruesome procedures causing excruciating pain to the victim.

Today, the House considers landmark legislation authored by Congressman TRENT FRANKS to protect unborn children beginning at the age of 20 weeks postfertilization from these pain-filled abortions.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is needed now more than ever because there are Gosnells all over America, dismembering and decapitating pain-capable babies for profit: men like Steven Brigham of New Jersey, an interstate abortion operator—some 35 aborted babies were found in his freezer; men like Leroy Carhart, caught on videotape joking about his abortion toolkit, complete with, as he said, a pickaxe and drill bit, while describing a 3-day-long late-term abortion procedure and the infant victim as ''putting meat in a Crock-Pot.''

Some euphemistically call this choice, but a growing number of Americans rightly regard it as violence against children, and huge majorities—60 percent, according to the November Quinnipiac poll—want it stopped.

Fresh impetus for this bill came from a huge study of nearly 5,000 babies, preemies, published last week in The New England Journal of Medicine. The next day The New York Times article titled ''Premature Babies May Survive At 22 Weeks If Treated'' touted the Journal's extraordinary findings of survival and hope.

Just imagine, Madam Speaker, preemies at 20 weeks are surviving, as technology and medical science advances. Alexis Hutchinson, featured in The New York Times story, is today a healthy 5-year-old who originally weighed in at a mere 1.1 pounds. Thus, the babies we seek to protect from harm today may indeed survive if treated humanely, with expertise and with an abundance of compassion.

I urge support for the legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to read from patients' stories that I have here today, starting with the fact that women need access to abortion care later in pregnancy for a variety of reasons and must have the ability to make decisions that are right for them, in consultation with their healthcare providers and those they trust. A woman's health, not politics, should be the basis of important medical decisions.

Kris from Indiana. When Kris went on her 20-week ultrasound, she thought she would learn the sex of her pregnancy but, instead, found out that her fetus had cystic hygroma and fetal hydrops. The doctor advised her there was no chance of survival. The only two options were to wait until she miscarried, which would risk her health and her future fertility, or to safely terminate the pregnancy. Kris said it was a hard decision, but she was happy she was able to make it with her family and those she trusted. Because of a 20-week ban in Indiana, she had to travel to Ohio to obtain her abortion care. If H.R. 36 were passed, she would have no place to go.

Lorna from Florida. Lorna is a mother of three, with a number of health issues, including lupus, a tumor on her upper intestines, and two uterine abrasions. When Lorna found out she was pregnant, she knew immediately that the carrying of the pregnancy to term was not an option for her. She had hemorrhaged while giving birth to her last child, and her sister, who also had lupus, had died after giving birth. Lorna didn't want to risk another potentially dangerous delivery and potentially leave her three children without a mother, and she went to the closest abortion care facility, got a free ultrasound, but was unable to obtain an abortion because of her health issues. The clinic recommended that Lorna obtain abortion care in a hospital setting, but due to her complex condition, the closest hospital that could handle her healthcare needs was in California. With help from the clinic and the NAF Hotline, Lorna was able to fly more than 2,000 miles to California to obtain the abortion care she needed at almost 22 weeks pregnant. She would not be able to do that under this bill.

Josephine from Florida. Josephine recently moved from Texas to Florida with two children to escape her abusive partner after he threatened to kill her. While trying to create a new stable home for her children, Josephine was raped and became pregnant. She couldn't afford to pay for her abortion, nor could she arrange for transportation to get to the closest provider, who was more than 80 miles away, so Josephine attempted to terminate the pregnancy on her own by ingesting poison. She ended up being hospitalized, needing several blood transfusions, and was still pregnant. By the time she was able to gather enough resources to cover her abortion procedure and transportation, she was 23 weeks pregnant and would not have been able to do that under this law.

Mya lives in Georgia. She and her mom tried borrowing money from friends and family to pay for her abortion but couldn't gather enough resources in time for her appointment, so they had to delay the care and reschedule. By the time Mya was able to raise enough money to make her appointment, she found out she was further

along in the pregnancy than she expected and was now 21 weeks pregnant. She was able to access care, but if H.R. 36 were the law, she would have been prohibited.

Niecy from Florida was raped by a man she thought was her friend. When she realized she was pregnant due to the rape, she knew immediately she wanted to terminate the pregnancy. As a full-time student, she had no income and couldn't tell her mom because she knew her mom would try to keep the pregnancy due to her mom's anti-choice religious beliefs. Niecy spent 2 months trying to raise enough money to pay for her procedure. She had nothing to pawn or sell and was so desperate that she even asked the rapist for money, but he refused to help her.

□ 1330

When Niecy was past 20 weeks, she was finally put in touch with the NAF Hotline and other funds available to provide the financial money that she needed.

Serafina from South Carolina started a new job and was working to build a stable life for her and her two kids in a homeless shelter when she found out she was pregnant. She decided terminating her pregnancy was the best decision for herself and her family. They had no home.

Unfortunately, Serafina found out that she was already more than 20 weeks pregnant. She had no items to pawn or sell, living in a shelter. Thanks to a friend willing to help her with money and a ride—and support—Serafina was able to get the care she needed, which she could not do if H.R. 36 were passed.

Gloria from Washington moved in with her parents in order to financially support them when she was faced with an unwanted pregnancy.

Do you notice in all of this, the men involved don't have to pay anything or do anything at all? Isn't that a strange circumstance?

When Gloria was faced with the unwanted pregnancy, she was fortunate to be working, but was only making minimum wage and had no paid sick leave and was still in her 90-day new job probationary period. Even after receiving her paycheck, she didn't have enough funds to continue supporting her family to travel to the nearest abortion care provider 3 hours away and pay for the procedure itself.

Eventually, she decided not to pay her other bills in order to have enough funds to cover her travel and care, but then she ran into another barrier: her boss. Because the provider was more than 150 miles away, she needed to take time off work, but her employer wouldn't allow her to do so. The situation placed the job she desperately needed in jeopardy and, fortunately, her boss eventually relented and she was able to obtain the abortion care she needed.

I will rest my case, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would like to first express my deepest and sincerest gratitude to every last person who played a role in the creation and development of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act now before us on this unique and historic day.

Madam Speaker, we really understand what we are all talking about here. Protecting little pain-capable unborn babies really is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. It really is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family.

I would just hope that Members of Congress, as well as all Americans, will go to paincapable.com and see for themselves what technology is now upon us in 2015; that unborn children entering their sixth month of pregnancy are capable of feeling pain is now beyond question.

The real question that remains is: Will those of us privileged to live and breathe in this, the land of the free and the home of the brave, finally come together and protect mothers and their little innocent pain-capable unborn babies from monsters like Kermit Gosnell? That is the question, Madam Speaker.

God help us to do it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, I stand here as a proud sponsor of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This is strong, commonsense legislation focused on protecting the lives of unborn children and their mothers, and I am very happy that this new language is even stronger than the original bill in January.

As a doctor, I know—and I can attest—that this bill is backed by scientific research showing that babies can indeed feel pain at 20 weeks, if not before. That is why it is so important we stand up for life and stand up for this human rights issue. This is a pro-life effort that deserves bipartisan support.

I fully urge passage of this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rights of the unborn and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule for the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I, along with many of my constituents in northern Michigan, believe that life inside the womb is just as precious as life outside the womb and that it must be protected. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will prevent abortions from occurring after the point at which many scientific studies have demonstrated that children in the womb can actually feel pain. All children, even the unborn, have the absolute right to life, and we need to do our utmost to protect the most defenseless among us.

I served as a doctor in northern Michigan, where I was able to witness the miracle of new life in the delivery room. Because of this, and because of my experience as a father and as a grandfather, I have made protecting the rights of the unborn my priority while serving in Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, as a medical doctor, I took an oath to protect lives. As a cardiothoracic surgeon for many years, I worked day and night to save lives in the operating room. Today, I stand proudly with my colleagues here on the House floor to defend the lives of those poor, innocent unborn children who don't have anybody else to stand up to defend them.

The scientific evidence is clear: unborn babies feel pain. They feel pain at 20 weeks postfertilization. This bill bans late-term abortions, with very limited exceptions.

According to the Charlotte Lozier Institute, the United States is currently one of only seven countries worldwide, including North Korea and China, that allows elective late-term abortions.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates enacting this bill will save 2,750 lives each year. Twenty-four States, including my home State of Louisiana, have already acted to ban these late-term abortions.

I urge my colleagues to be compassionate. I urge my colleagues to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act so that unborn lives in all 50 States are protected from painful late-term abortions.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This is a strong bill that prevents abortions after 20 weeks, except in certain circumstances, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill today.

As a mother of three, I know the worry and anxiety that comes along

with carrying a child. And many times, that worry doesn't end after birth. I still think about my children with concern every day, and I understand the difficulties and the decisions that many women have during this time.

Motherhood is a big responsibility and a huge change. As a community, we need to help women through this time. But we also have the responsibility to come together as a country and protect the most innocent and the vulnerable among us.

In this bill, we are talking about protecting unborn babies that are already 20 weeks old and mothers who are halfway through their pregnancy. That is about 5 months. At this stage, many women already have a baby bump and they are wearing maternity clothing. The baby can be as long as a banana is and kicking and moving around, even to the point where the mother will feel those kicks and that movement.

More importantly, this is the stage where we know the baby can feel pain and could be viable outside the womb with proper care. In fact, there is evidence that the pain that the unborn baby feels is even more intense than what a young child or an adult would feel because their nervous system isn't developed enough to block that pain.

The majority of women in the United States are with us on this bill. We must protect these innocent lives when they are the most vulnerable and sensitive among us to feeling pain.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Scientific evidence has demonstrated that by 20 weeks, unborn babies are able to feel pain; and thanks to ongoing medical improvements, premature babies at this stage are increasingly able to live outside the womb.

This bill will protect unborn babies 20 weeks and older from having to suffer the excruciating pain of an abortion death. Abortions are brutal and extremely painful, where the child is either dismembered or poisoned.

H.R. 36 will punish abortionists who violate the law, while adding important additional protections for unborn children and their mothers.

Every life at this stage is a precious gift from God, and we, as Americans, should continue to protect life. This bill will do just that.

Madam Speaker, I urge full support of the rule and for this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me continue with Amy from South Carolina. This is somewhat different but certainly poignant.

Amy and her husband, Chris, were very excited about their pregnancy. Amy's previous pregnancies had been uncomplicated, so they decided to forego genetic testing. However, during the scheduled 20-week ultrasound, the couple received the devastating news that their fetus had a structural and lethal abnormality known as trisomy 18. They were advised to go in for further genetic testing, which was very expensive.

The results to confirm this diagnosis took an additional 10 to 14 days, so Amy was past 20 weeks' gestation when she made the decision to obtain an abortion. With a nationwide 20-week ban, couples like Chris and Amy would not have been able to make decisions that were right for themselves and their families.

Karina from Arizona. The night before Karina called the NAF Hotline, she literally slept against a lamppost. She is homeless and makes and sells jewelry in order to buy food. She can't afford housing.

She called the hotline because she realized she was pregnant after being raped by the father of her five children. Even though she was raped, Arizona Medicaid would not cover her abortion care.

She could barely afford food most days and could not afford the cost of the abortion, so she had to delay her care. Thanks to multiple abortion funds, including the hotline fund and a discount from her care provider, she was able to obtain the abortion she needed. This bill would stop that.

Catherine from Georgia. Catherine was planning on carrying her pregnancy to term, even though she had a number of pregnancy complications, including having to receive blood transfusions throughout the pregnancy.

When she was post 20 weeks pregnant, Catherine found out her fetus had an anomaly. She had placed a child up for adoption in the past, so she knew that adoption was not an option for her again, nor was parenting this pregnancy.

She started to save money and tried pawning the title to her car but was told it was too old and worth nothing. Catherine was able to borrow money from friends, and called the hotline to find an abortion provider.

The night before her appointment, she said even though she knew she was making the right decision, she was nervous about the protesters who would be outside the clinic. The next day, she did not let the protesters yelling at her scare her away. She was able to obtain the care that she needed.

Madam Speaker, I have just received news that the death toll has risen to seven in the Amtrak tragedy.

It is past time to focus on the real priorities that face our country, and I will insert into the RECORD articles from The Baltimore Sun and Politico that I referred to previously.

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 13, 2015]

(By Kevin Rector and Jessica Anderson)

The derailment in Philadelphia of an Amtrak passenger train headed north from Washington and through multiple stops in Maryland left dozens of people injured and killed six—including a midshipman from the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis.

The academy notified its brigade of the death early Wednesday morning.

''I speak for the brigade of midshipmen, the faculty and staff when I say we are all completely heartbroken by this,'' said Cmdr. John Schofield, an academy spokesman.

The midshipman, who was not identified, was headed home on leave, the academy said. It did not say where the midshipman boarded the train.

An online timetable for Train 188, which was carrying a total of 238 passengers and five crew members, shows it had been scheduled to pass through Baltimore's Penn Station and several other stops in Maryland prior to reaching Philadelphia on Tuesday night, though it remained unclear Wednesday morning how many passengers boarded the train at those stations.

Officials said the train derailed at Frankford Junction in North Philadelphia shortly after 9 p.m. The online schedule had it departing Penn Station at 7:54 p.m.

The timetable also includes an original scheduled departure from Washington's Union Station at 7:10 p.m., and subsequent departures from New Carrollton at 7:22 p.m. and BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport at 7:37 p.m. prior to the train's reaching Penn Station.

After Penn Station, the train was scheduled to depart Aberdeen at 8:16 p.m., Wilmington, Del., at 8:43 p.m. and Philadelphia at 9:10 p.m., according to the online schedule.

Amtrak did not immediately respond to questions early Wednesday as to whether Train 188 made all of its locally scheduled stops and how many people boarded at each, or if it was on schedule.

On Wednesday morning, Lisa Bonanno stood in Penn Station looking at an electronic train schedule above, trying to figure out how to get to work in Washington. Bonanno said she was aboard Train 188 Tuesday night, but got off in Baltimore before its derailment in Philadelphia.

''I was on that train last night,'' she said.

Bonanno said she would probably end up taking a MARC train to work, given some delays, but that the derailment in Philadelphia would not deter her from riding Amtrak in the future.

''This is very unusual,'' she said. ''Driving is so much worse.''

The derailment happened in Port Richmond, one of five neighborhoods in what's known as Philadelphia's River Wards, dense rowhouse neighborhoods located off the Delaware River. Area resident David Hernandez, whose home is close to the tracks, heard the derailment.

''It sounded like a bunch of shopping carts crashing into each other,'' he said.

The crashing sound lasted a few seconds, he said, and then there was chaos and screaming.

The derailment was the deadliest incident involving an Amtrak train on the Northeast Corridor since the Maryland collision between an Amtrak train and a Conrail freight engine near Chase, in which 16 people were killed and another 175 were injured.

Officials expect the death toll of Tuesday's derailment could increase as investigators continue to move through the wreckage. The Naval Academy said grief counselors were on hand at its Annapolis campus for grieving midshipmen, faculty and staff.

Navy Secretary Ray Mabus expressed his condolences to the brigade during previously scheduled morning remarks at the academy, which wrapped up its academic year on Tuesday.

The Northeast Corridor, which runs from Washington to Boston, is the busiest stretch of passenger rail line in the country, serving 750,000 passengers and 2,000 commuter, intercity and freight trains per day, according to the Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Commission.

The commission has estimated that a loss of service on the corridor for a single day would cost $100 million in travel delays and lost productivity. Workers who ride trains on the corridor contribute $50 billion to the U.S. economy annually, the commission has found.

Locally, the corridor is used for Amtrak and freight trains as well as the Maryland Transit Administration's passenger MARC train service. Baltimore, a traditional railroad town, has some of the system's oldest infrastructure.

The Baltimore & Potomac Tunnel under West Baltimore, for instance, is 140 years old and a key choke point for Amtrak and other rail traffic, forcing trains to slow their speeds substantially. It has been slated to be replaced, though Amtrak officials have questioned whether funding will be provided to cover the estimated $1.5 billion price tag.

In a statement on the derailment Tuesday, Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake said her ''heart aches'' for the passengers who were on the train.

''Amtrak service is a way of life for so many of our city residents, as well as visitors from all across the Northeast who commute to, from and through our city every day,'' Rawlings-Blake said. ''My prayers are with the families of those who lost their lives in this tragedy. We will support the recovery efforts in every way possible as authorities work to identity the cause of the crash.''

Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter, who called the scene of the derailment ''an absolute disastrous mess'' on Tuesday night, said Wednesday that the train's black box had been recovered and was being analyzed.

Amtrak said rail service on the busy Northeast Corridor between New York and Philadelphia had been stopped. Nutter, citing the mangled train tracks and downed wires, said there was ''no circumstance under which there would be any Amtrak service this week through Philadelphia.''

A rapid-response team from the National Transportation Safety Board was on the scene Wednesday, but the cause of the derailment remained unknown. The Federal Railroad Administration also said it was dispatching at least eight investigators to the scene.

Amtrak canceled two local trains in Baltimore Wednesday, and trains on the Northeast Corridor between Philadelphia and New York were canceled. Those looking for information about family or friends on the train can call Amtrak's incident hotline at 800–523–9101, Amtrak said.

President Barack Obama expressed shock and sadness at the derailment in a statement in which he noted that Amtrak is ''a way of life for many'' who live and work along the Northeast Corridor. He also thanked police, fire fighters and medical personnel responding to the derailment.

''Philadelphia is known as the city of brotherly love—a city of neighborhoods and neighbors—and that spirit of loving-kindness was reaffirmed last night, as hundreds of first responders and passengers lent a hand to their fellow human beings in need,'' Obama said.

Pennsylvania Gov. Tom Wolf, who was in touch with Philadelphia's mayor and other state and local officials about the derailment, thanked the first responders for ''their brave and quick action.''

''My thoughts and prayers are with all of those impacted by tonight's train derailment,'' he said in a statement. ''For those who lost their lives, those who were injured, and the families of all involved, this situation is devastating.''

The impact on the East Coast's broader rail network was unclear. Rob Doolittle, a spokesman for railroad CSX Transportation, said the company had offered assistance to Amtrak but that its own mainline was unaffected and it was not experiencing any significant delays through Philadelphia.

Richard Scher, a spokesman for the Maryland Port Administration, said the derailment had occurred north of the port's main freight routings but that he was unsure if delays in Philadelphia were affected port cargo transports. A spokesman for railroad Norfolk Southern, which utilizes part of the Northeast Corridor for trains moving out of Maryland into Delaware, did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

Roel Bouduin, 35, arrived at Penn Station on time Wednesday morning for the beginning of a long day of travel. The resident of Belgium was scheduled to fly from New York to Toronto at 2:30 p.m.

''My plan was to take Amtrak. That's not going to work,'' he said as he waited at a ticket counter to get a refund.

Instead, his friend would take the day off from Johns Hopkins and drive to New York.

''We take trains daily at home. Taking a train is safer then taking a car,'' he said.

That said, as he rolled his suitcase from the ticket counter, Bouduin said he would enjoy ''a nice drive'' up to New York.

Many commuters prefer traveling from Baltimore to Washington or New York by train versus by car.

Reginald Exum is one of those travelers. He said he regularly travels to Washington and New York for his banking job. On Wednesday, though, he was riding to Washington from Penn Station, so the derailment didn't affect his commute.

''It's very unfortunate,'' he said. ''I feel bad for their families.''

In 1996, 11 people were killed when a MARC commuter train rammed into an Amtrak train in Silver Spring. That crash was blamed on the MARC engineer forgetting about a signal warning him to slow down.

In 1991, another incident occurred in nearly the same spot as the Chase accident in 1987, when an Amtrak train collided with a Conrail coal train—though no one was killed.

The site of Tuesday night's crash, near curving tracks at Frankford Junction, was also the scene of a previous crash.

In 1943, 79 people were killed and at least 120 injured when a Pennsylvania Railroad train carrying 541 people—including military servicemen returning from weekend furloughs—derailed in the same location, also on its way from Washington to New York.

[From Politico Pro, May 13, 2015]

House Appropriations Republicans voted down an amendment today that would have restored Amtrak funding levels seen in previous years, citing the spending caps under the Budget Control Act.

''Any increase in the caps under which we operate, that would go beyond current law, would require an understanding, an agreement, between the White House and the two bodies of Congress,'' Committee Chairman Hal Rogers said, adding that the only White House response he's seen is ''consternation.''

On a 21–29 vote, the committee defeated the amendment offered by THUD panel ranking member David Price that would have significantly boosted funding for several transportation programs, including Amtrak and WMATA.

House Appropriations ranking member Nita Lowey countered Republican arguments, saying it's critical that Amtrak be fully funded, especially after last night's deadly derailment.

''While we do not know the cause of this accident, we do know that starving rail of funding will not enable safer train travel,'' Lowey said. ''It's very clear that cutting the funding drastically does not help improve services at Amtrak.''

The House THUD bill would provide about $1.13 billion in Amtrak funding for fiscal 2016, down from about $1.4 billion this year.—Heather Caygle.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, we have before us a bill that once again solidifies the majority's insistence on putting political gain before women's health. We also have a ruling that unnecessarily governs consideration of three unrelated bills, each needing its own debate. These so-called grab-bag rules harm our institution, muddle debate, and dishonor the importance of the Rules Committee and its jurisdiction.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule provides for the consideration of several important pieces of legislation.

H.R. 1735, the FY16 NDAA, was the result of months of bipartisan work and includes crucial provisions to ensure our Armed Forces are agile, efficient, ready, and lethal.

No debate over these issues would be complete without an expression of our deep gratitude and thanks to the members of our military serving at home and overseas and the veterans who served before them. By providing their compensation, equipment, and vital skills education funding in this legislation, we make a small beginning on the impossible to repay debt that we owe them.

□ 1345

Consistent with our constitutional obligation to provide for the defense of our country fulfilled by consideration of the NDAA, H.R. 2048, the USA Freedom Act, similarly meets our responsibilities to secure America by tightening necessary authorities to combat potential terrorist threats, while making fundamental reforms, such as the

end of bulk collection of phone records to protect Americans' privacy and civil liberties.

The provisions of this bill that increase transparency by declassifying decisions, orders, and opinions of the FISA court and requiring the public posting of reports to Congress also ensure that Congress and the public can hold these actors accountable.

These critical reforms strengthen our national security, give the Federal Government the tools needed to combat threats, and ensure that privacy and civil liberties are protected.

Our civil liberties aren't the only rights meriting protection, however. The right to life is the most fundamental of rights, and I am proud the people's House will consider H.R. 36, the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, getting America out of a group with North Korea, China, and Vietnam as one of only seven nations permitting such late-term abortions.

H.R. 36 provides commonsense protections for 20-week-old and older unborn children who can feel pain as you and I do. They have fingers and toes, a heartbeat, and can kick hard enough to startle their mothers. Thanks to the grace of God and the advances of modern science, many of them can even survive outside the womb.

Millions of Americans welcome these developments, and a majority of our constituents support defending the lives of almost fully developed unborn children. That is no surprise in the wake of Kermit Gosnell's horrors and will only continue as more Americans learn about the dismemberment and other grotesque practices that accompany killing an unborn child of that age.

This legislation is a necessary step in recognizing the truth that science has made more clear with the passage of time; the unborn child in the womb is alive and a functioning member of the human family.

I urge my colleagues to join me in speaking for those who cannot speak for themselves by supporting this legislation, and I thank all of my eloquent colleagues who came down today to speak on this rule.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us provides for action by the House on three critical pieces of legislation, and I strongly urge my colleagues' support.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule for the underlying H.R. 36, the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, because it would allow politicians, not women or medical experts to decide women's personal medical decisions.

If it becomes law, H.R. 36 would ban abortion care after 20 weeks.

This is a blatant attempt to deny all women their constitutional rights and it will pose an extremely serious threat to the health of many women in the most desperate of circumstances.

To ban abortion care would block a woman's access to safe health care and deny her ability to make decisions according to her physician's advice.

Supreme Court precedent establishes that a woman has the unequivocal right to choose abortion care until the point of fetal viability.

This twenty-week abortion ban brazenly challenges the Supreme Court's standards and deliberately attempts to push the law earlier and earlier into a woman's pregnancy.

This ban would cause a hardship for women in need of safe, legal, later abortion care for a variety of reasons including menopausal women not expecting to become pregnant and who may not discover it for many weeks.

H.R. 36 interferes with the doctor-patient relationship, the sanctity of which is a cornerstone of medical care in our country.

25,000 women in the United States become pregnant as a result of rape here in the U.S. every year.

Approximately 30 percent of rapes involves women under age 18.

According to the Department of Justice, only 35 percent of women who are raped or sexually assaulted reported the assault to police.

This ban requires women rape victims to report their ordeal before they can terminate pregnancy resulting from rape or incest.

Our vote today on this legislation will have real life consequences.

Take for example the case of Tiffany Campbell.

When she was 19 weeks pregnant, Tiffany and her husband Chris learned her pregnancy was afflicted with a severe case of twin-to-twin transfusion syndrome, a condition where the two fetuses unequally share blood circulation.

This news was devastating to the Campbells.

The diagnosis was that one of the fetuses had a strained heart and acute risk of heart failure while the other had a blood supply that was insufficient to sustain normal development.

The Campbells were told that without a selective termination, they risked the loss of both fetuses.

At 22 weeks, in consultation with their doctors, they made the difficult decision to abort one fetus in order to save the other.

Today, the lifesaving procedure for one of the fetuses would be illegal under the new 20-week ban mode.

Then there is the ordeal that Vikki Stella faced.

Vikki is a diabetic who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival.

As a result of her diabetic medical condition, Vikki's doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion.

The procedure not only protected Vikki from immediate medical risks, but also ensured that she would be able to have children in the future.

As you see from each woman's story, every pregnancy is different.

In fact, none of us here is in the position to decide what is best for a woman and her family in their unique circumstances.

H.R. 36 would deprive women the ability to make very difficult and extremely personal medical decisions.

A woman's health, not politics should drive important medical decisions and ignoring a woman's individual circumstances threatens her health and takes an extremely personal medical decision away from a woman and her health care provider.

The Administration urges Congress in its Statement of Administration Policy to oppose H.R. 36 because it would unacceptably restrict women's health and reproductive right to choose.

Women, regardless of their status in life should be able to make choices about their bodies and their healthcare, and we as elected officials should not inject ourselves into decisions best made between a woman and her doctor.

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 186, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

YEAS—240

Abraham	Dold	Jenkins (KS)
Aderholt	Donovan	Jenkins (WV)
Allen	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Babin	Duncan (TN)	Jolly
Barr	Ellmers (NC)	Jones
Barton	Emmer (MN)	Jordan
Benishek	Farenthold	Joyce
Bilirakis	Fincher	Katko
Bishop (MI)	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Black	Fleming	King (NY)
Blackburn	Flores	Kinzinger (IL)
Blum	Forbes	Kline
Bost	Fortenberry	Knight
Boustany	Foxx	Labrador
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	LaMalfa
Brat	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Bridenstine	Garrett	Lance
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Latta
Brooks (IN)	Gibson	LoBiondo
Buchanan	Gohmert	Long
Buck	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Bucshon	Gosar	Love
Burgess	Gowdy	Lucas
Byrne	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Marchant
Chabot	Grothman	Marino
Chaffetz	Guinta	McCarthy
Clawson (FL)	Guthrie	McCaul
Coffman	Hanna	McClintock
Cole	Hardy	McHenry
Collins (GA)	Harper	McKinley
Collins (NY)	Harris	McMorris Rodgers
Comstock	Hartzler	McSally
Conaway	Heck (NV)	Meadows
Cook	Hensarling	Meehan
Costello (PA)	Herrera Beutler	Messer
Cramer	Hice, Jody B.	Mica
Crawford	Hill	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Holding	Miller (MI)
Culberson	Hudson	Moolenaar
Curbelo (FL)	Huelskamp	Mooney (WV)
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)	Mullin
Denham	Hultgren	Mulvaney
Dent	Hunter	Murphy (PA)
DeSantis	Hurd (TX)	Neugebauer
DesJarlais	Hurt (VA)	Newhouse
Diaz-Balart	Issa	

Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Barletta
Capps
Graves (MO)
Hinojosa
Ruiz
Smith (WA)

□ 1416

Mr. LUETKEMEYER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair may postpone further proceedings today on a motion to recommit as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

UNITING AND STRENGTHENING AMERICA BY FULFILLING RIGHTS AND ENSURING EFFECTIVE DISCIPLINE OVER MONITORING ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 255, I call up the bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 255, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114–111 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2048

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ensuring Effective Discipline Over Monitoring Act of 2015'' or the ''USA FREEDOM Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS REFORMS

SEC. 101. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CALL DETAIL RECORDS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Section 501(b)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''a statement'' and inserting ''in the case of an application other than an application described in subparagraph (C) (including an application for the production of call detail records other than in the manner described in subparagraph (C)), a statement''; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (D), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) in the case of an application for the production on an ongoing basis of call detail records created before, on, or after the date of the application relating to an authorized investigation (other than a threat assessment) conducted in accordance with subsection (a)(2) to protect against international terrorism, a statement of facts showing that—

''(i) there are reasonable grounds to believe that the call detail records sought to be produced based on the specific selection term required under subparagraph (A) are relevant to such investigation; and

''(ii) there is a reasonable, articulable suspicion that such specific selection term is associated with a foreign power engaged in international terrorism or activities in preparation therefor, or an agent of a foreign power engaged in international terrorism or activities in preparation therefor; and''.

(b) ORDER.—Section 501(c)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) in the case of an application described in subsection (b)(2)(C), shall—

''(i) authorize the production on a daily basis of call detail records for a period not to exceed 180 days;

''(ii) provide that an order for such production may be extended upon application under subsection (b) and the judicial finding under paragraph (1) of this subsection;

''(iii) provide that the Government may require the prompt production of a first set of call detail records using the specific selection term that satisfies the standard required under subsection (b)(2)(C)(ii);

''(iv) provide that the Government may require the prompt production of a second set of call detail records using session-identifying information or a telephone calling card number identified by the specific selection term used to produce call detail records under clause (iii);

''(v) provide that, when produced, such records be in a form that will be useful to the Government;

''(vi) direct each person the Government directs to produce call detail records under the order to furnish the Government forthwith all information, facilities, or technical assistance necessary to accomplish the production in such a manner as will protect the secrecy of the production and produce a minimum of interference with the services that such person is providing to each subject of the production; and

''(vii) direct the Government to—

''(I) adopt minimization procedures that require the prompt destruction of all call detail records produced under the order that the Government determines are not foreign intelligence information; and

''(II) destroy all call detail records produced under the order as prescribed by such procedures.''.

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(i) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR PRODUCTION OF TANGIBLE THINGS.—

''(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Attorney General may require the emergency production of tangible things if the Attorney General—

''(A) reasonably determines that an emergency situation requires the production of tangible things before an order authorizing such production can with due diligence be obtained;

''(B) reasonably determines that the factual basis for the issuance of an order under this section to approve such production of tangible things exists;

''(C) informs, either personally or through a designee, a judge having jurisdiction under this section at the time the Attorney General requires the emergency production of tangible things that the decision has been made to employ the authority under this subsection; and

''(D) makes an application in accordance with this section to a judge having jurisdiction under this section as soon as practicable, but not later than 7 days after the Attorney General requires the emergency production of tangible things under this subsection.

''(2) If the Attorney General requires the emergency production of tangible things under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall require that the minimization procedures required by this section for the issuance of a judicial order be followed.

''(3) In the absence of a judicial order approving the production of tangible things under this subsection, the production shall terminate when the information sought is obtained, when the application for the order is denied, or after the expiration of 7 days from the time the Attorney General begins requiring the emergency production of such tangible things, whichever is earliest.

''(4) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.

''(5) If such application for approval is denied, or in any other case where the production of tangible things is terminated and no order is issued approving the production, no information obtained or evidence derived from such production shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired from such production shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(6) The Attorney General shall assess compliance with the requirements of paragraph (5).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 501(d) (50 U.S.C. 1861(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''pursuant to an order'' and inserting ''pursuant to an order issued or an emergency production required'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''such order'' and inserting ''such order or such emergency production''; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the order'' and inserting ''the order or the emergency production''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''an order'' and inserting ''an order or emergency production''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''an order'' and inserting ''an order or emergency production''.

SEC. 103. PROHIBITION ON BULK COLLECTION OF TANGIBLE THINGS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Section 501(b)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(b)(2)), as amended by section 101(a) of this Act, is further amended by inserting before subparagraph (B), as redesignated by such section 101(a) of this Act, the following new subparagraph:

''(A) a specific selection term to be used as the basis for the production of the tangible things sought;''.

(b) ORDER.—Section 501(c) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking the semicolon and inserting '', including each specific selection term to be used as the basis for the production;''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) No order issued under this subsection may authorize the collection of tangible things without the use of a specific selection term that meets the requirements of subsection (b)(2).''.

SEC. 104. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—

(1) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 501(c)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)(1)) is amended by inserting after ''subsections (a) and (b)'' the following: ''and that the minimization procedures submitted in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(D) meet the definition of minimization procedures under subsection (g)''.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Section 501(g) (50 U.S.C. 1861(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority of the court established under section 103(a) to impose additional, particularized minimization procedures with regard to the production, retention, or dissemination of nonpublicly available information concerning unconsenting United States persons, including additional, particularized procedures related to the destruction of information within a reasonable time period.''.

(3) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 501(g)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1861(g)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the USA

PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, the'' and inserting ''The''; and

(B) by inserting after ''adopt'' the following: '', and update as appropriate,''.

(b) ORDERS.—Section 501(f)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(A) by striking ''that order'' and inserting ''the production order or any nondisclosure order imposed in connection with the production order''; and

(B) by striking the second sentence; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking clause (ii); and

(B) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

SEC. 105. LIABILITY PROTECTION.

Section 501(e) (50 U.S.C. 1861(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e)(1) No cause of action shall lie in any court against a person who—

''(A) produces tangible things or provides information, facilities, or technical assistance in accordance with an order issued or an emergency production required under this section; or

''(B) otherwise provides technical assistance to the Government under this section or to implement the amendments made to this section by the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015.

''(2) A production or provision of information, facilities, or technical assistance described in paragraph (1) shall not be deemed to constitute a waiver of any privilege in any other proceeding or context.''.

SEC. 106. COMPENSATION FOR ASSISTANCE.

Section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 102 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) COMPENSATION.—The Government shall compensate a person for reasonable expenses incurred for—

''(1) producing tangible things or providing information, facilities, or assistance in accordance with an order issued with respect to an application described in subsection (b)(2)(C) or an emergency production under subsection (i) that, to comply with subsection (i)(1)(D), requires an application described in subsection (b)(2)(C); or

''(2) otherwise providing technical assistance to the Government under this section or to implement the amendments made to this section by the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015.''.

SEC. 107. DEFINITIONS.

Section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 106 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms 'foreign power', 'agent of a foreign power', 'international terrorism', 'foreign intelligence information', 'Attorney General', 'United States person', 'United States', 'person', and 'State' have the meanings provided those terms in section 101.

''(2) ADDRESS.—The term 'address' means a physical address or electronic address, such as an electronic mail address or temporarily assigned network address (including an Internet protocol address).

''(3) CALL DETAIL RECORD.—The term 'call detail record'—

''(A) means session-identifying information (including an originating or terminating telephone number, an International Mobile Subscriber Identity number, or an International Mobile Station Equipment Identity number), a telephone calling card number, or the time or duration of a call; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) the contents (as defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any communication;

''(ii) the name, address, or financial information of a subscriber or customer; or

''(iii) cell site location or global positioning system information.

''(4) SPECIFIC SELECTION TERM.—

''(A) TANGIBLE THINGS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a 'specific selection term'—

''(I) is a term that specifically identifies a person, account, address, or personal device, or any other specific identifier; and

''(II) is used to limit, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, the scope of tangible things sought consistent with the purpose for seeking the tangible things.

''(ii) LIMITATION.—A specific selection term under clause (i) does not include an identifier that does not limit, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, the scope of tangible things sought consistent with the purpose for seeking the tangible things, such as an identifier that—

''(I) identifies an electronic communication service provider (as that term is defined in section 701) or a provider of remote computing service (as that term is defined in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code), when not used as part of a specific identifier as described in clause (i), unless the provider is itself a subject of an authorized investigation for which the specific selection term is used as the basis for the production; or

''(II) identifies a broad geographic region, including the United States, a city, a county, a State, a zip code, or an area code, when not used as part of a specific identifier as described in clause (i).

''(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude the use of multiple terms or identifiers to meet the requirements of clause (i).

''(B) CALL DETAIL RECORD APPLICATIONS.—For purposes of an application submitted under subsection (b)(2)(C), the term 'specific selection term' means a term that specifically identifies an individual, account, or personal device.''.

SEC. 108. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS ON BUSINESS RECORDS ORDERS.

Section 106A of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–177; 120 Stat. 200) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and calendar years 2012 through 2014'' after ''2006'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(C) with respect to calendar years 2012 through 2014, an examination of the minimization procedures used in relation to orders under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) and whether the minimization procedures adequately protect the constitutional rights of United States persons;''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''(as such term is defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)))'';

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) CALENDAR YEARS 2012 THROUGH 2014.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the audit conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2012 through 2014.'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For the period beginning on January 1, 2012, and ending on December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall assess—

''(A) the importance of the information acquired under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) to the activities of the intelligence community;

''(B) the manner in which that information was collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the intelligence community;

''(C) the minimization procedures used by elements of the intelligence community under such title and whether the minimization procedures adequately protect the constitutional rights of United States persons; and

''(D) any minimization procedures proposed by an element of the intelligence community under such title that were modified or denied by the court established under section 103(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)).

''(2) SUBMISSION DATE FOR ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Inspector General of the Department of Justice submits the report required under subsection (c)(3), the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2012 through 2014.'';

(5) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''a report under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2)'' and inserting ''any report under subsection (c) or (d)''; and

(ii) by striking ''Inspector General of the Department of Justice'' and inserting ''Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, and any Inspector General of an element of the intelligence community that prepares a report to assist the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community in complying with the requirements of this section''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) and (c)(2)'' and inserting ''any report submitted under subsection (c) or (d)'';

(6) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''The reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) and (c)(2)'' and inserting ''Each report submitted under subsection (c)''; and

(B) by striking ''subsection (d)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)(2)''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term 'intelligence community' has the meaning

given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

''(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term 'United States person' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).''.

SEC. 109. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by sections 101 through 103 shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter or eliminate the authority of the Government to obtain an order under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) as in effect prior to the effective date described in subsection (a) during the period ending on such effective date.

SEC. 110. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the production of the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication from an electronic communication service provider (as such term is defined in section 701(b)(4) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881(b)(4))) under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.).

TITLE II—FISA PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE REFORM

SEC. 201. PROHIBITION ON BULK COLLECTION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 402(c) (50 U.S.C. 1842(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) a specific selection term to be used as the basis for the use of the pen register or trap and trace device.''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 401 (50 U.S.C. 1841) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4)(A) The term 'specific selection term'—

''(i) is a term that specifically identifies a person, account, address, or personal device, or any other specific identifier; and

''(ii) is used to limit, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, the scope of information sought, consistent with the purpose for seeking the use of the pen register or trap and trace device.

''(B) A specific selection term under subparagraph (A) does not include an identifier that does not limit, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, the scope of information sought, consistent with the purpose for seeking the use of the pen register or trap and trace device, such as an identifier that—

''(i) identifies an electronic communication service provider (as that term is defined in section 701) or a provider of remote computing service (as that term is defined in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code), when not used as part of a specific identifier as described in subparagraph (A), unless the provider is itself a subject of an authorized investigation for which the specific selection term is used as the basis for the use; or

''(ii) identifies a broad geographic region, including the United States, a city, a county, a State, a zip code, or an area code, when not used as part of a specific identifier as described in subparagraph (A).

''(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'address' means a physical address or electronic address, such as an electronic mail address or temporarily assigned network address (including an Internet protocol address).

''(D) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude the use of multiple terms or identifiers to meet the requirements of subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 202. PRIVACY PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 402 (50 U.S.C. 1842) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) PRIVACY PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall ensure that appropriate policies and procedures are in place to safeguard nonpublicly available information concerning United States persons that is collected through the use of a pen register or trap and trace device installed under this section. Such policies and procedures shall, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the need to protect national security, include privacy protections that apply to the collection, retention, and use of information concerning United States persons.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection limits the authority of the court established under section 103(a) or of the Attorney General to impose additional privacy or minimization procedures with regard to the installation or use of a pen register or trap and trace device.''.

(b) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—Section 403 (50 U.S.C. 1843) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) PRIVACY PROCEDURES.—Information collected through the use of a pen register or trap and trace device installed under this section shall be subject to the policies and procedures required under section 402(h).''.

TITLE III—FISA ACQUISITIONS TARGETING PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES REFORMS

SEC. 301. LIMITS ON USE OF UNLAWFULLY OBTAINED INFORMATION.

Section 702(i)(3) (50 U.S.C. 1881a(i)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), if the Court orders a correction of a deficiency in a certification or procedures under subparagraph (B), no information obtained or evidence derived pursuant to the part of the certification or procedures that has been identified by the Court as deficient concerning any United States person shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired pursuant to such part of such certification or procedures shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of the United States person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(ii) EXCEPTION.—If the Government corrects any deficiency identified by the order of the Court under subparagraph (B), the Court may permit the use or disclosure of information obtained before the date of the correction under such minimization procedures as the Court may approve for purposes of this clause.''.

TITLE IV—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT REFORMS

SEC. 401. APPOINTMENT OF AMICUS CURIAE.

Section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(i) AMICUS CURIAE.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The presiding judges of the courts established under subsections (a) and (b) shall, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this subsection, jointly designate not fewer than 5 individuals to be eligible to serve as amicus curiae, who shall serve pursuant to rules the presiding judges may establish. In designating such individuals, the presiding judges may consider individuals recommended by any source, including members of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, the judges determine appropriate.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION.—A court established under subsection (a) or (b), consistent with the requirement of subsection (c) and any other statutory requirement that the court act expeditiously or within a stated time—

''(A) shall appoint an individual who has been designated under paragraph (1) to serve as amicus curiae to assist such court in the consideration of any application for an order or review that, in the opinion of the court, presents a novel or significant interpretation of the law, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate; and

''(B) may appoint an individual or organization to serve as amicus curiae, including to provide technical expertise, in any instance as such court deems appropriate or, upon motion, permit an individual or organization leave to file an amicus curiae brief.

''(3) QUALIFICATIONS OF AMICUS CURIAE.—

''(A) EXPERTISE.—Individuals designated under paragraph (1) shall be persons who possess expertise in privacy and civil liberties, intelligence collection, communications technology, or any other area that may lend legal or technical expertise to a court established under subsection (a) or (b).

''(B) SECURITY CLEARANCE.—Individuals designated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be persons who are determined to be eligible for access to classified information necessary to participate in matters before the courts. Amicus curiae appointed by the court pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be persons who are determined to be eligible for access to classified information, if such access is necessary to participate in the matters in which they may be appointed.

''(4) DUTIES.—If a court established under subsection (a) or (b) appoints an amicus curiae under paragraph (2)(A), the amicus curiae shall provide to the court, as appropriate—

''(A) legal arguments that advance the protection of individual privacy and civil liberties;

''(B) information related to intelligence collection or communications technology; or

''(C) legal arguments or information regarding any other area relevant to the issue presented to the court.

''(5) ASSISTANCE.—An amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2)(A) may request that the court designate or appoint additional amici curiae pursuant to paragraph (1) or paragraph (2), to be available to assist the amicus curiae.

''(6) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a court established under subsection (a) or (b) appoints an amicus curiae under paragraph (2), the amicus curiae—

''(i) shall have access to any legal precedent, application, certification, petition, motion, or such other materials that the court determines are relevant to the duties of the amicus curiae; and

''(ii) may, if the court determines that it is relevant to the duties of the amicus curiae, consult with any other individuals designated pursuant to paragraph (1) regarding information relevant to any assigned proceeding.

''(B) BRIEFINGS.—The Attorney General may periodically brief or provide relevant materials to individuals designated pursuant to paragraph (1) regarding constructions and interpretations of this Act and legal, technological, and other issues related to actions authorized by this Act.

''(C) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—An amicus curiae designated or appointed by the court may have access to classified documents, information, and other materials or proceedings only if that individual is eligible for access to classified information and to the extent consistent with the national security of the United States.

''(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Government to provide information to an amicus curiae appointed by the court that is privileged from disclosure.

''(7) NOTIFICATION.—A presiding judge of a court established under subsection (a) or (b) shall notify the Attorney General of each exercise of the authority to appoint an individual to serve as amicus curiae under paragraph (2).

''(8) ASSISTANCE.—A court established under subsection (a) or (b) may request and receive (including on a nonreimbursable basis) the assistance of the executive branch in the implementation of this subsection.

''(9) ADMINISTRATION.—A court established under subsection (a) or (b) may provide for the designation, appointment, removal, training, or other support for an individual designated to serve as amicus curiae under paragraph (1) or appointed to serve as amicus curiae under paragraph (2) in a manner that is not inconsistent with this subsection.

''(10) RECEIPT OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the ability of a court established under subsection (a) or (b) to request or receive information or materials from, or otherwise communicate with, the Government or amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) on an ex parte basis, nor limit any special or heightened obligation in any ex parte communication or proceeding.

''(j) REVIEW OF FISA COURT DECISIONS.—Following issuance of an order under this Act, a court established under subsection (a) shall certify for review to the court established under subsection (b) any question of law that may affect resolution of the matter in controversy that the court determines warrants such review because of a need for uniformity or because consideration by the court established under subsection (b) would serve the interests of justice. Upon certification of a question of law under this subsection, the court established under subsection (b) may give binding instructions or require the entire record to be sent up for decision of the entire matter in controversy.

''(k) REVIEW OF FISA COURT OF REVIEW DECISIONS.—

''(1) CERTIFICATION.—For purposes of section 1254(2) of title 28, United States Code, the court of review established under subsection (b) shall be considered to be a court of appeals.

''(2) AMICUS CURIAE BRIEFING.—Upon certification of an application under paragraph (1), the Supreme Court of the United States may appoint an amicus curiae designated under subsection (i)(1), or any other person, to provide briefing or other assistance.''.

SEC. 402. DECLASSIFICATION OF DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS.

(a) DECLASSIFICATION.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''**REPORTING REQUIREMENT**'' and inserting ''**OVERSIGHT**''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 602. DECLASSIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANT DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS.

''(a) DECLASSIFICATION REQUIRED.—Subject to subsection (b), the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review (as defined in section 601(e)) that includes a significant construction or interpretation of any provision of law, including any novel or significant construction or interpretation of the term 'specific selection term', and, consistent with that review, make publicly available to the greatest extent practicable each such decision, order, or opinion.

''(b) REDACTED FORM.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, may satisfy the requirement under subsection (a) to make a decision, order, or opinion described in such subsection publicly available to the greatest extent practicable by making such decision, order, or opinion publicly available in redacted form.

''(c) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, may waive the requirement to declassify and make publicly available a particular decision, order, or opinion under subsection (a), if—

''(1) the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, determines that a waiver of such requirement is necessary to protect the national security of the United States or properly classified intelligence sources or methods; and

''(2) the Director of National Intelligence makes publicly available an unclassified statement prepared by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence—

''(A) summarizing the significant construction or interpretation of any provision of law, which shall include, to the extent consistent with national security, a description of the context in which the matter arises and any significant construction or interpretation of any statute, constitutional provision, or other legal authority relied on by the decision; and

''(B) that specifies that the statement has been prepared by the Attorney General and constitutes no part of the opinion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to title VI and inserting the following new item:

''TITLE VI—OVERSIGHT'';

and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 601 the following new item:

''Sec. 602. Declassification of significant decisions, orders, and opinions.''.

TITLE V—NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER REFORM

SEC. 501. PROHIBITION ON BULK COLLECTION.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''may'' and inserting ''may, using a term that specifically identifies a person, entity, telephone number, or account as the basis for a request''.

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114(a)(2) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(2)) is amended by striking the period and inserting ''and a term that specifically identifies a customer, entity, or account to be used as the basis for the production and disclosure of financial records.''.

(c) DISCLOSURES TO FBI OF CERTAIN CONSUMER RECORDS FOR COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PURPOSES.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''that information,'' and inserting ''that information that includes a term that specifically identifies a consumer or account to be used as the basis for the production of that information,'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''written request,'' and inserting ''written request that includes a term that specifically identifies a consumer or account to be used as the basis for the production of that information,''; and

(3) in subsection (c), by inserting '', which shall include a term that specifically identifies a consumer or account to be used as the basis for the production of the information,'' after ''issue an order ex parte''.

(d) DISCLOSURES TO GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES FOR COUNTERTERRORISM PURPOSES OF CONSUMER REPORTS.—Section 627(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(a)) is amended by striking ''analysis.'' and inserting ''analysis and that includes a term that specifically identifies a consumer or account to be used as the basis for the production of such information.''.

SEC. 502. LIMITATIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (d) is provided, no wire or electronic communication service provider that receives a request under subsection (b), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose to any person that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under this section.

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A wire or electronic communication service provider that receives a request under subsection (b), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (b) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall notify the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.''.

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5), by striking subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (d) is provided, no financial institution that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose to any person that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under subsection (a).

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.''.

(c) IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(d) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (e) is provided, no consumer reporting agency that receives a request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose or specify in any consumer report, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under subsection (a), (b), or (c).

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency that receives a request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c) is issued in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.''.

(d) CONSUMER REPORTS.—Section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (d) is provided, no consumer reporting agency that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose or specify in any consumer report, that a government agency described in subsection (a) has sought or obtained access to information or records under subsection (a).

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the head of the government agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the head of the government agency described in subsection (a) or a designee.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request under subsection (a) is issued in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the head of the government agency described in subsection (a) or a designee, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the head or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.''.

(e) INVESTIGATIONS OF PERSONS WITH ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under subsection (c) is provided, no governmental or private entity that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall disclose to any person that an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a) has sought or obtained access to information under subsection (a).

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the head of an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A governmental or private entity that receives a request under subsection (a), or officer, employee, or agent thereof, may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

''(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

''(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

''(iii) other persons as permitted by the head of the authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a) or a designee.

''(B) APPLICATION.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

''(C) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF DISCLOSURE RECIPIENTS.—At the request of the head of an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall identify to the head of the authorized investigative agency or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.''.

(f) TERMINATION PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall adopt procedures with respect to nondisclosure requirements issued pursuant to section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, section 626 or 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u and 1681v), section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act (12 U.S.C. 3414), or section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162), as amended by this Act, to require—

(A) the review at appropriate intervals of such a nondisclosure requirement to assess whether the facts supporting nondisclosure continue to exist;

(B) the termination of such a nondisclosure requirement if the facts no longer support nondisclosure; and

(C) appropriate notice to the recipient of the national security letter, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement, and the applicable court as appropriate, that the nondisclosure requirement has been terminated.

(2) REPORTING.—Upon adopting the procedures required under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall submit the procedures to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 3511 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) NONDISCLOSURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) NOTICE.—If a recipient of a request or order for a report, records, or other information under section 2709 of this title, section 626 or 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u and 1681v), section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414), or section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162), wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with the request or order, the recipient may notify the Government or file a petition for judicial review in any court described in subsection (a).

''(B) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a notification under subparagraph (A), the Government shall apply for an order prohibiting the disclosure of the existence or contents of the relevant request or order. An application under this subparagraph may be filed in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the recipient of the order is doing business or in the district court of the United States for any judicial district within which the authorized investigation that is the basis for the request is being conducted. The applicable nondisclosure requirement shall remain in effect during the pendency of proceedings relating to the requirement.

''(C) CONSIDERATION.—A district court of the United States that receives a petition under subparagraph (A) or an application under subparagraph (B) should rule expeditiously, and shall, subject to paragraph (3), issue a nondisclosure order that includes conditions appropriate to the circumstances.

''(2) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—An application for a nondisclosure order or extension thereof or a response to a petition filed under paragraph (1) shall include a certification from the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, an Assistant Attorney General, or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee in a position not lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge in a Bureau field office designated by the Director, or in the case of a request by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government other than the Department of Justice, the head or deputy head of the department, agency, or instrumentality, containing a statement of specific facts indicating that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

''(A) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(B) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(C) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(D) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

''(3) STANDARD.—A district court of the United States shall issue a nondisclosure order or extension thereof under this subsection if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure of the information subject to the nondisclosure requirement during the applicable time period may result in—

''(A) a danger to the national security of the United States;

''(B) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

''(C) interference with diplomatic relations; or

''(D) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.''.

SEC. 503. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (b) or a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (b) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

(c) IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) through (m) as subsections (f) through (n), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c) or a non-disclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (d) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) or (b) or an order under subsection (c) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

(d) IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or a non-disclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (c) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

(e) INVESTIGATIONS OF PERSONS WITH ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3162) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A request under subsection (a) or a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with such request under subsection (b) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3511 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NOTICE.—A request under subsection (a) shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in paragraph (1).''.

TITLE VI—FISA TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 601. ADDITIONAL REPORTING ON ORDERS REQUIRING PRODUCTION OF BUSINESS RECORDS; BUSINESS RECORDS COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES.—Section 502(b) (50 U.S.C. 1862(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (6) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraphs:

''(1) a summary of all compliance reviews conducted by the Government for the production of tangible things under section 501;

''(2) the total number of applications described in section 501(b)(2)(B) made for orders approving requests for the production of tangible things;

''(3) the total number of such orders either granted, modified, or denied;

''(4) the total number of applications described in section 501(b)(2)(C) made for orders approving requests for the production of call detail records;

''(5) the total number of such orders either granted, modified, or denied;''.

(b) REPORTING ON CERTAIN TYPES OF PRODUCTION.—Section 502(c)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1862(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) the total number of applications made for orders approving requests for the production of tangible things under section 501 in which the specific selection term does not specifically identify an individual, account, or personal device;

''(D) the total number of orders described in subparagraph (C) either granted, modified, or denied; and

''(E) with respect to orders described in subparagraph (D) that have been granted or modified, whether the court established under section 103 has directed additional, particularized minimization procedures beyond those adopted pursuant to section 501(g).''.

SEC. 602. ANNUAL REPORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.), as amended by section 402 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 603. ANNUAL REPORTS.

''(a) REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.—

''(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall annually submit to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, subject to a declassification review by the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence, a report that includes—

''(A) the number of applications or certifications for orders submitted under each of sections 105, 304, 402, 501, 702, 703, and 704;

''(B) the number of such orders granted under each of those sections;

''(C) the number of orders modified under each of those sections;

''(D) the number of applications or certifications denied under each of those sections;

''(E) the number of appointments of an individual to serve as amicus curiae under section 103, including the name of each individual appointed to serve as amicus curiae; and

''(F) the number of findings issued under section 103(i) that such appointment is not appropriate and the text of any such findings.

''(2) PUBLICATION.—The Director shall make the report required under paragraph (1) publicly available on an Internet Web site, except that the Director shall not make publicly available on an Internet Web site the findings described in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (1).

''(b) MANDATORY REPORTING BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Director of National Intelligence shall annually make publicly available on an Internet Web site a report that identifies, for the preceding 12-month period—

''(1) the total number of orders issued pursuant to titles I and III and sections 703 and 704 and a good faith estimate of the number of targets of such orders;

''(2) the total number of orders issued pursuant to section 702 and a good faith estimate of—

''(A) the number of search terms concerning a known United States person used to retrieve the unminimized contents of electronic communications or wire communications obtained through acquisitions authorized under such section, excluding the number of search terms used to prevent the return of information concerning a United States person; and

''(B) the number of queries concerning a known United States person of unminimized noncontents information relating to electronic communications or wire communications obtained through acquisitions authorized under such section, excluding the number of queries containing information used to prevent the return of information concerning a United States person;

''(3) the total number of orders issued pursuant to title IV and a good faith estimate of—

''(A) the number of targets of such orders; and

''(B) the number of unique identifiers used to communicate information collected pursuant to such orders;

''(4) the total number of orders issued pursuant to applications made under section 501(b)(2)(B) and a good faith estimate of—

''(A) the number of targets of such orders; and

''(B) the number of unique identifiers used to communicate information collected pursuant to such orders;

''(5) the total number of orders issued pursuant to applications made under section 501(b)(2)(C) and a good faith estimate of—

''(A) the number of targets of such orders;

''(B) the number of unique identifiers used to communicate information collected pursuant to such orders; and

''(C) the number of search terms that included information concerning a United States person that were used to query any database of call detail records obtained through the use of such orders; and

''(6) the total number of national security letters issued and the number of requests for information contained within such national security letters.

''(c) TIMING.—The annual reports required by subsections (a) and (b) shall be made publicly available during April of each year and include information relating to the previous calendar year.

''(d) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) STATEMENT OF NUMERICAL RANGE.—If a good faith estimate required to be reported under subparagraph (B) of any of paragraphs (3), (4), or (5) of subsection (b) is fewer than 500, it shall be expressed as a numerical range of 'fewer than 500' and shall not be expressed as an individual number.

''(2) NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

''(A) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—Paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(B), and (5)(C) of subsection (b) shall not apply to information or records held by, or queries conducted by, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(B) ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS.—Paragraph (3)(B) of subsection (b) shall not apply to orders resulting in the acquisition of information by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that does not include electronic mail addresses or telephone numbers.

''(3) CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Director of National Intelligence concludes that a good faith estimate required to be reported under subsection (b)(2)(B) cannot be determined accurately because some but not all of the relevant elements of the intelligence community are able to provide such good faith estimate, the Director shall—

''(i) certify that conclusion in writing to the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on

Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

''(ii) report the good faith estimate for those relevant elements able to provide such good faith estimate;

''(iii) explain when it is reasonably anticipated that such an estimate will be able to be determined fully and accurately; and

''(iv) make such certification publicly available on an Internet Web site.

''(B) FORM.—A certification described in subparagraph (A) shall be prepared in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

''(C) TIMING.—If the Director of National Intelligence continues to conclude that the good faith estimates described in this paragraph cannot be determined accurately, the Director shall annually submit a certification in accordance with this paragraph.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONTENTS.—The term 'contents' has the meaning given that term under section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION.—The term 'electronic communication' has the meaning given that term under section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.

''(3) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER.—The term 'national security letter' means a request for a report, records, or other information under—

''(A) section 2709 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) section 1114(a)(5)(A) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(A));

''(C) subsection (a) or (b) of section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u(a), 1681u(b)); or

''(D) section 627(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(a)).

''(4) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term 'United States person' means a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a))).

''(5) WIRE COMMUNICATION.—The term 'wire communication' has the meaning given that term under section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents, as amended by section 402 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 602, as added by section 402 of this Act, the following new item:

''Sec. 603. Annual reports.''.

(c) PUBLIC REPORTING ON NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.—Section 118(c) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (18 U.S.C. 3511 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''United States''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking '', excluding the number of requests for subscriber information'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) CONTENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each report required under this subsection shall include a good faith estimate of the total number of requests described in paragraph (1) requiring disclosure of information concerning—

''(i) United States persons; and

''(ii) persons who are not United States persons.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—With respect to the number of requests for subscriber information under section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, a report required under this subsection need not separate the number of requests into each of the categories described in subparagraph (A).''.

(d) STORED COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 2702(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) the number of accounts from which the Department of Justice has received voluntary disclosures under subsection (c)(4).''.

SEC. 603. PUBLIC REPORTING BY PERSONS SUBJECT TO FISA ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.), as amended by sections 402 and 602 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 604. PUBLIC REPORTING BY PERSONS SUBJECT TO ORDERS.

''(a) REPORTING.—A person subject to a nondisclosure requirement accompanying an order or directive under this Act or a national security letter may, with respect to such order, directive, or national security letter, publicly report the following information using one of the following structures:

''(1) A semiannual report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, or national security letters with which the person was required to comply into separate categories of—

''(A) the number of national security letters received, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999;

''(B) the number of customer selectors targeted by national security letters, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999;

''(C) the number of orders or directives received, combined, under this Act for contents, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999;

''(D) the number of customer selectors targeted under orders or directives received, combined, under this Act for contents reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999;

''(E) the number of orders received under this Act for noncontents, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999; and

''(F) the number of customer selectors targeted under orders under this Act for noncontents, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0–999, pursuant to—

''(i) title IV;

''(ii) title V with respect to applications described in section 501(b)(2)(B); and

''(iii) title V with respect to applications described in section 501(b)(2)(C).

''(2) A semiannual report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, or national security letters with which the person was required to comply into separate categories of—

''(A) the number of national security letters received, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499;

''(B) the number of customer selectors targeted by national security letters, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499;

''(C) the number of orders or directives received, combined, under this Act for contents, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499;

''(D) the number of customer selectors targeted under orders or directives received, combined, under this Act for contents, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499;

''(E) the number of orders received under this Act for noncontents, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499; and

''(F) the number of customer selectors targeted under orders received under this Act for noncontents, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0–499.

''(3) A semiannual report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, or national security letters with which the person was required to comply in the into separate categories of—

''(A) the total number of all national security process received, including all national security letters, and orders or directives under this Act, combined, reported in bands of 250 starting with 0–249; and

''(B) the total number of customer selectors targeted under all national security process received, including all national security letters, and orders or directives under this Act, combined, reported in bands of 250 starting with 0–249.

''(4) An annual report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, and national security letters the person was required to comply with into separate categories of—

''(A) the total number of all national security process received, including all national security letters, and orders or directives under this Act, combined, reported in bands of 100 starting with 0–99; and

''(B) the total number of customer selectors targeted under all national security process received, including all national security letters, and orders or directives under this Act, combined, reported in bands of 100 starting with 0–99.

''(b) PERIOD OF TIME COVERED BY REPORTS.—

''(1) A report described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall include only information—

''(A) relating to national security letters for the previous 180 days; and

''(B) relating to authorities under this Act for the 180-day period of time ending on the date that is not less than 180 days prior to the date of the publication of such report, except that with respect to a platform, product, or service for which a person did not previously receive an order or directive (not including an enhancement to or iteration of an existing publicly available platform, product, or service) such report shall not include any information relating to such new order or directive until 540 days after the date on which such new order or directive is received.

''(2) A report described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) shall include only information relating to the previous 180 days.

''(3) A report described in paragraph (4) of subsection (a) shall include only information for the 1-year period of time ending on the date that is not less than 1 year prior to the date of the publication of such report.

''(c) OTHER FORMS OF AGREED TO PUBLICATION.—Nothing in this section prohibits the Government and any person from jointly agreeing to the publication of information referred to in this subsection in a time, form, or manner other than as described in this section.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONTENTS.—The term 'contents' has the meaning given that term under section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER.—The term 'national security letter' has the meaning given that term under section 603.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents, as amended by sections 402 and 602 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 603, as added by section 602 of this Act, the following new item:

''Sec. 604. Public reporting by persons subject to orders.''.

SEC. 604. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT AND THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.

Section 601(c)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1871(c)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) not later than 45 days after the date on which the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review issues a decision, order, or opinion, including any denial or modification of an application under this Act, that includes significant construction or interpretation of any provision of law or results in a change of application of any provision of this Act or a novel application of any provision of this Act, a copy of such decision, order, or opinion and any pleadings, applications, or memoranda of law associated with such decision, order, or opinion; and''.

SEC. 605. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS UNDER FISA.

(a) ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.—Section 108(a)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1808(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate,'' and inserting ''the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate''.

(b) PHYSICAL SEARCHES.—The matter preceding paragraph (1) of section 306 (50 U.S.C. 1826) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate,'' and inserting ''Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives''.

(c) PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.—Section 406(b) (50 U.S.C. 1846(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) each department or agency on behalf of which the Attorney General or a designated attorney for the Government has made an application for an order authorizing or approving the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device under this title; and

''(5) for each department or agency described in paragraph (4), each number described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).''.

(d) ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS AND OTHER TANGIBLE THINGS.—Section 502(a) (50 U.S.C. 1862(a)) is amended by striking ''Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate'' and inserting ''Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate''.

TITLE VII—ENHANCED NATIONAL SECURITY PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. EMERGENCIES INVOLVING NON-UNITED STATES PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105 (50 U.S.C. 1805) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the lawfully authorized targeting of a non-United States person previously believed to be located outside the United States for the acquisition of foreign intelligence information may continue for a period not to exceed 72 hours from the time that the non-United States person is reasonably believed to be located inside the United States and the acquisition is subject to this title or to title III of this Act, provided that the head of an element of the intelligence community—

''(A) reasonably determines that a lapse in the targeting of such non-United States person poses a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person;

''(B) promptly notifies the Attorney General of a determination under subparagraph (A); and

''(C) requests, as soon as practicable, the employment of emergency electronic surveillance under subsection (e) or the employment of an emergency physical search pursuant to section 304(e), as warranted.

''(2) The authority under this subsection to continue the acquisition of foreign intelligence information is limited to a period not to exceed 72 hours and shall cease upon the earlier of the following:

''(A) The employment of emergency electronic surveillance under subsection (e) or the employment of an emergency physical search pursuant to section 304(e).

''(B) An issuance of a court order under this title or title III of this Act.

''(C) The Attorney General provides direction that the acquisition be terminated.

''(D) The head of the element of the intelligence community conducting the acquisition determines that a request under paragraph (1)(C) is not warranted.

''(E) When the threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person is no longer reasonably believed to exist.

''(3) Nonpublicly available information concerning unconsenting United States persons acquired under this subsection shall not be disseminated during the 72 hour time period under paragraph (1) unless necessary to investigate, reduce, or eliminate the threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(4) If the Attorney General declines to authorize the employment of emergency electronic surveillance under subsection (e) or the employment of an emergency physical search pursuant to section 304(e), or a court order is not obtained under this title or title III of this Act, information obtained during the 72 hour acquisition time period under paragraph (1) shall not be retained, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(5) Paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (e) shall apply to this subsection.''.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.—Section 106(j) (50 U.S.C. 1806(j)) is amended by striking ''section 105(e)'' and inserting ''subsection (e) or (f) of section 105''.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 108(a)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1808(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) the total number of authorizations under section 105(f) and the total number of subsequent emergency employments of electronic surveillance under section 105(e) or emergency physical searches pursuant to section 301(e).''.

SEC. 702. PRESERVATION OF TREATMENT OF NON-UNITED STATES PERSONS TRAVELING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN POWERS.

Section 101(b)(1) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', irrespective of whether the person is inside the United States''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''of such person's presence in the United States''; and

(B) by striking ''such activities in the United States'' and inserting ''such activities''.

SEC. 703. IMPROVEMENT TO INVESTIGATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

Section 101(b)(1) is further amended by striking subparagraph (E) and inserting the following new subparagraph (E):

''(E) engages in the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or activities in preparation therefor, for or on behalf of a foreign power, or knowingly aids or abets any person in the conduct of such proliferation or activities in preparation therefor, or knowingly conspires with any person to engage in such proliferation or activities in preparation therefor; or''.

SEC. 704. INCREASE IN PENALTIES FOR MATERIAL SUPPORT OF FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 2339B(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''15 years'' and inserting ''20 years''.

SEC. 705. SUNSETS.

(a) USA PATRIOT IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (50 U.S.C. 1805 note) is amended by striking ''June 1, 2015'' and inserting ''December 15, 2019''.

(b) INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2004.—Section 6001(b)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking ''June 1, 2015'' and inserting ''December 15, 2019''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (50 U.S.C. 1805 note), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by striking ''sections 501, 502, and'' and inserting ''title V and section''.

TITLE VIII—SAFETY OF MARITIME NAVIGATION AND NUCLEAR TERRORISM CONVENTIONS IMPLEMENTATION

Subtitle A—Safety of Maritime Navigation

SEC. 801. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2280 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 2280 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)(i), by striking ''a ship flying the flag of the United States'' and inserting ''a vessel of the United States or a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 70502 of title 46)'';

(B) in paragraph (1)(A)(ii), by inserting '', including the territorial seas'' after ''in the United States''; and

(C) in paragraph (1)(A)(iii), by inserting '', by a United States corporation or legal entity,'' after ''by a national of the United States'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 2(c)'' and inserting ''section 13(c)'';

(3) by striking subsection (d);

(4) by striking subsection (e) and inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section, section 2280a, section 2281, and section 2281a, the term—

''(1) 'applicable treaty' means—

''(A) the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, done at The Hague on 16 December 1970;

''(B) the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal on 23 September 1971;

''(C) the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973;

''(D) International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979;

''(E) the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, done at Vienna on 26 October 1979;

''(F) the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal on 24 February 1988;

''(G) the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988;

''(H) International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997; and

''(I) International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1999;

''(2) 'armed conflict' does not include internal disturbances and tensions, such as riots, isolated and sporadic acts of violence, and other acts of a similar nature;

''(3) 'biological weapon' means—

''(A) microbial or other biological agents, or toxins whatever their origin or method of production, of types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic, protective, or other peaceful purposes; or

''(B) weapons, equipment, or means of delivery designed to use such agents or toxins for hostile purposes or in armed conflict;

''(4) 'chemical weapon' means, together or separately—

''(A) toxic chemicals and their precursors, except where intended for—

''(i) industrial, agricultural, research, medical, pharmaceutical, or other peaceful purposes;

''(ii) protective purposes, namely those purposes directly related to protection against toxic chemicals and to protection against chemical weapons;

''(iii) military purposes not connected with the use of chemical weapons and not dependent on the use of the toxic properties of chemicals as a method of warfare; or

''(iv) law enforcement including domestic riot control purposes,

as long as the types and quantities are consistent with such purposes;

''(B) munitions and devices, specifically designed to cause death or other harm through the toxic properties of those toxic chemicals specified in subparagraph (A), which would be released as a result of the employment of such munitions and devices; and

''(C) any equipment specifically designed for use directly in connection with the employment of munitions and devices specified in subparagraph (B);

''(5) 'covered ship' means a ship that is navigating or is scheduled to navigate into, through or from waters beyond the outer limit of the territorial sea of a single country or a lateral limit of that country's territorial sea with an adjacent country;

''(6) 'explosive material' has the meaning given the term in section 841(c) and includes explosive as defined in section 844(j) of this title;

''(7) 'infrastructure facility' has the meaning given the term in section 2332f(e)(5) of this title;

''(8) 'international organization' has the meaning given the term in section 831(f)(3) of this title;

''(9) 'military forces of a state' means the armed forces of a state which are organized, trained, and equipped under its internal law for the primary purpose of national defense or security, and persons acting in support of those armed forces who are under their formal command, control, and responsibility;

''(10) 'national of the United States' has the meaning stated in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22));

''(11) 'Non-Proliferation Treaty' means the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow on 1 July 1968;

''(12) 'Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party' means any State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to include Taiwan, which shall be considered to have the obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty of a party to that treaty other than a Nuclear Weapon State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty;

''(13) 'Nuclear Weapon State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty' means a State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty that is a nuclear-weapon State, as that term is defined in Article IX(3) of the Non-Proliferation Treaty;

''(14) 'place of public use' has the meaning given the term in section 2332f(e)(6) of this title;

''(15) 'precursor' has the meaning given the term in section 229F(6)(A) of this title;

''(16) 'public transport system' has the meaning given the term in section 2332f(e)(7) of this title;

''(17) 'serious injury or damage' means—

''(A) serious bodily injury,

''(B) extensive destruction of a place of public use, State or government facility, infrastructure facility, or public transportation system, resulting in major economic loss, or

''(C) substantial damage to the environment, including air, soil, water, fauna, or flora;

''(18) 'ship' means a vessel of any type whatsoever not permanently attached to the sea-bed, including dynamically supported craft, submersibles, or any other floating craft, but does not include a warship, a ship owned or operated by a government when being used as a naval auxiliary or for customs or police purposes, or a ship which has been withdrawn from navigation or laid up;

''(19) 'source material' has the meaning given that term in the International Atomic Energy Agency Statute, done at New York on 26 October 1956;

''(20) 'special fissionable material' has the meaning given that term in the International Atomic Energy Agency Statute, done at New York on 26 October 1956;

''(21) 'territorial sea of the United States' means all waters extending seaward to 12 nautical miles from the baselines of the United States determined in accordance with international law;

''(22) 'toxic chemical' has the meaning given the term in section 229F(8)(A) of this title;

''(23) 'transport' means to initiate, arrange or exercise effective control, including decisionmaking authority, over the movement of a person or item; and

''(24) 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and all territories and possessions of the United States.''; and

(5) by inserting after subsection (d) (as added by paragraph (4) of this section) the following:

''(e) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.

''(f) DELIVERY OF SUSPECTED OFFENDER.—The master of a covered ship flying the flag of the United States who has reasonable grounds to believe that there is on board that ship any person who has committed an offense under section 2280 or section 2280a may deliver such person to the authorities of a country that is a party to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation. Before delivering such person to the authorities of another country, the master shall notify in an appropriate manner the Attorney General of the United States of the alleged offense and await instructions from the Attorney General as to what action to take. When delivering the person to a country which is a state party to the Convention, the master shall, whenever practicable, and if possible before entering the territorial sea of such country, notify the authorities of such country of the master's intention to deliver such person and the reasons therefor. If the master delivers such person, the master shall furnish to the authorities of such country the evidence in the master's possession that pertains to the alleged offense.

''(g)(1) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—Any real or personal property used or intended to be used to commit or to facilitate the commission of a violation of this section, the gross proceeds of such violation, and any real or personal property traceable to such property or proceeds, shall be subject to forfeiture.

''(2) APPLICABLE PROCEDURES.—Seizures and forfeitures under this section shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46 of title 18, United States Code, relating to civil forfeitures, except that such duties as are imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury under the customs laws described in section 981(d) shall be performed by such officers, agents, and other persons as may be designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Defense.''.

SEC. 802. NEW SECTION 2280A OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 2280 the following new section:

''§ 2280a. Violence against maritime navigation and maritime transport involving weapons of mass destruction

''(a) OFFENSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the exceptions in subsection (c), a person who unlawfully and intentionally—

''(A) when the purpose of the act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act—

''(i) uses against or on a ship or discharges from a ship any explosive or radioactive material, biological, chemical, or nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device in a manner that causes or is likely to cause death to any person or serious injury or damage;

''(ii) discharges from a ship oil, liquefied natural gas, or another hazardous or noxious substance that is not covered by clause (i), in such quantity or concentration that causes or is likely to cause death to any person or serious injury or damage; or

''(iii) uses a ship in a manner that causes death to any person or serious injury or damage;

''(B) transports on board a ship—

''(i) any explosive or radioactive material, knowing that it is intended to be used to cause, or in a threat to cause, death to any person or serious injury or damage for the purpose of intimidating a population, or compelling a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act;

''(ii) any biological, chemical, or nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device, knowing it to be a biological, chemical, or nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device;

''(iii) any source material, special fissionable material, or equipment or material especially designed or prepared for the processing, use, or production of special fissionable material, knowing that it is intended to be used in a nuclear explosive activity or in any other nuclear activity not under safeguards pursuant to an International Atomic Energy Agency comprehensive safeguards agreement, except where—

''(I) such item is transported to or from the territory of, or otherwise under the control of, a Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party; and

''(II) the resulting transfer or receipt (including internal to a country) is not contrary to the obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty of the Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party from which, to the territory of which, or otherwise under the control of which such item is transferred;

''(iv) any equipment, materials, or software or related technology that significantly contributes to the design or manufacture of a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device, with the intention that it will be used for such purpose, except where—

''(I) the country to the territory of which or under the control of which such item is transferred is a Nuclear Weapon State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty; and

''(II) the resulting transfer or receipt (including internal to a country) is not contrary to the obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty of a Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party from which, to the territory of which, or otherwise under the control of which such item is transferred;

''(v) any equipment, materials, or software or related technology that significantly contributes to the delivery of a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device, with the intention that it will be used for such purpose, except where—

''(I) such item is transported to or from the territory of, or otherwise under the control of, a Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party; and

''(II) such item is intended for the delivery system of a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device of a Nuclear Weapon State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty; or

''(vi) any equipment, materials, or software or related technology that significantly contributes to the design, manufacture, or delivery of a biological or chemical weapon, with the intention that it will be used for such purpose;

''(C) transports another person on board a ship knowing that the person has committed an act that constitutes an offense under section 2280 or subparagraph (A), (B), (D), or (E) of this section or an offense set forth in an applicable treaty, as specified in section 2280(d)(1), and intending to assist that person to evade criminal prosecution;

''(D) injures or kills any person in connection with the commission or the attempted commission of any of the offenses set forth in subparagraphs (A) through (C), or subsection (a)(2), to the extent that the subsection (a)(2) offense pertains to subparagraph (A); or

''(E) attempts to do any act prohibited under subparagraph (A), (B) or (D), or conspires to do any act prohibited by subparagraphs (A) through (E) or subsection (a)(2),

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both; and if the death of any person results from conduct prohibited by this paragraph, shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

''(2) THREATS.—A person who threatens, with apparent determination and will to carry the threat into execution, to do any act prohibited under paragraph (1)(A) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) JURISDICTION.—There is jurisdiction over the activity prohibited in subsection (a)—

''(1) in the case of a covered ship, if—

''(A) such activity is committed—

''(i) against or on board a vessel of the United States or a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 70502 of title 46) at the time the prohibited activity is committed;

''(ii) in the United States, including the territorial seas; or

''(iii) by a national of the United States, by a United States corporation or legal entity, or by a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States;

''(B) during the commission of such activity, a national of the United States is seized, threatened, injured, or killed; or

''(C) the offender is later found in the United States after such activity is committed;

''(2) in the case of a ship navigating or scheduled to navigate solely within the territorial sea or internal waters of a country other than the United States, if the offender is later found in the United States after such activity is committed; or

''(3) in the case of any vessel, if such activity is committed in an attempt to compel the United States to do or abstain from doing any act.

''(c) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.

''(d)(1) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—Any real or personal property used or intended to be used to commit or to facilitate the commission of a violation of this section, the gross proceeds of such violation, and any real or personal property traceable to such property or proceeds, shall be subject to forfeiture.

''(2) APPLICABLE PROCEDURES.—Seizures and forfeitures under this section shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46 of title 18, United States Code, relating to civil forfeitures, except that such duties as are imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury under the customs laws described in section 981(d) shall be performed by such officers, agents, and other persons as may be designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Defense.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2280 the following new item:

''2280a. Violence against maritime navigation and maritime transport involving weapons of mass destruction.''.

SEC. 803. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 2281 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 2281 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 2(c)'' and inserting ''section 13(c)'';

(2) in subsection (d), by striking the definitions of ''national of the United States,'' ''territorial sea of the United States,'' and ''United States''; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) EXCEPTIONS.—This section does not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.''.

SEC. 804. NEW SECTION 2281A OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 2281 the following new section:

''§ 2281a. Additional offenses against maritime fixed platforms

''(a) OFFENSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A person who unlawfully and intentionally—

''(A) when the purpose of the act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act—

''(i) uses against or on a fixed platform or discharges from a fixed platform any explosive or radioactive material, biological, chemical, or nuclear weapon in a manner that causes or is likely to cause death or serious injury or damage; or

''(ii) discharges from a fixed platform oil, liquefied natural gas, or another hazardous or noxious substance that is not covered by clause (i), in such quantity or concentration

that causes or is likely to cause death or serious injury or damage;

''(B) injures or kills any person in connection with the commission or the attempted commission of any of the offenses set forth in subparagraph (A); or

''(C) attempts or conspires to do anything prohibited under subparagraph (A) or (B),

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both; and if death results to any person from conduct prohibited by this paragraph, shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

''(2) THREAT TO SAFETY.—A person who threatens, with apparent determination and will to carry the threat into execution, to do any act prohibited under paragraph (1)(A), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) JURISDICTION.—There is jurisdiction over the activity prohibited in subsection (a) if—

''(1) such activity is committed against or on board a fixed platform—

''(A) that is located on the continental shelf of the United States;

''(B) that is located on the continental shelf of another country, by a national of the United States or by a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States; or

''(C) in an attempt to compel the United States to do or abstain from doing any act;

''(2) during the commission of such activity against or on board a fixed platform located on a continental shelf, a national of the United States is seized, threatened, injured, or killed; or

''(3) such activity is committed against or on board a fixed platform located outside the United States and beyond the continental shelf of the United States and the offender is later found in the United States.

''(c) EXCEPTIONS.—This section does not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) 'continental shelf' means the sea-bed and subsoil of the submarine areas that extend beyond a country's territorial sea to the limits provided by customary international law as reflected in Article 76 of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea; and

''(2) 'fixed platform' means an artificial island, installation, or structure permanently attached to the sea-bed for the purpose of exploration or exploitation of resources or for other economic purposes.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2281 the following new item:

''2281a. Additional offenses against maritime fixed platforms.''.

SEC. 805. ANCILLARY MEASURE.

Section 2332b(g)(5)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''2280a (relating to maritime safety),'' before ''2281'', and by striking ''2281'' and inserting ''2281 through 2281a''.

Subtitle B—Prevention of Nuclear Terrorism

SEC. 811. NEW SECTION 2332I OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 2332h the following:

''§ 2332i. Acts of nuclear terrorism

''(a) OFFENSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly and unlawfully—

''(A) possesses radioactive material or makes or possesses a device—

''(i) with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury; or

''(ii) with the intent to cause substantial damage to property or the environment; or

''(B) uses in any way radioactive material or a device, or uses or damages or interferes with the operation of a nuclear facility in a manner that causes the release of or increases the risk of the release of radioactive material, or causes radioactive contamination or exposure to radiation—

''(i) with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury or with the knowledge that such act is likely to cause death or serious bodily injury;

''(ii) with the intent to cause substantial damage to property or the environment or with the knowledge that such act is likely to cause substantial damage to property or the environment; or

''(iii) with the intent to compel a person, an international organization or a country to do or refrain from doing an act,

shall be punished as prescribed in subsection (c).

''(2) THREATS.—Whoever, under circumstances in which the threat may reasonably be believed, threatens to commit an offense under paragraph (1) shall be punished as prescribed in subsection (c). Whoever demands possession of or access to radioactive material, a device or a nuclear facility by threat or by use of force shall be punished as prescribed in subsection (c).

''(3) ATTEMPTS AND CONSPIRACIES.—Whoever attempts to commit an offense under paragraph (1) or conspires to commit an offense under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be punished as prescribed in subsection (c).

''(b) JURISDICTION.—Conduct prohibited by subsection (a) is within the jurisdiction of the United States if—

''(1) the prohibited conduct takes place in the United States or the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States;

''(2) the prohibited conduct takes place outside of the United States and—

''(A) is committed by a national of the United States, a United States corporation or legal entity or a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States;

''(B) is committed on board a vessel of the United States or a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 70502 of title 46) or on board an aircraft that is registered under United States law, at the time the offense is committed; or

''(C) is committed in an attempt to compel the United States to do or abstain from doing any act, or constitutes a threat directed at the United States;

''(3) the prohibited conduct takes place outside of the United States and a victim or an intended victim is a national of the United States or a United States corporation or legal entity, or the offense is committed against any state or government facility of the United States; or

''(4) a perpetrator of the prohibited conduct is found in the United States.

''(c) PENALTIES.—Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $2,000,000 and shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

''(d) NONAPPLICABILITY.—This section does not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section, the term—

''(1) 'armed conflict' has the meaning given that term in section 2332f(e)(11) of this title;

''(2) 'device' means:

''(A) any nuclear explosive device; or

''(B) any radioactive material dispersal or radiation-emitting device that may, owing to its radiological properties, cause death, serious bodily injury or substantial damage to property or the environment;

''(3) 'international organization' has the meaning given that term in section 831(f)(3) of this title;

''(4) 'military forces of a state' means the armed forces of a country that are organized, trained and equipped under its internal law for the primary purpose of national defense or security and persons acting in support of those armed forces who are under their formal command, control and responsibility;

''(5) 'national of the United States' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22));

''(6) 'nuclear facility' means:

''(A) any nuclear reactor, including reactors on vessels, vehicles, aircraft or space objects for use as an energy source in order to propel such vessels, vehicles, aircraft or space objects or for any other purpose;

''(B) any plant or conveyance being used for the production, storage, processing or transport of radioactive material; or

''(C) a facility (including associated buildings and equipment) in which nuclear material is produced, processed, used, handled, stored or disposed of, if damage to or interference with such facility could lead to the release of significant amounts of radiation or radioactive material;

''(7) 'nuclear material' has the meaning given that term in section 831(f)(1) of this title;

''(8) 'radioactive material' means nuclear material and other radioactive substances that contain nuclides that undergo spontaneous disintegration (a process accompanied by emission of one or more types of ionizing radiation, such as alpha-, beta-, neutron particles and gamma rays) and that may, owing to their radiological or fissile properties, cause death, serious bodily injury or substantial damage to property or to the environment;

''(9) 'serious bodily injury' has the meaning given that term in section 831(f)(4) of this title;

''(10) 'state' has the same meaning as that term has under international law, and includes all political subdivisions thereof;

''(11) 'state or government facility' has the meaning given that term in section 2332f(e)(3) of this title;

''(12) 'United States corporation or legal entity' means any corporation or other entity organized under the laws of the United States or any State, Commonwealth, territory, possession or district of the United States;

''(13) 'vessel' has the meaning given that term in section 1502(19) of title 33; and

''(14) 'vessel of the United States' has the meaning given that term in section 70502 of title 46.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2332h the following:

''2332i. Acts of nuclear terrorism.''.

(c) DISCLAIMER.—Nothing contained in this section is intended to affect the applicability of any other Federal or State law that might pertain to the underlying conduct.

(d) INCLUSION IN DEFINITION OF FEDERAL CRIMES OF TERRORISM.—Section 2332b(g)(5)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''2332i (relating to acts of nuclear terrorism),'' before ''2339 (relating to harboring terrorists)''.

SEC. 812. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 831 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 831 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(a) in subsection (a)—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) as paragraphs (4) through (9);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) without lawful authority, intentionally carries, sends or moves nuclear material into or out of a country;'';

(3) in paragraph (8), as redesignated, by striking ''an offense under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4)'' and inserting ''any act prohibited under paragraphs (1) through (5)''; and

(4) in paragraph (9), as redesignated, by striking ''an offense under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4)'' and inserting ''any act prohibited under paragraphs (1) through (7)'';

(b) in subsection (b)—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(7)'' and inserting ''(8)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(8)'' and inserting ''(9)'';

(c) in subsection (c)—

(1) in subparagraph (2)(A), by adding after ''United States'' the following: ''or a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States'';

(2) by striking paragraph (5);

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking ''or'' at the end; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (4), the following:

''(5) the offense is committed on board a vessel of the United States or a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 70502 of title 46) or on board an aircraft that is registered under United States law, at the time the offense is committed;

''(6) the offense is committed outside the United States and against any state or government facility of the United States; or

''(7) the offense is committed in an attempt to compel the United States to do or abstain from doing any act, or constitutes a threat directed at the United States.'';

(d) by redesignating subsections (d) through (f) as (e) through (g), respectively;

(e) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) NONAPPLICABILITY.—This section does not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.''; and

(f) in subsection (g), as redesignated—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7), the following:

''(8) the term 'armed conflict' has the meaning given that term in section 2332f(e)(11) of this title;

''(9) the term 'military forces of a state' means the armed forces of a country that are organized, trained and equipped under its internal law for the primary purpose of national defense or security and persons acting in support of those armed forces who are under their formal command, control and responsibility;

''(10) the term 'state' has the same meaning as that term has under international law, and includes all political subdivisions thereof;

''(11) the term 'state or government facility' has the meaning given that term in section 2332f(e)(3) of this title; and

''(12) the term 'vessel of the United States' has the meaning given that term in section 70502 of title 46.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2048, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we speak, thousands—no, millions—of telephone metadata records are flowing into the NSA on a daily basis, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Despite changes to the NSA bulk telephone metadata program announced by President Obama last year, the bulk collection of the records has not ceased and will not cease unless and until Congress acts to shut it down.

Not even last week's decision by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals will end this collection. The responsibility falls to us, and today we must answer the call and the will of the American people to do just that.

When we set out to reform this program 1 year ago, I made the pledge to my colleagues in Congress and to the American people that Americans' liberty and America's security can coexist, that these fundamental concepts are not mutually exclusive. They are embedded in the very fabric that makes this Nation great and that makes this Nation an example for the world.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House today—H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act—protects these pillars of American democracy. It affirmatively ends the indiscriminate bulk collection of telephone metadata. But it goes much further than this. It prohibits the bulk collection of all records under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, as well as under the FISA pen register trap and trace device statute and the National Security Letter statutes.

In place of the current bulk telephone metadata program, the USA FREEDOM Act creates a targeted program that allows the intelligence community to collect non-content call detail records held by the telephone companies, but only with the prior approval of the FISA court and subject to the ''special selection term'' limitation. The records provided to the government in response to queries will be limited to two ''hops,'' and the government's handling of any records it acquires will be governed by minimization procedures approved by the FISA court.

The USA FREEDOM Act prevents government overreach by strengthening the definition of ''specific selection term''—the mechanism used to prohibit bulk collection—to ensure the government can collect the information it needs to further a national security investigation while also prohibiting large-scale, indiscriminate collection, such as data from an entire State, city, or ZIP Code.

The USA FREEDOM Act strengthens civil liberties and privacy protections by authorizing the FISA court to appoint an individual to serve as amicus curiae from a pool of experts to advise the court on matters of privacy and civil liberties, communications technology, and other technical or legal matters. It also codifies important procedures for recipients of National Security Letters to challenge nondisclosure requests.

The bill increases transparency by requiring declassification of all significant FISA court opinions and provides procedures for certified questions of law to the FISA court of review and the United States Supreme Court.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2048 requires the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence to provide the public with detailed information about how the intelligence community uses these national security authorities, and provides even more robust transparency reporting by America's technology companies.

The USA FREEDOM Act enhances America's national security by closing loopholes that make it difficult for the government to track foreign terrorists and spies as they enter or leave the country; clarifying the application of FISA to foreign targets who facilitate the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; increasing the maximum penalties for material support of a foreign terrorist organization; and expanding the sunsets of the expiring PATRIOT Act provisions to December 2019.

From beginning to end, this is a carefully crafted, bipartisan bill that enjoys wide support. I would like to thank the sponsor of this legislation, Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER; full

committee Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS; and Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet Subcommittee Ranking Member JERRY NADLER for working together with me on this important bipartisan legislation.

I also want to thank the staffs of these Members for the many hours, weeks, yes, even months of hard work they have put into this effort. Furthermore, I would like to thank my staff, Caroline Lynch, the chief counsel of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, and Jason Herring, as well as Aaron Hiller with Mr. CONYERS and Bart Forsyth with Mr. SENSENBRENNER for their long hours and steadfast dedication to this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: On April 30, 2015, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 2048, the USA Freedom Act of 2015, reported to the House.

As you know, H.R. 2048 contains provisions that amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which is within the jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. As a result of your prior consultation with the Committee, and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 2048, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will waive further consideration of the bill.

The Committee takes this action only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the jurisdictional interest of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence over this bill or any similar bill. Furthermore, this waiver should not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee in the future, including in connection with any subsequent consideration of the bill by the House. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will seek conferees on the bill during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during the House debate on H.R. 2048. I appreciate the constructive work between our committees on this matter and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 7, 2015.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NUNES: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2048, the ''U.S.A. Freedom Act of 2015.'' As you noted, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence was granted an additional referral on the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to waive further consideration of H.R. 2048 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, for which you will have my support.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee Report as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 2048.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: On April 30, 2015, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act, to be reported favorably to the House. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 2048 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2048 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation and/or in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2048, the ''U.S.A. Freedom Act of 2015.'' As you noted, the Committee on Financial services was granted an additional referral on the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to waive further consideration of H.R. 2048 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. 1 acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Financial Services is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, for which you will have my support.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 2048.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ladies and gentlemen, with the passage of the USA FREEDOM Act today, the House will have done its part to enact historic and sweeping reforms to the government's surveillance program and powers. This legislation ends bulk collection, creates a panel of experts to guide the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, and mandates extensive government reporting.

Today we have a rare opportunity to restore a measure of restraint to surveillance programs that have simply gone too far. For years the government has read section 215 of the PATRIOT Act to mean that it may collect all domestic telephone records merely because some of them may be relevant at some time in the future.

Last week, endorsing a view that I and many of my colleagues have held for years, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals held that ''the text of section 215 cannot bear the weight the government asks us to assign it, and it does not authorize the telephone metadata program.''

Now, with section 215 set to expire on June 1, we have the opportunity—and the obligation—to act clearly and decisively and end the program that has infringed on our rights for far too long.

A vote in favor of the USA FREEDOM Act is an explicit rejection of the government's unlawful interpretation of section 215 and similar statutes. Put another way, a vote in favor of this bill is a vote to end dragnet surveillance in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the ban on bulk collection contained in this legislation turns on the idea of a ''specific selection term'' and requires the government to limit the scope of production as narrowly as possible. This definition is much improved from the version of this bill that passed the House last Congress.

The bill further requires the government to declassify and publish all novel and significant opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

□ 1430

It also creates a panel of experts to advise the court on the protection of

privacy and civil liberties, communications technology, and other legal and technical matters.

These changes, along with robust reporting requirements for the government and flexible reporting options for private companies, create a new and inescapable level of that all-important consideration of transparency. The government may one day again attempt to expand its surveillance power by clever legal argument, but it will no longer be allowed to do so in secret.

Mr. Speaker, there are Members of the House and Senate who oppose this bill because it does not include every reform to surveillance law that we can create, and then there are others who oppose it because it includes any changes to existing surveillance programs.

This bill represents a reasonable consensus, and it will accomplish the most sweeping set of reforms to government surveillance in nearly 40 years.

H.R. 2048 has earned the support of privacy advocates, private industry, the White House, and the intelligence community. It ends dragnet surveillance and does so without diminishing in any way our ability to protect this country.

I want to extend my sincere thanks to Chairman GOODLATTE, to Mr. SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin, and to Mr. NADLER of New York for working with me to bring a stronger version of the USA FREEDOM Act to the floor. I think we succeeded. I also want to thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for helping us to reach this point.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2048, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigation Subcommittee and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, you know you have drafted a strong bill when you unite both national security hawks and civil libertarians. The USA FREEDOM Act has done that. It also has the support of privacy groups, tech companies, and the intelligence community.

This bill is an extremely well-drafted compromise, the product of nearly 2 years of work. It effectively protects America's civil liberties and our national security. I am very proud of the USA FREEDOM Act and am confident it is the most responsible path forward.

I do not fault my colleagues who wish that this bill went further to protect our civil liberties. For years, the government has violated the privacy of innocent Americans, and I share your anger, but letting section 215 and other surveillance authorities expire would not only threaten our national security, it would also mean less privacy protections. I emphasize it would also mean less privacy protections.

The USA FREEDOM Act also ends bulk collections across all domestic surveillance authorities, not just section 215. It also expands transparency with increased reporting from both government and private companies. If the administration finds a new way to circumvent the law, Congress and the public will know. The bill also requires the FISC to declassify significant legal decisions, bringing an end to secret laws.

If the PATRIOT Act authorities expire and the FISC approves bulk collection under a different authority, how will the public know? Without the USA FREEDOM Act, they will not. Allowing the PATRIOT Act authorities to expire sounds like a civil libertarian victory, but it will actually mean less privacy and more risk—less privacy and more risk.

Now, to my colleagues who oppose the USA FREEDOM Act because they don't believe it does enough for national security, this bill is a significant improvement over the status quo. Americans will be safer post USA FREEDOM than they would be if Congress passes a clean reauthorization of the expiring provisions.

I am not ignorant to the threats we face, but a clean reauthorization would be irresponsible. Congress never intended section 215 to allow bulk collection. That program is illegal and based on a blatant misinterpretation of the law. That said, the FREEDOM Act gives the intelligence community new tools to combat terrorism in more targeted and effective ways.

Specifically, the bill replaces the administration's bulk metadata collection with a targeted program to collect only the records the government needs without compromising the privacy of innocent Americans.

It includes new authorities to allow the administration to expedite emergency requests under section 215 and fills holes in our surveillance law that require intelligence agencies to go dark on known terrorists or spies when they transit from outside to inside the U.S. or vice versa.

Under current law, the administration has to temporarily stop monitoring persons of interest as it shifts between domestic and international surveillance authorities. What is more likely to stop the next terrorist attack: the bulk collection of innocent Americans or the ability to track down a known terrorist as soon as he or she enters the United States?

If you answer that question the same way I do, then don't let the bluster and fear-mongering of the bill's opponents convince you we are safer with a clean reauthorization than we are with this bill.

Attorney General Lynch and Director of National Intelligence Clapper recognize this. In a recent letter of support, they wrote:

> The significant reforms contained in this legislation will provide the public greater confidence in how our intelligence activities are carried out and in the oversight of those activities, while ensuring vital national security authorities remain in place.

Let's not kill these important reforms because we wish this bill did more. There is no perfect. Every bill we vote on could do more. I play the lottery. When I win, I don't throw away the winning ticket because I wish the jackpot were higher.

It is time to pass the USA FREEDOM Act. I am asking all my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans, security hawks, and civil libertarians—to vote for it. Let's speak with one voice in the House of Representatives and together urge the United States Senate to work quickly and adopt these important reforms.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), to recognize his indefatigable work, a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the USA FREEDOM Act represents a return to the basic principle of the Fourth Amendment, the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures.

Before the government may search our homes, seize our persons, or intercept our communications, it must first make a showing of individualized suspicion. The intrusion it requests must be as targeted and as brief as circumstances allow. The Fourth Amendment demands no less.

That is why we are here today. We have learned that the government has engaged in unreasonable searches against all of us. It has gathered an enormous amount of information about every phone call in the United States. It has deemed all of our phone calls relevant to a terrorism investigation. It is intolerable to our sense of freedom.

Today, we are acting to stop it. The bill before us prohibits the intelligence community from engaging in bulk data collection within the United States.

This practice, the dragnet collection without a warrant of telephone records and Internet metadata, is the contemporary equivalent of the British writs of assistance that early American revolutionaries opposed and that the Fourth Amendment was drafted to outlaw. It has never complied with the Constitution and must be brought to an end without delay.

The legal theories that justified these programs were developed and approved in secret, and that practice

must also come to an end. There must not be a body of secret law in the United States.

Section 215 says tangible things may be seized if they are relevant to a terrorism investigation. The government's interpretation that this means ''everything'' is obviously wrong, could only have been advanced in secret, and cannot withstand the public scrutiny to which it is now subjected. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals threw out this notion last week, and now, we must do so as well.

This bill further requires the government to promptly declassify and release each novel or significant opinion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. In the future, if the government advances a similarly dubious legal claim, there will be an advocate in court to oppose it. If the court should agree with the novel claim, the public will know about it almost immediately, and the responsibility will lie with us to correct it just as quickly.

Before I close, I want to be clear. Not every reform I would have hoped to enact is included in this bill. We must do more to protect U.S. person information collected under section 702 of FISA. We must act to reform other authorities, many of them law enforcement rather than intelligence community authorities, to prevent indiscriminate searches in other circumstances.

I will continue to fight for these reforms, among others, and I know that I will not be alone in taking up that challenge in the days to come, but I am grateful that we have the opportunity to take this first major step to restore the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects and to do so without in any way endangering national security.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Chairman SENSENBRENNER, and Ranking Member CONYERS for their continued leadership on this legislation, and I urge every one of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I yield to the next speaker, I want to say to him and his colleagues on the House Intelligence Committee that they did marvelous work in protecting not only the national security, but the civil liberties of Americans.

They worked with the Judiciary Committee together to prove that we can have very high levels of civil liberty and very high levels of national security. I thank Chairman NUNES and his staff for that outstanding work.

Now, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015.

Ideally, we would reauthorize section 215 of the U.S. PATRIOT Act and other expiring FISA authorities without making any changes. These provisions authorize important counterterrorism programs, including the NSA bulk telephone metadata program.

What is more, they are constitutional, authorized by Congress, and subject to multiple layers of oversight from all three branches of government. As threats to Americans at home and abroad increase by the day, now is not the time to be weakening our national security with all the tragic consequences that may follow.

However, I also realize that some of my colleagues disagree. Despite the fact that the NSA bulk telephone metadata program has never been intentionally misused, many Members wish to make changes to increase confidence in the program and allow greater transparency into intelligence activities.

Like the bill the House passed last year with more than 300 votes, this bill would replace the bulk program that will expire on June 1 with a targeted authority. This new targeted authority will be slower and potentially less effective than the current program. Along with Ranking Member SCHIFF, I have worked with the Judiciary Committee to ensure these changes still allow as much operational flexibility as possible.

Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, and Subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER, thank you for the constructive work between our committees.

In addition, the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 contains several significant measures to improve national security that were not part of last year's bill. It closes a loophole in current law that requires the government to stop monitoring the communications of foreign terrorists, including ISIL fighters from Syria and Iraq, when they enter the United States.

It streamlines the process for the government to track foreign spies who temporarily leave the United States. It helps the government investigate proliferators of weapons of mass destruction. It increases the maximum sentence for material support to a foreign terrorist organization.

Those changes are real improvements that will make it easier for our intelligence and law enforcement agencies to keep Americans safe.

Again, I would prefer a clean reauthorization, but the bill we consider today is the best way forward in the House to ensure Congress takes responsible action to protect national security. I urge my colleagues to support it.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2015.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write regarding H.R. 2048, the ''USA Freedom Act,'' which was recently ordered reported by the Judiciary Committee, to provide perspectives on the legislation, particularly an assessment that the pending version of the bill could impede the effective operation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Courts.

In letters to the Committee on January 13, 2014 and May 13, 2014, we commented on various proposed changes to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). Our comments focused on the operational impact of certain proposed changes on the Judicial Branch, particularly the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (''FISC'') and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review (collectively ''FISA Courts''), but did not express views on core policy choices that the political branches are considering regarding intelligence collection. In keeping with that approach, we offer views on aspects of H.R. 2048 that bear directly on the work of the FISA Courts and how that work is presented to the public. We sincerely appreciate the ongoing efforts of the bipartisan leadership of all the congressional committees of jurisdiction to listen to and attempt to accommodate our perspectives and concerns.

We respectfully request that, if possible, this letter be included with your Committee's report to the House on the bill.

SUMMARY OF CONCERNS

We have three main concerns. First, H.R. 2048 proposes a ''panel of experts'' for the FISA Courts which could, in our assessment, impair the courts' ability to protect civil liberties by impeding their receipt of complete and accurate information from the government (in contrast to the helpful amicus curiae approach contained in the FISA Improvements Act of 2013 (''FIA''), which was approved in similar form by the House in 2014). Second, we continue to have concerns with the prospect of public ''summaries'' of FISA Courts' opinions when the opinions themselves are not released to the public. Third, we have a few other specific technical concerns with H.R. 2048 as drafted.

NATURE OF THE FISA COURTS

With the advent of a new Congress and newly proposed legislation, it seems helpful to restate briefly some key attributes of the work of the FISA Courts.

The vast majority of the work of the FISC involves individual applications in which experienced judges apply well-established law to a set of facts presented by the government—a process not dissimilar to the ex parte consideration of ordinary criminal search warrant applications. Review of entire programs of collection and applications involving bulk collection are a relatively small part of the docket, and applications involving novel legal questions, though obviously important, are rare.

In all matters, the FISA Courts currently depend on—and will always depend on—prompt and complete candor from the government in providing the courts with all relevant information because the government is typically the only source of such information.

A ''read copy'' practice—similar to the practices employed in some federal district

courts for Title III wiretap applications—wherein the government provides the FISC with an advance draft of each planned application, is the major avenue for court modification of government-sought surveillance. About a quarter of ''read copies'' are modified or withdrawn at the instigation of the FISC before the government presents a final application—in contrast to the overwhelming majority of formal applications that are approved by the Court because modifications at the ''read copy'' stage have addressed the Court's concerns in cases where final applications are submitted.

The FISC typically operates in an environment where, for national security reasons and because of statutory requirements, time is of the essence, and collateral litigation, including for discovery, would generally be completely impractical.

At times, the FISA Courts are presented with challenging issues regarding how existing law applies to novel technologies. In these instances, the FISA Courts could benefit from a conveniently available explanation or evaluation of the technology from an informed non-government source. Congress could assist in this regard by clarifying the law to provide mechanisms for this to occur easily (e.g., by providing for precleared experts with whom the Court can share and receive information to the extent it deems necessary).

THE ''PANEL OF EXPERTS'' APPROACH OF H.R. 2048 COULD IMPEDE THE FISA COURTS' WORK

H.R. 2048 provides for what proponents have referred to as a ''panel of experts'' and what in the bill is referred to as a group of at least five individuals who may serve as an ''amicus curiae'' in a particular matter. However, unlike a true amicus curiae, the FISA Courts would be required to appoint such an individual to participate in any case involving a ''novel *or* significant interpretation of law'' (emphasis added)—unless the court ''issues a finding'' that appointment is not appropriate. Once appointed, such amici are required to present to the court, ''as appropriate,'' legal arguments in favor of privacy, information about technology, or other ''relevant'' information. Designated amici are required to have access to ''all relevant'' legal precedent, as well as certain other materials ''the court determines are relevant.''

Our assessment is that this ''panel of experts'' approach could impede the FISA Courts' role in protecting the civil liberties of Americans. We recognize this may not be the intent of the drafters, but nonetheless it is our concern. As we have indicated, the full cooperation of rank-and-file government personnel in promptly conveying to the FISA Courts complete and candid factual information is critical. A perception on their part that the FISA process involves a ''panel of experts'' officially charged with opposing the government's efforts could risk deterring the necessary and critical cooperation and candor. Specifically, our concern is that imposing the mandatory ''duties''—contained in subparagraph (i)(4) of proposed section 401 (in combination with a quasi-mandatory appointment process)—could create such a perception within the government that a standing body exists to oppose intelligence activities.

Simply put, delays and difficulties in receiving full and accurate information from Executive Branch agencies (including, but not limited to, cases involving non-compliance) present greater challenges to the FISA Courts' role in protecting civil liberties than does the lack of a non-governmental perspective on novel legal issues or technological developments. To be sure, we would welcome a means of facilitating the FISA Courts' obtaining assistance from nongovernmental experts in unusual cases, but it is critically important that the means chosen to achieve that end do not impair the timely receipt of complete and accurate information from the government.

It is on this point especially that we believe the ''panel of experts'' system in H.R. 2048 may prove counterproductive. The information that the FISA Courts need to examine probable cause, evaluate minimization and targeting procedures, and determine and enforce compliance with court authorizations and orders is exclusively in the hands of the government—specifically, in the first instance, intelligence agency personnel. If disclosure of sensitive or adverse information to the FISA Courts came to be seen as a prelude to disclosure to a third party whose mission is to oppose or curtail the agency's work, then the prompt receipt of complete and accurate information from the government would likely be impaired—ultimately to the detriment of the national security interest in expeditious action *and* the effective protection of privacy and civil liberties.

In contrast, a ''true'' amicus curiae approach, as adopted, for example, in the FIA, facilitates appointment of experts outside the government to serve as amici curiae and render any form of assistance needed by the court, without any implication that such experts are expected to oppose the intelligence activities proposed by the government. For that reason, we do not believe the FIA approach poses any similar risk to the courts' obtaining relevant information.

''SUMMARIES'' OF UNRELEASED FISA COURT OPINIONS COULD MISLEAD THE PUBLIC

In our May 13, 2014, letter to the Committee on H.R. 3361, we shared the nature of our concerns regarding the creation of public ''summaries'' of court opinions that are not themselves released. The provisions in H.R. 2048 are similar and so are our concerns. To be clear, the FISA Courts have never objected to their opinions—whether in full or in redacted form—being released to the public to the maximum extent permitted by the Executive's assessment of national security concerns. Likewise, the FISA Courts have always facilitated the provision of their full opinions to Congress. *See, e.g.*, FISC Rule of Procedure 62(c). Thus, we have no objection to the provisions in H.R. 2048 that call for maximum public release of court opinions. However, a formal practice of creating summaries of court opinions without the underlying opinion being available is unprecedented in American legal administration. Summaries of court opinions can be inadvertently incorrect or misleading, and may omit key considerations that can prove critical for those seeking to understand the import of the court's full opinion. This is particularly likely to be a problem in the fact-focused area of FISA practice, under circumstances where the government has already decided that it cannot release the underlying opinion even in redacted form, presumably because the opinion's legal analysis is inextricably intertwined with classified facts.

ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL COMMENTS ON H.R. 2048

The Judiciary, like the public, did not participate in the discussions between the Administration and congressional leaders that led to H.R. 2048 (publicly released on April 28, 2015 and reported by the Judiciary Committee without changes on April 30). In the few days we have had to review the bill, we have noted a few technical concerns that we hope can be addressed prior to finalization of the legislation, should Congress choose to enact it. These concerns (all in the amicus curiae subsection) include:

Proposed subparagraph (9) appears inadvertently to omit the ability of the FISA Courts to train and administer amici between the time they are designated and the time they are appointed.

Proposed subparagraph (6) dots not make any provision for a ''true amicus'' appointed under subparagraph (2)(B) to receive necessary information.

We are concerned that a lack of parallel construction in proposed clause (6)(A)(i) (apparently differentiating between access to legal precedent as opposed to access to other materials) could lead to confusion in its application.

We recommend adding additional language to clarify that the exercise of the duties under proposed subparagraph (4) would occur in the context of Court rules (for example, deadlines and service requirements).

We believe that slightly greater clarity could be provided regarding the nature of the obligations referred to in proposed subparagraph (10).

These concerns would generally be avoided or addressed by substituting the FIA approach. Furthermore, it bears emphasis that, even if H.R. 2048 were amended to address all of these technical points, our more fundamental concerns about the ''panel of experts'' approach would not be fully assuaged. Nonetheless, our staff stands ready to work with your staff to provide suggested textual changes to address each of these concerns.

Finally, although we have no particular objection to the requirement in this legislation of a report by the Director of the AO, Congress should be aware that the AO's role would be to receive information from the FISA Courts and then simply transmit the report as directed by law.

For the sake of brevity, we are not restating here all the comments in our previous correspondence to Congress on proposed legislation similar to H.R. 2048. However, the issues raised in those letters continue to be of importance to us.

We hope these comments are helpful to the House of Representatives in its consideration of this legislation. If we may be of further assistance in this or any other matter, please contact me or our Office of Legislative Affairs.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. DUFF,
Director.

□ 1445

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), an effective member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill makes meaningful reform to a few of the surveillance programs, but it in no way stops all of the bulk collection of U.S. person communications currently occurring. This bill won't stop the most egregious and widely reported privacy violations that occur under section 702 and Executive Order No. 12333.

In a declassified decision, the FISA court said that the NSA had been collecting substantially more U.S. person

communications through its upstream collection program than it had originally told the court. With upstream collection, the NSA directly taps into international Internet cables to search through all of the communications that flow through it, looking for communications that map certain criteria.

Four years ago, the court found that the government was collecting tens of thousands of wholly domestic communications a year. Why? Because all of your data is everywhere. No accurate estimate can be given for the even larger number of communications collected in which a U.S. person was a party to the communication.

The Director of National Intelligence confirmed the government searches this vast amount of data, including the content of email and of telephone calls, without individualized suspicion, probable cause, and without a warrant. The Director of the FBI says they use information to build criminal cases against U.S. persons. This is an end run around the Fourth Amendment, and it has to stop.

This bill did not create those problems. However, this bill doesn't correct those problems. During the markup of the bill, Chairman GOODLATTE stated that these issues would be next, but we can't afford to wait until the final hour of expiration to take action like we did with this bill. To do so would mean at least another 2 years of the mass surveillance of Americans, which is unconscionable. Last year, the House voted 293–123 to close these backdoor loopholes, but the Rules Committee would not allow the House to vote today to put these fixes into this bill.

I voted in committee to advance this bill for a couple of reasons, and I do want to thank all of the members who worked on this but single out Congressman JIM SENSENBRENNER, who was the author of the bill and who has worked so hard to make sure that improvements are made. The bill is an improvement over a straight reauthorization of the bill. I also listened carefully to the verbal commitments that the 702 fix would be included, and I reserve the right to oppose this bill when it comes back from the Senate if we can't close these loopholes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES), a member of the House Judiciary Committee and an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the USA FREEDOM Act, which passed the Judiciary Committee with bipartisan support just 2 weeks ago.

The bill accomplishes the twin goals of protecting our Nation from our enemies while safeguarding the civil liberties that our servicemembers fight for every day.

Americans across the country have called for the NSA to listen less and elected officials to listen more. The USA FREEDOM Act will end the NSA's bulk collection program, which was established under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, and it will further protect Americans' Fourth Amendment rights by strengthening oversight and accountability of the intelligence community.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I work with our servicemembers and military leaders daily to ensure our adversaries do not harm this great Nation. That is why I applaud Chairman GOODLATTE and Mr. SENSENBRENNER for including provisions in the bill to address the growing threat of ISIL.

With continued threats of terrorism, our Nation's intelligence community must be equipped to protect our Nation and national security interests. However, any intelligence framework must be confined within the boundaries of the United States Constitution. Striking this balance between safeguarding privacy and protecting Americans is a challenge in today's post-9/11 world, but it is one that should not tip towards allowing the government to trample on our constitutional rights. Security must not come at the cost of Americans' liberties. That is why I urge my colleagues today to support this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the ranking member and the chairman of the full committee. As my colleagues have done, let me also acknowledge the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, on which I serve as the ranking member. As many have noted, let me acknowledge the work of Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. CONYERS and their leadership on a very important statement on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the USA FREEDOM Act is the House's unified response to the unauthorized disclosures and subsequent publication in the media in June 2013 regarding the National Security Agency's collection from Verizon of the phone records of all of its American customers which were authorized by the FISA court pursuant to section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the public was not happy. There was justifiable concern on the part of the public and by a large percentage of the Members of this body that the extent and scale of the NSA data collection bundling, which, by orders of magnitude, exceeded anything previously authorized or contemplated, may have constituted an unwarranted invasion of privacy and a threat to the civil liberties of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a decade-plus-long member of the Homeland Security Committee. I do not in any way want to infringe upon the security of this Nation, but if we allow the terrorists to terrorize us, then we are in very bad shape, and I am glad the voices of opposition were raised.

To quell the growing controversy, the Director of National Intelligence declassified and released limited information about the program, but it did not, by any means, satisfy the concern raised by Americans. The DNI stated that the only type of information acquired under the court's order was telephone metadata, such as telephone numbers dialed and length of calls. That did not satisfy our concern.

I am very pleased that we are here on the floor of the House putting forward something that addresses the concerns but that does not undermine the security of America. For example, I introduced the FISA court in the Sunshine Act of 2013 in response to this. Without compromising national security, it was bipartisan legislation that gave much-needed transparency to the decision orders and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, or FISA.

My bill would require the Attorney General to disclose each decision. I am glad that, in this bill, we have positions and points where the Attorney General is conducting declassification review. I am also pleased that the bill before us contains an explicit prohibition and a restraint, pursuant to section 215, on the bulk collection of tangible things.

We are making a difference with the USA FREEDOM Act, and it is interesting that groups as different as the R Street Institute and the Human Rights Watch are, in essence, supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can do what we need to do by passing this legislation and by then going to an amendment on section 702, which I will support. Security goes along with protection, and I believe this particular legislation does it.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and an original co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2048, the "USA Freedom Act," which is stands for "Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping, Dragnet-collection, and Online Monitoring Act."

I support the USA Freedom Act for several reasons:

1. The bill ends all bulk collection of business records under Section 215 and prohibits bulk collection under the FISA Pen Register/Trap and Trace Device authority and National Security Letter authorities.

2. The USA Freedom Act strengthens the definition of "specific selection term," the mechanism used to prohibit bulk collection, which prevents large-scale, indiscriminate data collection while at the same time ensuring the government can collect the information it needs to further a national security investigation.

3. The USA Freedom Act strengthens protections for civil liberties by creating a panel of

experts to advise the FISA Court on matters of privacy and civil liberties, communications technology, and other technical or legal matters and also codifies important procedures for recipients of National Security Letters.

4. The bill increases transparency by requiring declassification of all significant opinions of the FISA Court and provides procedures for certified questions of law to the FISA Court of Review and the Supreme Court.

5. The USA Freedom Act requires the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence to provide the public with detailed guidance about how they can use these national security authorities, and provides even more reporting by America's technology companies.

6. The USA Freedom Act contains several important national security enhancements, including closing loopholes that make it difficult for the government to track foreign terrorists and spies as they enter or leave the country.

The USA Freedom Act is the House's unified response to the unauthorized disclosures and subsequent publication in the media in June 2013 regarding the National Security Agency's collection from Verizon of the phone records of all of its American customers, which was authorized by the FISA Court pursuant to Section 215 of the Patriot Act.

Public reaction to the news of this massive and secret data gathering operation was swift and negative.

There was justifiable concern on the part of the public and a large percentage of the Members of this body that the extent and scale of this NSA data collection operation, which exceeded by orders of magnitude anything previously authorized or contemplated, may constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy and threat to the civil liberties of American citizens.

To quell the growing controversy, the Director of National Intelligence declassified and released limited information about this program. According to the DNI, the information acquired under this program did not include the content of any communications or the identity of any subscriber.

The DNI stated that ''the only type of information acquired under the Court's order is telephony metadata, such as telephone numbers dialed and length of calls.''

The assurance given by the DNI, to put it mildly, was not very reassuring.

In response, many Members of Congress, including the Ranking Member CONYERS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and myself, introduced legislation in response to the disclosures to ensure that the law and the practices of the executive branch reflect the intent of Congress in passing the USA Patriot Act and subsequent amendments.

For example, I introduced H.R. 2440, the ''FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013,'' bipartisan legislation, that provided much needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or ''FISA Court.''

Specifically, my bill required the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), allowing Americans to know how broad of a legal authority the government is claiming under the PATRIOT ACT and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to conduct the surveillance needed to keep Americans safe.

I am pleased that these requirements are incorporated in substantial part in the USA Freedom Act, which requires the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion of the FISA court that includes a significant construction or interpretation of law and to submit a report to Congress within 45 days.

As I indicated, perhaps the most important reasons for supporting passage of H.R. 2048 is the bill's prohibition on domestic bulk collection, as well as its criteria for specifying the information to be collected, applies not only to Section 215 surveillance activities but also to other law enforcement communications interception authorities, such as national security letters.

Finally, I strongly support the USA Freedom Act because Section 301 of the bill continues to contain protections against ''reverse targeting,'' which became law when an earlier Jackson Lee Amendment was included in H.R. 3773, the RESTORE Act of 2007.

''Reverse targeting,'' a concept well known to members of this Committee but not so well understood by those less steeped in the arcana of electronic surveillance, is the practice where the government targets foreigners without a warrant while its actual purpose is to collect information on certain U.S. persons.

One of the main concerns of libertarians and classical conservatives, as well as progressives and civil liberties organizations, in giving expanded authority to the executive branch was the temptation of national security agencies to engage in reverse targeting may be difficult to resist in the absence of strong safeguards to prevent it.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, preserved in Section 301 of the USA Freedom Act, reduces even further any such temptation to resort to reverse targeting by making any information concerning a United States person obtained improperly inadmissible in any federal, state, or local judicial, legal, executive, or administrative proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, I noted in an op-ed published way back in October 2007, that as Alexis DeTocqueville, the most astute student of American democracy, observed nearly two centuries ago, the reason democracies invariably prevail in any military conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to success: initiative, innovation, courage, and a love of justice.

I support the USA Freedom Act because it will help keep us true to the Bill of Rights and strikes the proper balance between cherished liberties and smart security.

I urge my colleagues to support the USA Freedom Act.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS), a member of the House Judiciary Committee and an original cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor.

This vital bill will reform our Nation's intelligence-gathering programs to end the bulk collection of data, strengthen Americans' civil liberties, and protect our homeland from those who wish to do us harm.

In passing this legislation, we can provide officials with the tools they need to combat terrorist groups, such as ISIL, by closing a current loophole that requires the government to stop tracking foreign terrorists upon their entering the United States.

This bill will also provide for the robust oversight of our intelligence agencies by requiring additional reporting standards on how FISA authorities are employed. Furthermore, H.R. 2048 will prevent government overreach and will increase privacy protections by ending the large-scale, indiscriminate collection of data, which includes all records from an entire State, city, or ZIP Code.

With section 215 of the PATRIOT Act set to expire soon, it is vital that Congress acts quickly to pass this bipartisan bill so that we can keep our country safe and so that we can work to restore the trust of the American people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, in a democracy, there must be a balance between effective national security protection on the one hand and a healthy respect for privacy and civil liberties interests on the other. This is a balance that traces all the way back to the founding of the Republic. It is rooted most prominently in the Bill of Rights, in the Constitution, in the Fourth Amendment. Yet, in its zeal to protect the homeland, our national security apparatus overreached into the lives of everyday, hard-working Americans in a manner that was inconsistent with our traditional notions of privacy and civil liberties. This overreach was unnecessary, unacceptable, and unconstitutional.

By ending bulk collection through section 215, we have taken a substantial step in the right direction toward restoring the balance. More must be done, but I am going to support this legislation because of the meaningful effort that has been made to help strike the appropriate balance.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), who is the chairman of the Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet Subcommittee and a strong supporter of this legislation.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, each person who comes up here will talk to you about the painstaking work that the chairman and the ranking member went through to craft a bill that would both strengthen our security, following on

with things we have learned since the enactment of the PATRIOT Act, and also make changes based on both lessons learned of things the PATRIOT Act overdid and excesses by the Presidential usurping of the intent of Congress. We have achieved that by a 25–2 vote in our committee, a vote that is almost unheard of.

I think, most importantly, though, we are doing something the American people need to know, and that is we are bringing transparency to the process for the first time. Under this legislation, a FISA court, working in secrecy, that makes a decision to expand or to in some other way add more surveillance will have to publish those findings, declassify them, and make them available not just to Congress but to the American people.

We cannot guarantee that behind closed doors secret—and necessarily secret—judge actions would always be what we would like, but under this reform, we can ensure that Congress and the American people will have the transparency and oversight as to those actions, not by whom they were after but what they did. That is going to bring the true reform that has been needed in a process in which the trust of the American people has been in doubt since the Snowden revelation.

I, personally, want to thank the ranking member and the chairman. This could not have happened without bipartisan work and without the support of those who want to strengthen our security and of those who want to strengthen and retain our freedoms under the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Second Circuit confirmed what a lot of Members have been saying for years: the NSA has brazenly exploited the PATRIOT Act to conduct surveillance far beyond what the law permits; but the court refrained from enforcing its decision, instead placing the burden on Congress to protect Americans from unwarranted mass surveillance.

That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of this year's USA FREEDOM Act, a serious reform bill that would go a long way to protecting Americans' privacy by ending bulk collection and by creating greater transparency, oversight, and accountability.

□ 1500

After the House acts today, it is up to the Senate leaders to pass these reforms or let the expiring provisions of the PATRIOT Act sunset on June 1 because a clean reauthorization is absolutely unacceptable. I urge my colleagues in each Chamber to support this critical effort to end bulk collection and protect both Americans' privacy and America's security.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a former CIA officer, I completely understand the need for the men and women in our intelligence agencies to have access to timely, vital information as they track down bad guys.

As an American citizen, I know how important our civil rights are and that it is the government's job to protect those rights, not infringe upon them. I believe that we, as a nation, as a government, as a people can do both, and that is why I am supporting the USA FREEDOM Act. Because it prioritizes both and strikes the right balance between privacy and security, Americans can rest assured that their private information isn't being subjected to bulk collection by the NSA. They can be confident that there are privacy experts advising the FISA court advocating for our civil liberties, and they can be proud of an intelligence community who works hard every day to make sure that our country is protected.

I have seen firsthand the value these programs bring, but I also know that if Americans don't feel they can trust their own government, we are losing the battle right here at home. It is my hope that this bill will increase transparency and accountability to the program so that our hard-working intelligence community can continue their job of defending the country, and American citizens can be confident that they are being protected from enemies both foreign and domestic. Upholding civil liberties are not burdens; they are what make all of us safer and stronger.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), who is the distinguished ranking member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to manage that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me say thank you to Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS as well as to my colleague, Chairman NUNES. We have worked this issue together for a long time, and I am very proud of the bipartisan legislation that we have produced. I also want to thank the administration that worked with us so long and hard, and the work done in the last Congress by former HPSCI Chairman Mike Rogers and former HPSCI Ranking Member DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2048.

This Nation was founded on the revolutionary principle that liberty need not be sacrificed to security, that public safety can and must coexist with individual liberty. Our Founders set out to create a lasting Union and a great Nation, one in which the people would be free to govern themselves, to express themselves, to worship for themselves, while also being secure in their homes, their papers, and their persons.

Nearly two-and-a-half centuries later, it is easy to forget that these freedoms were enshrined in the Constitution amidst great peril. Americans had only recently fought a war for independence and would be confronted by powerful and often hostile forces in the future, including the powerful empires of Britain, France, and Spain. Here were truly existential threats, and still the Founders said, We can be secure and we can be free. They were right; we can and we must.

So today, at another moment of national danger, we are challenged to reaffirm our commitment to these twin imperatives—security and liberty—and to prove again that we can find the right balance for our times. The USA FREEDOM Act strikes that delicate but vitally important balance.

On the side of freedom, it ends bulk collection, not just of telephone metadata under section 215, but of any bulk collection under any other authority. It creates a specific procedure for telephone metadata that allows the government, upon court approval, to query the data that the telephone companies already keep, something I have long advocated. It increases transparency by requiring a declassification review of all significant FISA court opinions and by requiring the government to provide the public with detailed information about how they use these national security authorities. And it provides for a panel of experts to advocate for privacy and civil liberties before the FISA court, also something that I have advocated for quite sometime.

At the same time, the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 preserves important capabilities and makes further national security enhancements by closing loopholes that make it difficult for the government to track foreign terrorists and spies as they enter or leave the country, clarifying the application of FISA to those who facilitate the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and increasing the maximum penalties for those who provide material support for terrorism. This is a strong bill and should advance with such an overwhelming majority that it compels the Senate to act.

But this is not a one-and-done legislative fix or the end of our work. Rather, it is a reaffirmation of our commitment to constantly recalibrate our

laws to make sure that privacy and security are coexisting and mutually reinforcing. While the public may have begun its debate on these programs 2 years ago, many of us—myself included—have been working these issues long before, and we will continue to work them long afterwards. That is our responsibility and the great obligation the Founders bequeathed to us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, for both the time today and for his diligent work on the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, the world we live in is a dangerous place. Indeed, it is far more dangerous than it ever has been. Acts of terror reached a record level last year, and with the wickedness of groups like ISIS and Boko Haram showing continued, complete disregard for human life, our Nation must always remain prepared and vigilant.

The legislation before us today, Mr. Speaker, builds on the reforms from the legislation passed last Congress, championed by my friend Representative SENSENBRENNER, and it accounts for the absolute need to protect civil liberties while also remaining clear-eyed and vigilant about the real threats that we face every day around the world.

I thank the chairman and I thank the committee for their work. I urge support for H.R. 2048.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the USA FREEDOM Act, which virtually deletes the National Security Agency's database of Americans' phone and email records. The bulk collection of what we know now as metadata will end.

Under this bill, the government will now have to seek court approval before petitioning private cell phone companies for records. The court will have to approve each application except in emergencies, and major court decisions will be made public.

It is very similar to legislation drafted and introduced last year by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, under the leadership of former Chairman Rogers and myself, together with our colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary, led by Congressmen GOODLATTE and CONYERS. That bill passed with an overwhelming bipartisan majority, and I want to thank Congressmen GOODLATTE and CONYERS, as well as Congressmen SCHIFF and NUNES, also with Congressmen SENSENBRENNER and NADLER and other Members who worked hard and continued the pursuit on this much-needed reform.

We need this bill, though, to keep our country safe. Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, which is the part that legalizes much of NSA's critical work to protect us from terrorists, expires in less than 3 weeks, on June 1. If we do not reauthorize it with the reforms demanded by the public, essential capabilities to track legitimate terror suspects will expire also. That couldn't happen at a worse time. We live in a dangerous world. The threats posed by ISIS and other terrorist groups are just the tip of the iceberg.

We also need strong defenses against increasingly aggressive cyberterrorists and the lone wolf terrorists who are often American citizens, for example. This bill restores Americans' confidence that the government is not snooping on its own citizens by improving the necessary checks and balances to our democracy. This bill balances the need to protect our country with the need to protect our constitutional rights and civil liberties.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), chairman of our Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee and a strong supporter of this legislation.

Mr. MARINO. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the USA FREEDOM Act. I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on a true compromise piece of legislation. It protects the privacy of American citizens, according to the Constitution, while ensuring our national security, which is a priority. I understand the importance of reauthorizing these important FISA provisions.

As a U.S. attorney, I had these tools at my disposal, and I used them to protect Americans in Pennsylvania and across the country. We needed them at the time, and we need them now. However, I equally understand the importance of also protecting the privacy interests of American citizens. The act ends bulk collection; it strengthens protections of civil liberties; it increases transparency; all while ensuring that our intelligence and national security agencies have the tools they need to fight terrorism abroad. In addition, the USA FREEDOM Act protects American citizens at home.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, as well as Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for their good, bipartisan work on a bill that I think is long overdue.

The good work on this bill, Mr. Speaker, goes back to the fact that the PATRIOT Act, a piece of legislation crafted in haste and in fear after the tragic events of 9/11, in my opinion, pushed the boundaries too far on the government's ability to surveil and gather information on people, including American citizens.

The USA FREEDOM Act, which I stand today to support, goes a very long way to restoring an appropriate balance between the imperative of national security and the civil liberties which we hold so dear. This bill makes important reforms to the FISA court, but, importantly, it prohibits—I will say again, prohibits—the bulk collection, under section 215, under the pen register authorities, and under National Security Letter statutes, of data on American citizens. Americans will now rest easy knowing that their calls or other records will not be warehoused by the government, no matter how careful that government is in the procedures it uses to access those files.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the legal interpretations, most recently definitively ruled upon by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, whatever the legal interpretations, there is something about the idea of a government keeping extensive records on its free citizens which damages our intuitive sense of freedom and liberty. So whatever the law and whatever the legal interpretations—and I do believe those have been settled—what we do here today, which is to say that the government of the United States will not keep detailed call or other bulk records on its free citizens, I believe is an important step forward for this country.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the USA FREEDOM Act.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 30 seconds remaining, the gentleman from Virginia has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, 30 seconds, is that the total amount of time the other side has?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The minority has 7 minutes total remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, once again I want to thank my colleagues for their good work. I also want to acknowledge Mr. SENSENBRENNER for his strong advocacy on this measure.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to simply ask my

colleagues to reject an unlawful surveillance program, to restore limits to a range of surveillance authorities, to compel the government to act with some measure of transparency, and to end the practice of dragnet surveillance in the United States.

In addition, I would like to thank the staff who have worked so hard on this bill: Caroline Lynch, Jason Herring, Bart Forsyth, Lara Flint, Chan Park, Matthew Owen, and Aaron Hiller.

I close by thanking in advance my colleagues who, like many of us, are inclined to strongly support H.R. 2048.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

From the founding of the American Republic, this country has been engaged in a profound debate about the responsibilities and the limits of our Federal Government.

The tension between these two essential functions of the government did not suddenly spring into existence in this age of cyber attacks and terrorist plots. Americans have long grappled with their need for security and their innate desire to protect their personal liberty from government intrusion.

Benjamin Franklin is often quoted as saying:

> Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

After the horrific attacks on September 11, the country was determined not to allow such an attack to occur again. The changes we made then to our intelligence laws helped keep us safe from implacable enemies. Today, we renew our commitment to our Nation's security and the safety of the American people.

We also make this pledge that the United States of America will remain a nation whose government answers to the will of its people. This country must be what it always has been, a beacon of freedom to the world, a place where the principles of the Founders—including the commitment to individual liberties—will continue to live, protected and nourished for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, last week a federal appeals court declared that the NSA's bulk data collection on American citizens over the past 14 years was illegal. So why is Congress considering a bill that would legalize a program already deemed illegal? Unfortunately, that is what the USA FREEDOM Act does, and I believe codifies a program that violates the Constitution. When the Fourth Amendment says that the American people have the right to be free from warrantless searches and seizures of themselves and their property, I think it's a pretty clear statement on the limits of governmental action. Unfortunately, the bill today does not fully protect that right and accordingly I don't support it. The bill's purpose was to rein in the NSA's bulk data collection program but failed on that front, and I wanted to offer a few thoughts as to why.

First, the bill uses broad language to define who and what the government can search, which means that it still could technically collect Americans' information in bulk—just not as much as before. The bill does this by leaving the door open for the government to search geographic regions instead of the entire country as it does now. For example, the government could require phone companies to turn over all the records of their customers in South Carolina or even in a town like Mt. Pleasant in my district. I don't think the Founding Fathers' intent of the Fourth Amendment was to have it apply only in cases of nationwide warrantless searches; rather it should apply to any search anywhere.

Second, the bill doesn't even address a part of the PATRIOT Act called Section 702 that covers data that crosses our borders. This section allows the government to sweep up the content of an American citizen's emails, instant messages and web browsing history just because they happen to be communicating with someone outside the U.S. In fact, the former NSA director General Keith Alexander admitted that the NSA specifically searches Section 702 data using ''U.S. person identifiers.'' This so-called ''back door search loophole'' should have been closed in this bill because it violates the Fourth Amendment by getting around the warrant requirement. The notion that Americans' rights are contingent on the geography of where a call is directed is not consistent with the Constitution and highlights why this particular section needs to be changed.

Third, this bill does not require the government to destroy information obtained on Americans who are not connected to an investigation. The way this happens is the government stores the information it collected on a particular phone call, even if one of those individuals on the call is suspected of no wrongdoing. The Constitution I believe is rather clear in the principle that organizations like the NSA and the FBI should not be able to store information that is inadvertently collected on people who are not suspected of committing a crime, and at a very minimum the FREEDOM Act does not use this opportunity to shine a light on the problem.

Pericles, the Greek general of Athens, once said that ''Freedom is the sure possession of those alone who have the courage to defend it.'' Ultimately, I believe this bill is another missed opportunity for Congress to address what the judiciary has now ruled to be the unconstitutional and unlawful actions of the Executive branch. It really matters the Second Circuit federal court in New York issued an opinion last week stating that the NSA has stretched the meaning of the text of the PATRIOT Act so that it no longer represents congressional intent and called the NSA's bulk data collection illegal. It really matters that this bill would codify actions of the NSA that were ruled to be outside the bounds of law. I think it also matters that the debate that is taking place is as old as civilization as there has always been a tension between security and freedom. And it really matters that historically those civilizations that have given up freedom in the interest of security have historically lost both. For all these reasons each one of us should care deeply about what happens next on bulk collections at the NSA—and the way this bill comes up short in protecting liberty's foundation, civil liberty.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, out of necessity to reauthorize the expiring intelligence gathering authorities, I reluctantly vote for H.R. 2048. A recent federal appeals court decision has increased our need to address these authorities. Unfortunately, their pending expiration is now forcing Congress to act hastily rather than take the necessary time to adequately analyze the court's decision and update the laws accordingly.

I recognize the distrust created by the Obama Administration's abuse of power, as well as the damage caused by recent intelligence leaks containing fragments, inaccuracies, and speculation. It is unfortunate that those actions will continue to make it more difficult to gather the information necessary to counter terrorism. It is even more alarming that this trend will inevitably make our country less safe.

Very few Americans will ever learn the full details of the considerable successes of the National Security Agency (NSA). But through the dedication and commitment of its men and women, the NSA has helped to keep our nation and its citizens safe. I remain confident in their professionalism as they strive to prevent future terrorist attacks and support our warfighters overseas.

I believe the first job of the federal government is to defend the country and protect our citizens within the framework of the Constitution, and I will continue to do all I can to contribute to that effort.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, tonight I must rise to voice my concerns with the USA Freedom Act. While I recognize the improvements this bill attempts to make with regard to mass surveillance and information gathering efforts, I simply cannot vote for this bill.

I was pleased to hear that the Second Circuit Court recently found metadata collection to be illegal and commend the bi-partisan work that resulted in a bill that attempts to adhere to the court's decision. I recognize that the USA Freedom Act includes positive changes such as tighter language dictating when the NSA can access a database of call records, new allowances that grant technology companies the right to disclose governmental inquiries to their users and increases penalties for people caught aiding in terrorist efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that other provisions in the bill would continue to allow for large swaths of information gathering. Simply put, I cannot vote for a bill that does not protect the privacy enshrined in the Fourth Amendment and guaranteed to all Americans. The risk of faulty information collection is not a risk I am willing to take with any American's privacy. Upholding the U.S. Constitution is non-negotiable.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD my strong support of H.R. 2048, the USA Freedom Act of 2015, which I am proud to cosponsor.

This bipartisan bill will go a long way to reign in the abusive bulk surveillance practices that have left many Americans concerned for their privacy protections.

Furthermore, this bill will establish additional civil liberty protections and increased transparency, accountability, and oversight for over our national security practices.

As a policymaker, I am proud to support legislation that will protect our values of privacy and civil liberties while also providing our national security officials with the targeted tools that they need to ensure the safety of all Americans.

This bill is also a testament to what we can accomplish when we come together to work in a bipartisan way to meet the needs of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2048.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have always been a staunch defender of privacy and civil liberties. I voted against the Patriot Act and its extension in 2008 and 2011 because I feared it gave the federal government too much unchecked power over the rights of law abiding citizens and lacked effective oversight tools for Congress. Clearly I was proven right. Thankfully, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ruled that the NSA's program to collect telephone records in bulk under Section 215 of the Patriot Act is illegal. This was a big win for privacy and civil liberties advocates, but it is not the end of the fight. Given this decision, it is clear that Congress must do more to rein in unconstitutional intrusion into our personal lives. Unfortunately, today's bill fell short of those reforms.

H.R. 2048 is an improvement from the weakened bill that passed the House last year. However, it falls short of shutting the door on unrestrained government surveillance. The bill does nothing to address ''backdoor'' searches of U.S. citizens under Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act. This statute is possibly of more concern than the telephone records collected under Section 215. While Section 702 expressly prohibits the government from intentionally targeting the communications of U.S. persons, the NSA has applied an incredibly loose interpretation of this statute and used it to justify collecting not only communications records of U.S. citizens, but also the contents of communications, including email, social media messages, or web browsing history.

While this bill attempts to address bulk data collection under Section 215 of the Patriot Act, the NSA has an unscrupulous tendency to find loopholes in statute and twist the intent of Congress to fulfill their own wishes. I fear that given our past experience, this bill will undermine the Second Circuit's decision and create new legal loopholes for the NSA and law enforcement agencies to collect even more data on millions of Americans.

It is possible to gain information on potential terrorist threats while still protecting the privacy and freedom of American citizens, complying with the Constitution, and preserving adequate congressional and judicial oversight. The original version of the USA Freedom Act, introduced in 2013, balanced these priorities. The bill we considered today did not. I urge the Senate to make the needed reforms to this bill so that it bolsters the Second Circuit's decision and accomplishes the goal of once and for all ending mass government surveillance of law-abiding Americans.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2048, the USA Freedom Act.

In the wake of last week's 2nd Circuit Court Decision, I want to commend Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, Congressman SENSENBRENNER, and Congressman NADLER, for crafting legislation that makes meaningful reforms to many NSA surveillance programs—including Section 215 of the Patriot Act—and is a departure from the untenable status quo. However, despite these positive reforms, this bill fails to address Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act, an even more invasive program than Section 215 which allows the government to collect both data and content of Americans without a warrant.

Last year's version of the USA Freedom Act similarly scaled back many of the surveillance programs the NSA currently has at its disposal. Unfortunately, Section 702 was not one of them. Throughout the process, we were repeatedly assured by Chairman GOODLATTE and Congressman SENSENBRENNER that there would be a real future effort to address Section 702. At that time, Rep. SENSENBRENNER stated, ''Section 702 of FISA has been improperly used to obtain the content of Americans' private communications without a warrant, which is unconstitutional under the Fourth Amendment and a blatant violation of Americans' civil liberties.''

Like Rep. SENSENBRENNER, I have also consistently said that Section 702 opened the door to some of the most troublesome surveillance practices that have come to light in recent years. Last year, I strongly supported the effort to fix those aspects of Section 702. Unfortunately, as I indicated last year, last minute changes stripped out provisions that would have ''prevented the NSA from being able to search government databases for foreign communications content of American citizens without a warrant.'' When those important provisions were removed, Chairman GOODLATTE and Rep. SENSENBRENNER pledged that we would address these reforms without delay.

Unfortunately, here we are a year later and Chairman GOODLATTE and Rep. SENSENBRENNER still have not allowed for a full debate and vote on this issue. Despite the Chairman's supposed support to end Section 702, when Congresswoman LOFGREN offered an amendment during markup of the USA Freedom Act to prohibit these warrantless backdoor searches, Chairman GOODLATTE said, ''this is a poison pill amendment . . ., there is a time and a place for everything.'' When this bill came before the Rules Committee, Rep. LOFGREN was not even allowed to offer her amendment.

The refusal to include reforms to Section 702 is even more disappointing given that there are many important provisions in this bill that provide additional safeguards to protect the privacy and civil liberties of Americans. Specifically, this bill puts significant constraints on the government's ability to collect data under Section 215. No longer will the NSA be able to collect the phone records of millions of Americans who have no connection to crime or terrorism. Instead, every request made by the NSA for specific call records must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the FISA court.

This legislation also carefully constructs the definition of the ''specific selection terms'' the government can use to access call records. H.R. 2048 requires the ''specific selection term'' to be an ''individual, account, or personal device.'' As a result, no longer will the NSA be able to collect phone records in bulk using terms like ''People in Maryland'' and ''Area Code 301.''

Despite these improvements to Section 215, I remain disappointed that the bill does not establish a Citizens Advocate to represent citizens' privacy interests at the secret FISA Court proceedings. In 2013, Representative JIM JORDAN and I introduced bipartisan legislation to create such a position. The initial draft of last year's USA Freedom Act included this provision, but this language has since been weakened and only provides for a panel of advisors to be employed at the discretion of the FISC.

Last month's decision by the Second Circuit in ACLU v. Clapper, makes clear that Section 215 is illegal and that a clean re-authorization would be a clear violation of the law. So while I appreciate the reforms made in this bill to Section 215, these reforms are modest given the Court's recent decision. On the other hand, Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act does not sunset until the end of 2017 and there is no clear indication that we will be voting to curtail this program anytime in the near future. I believe that today's legislation could be our last real opportunity to address this. It is my hope that the companion legislation in the Senate includes these provisions and that I will be able to support a final compromise bill later this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 255, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO YEMEN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–36)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012, with respect to Yemen is to continue in effect beyond May 16, 2015.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Yemen and others continue to threaten Yemen's peace, security, and stability, including by obstructing the implementation of the agreement of November 23, 2011, between the Government of Yemen and those in opposition to it, which provided for a peaceful transition of power that meets the legitimate demands and aspirations of the Yemeni people for change, and by obstructing the political process in Yemen. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13611 with respect to Yemen.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 13, 2015.*

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 255, I call up the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 255, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 114–111 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 36

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ENACTMENT.

Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) Pain receptors (nociceptors) are present throughout the unborn child's entire body and nerves link these receptors to the brain's thalamus and subcortical plate by no later than 20 weeks after fertilization.

(2) By 8 weeks after fertilization, the unborn child reacts to touch. After 20 weeks, the unborn child reacts to stimuli that would be recognized as painful if applied to an adult human, for example, by recoiling.

(3) In the unborn child, application of such painful stimuli is associated with significant increases in stress hormones known as the stress response.

(4) Subjection to such painful stimuli is associated with long-term harmful neurodevelopmental effects, such as altered pain sensitivity and, possibly, emotional, behavioral, and learning disabilities later in life.

(5) For the purposes of surgery on unborn children, fetal anesthesia is routinely administered and is associated with a decrease in stress hormones compared to their level when painful stimuli are applied without such anesthesia. In the United States, surgery of this type is being performed by 20 weeks after fertilization and earlier in specialized units affiliated with children's hospitals.

(6) The position, asserted by some physicians, that the unborn child is incapable of experiencing pain until a point later in pregnancy than 20 weeks after fertilization predominately rests on the assumption that the ability to experience pain depends on the cerebral cortex and requires nerve connections between the thalamus and the cortex. However, recent medical research and analysis, especially since 2007, provides strong evidence for the conclusion that a functioning cortex is not necessary to experience pain.

(7) Substantial evidence indicates that children born missing the bulk of the cerebral cortex, those with hydranencephaly, nevertheless experience pain.

(8) In adult humans and in animals, stimulation or ablation of the cerebral cortex does not alter pain perception, while stimulation or ablation of the thalamus does.

(9) Substantial evidence indicates that structures used for pain processing in early development differ from those of adults, using different neural elements available at specific times during development, such as the subcortical plate, to fulfill the role of pain processing.

(10) The position, asserted by some commentators, that the unborn child remains in a coma-like sleep state that precludes the unborn child experiencing pain is inconsistent with the documented reaction of unborn children to painful stimuli and with the experience of fetal surgeons who have found it necessary to sedate the unborn child with anesthesia to prevent the unborn child from engaging in vigorous movement in reaction to invasive surgery.

(11) Consequently, there is substantial medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain at least by 20 weeks after fertilization, if not earlier.

(12) It is the purpose of the Congress to assert a compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain.

(13) The compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain is intended to be separate from and independent of the compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage of viability, and neither governmental interest is intended to replace the other.

(14) Congress has authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Supreme Court's Commerce Clause precedents and under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

SEC. 3. PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

''SEC. 1532. PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION.

''(a) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be unlawful for any person to perform an abortion or attempt to do so, unless in conformity with the requirements set forth in subsection (b).

''(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ABORTIONS.—

''(1) ASSESSMENT OF THE AGE OF THE UNBORN CHILD.—The physician performing or attempting the abortion shall first make a determination of the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child or reasonably rely upon such a determination made by another physician. In making such a determination, the physician shall make such inquiries of the pregnant woman and perform or cause to be performed such medical examinations and tests as a reasonably prudent physician, knowledgeable about the case and the medical conditions involved, would consider necessary to make an accurate determination of post-fertilization age.

''(2) PROHIBITION ON PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN ABORTIONS.—

''(A) GENERALLY FOR UNBORN CHILDREN 20 WEEKS OR OLDER.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the abortion shall not be performed or attempted, if the probable post-fertilization age, as determined under paragraph (1), of the unborn child is 20 weeks or greater.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply if—

''(i) in reasonable medical judgment, the abortion is necessary to save the life of a pregnant woman whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, but not including psychological or emotional conditions;

''(ii) the pregnancy is the result of rape against an adult woman, and at least 48 hours prior to the abortion—

''(I) she has obtained counseling for the rape; or

''(II) she has obtained medical treatment for the rape or an injury related to the rape; or

''(iii) the pregnancy is a result of rape against a minor or incest against a minor, and the rape or incest has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to either—

''(I) a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse; or

''(II) a law enforcement agency.

''(C) REQUIREMENT AS TO MANNER OF PROCEDURE PERFORMED.—Notwithstanding the definitions of 'abortion' and 'attempt an abortion' in this section, a physician terminating or attempting to terminate a pregnancy under an exception provided by subparagraph

(B) may do so only in the manner which, in reasonable medical judgment, provides the best opportunity for the unborn child to survive.

''(D) REQUIREMENT THAT A PHYSICIAN TRAINED IN NEONATAL RESUSCITATION BE PRESENT.—If, in reasonable medical judgment, the pain-capable unborn child has the potential to survive outside the womb, the physician who performs or attempts an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) shall ensure a second physician trained in neonatal resuscitation is present and prepared to provide care to the child consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (E).

''(E) CHILDREN BORN ALIVE AFTER ATTEMPTED ABORTIONS.—When a physician performs or attempts an abortion in accordance with this section, and the child is born alive, as defined in section 8 of title 1 (commonly known as the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002), the following shall apply:

''(i) DEGREE OF CARE REQUIRED.—Any health care practitioner present at the time shall humanely exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to a child born alive at the same gestational age in the course of a natural birth.

''(ii) IMMEDIATE ADMISSION TO A HOSPITAL.—Following the care required to be rendered under clause (i), the child born alive shall be immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

''(iii) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician's office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a failure to comply with the requirements of this subparagraph must immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency or both.

''(F) DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) DOCUMENTATION PERTAINING TO ADULTS.—A physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B)(ii) shall, prior to the abortion, place in the patient medical file documentation from a hospital licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, a medical clinic licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, from a personal physician licensed by the State, a counselor licensed by the State, or a victim's rights advocate provided by a law enforcement agency that the adult woman seeking the abortion obtained medical treatment or counseling for the rape or an injury related to the rape.

''(ii) DOCUMENTATION PERTAINING TO MINORS.—A physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B)(iii) shall, prior to the abortion, place in the patient medical file documentation from a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse that the rape or incest was reported prior to the abortion; or, as an alternative, documentation from a law enforcement agency that the rape or incest was reported prior to the abortion.

''(G) INFORMED CONSENT.—

''(i) CONSENT FORM REQUIRED.—The physician who intends to perform or attempt to perform an abortion under the provisions of subparagraph (B) may not perform any part of the abortion procedure without first obtaining a signed Informed Consent Authorization form in accordance with this subparagraph.

''(ii) CONTENT OF CONSENT FORM.—The Informed Consent Authorization form shall be presented in person by the physician and shall consist of—

''(I) a statement by the physician indicating the probable post-fertilization age of the pain-capable unborn child;

''(II) a statement that Federal law allows abortion after 20 weeks fetal age only if the mother's life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, when the pregnancy was the result of rape, or an act of incest against a minor;

''(III) a statement that the abortion must be performed by the method most likely to allow the child to be born alive unless this would cause significant risk to the mother;

''(IV) a statement that in any case in which an abortion procedure results in a child born alive, Federal law requires that child to be given every form of medical assistance that is provided to children spontaneously born prematurely, including transportation and admittance to a hospital;

''(V) a statement that these requirements are binding upon the physician and all other medical personnel who are subject to criminal and civil penalties and that a woman on whom an abortion has been performed may take civil action if these requirements are not followed; and

''(VI) affirmation that each signer has filled out the informed consent form to the best of their knowledge and understands the information contained in the form.

''(iii) SIGNATORIES REQUIRED.—The Informed Consent Authorization form shall be signed in person by the woman seeking the abortion, the physician performing or attempting to perform the abortion, and a witness.

''(iv) RETENTION OF CONSENT FORM.—The physician performing or attempting to perform an abortion must retain the signed informed consent form in the patient's medical file.

''(H) REQUIREMENT FOR DATA RETENTION.—Paragraph (j)(2) of section 164.530 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, shall apply to documentation required to be placed in a patient's medical file pursuant to subparagraph (F) of subsection (b)(2) and a consent form required to be retained in a patient's medical file pursuant to subparagraph (G) of such subsection in the same manner and to the same extent as such paragraph applies to documentation required by paragraph (j)(1) of such section.

''(I) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN CASES OF RISK OF DEATH OR MAJOR INJURY TO THE MOTHER.—Subparagraphs (C), (D), and (G) shall not apply if, in reasonable medical judgment, compliance with such paragraphs would pose a greater risk of—

''(I) the death of the pregnant woman; or

''(II) the substantial and irreversible physical impairment of a major bodily function, not including psychological or emotional conditions, of the pregnant woman.

''(ii) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.—Notwithstanding the definitions of the terms 'medical treatment' and 'counseling' in subsection (g), the counseling or medical treatment described in subparagraph (B)(ii) may not be provided by a facility that performs abortions (unless that facility is a hospital).

''(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION IN CASES OF REPORTS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—The requirements of subparagraph (B)(ii) do not apply if the rape has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to a law enforcement agency or Department of Defense victim assistance personnel.

''(iv) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN STATE LAWS.—

''(I) STATE LAWS REGARDING REPORTING OF RAPE AND INCEST.—The physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) shall comply with such applicable State laws that are in effect as the State's Attorney General may designate, regarding reporting requirements in cases of rape or incest.

''(II) STATE LAWS REGARDING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT.—The physician who intends to perform an abortion on a minor under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) shall comply with any applicable State laws requiring parental involvement in a minor's decision to have an abortion.

''(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

''(d) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—A woman upon whom an abortion in violation of subsection (a) is performed or attempted may not be prosecuted under, or for a conspiracy to violate, subsection (a), or for an offense under section 2, 3, or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

''(e) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

''(1) CIVIL ACTION BY A WOMAN ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—A woman upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted in violation of any provision of this section may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

''(2) CIVIL ACTION BY A PARENT OF A MINOR ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—A parent of a minor upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted under an exception provided for in subsection (b)(2)(B), and that was performed in violation of any provision of this section may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation obtain appropriate relief, unless the pregnancy resulted from the plaintiff's criminal conduct.

''(3) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

''(A) objectively verifiable money damages for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation;

''(B) statutory damages equal to three times the cost of the abortion; and

''(C) punitive damages.

''(4) ATTORNEYS FEES FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

''(5) ATTORNEYS FEES FOR DEFENDANT.—If a defendant in a civil action under this subsection prevails and the court finds that the plaintiff's suit was frivolous, the court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee in favor of the defendant against the plaintiff.

''(6) AWARDS AGAINST WOMAN.—Except under paragraph (5), in a civil action under this subsection, no damages, attorney's fee or other monetary relief may be assessed against the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted.

''(f) DATA COLLECTION.—

''(1) DATA SUBMISSIONS.—Any physician who performs or attempts an abortion described in subsection (b)(2)(B) shall annually submit a summary of all such abortions to the National Center for Health Statistics (hereinafter referred to as the 'Center') not later than 60 days after the end of the calendar year in which the abortion was performed or attempted.

''(2) CONTENTS OF SUMMARY.—The summary shall include the number of abortions performed or attempted on an unborn child who had a post-fertilization age of 20 weeks or more and specify the following for each abortion under subsection (b)(2)(B):

''(A) the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child;

''(B) the method used to carry out the abortion;

''(C) the location where the abortion was conducted;

''(D) the exception under subsection (b)(2)(B) under which the abortion was conducted; and

''(E) any incident of live birth resulting from the abortion.

''(3) EXCLUSIONS FROM DATA SUBMISSIONS.—A summary required under this subsection shall not contain any information identifying the woman whose pregnancy was terminated and shall be submitted consistent with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1320d-2 note).

''(4) PUBLIC REPORT.—The Center shall annually issue a public report providing statistics by State for the previous year compiled from all of the summaries made to the Center under this subsection. The Center shall take care to ensure that none of the information included in the public reports could reasonably lead to the identification of any pregnant woman upon whom an abortion was performed or attempted. The annual report shall be issued by July 1 of the calendar year following the year in which the abortions were performed or attempted.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

''(1) ABORTION.—The term 'abortion' means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

''(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

''(B) to intentionally terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than—

''(i) after viability to produce a live birth and preserve the life and health of the child born alive; or

''(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

''(2) ATTEMPT.—The term 'attempt', with respect to an abortion, means conduct that, under the circumstances as the actor believes them to be, constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in performing an abortion.

''(3) COUNSELING.—The term 'counseling' means counseling provided by a counselor licensed by the State, or a victims rights advocate provided by a law enforcement agency.

''(4) FACILITY.—The term 'facility' means any medical or counseling group, center or clinic and includes the entire legal entity, including any entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such facility.

''(5) FERTILIZATION.—The term 'fertilization' means the fusion of human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

''(6) MEDICAL TREATMENT.—The term 'medical treatment' means treatment provided at a hospital licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, at a medical clinic licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, or from a personal physician licensed by the State.

''(7) MINOR.—The term 'minor' means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

''(8) PERFORM.—The term 'perform', with respect to an abortion, includes inducing an abortion through a medical or chemical intervention including writing a prescription for a drug or device intended to result in an abortion.

''(9) PHYSICIAN.—The term 'physician' means a person licensed to practice medicine and surgery or osteopathic medicine and surgery, or otherwise legally authorized to perform an abortion.

''(10) POST-FERTILIZATION AGE.—The term 'post-fertilization age' means the age of the unborn child as calculated from the fusion of a human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

''(11) PROBABLE POST-FERTILIZATION AGE OF THE UNBORN CHILD.—The term 'probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child' means what, in reasonable medical judgment, will with reasonable probability be the post-fertilization age of the unborn child at the time the abortion is planned to be performed or induced.

''(12) REASONABLE MEDICAL JUDGMENT.—The term 'reasonable medical judgment' means a medical judgment that would be made by a reasonably prudent physician, knowledgeable about the case and the treatment possibilities with respect to the medical conditions involved.

''(13) UNBORN CHILD.—The term 'unborn child' means an individual organism of the species homo sapiens, beginning at fertilization, until the point of being born alive as defined in section 8(b) of title 1.

''(14) WOMAN.—The term 'woman' means a female human being whether or not she has reached the age of majority.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1532. Pain-capable unborn child protection.''.

(c) CHAPTER HEADING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER HEADING IN CHAPTER.—The chapter heading for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''**Partial-Birth Abortions**'' and inserting ''**Abortions**''

(2) TABLE OF CHAPTERS FOR PART I.—The item relating to chapter 74 in the table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Partial-Birth Abortions'' and inserting ''Abortions''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 36, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Since the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade, medical knowledge regarding the development of unborn babies and their capacities at various stages of growth has advanced dramatically.

To give you a sense of how much technology has advanced, here is the issue of The New York Times announcing the Roe v. Wade decision in 1973. It contains ads for the latest in advanced technology, including a computer the size of a file cabinet you could rent for $3,000 a month that only had one-thousandths the memory of a modern cell phone and a basic AM radio that was as big as your hand.

Thirty-five years later, in the age of ultrasound pictures, the same newspaper would report on the latest advanced research on the pain experienced by unborn children, focusing on the research of Dr. Sunny Anand, an Oxford-trained neonatal pediatrician who held an appointment at Harvard Medical School.

As Dr. Anand has testified regarding abortions: ''If the fetus is beyond 20 weeks of gestation, I would assume that there will be pain caused to the fetus, and I believe it will be severe and excruciating pain.''

A few years later, the terrifying facts uncovered in the grand jury report regarding the prosecution of late-term abortionist Kermit Gosnell would contain references to a neonatal expert who said the cutting of babies' spinal cords intended to be late-term aborted would cause them ''a tremendous amount of pain.''

Congress has the power and the responsibility to acknowledge these developments in our understanding of the ability of unborn children to feel pain by prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, postfertilization, the point at which scientific evidence shows the unborn can experience great suffering.

The bill before us would do just that. It also includes provisions to protect the life of the mother and additional exceptions for cases of rape and incest.

Some Members, last Congress and today, have called this bill extreme; but such claims are clearly false, as evidenced by the polls, which show astounding support for this bill.

A Quinnipiac poll found that 62 percent of people surveyed supported a ban on abortions after 20 weeks or earlier. A clear majority of men, women, Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, married people, and single people support a ban on abortion after 20 weeks or earlier.

Among women, 68 percent of women support a ban on abortion at 20 weeks or earlier, including 66 percent of single women and 71 percent of married women. Even 49 percent of the Democrats polled support a ban on abortion at 20 weeks or earlier, significantly more than those who opposed it.

A Washington Post poll similarly found 66 percent support for this bill, and a Huffington Post poll found support at 59 percent.

Today, America is one of the few countries on Earth, including North

Korea and China, that allows permissive late-term abortions. These polls show the American people want to change that.

Today is the second anniversary of Kermit Gosnell's conviction for first degree murder. Following the Gosnell trial, we were all reminded that when late-term babies are taken from the womb and cut with scissors, they whimper and cry and flinch from pain. Unborn babies, when cut inside the womb, also whimper and cry and flinch from pain.

Delivered or not, babies are babies, and they can feel pain at least by 20 weeks. It is time to welcome young children who can feel pain into the human family, and this bill, at last, will do just that.

Finally, I would note that it is rare for the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office to be so confident that a bill would save lives that it makes an estimate as to the number of lives that would be saved were the bill to be enacted; but the CBO did just that, conservatively estimating that this bill, if enacted, would save 2,500 lives each year. It could save many thousands more.

Let that sink in for a moment. This bill, if enacted, would probably save, at a minimum, thousands of lives per year. It would give America the gift of thousands more children and, consequently, thousands more mothers and thousands more fathers, with all the wondrous human gifts they will bring to the world in so many amazing forms, including their own children, for generations to come.

I congratulate Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice Chairman TRENT FRANKS for introducing this vital legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this legislation is a dangerous and far-reaching attack on a woman's constitutional right to choose whether or not to terminate a pregnancy, a right that the Supreme Court guaranteed 42 years ago in the case of Roe v. Wade.

One of the most significant problems with this legislation is that it fails to include any exception for a woman's health. Many serious health conditions materialize or worsen late in pregnancy, including damage to the heart and kidneys, hypertension, and even some forms of hormone-induced cancer; yet, by failing to include a health exception, H.R. 36 would force a woman to wait until her condition was nearly terminal before she could obtain an abortion to address her health condition.

In addition, H.R. 36 is unconstitutional based on longstanding Supreme Court precedent. I will explain. Roe v. Wade's basic holding is that a woman has a constitutional right to have an abortion prior to the fetus' viability. Viability is generally considered to be around 24 weeks from fertilization, not 20 weeks. By banning previability abortions, H.R. 36 is a direct challenge to Roe v. Wade.

In addition, Roe made clear that any regulation on abortion, even after viability, must not pose a substantial risk to the woman's health; but, as I have already noted, H.R. 36 lacks any exception to protect a pregnant woman's health. It is, therefore, not surprising that the Nation's leading civil rights organizations, medical professionals, and women's groups oppose this bill.

In addition, 15 religious organizations noted in a letter to Members of Congress opposing nearly identical legislation in the last Congress that ''the decision to end a pregnancy is best left to a woman in consultation with her family, her doctor, and her faith.''

Finally, I want to be clear that, contrary to assertions made by the bill's proponents, this legislation still contains a woefully inadequate exception for victims of rape. The so-called rape exception is still based on a complete lack of understanding of the very real challenges rape survivors face and why a rape may go unreported.

It is also grounded in the distrust of women, assuming that women cannot be trusted to tell the truth or to make the best medical decisions for themselves and their families.

For adult rape survivors, the bill no longer requires that the rape be reported to law enforcement. However, a woman must still obtain counseling 48 hours prior to the abortion, and the fact that she has obtained counseling for a rape must be certified and documented in her medical file. This counseling cannot be obtained in the same facility where the abortion is provided.

For minor victims of rape or incest, an exception from the bill's onerous and unconstitutional restrictions only applies if the rape has been reported to law enforcement or ''a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse,'' so rape is not rape unless the minor has reported it, even if that means putting her own safety at risk.

For these reasons, my colleagues, I urge opposition to this dangerous legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) be permitted to control the remainder of the time as my designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, when I became a nurse more than 40 years ago, I took a vow to ''devote myself to the welfare of those committed to my care,'' but our understanding of the science limited to the extent to which I could fulfill that promise has evolved.

During my first years of nursing, if a woman came into our hospital in labor at 32 weeks of pregnancy, our odds of saving her child were slim. However, today, babies are being saved as early as 22 weeks into fetal development, according to a study that was just released this past week by The New York Times. What's more, there is significant evidence that, at 20 weeks of development, unborn children have the capacity to feel pain.

Sadly, while we celebrate advances in technology that prove life has value and worth before leaving the hospital, we also continue to be one of only seven nations that allow elective, late-term abortions—one of only seven nations around this world.

It is difficult to imagine a more important measure of society than how it treats the most innocent and defenseless population. By condoning the destruction of unborn life that could otherwise live outside the womb, the United States tragically fails to meet this most fundamental human rights standard.

Basic decency and human compassion demand that something has to change. Polls consistently show that upwards of 60 percent of Americans support putting an end to the dangerous and inhumane practice of late-term abortions. To be clear, we have a mandate to act.

That is why I strongly support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act this week, which will provide Federal protection for an unborn child at 20 weeks, with exceptions to saving the life of the mother or in cases of rape and incest.

Today's vote coincides with the 2-year anniversary of the conviction of the evil abortionist, Kermit Gosnell, who killed babies born alive in his clinic and who is responsible for the death of an adult woman. Americans were rightfully outraged when they were told of his crimes.

The truth is that innocent, unborn children routinely suffer that same fate as Gosnell's victims did through ''normal'' late-term abortions and the government does not bat an eye. The only difference between these casualties and the loss of life that resulted in Gosnell's murder conviction is the location.

Madam Speaker, if we cannot appeal to my pro-abortion lawmakers' sense of compassion when it comes to this issue, then surely we can at least appeal to their senses of logic and fact.

Knowing that premature babies are being saved as early as 22 weeks into

fetal development, there is no legitimate reason to oppose this bill. In the year 2015, the United States has no business aborting a life that can live outside the womb. Science agrees and so do the majority of Americans.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will right this wrong.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I appreciate the good feelings and earnest arguments made by the gentlewoman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Arizona, but the fact is this bill is patently unconstitutional because this bill is not about viability; it is a subterfuge for viability and talks about the issue of pain. Pain is not the issue; viability is the issue.

What the real issue is, politicians are not medical experts, and women should make these decisions based upon information from people they trust. Women should make these decisions based upon information from people they trust.

The information given about this bill is limited, and the fact is Dr. Anand, who was cited by my friend, the chairman of the committee, is from the University of Tennessee in Memphis, where I am from.

The fact is Dr. Anand, if he had gone further, since 2005, has turned down requests to testify in regard to this type of legislation because he doesn't think that his studies have been used properly. Abortion is not the focus, and the politicization of his work has gotten completely out of hand.

The fact is there are polls that say one thing and polls that say another. The poll that I respect most shows it to be about an even one-third split on support, opposition, and indecision.

This isn't about polls; this is supposed to be about the Constitution and upholding Roe v. Wade and medical experts and not politicians making decisions that are poll-driven and possibly favorable to their own constituencies.

The exceptions for incest are the most egregious. If a woman is pregnant because of incest, under this law, if the lady is under 18 years of age, there is one rule; but, if she is 18 years of age or older, there is another rule.

What it says is, if you are 18 or over and you are pregnant as a result of incest, then you cannot get an abortion—you cannot—but, if you are under 18, you can if you report it to the law enforcement authorities.

In the discussion last night at Rules Committee, the vice chair of Rules Committee errantly compared rape and incest. Incest does not necessarily involve rape. It involves intercourse between parties that are not legally supposed to have intercourse and issues which could result in problems for the child.

Incest should always be an exception, and the life and health of the mother should always be an exception, and the health exceptions are limited to physical and not mental and emotional, which are the most pressing for women. There is also a 48-hour waiting period in this bill.

This bill is unconstitutional and wrong. We should respect medical experts and not politicians and women to make decisions with people they trust.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding and for her leadership and for all of the people that have worked so hard to bring this important bill to the House floor.

If you look at what we are doing here today, we are standing up for life of our most innocent. We are talking about babies that are more than 20 weeks in the womb. Scientific evidence shows that after 20 weeks, these babies can feel pain, and so this bill prohibits abortions after 5 months of pregnancy.

I am proud to come from Louisiana, which has the distinction of being the most pro-life State in the Nation. Our State already bans this procedure, as do many.

It is not just States we are talking about. Most nations in the world don't allow this procedure after 20 weeks. The United States will finally be joining the vast majority of other countries around the world and the vast majority of Americans who understand that it is not right to have abortions after 20 weeks.

This is an important bill. I think it is a very strong message that we are going to be sending in defense of life by passing it. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

□ 1545

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 36.

For more than 40 years, the Supreme Court has clearly and consistently held that women have the constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy prior to viability or at any time to protect the life and health of the mother. This bill is unconstitutional as it violates both of those provisions.

The bill provides a narrow exemption to protect women's lives, allowing physicians to terminate pregnancy after 20 weeks only if a woman's life is at imminent risk. This exemption fails to account for the many severe health issues that may arise late in pregnancy and forces physicians to think about legal implications rather than about a patient's health.

Perhaps most cruelly, this legislation includes only a very narrow exemption for victims of rape and incest, requiring that any woman seeking an abortion after 20 weeks prove that she either reported the rape to the authorities or sought counseling services. The unfortunate reality is only 35 percent of sexual assaults are ever reported, and we know that there are many reasons for not reporting a rape: the toll our criminal justice system takes on victims, the humiliation and intimidation faced by victims of assault, and even the additional risk to their personal safety.

So why place this limit on the rape exception? What does this narrow exemption say about our Republican colleagues' view of women? It is quite simple. This bill says they believe women lie. The Republicans seem to think that women are too dishonest to believe when they say they have been raped.

This bill continues a too long tradition of treating women like second class citizens. Measures introduced at the State and Federal level to restrict abortions imply that women lie about rape, that women are misinformed about their own pregnancies and must undergo invasive tests and exams, and that women are immoral for ever making the choice to terminate a pregnancy no matter what the circumstance. That is insulting. It is, frankly, none of our business.

Enough is enough. Doctors, not politicians, should be providing women guidance, support, and medical advice throughout their pregnancy, and particularly when making a deeply personal decision to terminate a pregnancy. And women, not politicians, should make that decision for themselves.

We must defeat this unconstitutional bill and continue to afford women their constitutional right enjoyed by every man, without question, to make decisions about their health care in the privacy of their doctors' offices. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this terrible bill.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, it is my honor now to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), who is the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, for the sake of all of those who founded this Nation and dreamed of what America could someday be, and for the sake of all of those who died in darkness so Americans could walk in the light of freedom, it is so very important that those of us who are privileged to be Members of this

Congress pause from time to time and remind ourselves of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation, said:

> The care of human life and its happiness, and not its destruction, is the chief and only object of good government.

The phrase of the Fifth Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says no person shall ''be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.''

And the 14th Amendment says that no State shall ''deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.''

Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights, especially those that can't defend themselves, is why we are all here. Yet today, Madam Speaker, a great shadow looms over America. More than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia and without any Federal protection of any kind in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

It is the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States today, and almost every other civilized nation on Earth protects pain-capable unborn babies, at this age particularly. And every credible poll of Americans shows the American people are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting them, yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.

Madam Speaker, it just seems that we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the crimes of a past generation, but we often become so staggeringly blind when it comes to facing and rejecting the worst of atrocities in our own time.

Thankfully, Madam Speaker, I believe the winds of change are now beginning to blow and that this tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America because today—today—we are poised to pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber. And no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions or deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisting of the words, changing of subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, it remains that this bill is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at the sixth month, at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand. Ultimately, it is one that all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Madam Speaker, this is a vote all of us will remember the rest of our lives. It will be considered in the annals of history and, I believe, in the counsels of eternity, itself.

But it shouldn't be such a hard vote because, in spite of all of the political noise, protecting little unborn, pain-capable babies is not a Republican issue, and it is not a Democrat issue. It is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family.

It is time that we open our eyes and let our consciences catch up with our technology. It is time for the Members of the United States Congress to open our eyes and our souls and remember that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are all here. That is why we are here.

Madam Speaker, it is time for all Americans to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little pain-capable unborn children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36, a nationwide 20-week abortion ban.

It is truly appalling to me that House leaders keep ignoring the needs of middle class families while taking up bill after bill restricting women's access to health care—and during National Women's Health Week, no less.

The legislation we are debating today is an unconscionable attack that ignores medical safety and puts women's health at risk. It creates unnecessary burdens to care for sexual assault survivors, who are already facing extraordinarily difficult circumstances, and it injects ideology into the doctor-patient relationship. It puts politicians, rather than women, in charge of their medical care.

Madam Speaker, House leaders need to stop interfering in what is a deeply personal medical decision. The American people expect better from this Chamber, and they deserve real solutions to the challenges they are facing. This bill fails women and their families, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, it is now my delight to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge the whole House to support H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

H.R. 36 is the most pro-life legislation to ever come before this body, and it reflects the will of the American people. As such, it also reflects the contributions of many people and many perspectives.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor. I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), our Conference chair, for her leadership in helping us shepherd this bill to the floor.

I want to take a moment to recognize all of the Americans who spoke out for this bill. Their voices have been heard. After all, they have no higher obligation than to speak out for those who can't speak for themselves, to defend the defenseless. That is what this bill does.

We know that by 5 months in the womb, unborn babies are capable of feeling pain, and it is morally wrong to inflict pain on an innocent human being. Protecting these lives is the right thing to do. Again, a majority of Americans agree.

Madam Speaker, growing up with 11 brothers and sisters, I didn't need my parents to tell me that every child is a gift from God. But let me tell you, they did, and they did it often because that respect, that sanctity, and that dignity is everything.

A vote for this bill is a vote to protect innocent lives and to protect our dearest values for generations to come. We should all be proud to take this stance today, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill today.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I have had more than a momentous time to be in this body.

I was moved by the conviction of my friend and colleague and the Speaker, Mr. FRANKS and Mr. BOEHNER, because I know that they speak from their hearts.

But faith cannot be distributed on one side of the aisle. My faith, my God is no less than the Republicans'.

I speak for those who cannot be here today. I speak for mothers who suffer in corners, trying to provide for their children, but love their children and gave birth to them. I speak for those whom I sat in a room called the Judiciary Committee some years ago and listened to the pain of mothers who said: I want this child, but my doctor has advised me that my life would not have survived to take care of my other children had I not had the ability to be able to follow my doctor and my faith, praying with my husband, my faith leader, my extended family to make the decisions that would, in fact, provide for not only future children, but for my sanctity and ability to be the woman that I need to be.

Just outside this Chamber, I met the author of the song ''Glory.'' Many of us

heard it in the movie ''Selma.'' In the opening line, it says: ''One day when the glory comes, it will be ours. It will be ours.''

Everybody's glory is different. But H.R. 36—besides being unconstitutional—speaks against 25,000 women in the United States who became pregnant as a result of rape. Madam Speaker, 30 percent of rapes involve women under 18. It speaks against those women because it requires a woman rape victim to report her ordeal before she can terminate a pregnancy, to go to a law enforcement officer.

It challenges their faith and their love of God. I am incensed that we challenge someone's faith. I speak for those women who cannot be here today, who love children, who love life, who are good mothers. And I take no less in the conviction of those who have spoken for my conviction and the conviction of those women.

Tiffany Campbell, when she was 19 weeks pregnant, Tiffany and her husband, Chris, learned her pregnancy was afflicted with a severe case of twin-to-twin transfusion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

□ 1600

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Twin-to-twin transfusion syndrome is a condition where the two fetuses unequally share blood circulation. The news was devastating, but they had to make a decision that was guided by the doctor and their faith. The Campbells were told that without selective termination, they risked the loss of both fetuses. They would not have any. At 22 weeks, in consultation with their doctors—and I know their faith—they made the difficult decision to abort one fetus in order to save the other. Today the lifesaving procedure for one of the fetuses would be illegal under the new 20-week ban.

Madam Speaker, I beg of my colleagues. I know there will be those who will vote, but as I stand here today, I do not condemn the conviction of my friends. But right now I am welled up with tears because I have hugged those who had nowhere else to go. And no man can stand and tell a woman what rape is and how it feels and what the results of that is. That is why the Constitution in the Ninth Amendment and the Supreme Court interpreted Roe v. Wade as it did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman. I will come to a close. But I am welled with emotion, not for killing, but for saving; not for condemnation, but for appreciation; not for judging, but for letting people know that I have constituents who are huddled in places right now in Houston, Texas, in fear, huddled because laws have prevented them from good counseling, counseling before such tragedy would happen, laws that have prevented them from having facilities in their area. They fall victim to shysters because of laws that we pass here.

I cannot see that anymore, and H.R. 36 now makes it a Federal offense and offends doctors and people of faith. So I close by simply saying that I love that song ''Glory.'' It says: ''One day when the glory comes, it will be ours. It will be ours.''

But glory has to be tolerance and acceptance of people's condition. Prayerfully we must do the right thing in this Congress and vote against H.R. 36.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the ''Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.''

I opposed this irresponsible and reckless legislation the last time it was brought to the floor under a suspension of the rules and fell well short of the two thirds majority needed to pass.

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary, puts the lives of women at risk, interferes with women's constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, and diverts our attention from the real problems facing American people.

A more accurate short title for this bill would be the ''Violating the Rights of Women Act of 2015.''

Instead of resuming their annual War on Women, our colleagues across the aisle should be working with Democrats to build upon the ''Middle-Class Economics'' championed by the Obama Administration that have succeeded in ending the economic meltdown it inherited in 2009 and revived the economy to the point where today we have the highest rate of growth and lowest rate of unemployment since the boom years of the Clinton Administration.

Madam Speaker, we could and should instead be voting to raise the minimum wage to at least $10.10 per hour so that people who work hard and play by the rules do not have to raise their families in poverty.

Instead of voting to abridge the constitutional rights of women for the umpteenth time, we should bring to the floor for a first vote comprehensive immigration reform legislation or legislations repairing the harm to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by the Supreme Court's decision in Shelby County v. Holder.

The one thing we should not be doing is debating irresponsible ''messaging bills'' that abridge the rights of women and have absolutely no chance of overriding a presidential veto.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 36 seeks to take the misguided and mean-spirited policy that in 2013 was directed at the District of Columbia and make it the law of the land.

In so doing, the bill poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in Roe v. Wade.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances.

It is these women who receive the 1.5 percent of abortions that occur after 20 weeks.

Women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival.

Because of Vikki's diabetic, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion.

Because Vikki was able to terminate the pregnancy, she was protected from the immediate and serious medical risks to her health and her ability to have children in the future was preserved.

Madam Speaker, every pregnancy is different.

No politician knows, or has the right to assume what is best for a woman and her family.

These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, their God,

Madam Speaker, I also strongly oppose H.R. 36 because it lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

In Roe v. Wade, the Court held that a state could prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability.

While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

By prohibiting nearly all abortions beginning at ''the probable post-fertilization age'' of 20 weeks, H.R. 36 violates this clear and long standing constitutional rule.

Madam Speaker, the constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

I strongly oppose H.R. 36 and urge all members to join me in voting against this unwise measure that put the lives and health of women at risk.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of life. Life begins at conception. We know that after 3 weeks, the baby has a heartbeat. After 7 weeks, the baby begins kicking in the womb. Believe me, as a mother of three, I know it well. By week eight, the baby begins to hear and fingerprints begin to form. After 10 weeks, the baby is able to turn his or her head, frown, and get the hiccups. By week 11, the baby can grasp with his or her hands. By week 12, the baby can suck his or her thumb. By

week 15, the baby has an adult's taste buds. By week 18, that baby can flex his or her arms. And by week of 20, Madam Speaker, not only can that baby recognize the sound of his or her own mother's voice, but that baby can also feel pain.

Madam Speaker, it is not only the pain of the child that we must be concerned with, but it is also the pain of the mother.

H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, provides protections for both the woman and the child. This is not a bill restricting women's rights. This is a bill that supports and protects life. This bill is prowoman. It encourages discussion, medical treatment, and counseling for women who have been victimized. This bill is prowoman. It empowers women with a civil right of action if this law is not followed.

This bill, Madam Speaker, is prochild. It ensures that a baby born alive will be given lifesaving treatment. This bill is a prowoman and prochild solution to what our science and our values—our deeply held values—already tell us: that a baby at 22 weeks can feel pain, and that that baby deserves protection.

Madam Speaker, I am for life at all stages. I am for the life of the baby and the life of the mother. I will continue to work for the day when not only is abortion illegal but, Madam Speaker, it is unthinkable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), and that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36. Instead of considering legislation that would help to promote our economic recovery, expand educational opportunities, repair our crumbling infrastructure, or invest in science and research, our House colleagues on the Republican side continue to pursue an extreme social agenda.

I stand to strongly oppose H.R. 36, which would violate Supreme Court precedent and impose arbitrary and unconstitutional restrictions on women's healthcare decisions. Every woman in America deserves access to affordable, comprehensive health care, including full reproductive health care. H.R. 36 would ban abortions after 20 weeks even though medical professionals have explained that some deadly and severe conditions cannot be diagnosed earlier.

Madam Speaker, politicians are not medical experts and should not be making healthcare decisions for women in this country. These decisions are properly made by women in consultation with their healthcare professionals, not by a bunch of politicians in Washington.

In addition, the bill contains an unreasonably narrow exception for cases in which the woman's life is in danger or the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest: only if the woman has sought mental health counseling or reported the incident to law enforcement—even though we know that a majority of these crimes go undisclosed or unreported.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a dangerous distraction from the pressing needs facing our country. I urge my colleagues to oppose this terrible bill and leave healthcare decisions in the hands of the people they belong in, the women of this country.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her leadership on this important issue.

Madam Speaker, there is a rule in the House of Representatives that any little child who is a guest of ours can come right down here and be in the well with us. Now let's assume for a moment that one of those children tripped and fell and hurt themselves and cried out in pain. There is not a Member of this body that wouldn't rush to their side and comfort them. And that is what this bill does today. It rushes to the side of children who are feeling the pain of violence of abortion.

Let's stand with them. Let's stand with women who deserve better than the aggressive tactics of the abortion industry and their profit seeking and marketing. Let's rebuild our Nation's compassion capacity so that we can understand what is right and just by protecting the little ones who are most vulnerable. Let's do something good for America today.

Mr. COHEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, of course I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36, which is nothing more than another ideological attack on women's reproductive rights.

This bill would institute a nationwide ban on abortion after 20 weeks with no exceptions to protect women's health. It adds unnecessary burdens and obstacles to deny medical care to women in the most desperate of circumstances, including in the instance of rape, by requiring women to seek counseling or medical treatment prior to her medical procedure. I remember the days of back-alley abortions. Many women died, and more were permanently injured before Roe v. Wade.

Madam Speaker, with this egregious bill, Republicans have once again decided to take us back there, to threaten physicians, for instance, with criminal prosecution. This bill is unconstitutional; it is dangerous; and it is wrong. No woman should have a politician interfering in her personal health decisions. They should always be kept private, period. And my faith is as deep as those using their faith, imposing their faith on women who must make these very difficult personal decisions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Instead of passing yet another bill that attacks women, we should get back to the real work that American families desperately need, like eliminating poverty, instituting real criminal justice reform, and increasing job opportunities for all.

For those who say that they support life, then why not support universal preschool, paid family medical leave, affordable child care, and support those life-affirming measures that we are trying to get passed here? So I urge a ''no'' vote on this outrageous attack on women.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chair of the Pro-Life Caucus.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership. Thank you to TRENT FRANKS, Speaker BOEHNER, KEVIN MCCARTHY, CATHY MCMORRIS-RODGERS, and the gentlewoman presiding in the Chair—so many. This has been a team effort, and it will yield considerable protection when it is finally enacted into law.

Madam Speaker, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is landmark human rights law. It recognizes the compelling body of medical evidence that unborn children feel pain and seeks to safeguard and protect vulnerable children from the violence of abortion.

Dr. Anand, a leading expert in the area of fetal pain, has said: ''It is my opinion that the human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.''

Dr. Malloy testified before the Judiciary Committee and said:

> When we speak of infants at 20 weeks we no longer have to rely on ultrasound imagery because premature patients are kicking, moving, and reacting and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit.

Today, Madam Speaker, surgeons routinely administer anesthesia to unborn children—society's littlest patients—to treat diseases and anomalies

and to perform benign corrective surgeries.

Today, there are Kermit Gosnells—you remember him, the infamous abortionist who was convicted 2 years ago today in Philadelphia. They are all over America inflicting not only violence and death on very young children, but excruciating pain as well. And, you know, when it comes to pain, I don't know about you, but I feel this way, I dread it, we all seek to avoid it, we even fear it, and we go to great and extraordinary lengths to mitigate its severity and duration. This legislation protects an entire age-specific class of kids from preventable pain and death.

Madam Speaker, this is human rights legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, two years ago today, Pennsylvania abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murder, conspiracy to kill and involuntary manslaughter and sentenced to life imprisonment.

Even though the news of Gosnell's child slaughter was largely suppressed by the mainstream media, many of my colleagues may remember that Dr. Gosnell operated a large Philadelphia abortion clinic where women died and countless babies were dismembered or chemically destroyed often by having their spinal cords snipped—all gruesome procedures causing excruciating pain to the victim.

Today, the House considers landmark legislation authored by TRENT FRANKS to protect unborn children beginning at the age of 20 weeks post fertilization from pain-filled abortions.

The Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is needed now more than ever because there are Gosnells all over America, dismembering and decapitating pain-capable babies for profit:

Men like Steven Brigham of New Jersey, an interstate abortion operator—35 aborted babies were found in his freezer.

Men like Leroy Carhart, caught on video tape joking about his abortion toolkit—complete with a ''pickaxe'' and ''drill bit''—while describing a three day long late term abortion procedure and the infant victim as ''putting meat in a crock pot.''

Or like Deborah Edge who wrote in an oped that she ''saw the abortionist puncture the soft spot in the baby's head or snip his neck if it was delivered alive.''

Some euphemistically call this choice, but, a growing number of Americans rightly regard it as violence against children. And huge majorities—60% according to November 2014 Quinnipiac poll—want it stopped!

Fresh impetus for the bill came from a huge study of nearly 5,000 babies—preemies—published last week in the New England Journal of Medicine. The next day, a New York Times article titled: ''Premature Babies May Survive at 22 Weeks if Treated'' touted the Journal's extraordinary findings of survival and hope. (Let me note that these 22 week old children referred to in the Times articles are the same age as the 20 week children that will be protected by this bill. The only difference is the method used to calculate age.)

Just imagine, Madam Speaker, preemies at 20 weeks are surviving as technology and medical science advance. And some like Alexis Hutchinson, featured in the New York Times story is today a healthy 5 year old who originally weighed in at a mere 1.1 pounds.

Thus the babies we seek to protect from harm today may survive if treated humanely, with expertise and compassion—not the cruelty of the abortion.

That is why, H.R. 36 requires that a late abortion permitted under limited circumstances provide the ''best opportunity for the unborn child to survive'' and that ''a second physician trained in neonatal resuscitation'' be ''present and prepared to provide care to a child'' consistent with the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act recognizes the medical evidence that unborn children feel pain.

One leading expert in the field of fetal pain, Dr. Anand, at the University of Tennessee stated in his expert report, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Justice: ''It is my opinion that the human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.''

Surgeons today entering the womb to perform corrective procedures on unborn children have seen those babies flinch, jerk, and recoil from sharp objects and incisions.

Surgeons routinely administer anesthesia to unborn children in the womb. We now know that the child ought to be treated as a patient, and there are many anomalies, many sicknesses that can be treated while the child is still in utero. When those interventions are done, anesthesia is given.

Dr. Colleen Malloy, assistant professor, Division of Neonatology at the Northwestern University, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee said: ''When we speak of infants at 20 weeks post-fertilization we no longer have to rely on inferences or ultrasound imagery, because such premature patients are kicking, moving and reacting and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit.''

Dr. Malloy went on to say, ''in today's medical arena, we resuscitate patients at this age and are able to witness their ex-utero growth.'' She says ''I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment or cardiac injection.''

Other provisions in H.R. 36 include:

An Informed Consent Form including the age of the child; a description of the law; an explanation that if the baby is born-alive, he or she will be given medical assistance and transported to a hospital; and information about the woman's right to sue if these protections are not followed. Women deserve this information.

The woman is empowered with a Civil Right of Action, so she may sue abortion providers who fail to comply with the law. Parents are also given a civil right of action if the law is not followed with regard to their minor daughter.

In the case of a minor who is pregnant as a result of rape or incest and is having an abortion at 20 weeks or later, the abortion provider must notify either social services, or law enforcement to ensure the safety of the child and stop any ongoing abuse.

In the case of an adult who is pregnant as a result of a sexual assault and is having an abortion at 20 weeks or later, the provider must ensure that she has received medical treatment or counseling at least 48 hours prior to the abortion.

Compliance with State Laws including parental involvement requirements, and state reporting requirements is required.

The National Center for Health Statistics will issue an Annual Statistical Report (without personally identifying information) providing statistical information about abortions carried out after 20 weeks post-fertilization age.

Finally, pain, we all dread it. We avoid it. We even fear it. And we all go to extraordinary lengths to mitigate its severity and its duration.

Today, there are Kermit Gosnells all over America inflicting not only violence, cruelty, and death on very young children, but excruciating pain as well. This legislation protects an entire age specific class of kids from preventable pain—and death.

[From Americans United for Life]

BACKGROUNDER: MATERNAL HEALTH AND LATE-TERM ABORTION

ABORTION POSES SIGNIFICANT RISKS TO MATERNAL HEALTH BY 20 WEEKS GESTATION

A well-respected peer-reviewed journal—one which is also frequently cited by abortion advocates—notes that, ''Abortion has a higher medical risk to women when the procedure is performed later in pregnancy. Compared to abortion at eight weeks of an unborn child's gestation or earlier, the relative risk increases exponentially at higher gestations.'' (L.A. Bartlett et al., Risk factors for legal induced abortion-related mortality in the United States, Obstetrics & Gynecology 103(4):729–37 (2004)). From the Bartlett study:

''The risk of death associated with abortion increases with the length of pregnancy, from one death for every one million abortions at or before eight weeks gestation to one per 29,000 abortions at sixteen to twenty weeks and one per 11,000 abortions at twenty-one or more weeks.''

As noted in the Bartlett study, gestational age is the strongest risk factor for abortion-related mortality. Compared to abortion at eight weeks gestation, the relative risk of mortality increases significantly (by 38 percent for each additional week) at higher gestations.

In other words, a woman seeking an abortion at 20 weeks is 35 times more likely to die from abortion than she was in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die from abortion than she was in the first trimester.

Moreover, the researchers in the Bartlett study concluded that it may not be possible to reduce the risk of death in later-term abortions because of the ''inherently greater technical complexity of later abortions.'' This is because later-term abortions require a greater degree of cervical dilation, with an increased blood flow in a later-term abortion which predisposes the woman to hemorrhage, and because the myometrium is relaxed and more subject to perforation.

The same exact study is relied upon by the pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute in its Facts on Induced Abortion in the United States. In fact, Guttmacher emphasizes the increased risk by setting it apart in the text:

The risk of death associated with abortion increases with the length of pregnancy, from

one death for every one million abortions at or before eight weeks to one per 29,000 at 16–20 weeks—and one per 11,000 at 21 or more weeks.

At least two studies have now concluded that second-trimester abortions (13–24 weeks) and third-trimester abortions (25–26 weeks) pose more serious risks to women's physical health than first-trimester abortions. Other researchers confirm a substantially increased risk of death from abortions performed later in gestation, equaling or surpassing the risk of death from live birth. Researchers have also found that women who undergo abortions at 13 weeks or beyond report ''more disturbing dreams, more frequent reliving of the abortion, and more trouble falling asleep.''

Further, even Planned Parenthood, the largest abortion provider in the United States, agrees that abortion becomes riskier later in pregnancy. Planned Parenthood states on its national website, ''The risks [of surgical abortion] increase the longer you are pregnant. They also increase if you have sedation or general anesthesia [which would be necessary at or after 20 weeks gestation].''

When the Supreme Court decided Roe v. Wade in 1973, there was no evidence in the record related to medical data showing the health risks to women from abortion. The ''abortion is safer than childbirth'' mantra of 1973 has been refuted by the plethora of peer-reviewed studies published in the last 40 years. Specifically, recent studies demonstrate that childbirth is safer than abortion especially at later gestations.

Moreover, studies reveal that abortion carries serious long-term risks other than the risk of death. These studies reveal significant long-term physical and psychological risks inherent in abortion—risks that, as agreed by both pro-life and pro-abortion advocates, increase with advancing gestational age.

In sum, it is undisputed that the later in pregnancy an abortion occurs, the riskier it is and the greater the chance for significant complications.

Mr. COHEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, which amounts to nothing less than an assault on women's fundamental rights. This is about a woman's ability to make her own decisions in consultation with her doctor, not politicians.

Not only does this unconstitutional bill run afoul of longstanding judicial precedent, but it will also jeopardize women's health by banning abortion after 20 weeks even in cases were pregnancy complications arise from serious health issues like pulmonary hypertension, heart condition, kidney disease, and cancer.

What about the life of the mother? Women facing desperate medical situations will see their healthcare options restricted through this unacceptable bill.

Furthermore, rape and incest victims will face additional hurdles when terminating a pregnancy. Doctors and healthcare providers will encounter threats of fines and even imprisonment when they are simply trying to provide compassionate care to women in need.

Madam Speaker, this bill inserts the government into one of the most personal decisions a woman can make and would interfere with the relationship between women and their doctors. So much for getting government off my back. I would like to see the government out of my bedroom.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I now yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

□ 1615

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, our Declaration of Independence states that everyone is endowed by our creator with an unalienable right to life. Recognition of God-given rights is part of who we are.

Indeed, who could forget President Kennedy's words more than 50 years ago when he said:

> Our rights do not come from the generosity of the State but from the hand of God.

This legislation expands protections for the right to life. It recognizes that a class of children, unborn babies older than 20 weeks who feel the pain of abortion, should be protected.

We must stand in solidarity with these vulnerable children and affirm: we will protect you.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 36.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, this is an outrage. We are again debating a bill that takes away women's constitutional rights.

I agree with the gentleman from Arizona that we are privileged. We are privileged to be Members of Congress and represent our districts and our country, but we are not medical experts, and we are not privileged to insert ourselves into these most personal decisions that must remain with women, their doctors, their families, and their faith.

Clearly absent from this Congress' agenda is any discussion about persistent wage inequality hurting women and their families. What about paid parental leave? or making sure families get access to quality child care? What are we doing about feeding hungry children? or making sure that every child can access education? How about anything at all concerning women that doesn't have to do with restricting reproductive rights?

Let's call this bill what it is. It is an unconstitutional bill that would force survivors of sexual assault and incest to jump through hoops in order to get the medical care they need. This bill is an insult to women and to their families.

As women and families are working hard to move this country forward, we are seeing a Republican Congress obsessed with moving us backwards.

I urge this Congress to get back to work for them and reject this unconstitutional and insulting bill.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This bill takes an important step to protect innocent life. Scientific evidence shows that unborn babies have the capacity to experience pain after 20 weeks. Ending these lives through abortion is both unconscionable and inhumane.

As Members of Congress, it is our duty to protect those who are defenseless. Our bill affirms the humanity of the unborn while curbing the inhumanity of abortion. As one of seven children, with five children of my own, and grandfather of 12, I ask my colleagues to support this pro-life bill.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Here we are again, at a time when this Congress should be focusing on the American people's top priorities, drawing our economy, creating good-paying jobs, dealing with crumbling infrastructure, dealing with the big challenges that the American people sent us to do, and we are not doing that; we continue yet another attack on women's health.

Healthcare decisions should be made between a woman and her doctor, not politicians in Washington. Let me repeat, healthcare decisions should be made between a woman and her doctor, not politicians here in Washington. We need to work together on the things we agree on. This keeps coming up over and over again.

American people, American women, deserve the respect that should be accorded to them to exercise their right of privacy and their constitutionally protected right and not have people here in this Chamber continually attack their decisions that should be made in direct personal private consultation with their physician. To do anything other than that, I think, is taking this country and this Congress in the wrong direction.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from

Tennessee for her work on this bill and all of my colleagues who had a hand in it, particularly the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for authoring this important legislation.

I think most people would be surprised to learn that the United States is one of only seven countries in the world that allows elective abortions to be performed after 20 weeks. Science has shown us that unborn children can feel pain. Some may argue against this; but then why would unborn babies, who are given lifesaving operations while still in the womb, routinely given anesthesia?

The Founding Fathers strongly believed that human beings are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which is the right to life. It is the duty of the Members of Congress to protect those who cannot speak for themselves.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), on the day after Yogi Berra's 90th birthday—not related.

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, I am a doctor. I have been a doctor for over 20 years. When I graduated from medical school, I took an oath. That oath contains that promise of patient autonomy, that I am going to sit with my patients, I am going to answer their questions, and I am going to empower them to make the decisions that best fit their lives and their health care. That is sacred to the oath that I swore when I became a doctor.

This bill will make it criminal for me to do my job as a doctor. It is all about empowering our patients to make the decisions that best fit their lives, answering their questions. It is personal.

I think about this as a father of a daughter. I want my daughter to grow up in a country where she is in charge of her own healthcare decisions. When we think about limited government, none of us wants the government to come into the examining room and get between that doctor-patient relationship.

This is sacred. This is what health care is all about. It is about working with our patients, answering their questions, and putting them in charge of their own healthcare decisions.

This is a bad bill; this is a bill with massive government overreach. Vote against this bill, and let us do our job as doctors.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, the most basic responsibility of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people is to protect the people. We protect our senior citizens' economic security with Social Security. We protect our country with our national security. We have a Department of Homeland Security to protect all people.

It seems that the very least we can do for the most vulnerable, defenseless, and innocent among us is to protect them with this basic right, to protect them from the imposition of the excruciating pain imposed on them by government sanction no less—abortion.

I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this important bill.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 36. It endangers women's health. It contains a woefully inadequate rape exception, is patently unconstitutional, and it contains no health exception for the mother.

The entire premise that women must provide ''proof of rape'' is preposterous and hurtful to women who have already faced incredible trauma. Most of us cannot begin to fathom what a woman has faced in these situations. The FBI rates rape the second worst crime, preceded only by murder, in terms of the destruction and continuing harm to the victim.

This is truly adding insult to injury. The majority party expects survivors to be mindful of keeping good medical paper records and to file paperwork that they, the majority, have decided that the rape victim should file. The reality is that abortions after 20 weeks are rare and represent just 1.5 percent of pregnancies that are terminated.

In almost all of these cases, the women choosing an abortion are doing so because there is a grave problem with their pregnancy and their own health that affects their fetus. Some fetuses are incompatible with life, and in some cases, going to full term would destroy a woman's ability to have future children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COHEN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Even after four decades of settled law, some of my colleagues still refuse to cede women their constitutional right and the autonomy and human dignity that goes with being allowed to make your own decisions about your own body and your own health care.

The party of individual rights and states' rights wants to go into medical, personal decisions of women in this country with their doctors.

I urge my colleagues to reject this awful bill, H.R. 36, and recognize that women are both capable and prepared to make decisions about their own bodies and their own medical care.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 36.

I would point out that we have had an estimate of 58 million abortions in this country since Roe v. Wade. That is roughly 14 million by Planned Parenthood alone, and it is about 1 million abortions a year in this country.

We ended partial birth abortion for one reason: because those babies' lives were ended the moment before they could scream for their own mercy. Now, with the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, we are going to be able to stop that abortion that is coming because we can see in 4–D ultrasound that these babies are writhing for their own mercy.

These babies need to be brought forward into us so that they can live, learn, laugh, and love so that, one day, they can stand here and celebrate the life that we gave them.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to make note that we have the American College of Nurse-Midwives; the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; the American Medical Student Association; the American Medical Women's Association; the American Nurses Association; the American Psychological Association; and many, many others against this bill. I would like to hear on the other side some of the medical groups that are supportive of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This bill will protect women and children by establishing Federal legal protections from unborn babies of 20 weeks. Substantial evidence has shown that children at 20 weeks, or the fifth month of pregnancy, have the capacity to feel pain and, due to modern medicine, are increasingly likely to survive a premature birth.

Furthermore, this bill protects the health of mothers when they are at their most vulnerable state. At 20 weeks, a woman is 35 times more likely to die from abortion than she would in the first trimester. After 21 weeks, that risk of death for the mother increases almost one hundredfold.

It is fitting that this bill comes before the House floor on National Women's Health Week, a weeklong observance led by the U.S. Department of Health encouraging women to prioritize their health.

I am pleased to stand in support of this piece of women's health legislation today. This bill will empower

women in their healthcare provisions and protect the lives of the innocent unborn.

□ 1630

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This bill protects unborn children and ensures that those born alive are given the same level of care as other premature infants.

I would like to introduce you to Micah Pickering and his parents. His mom, Danielle, recalls being told that her son, if born early, was not going to be viable at 20 weeks. She says:

We were told that our baby would not cry upon birth. We were told that he would be stillborn. We were told that, if by some miracle he survived, he had a 95 percent chance of horrible, life-altering disabilities that would likely include not walking, not talking, not even eating on his own. On the morning Micah was born, he defied all odds. We didn't know what God's will for Micah was, but we do now—it is to be a voice for all of those other babies.

I insert into the RECORD Danielle Pickering's full story and letter.

''MIRACLE MICAH''

(By Danielle Pickering, Mom)

My son was not ''viable''. It was a word we were coming to hate. It all started the day my water broke, at 21 weeks. I was treated as if I had a Urinary Tract Infection, instead of a rupture of membranes. I was sent home with no instructions to do anything outside of my normal routine. I worked 8 hours a day in a warehouse, I cooked meals for my husband and myself, and I went to yard sales like normal, all with my water broken. One week later, at exactly 22 weeks, I started having small contractions and bleeding. My husband and I rushed to the Emergency Room, where they confirmed that my water was at less than 1 CM, and that I would be ambulanced to the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics for the remainder of my pregnancy.

When I was admitted my heart rate was high, baby's heart rate was high, and I was running a fever. They determined that since baby was not ''viable'' they would like to induce labor as they feared I had a life threatening infection. We called on everyone we knew to start praying, and within two hours I was now stable. We were then told that it was our decision to induce or to hold out and see what baby does, but they couldn't do anything at that time to stop labor. We decided to wait. We couldn't induce when we were sure this baby was not going to make it.

For the next three days we were told horrific statistics that no parent should ever have to face. We were told that our baby would not cry upon birth. We were told that he will likely be stillborn. We were told that, if by some miracle he survived he had a 95% chance of horrible life altering disabilities that would likely include not walking, not talking, not even eating on his own.

On the morning of 22 weeks and 4 days, Micah was born. He defied all odds and cried two times upon birth. This was music to this devastated mom's ears. I didn't get to see him. He was rushed away by a huge team of Doctors and Nurses dedicated to saving his life, as that was the choice we had made. You see, we were told that we didn't have to choose to intubate him and put him on a ventilator, but we had to do all we could to save this precious life. He had trusted his Mommy from conception to care and nourish him, and though my body was failing him, I wasn't going to! I was going to fight for him. I was going to advocate for him! I was going to be the voice of this tiny, fragile little boy who already I was so in love with, and hadn't even seen yet and thanks to an anterior placenta I hadn't even felt him kick or move yet.

The second I was able to meet Micah changed my life. He was so small. I didn't know what to expect. Would he look ''normal''? Could I bond with this baby? Those questions were a mess in my head as I was wheeled into his room two hours after his birth. The sight I saw was a perfectly formed baby. Lots of tubes and monitors all set up to be an artificial womb to this baby born too soon. My husband and I stood there just staring at this beautiful little boy who we were told we couldn't hold as the skin was so sensitive it would hurt him. We were told we could press lightly on the skin so we each put our hand near him. HE reached up, and held our fingers. This was the strongest grasp I would ever feel. I never knew how strong a baby was until that moment! He had a powerful grip on our hands, and now our hearts.

Micah was about to spend the next 4 months in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. He was going to go through heart surgery, at 2 weeks old and just over a pound. He was going to hang on to life by a thread some days. There were days I couldn't leave his room. I slept on the floor next to his warmer bed many nights, because my heart was so grieved for this tiny baby and I couldn't leave him alone. He was going to go through every ventilator they had available. He was going to be on Nitric Oxide to help his lungs. He would get scores of X-Rays and heel pricks. He was going to do something amazing-all because we were able to say ''Yes, Please save our baby''.

Here was this little baby who was on morphine for pain. He still had his eyes fused shut. You could see his chest vibrate from the ventilators. It was heartbreaking. Here was a boy who we would see get to take his first sneeze. His first smile. We would get to see the hiccups, from the outside. We would watch his eyes slowly unfuse. We would watch his hair grow in and we would watch his body develop. It was indescribably the most joyful time of our life.

We knew the Lord had a plan for Micah. Our prayer to God from early on was that Micah's life, Micah's story, and Micah's example would help others, and could somehow save other babies born too soon. We didn't know what the will for Micah was, but we do now. It was to be a voice for all those other babies. We didn't understand at the time that Micah was right on time, but now we do. Until you are faced with a situation like this, you cannot grasp the intensity that will become every decision. You can read every doctor report, you can get advice from everyone. You can be knowledgeable on every part of prematurity, but that does not change the fact that Micah was just as much full of life at 22.4 weeks as he now is at almost 3 years old. Every scary moment has been worth it. Every doctor visit, every oxygen tank we went through, every middle of the night phone call from Neonatologists, was worth it. We now have a very perfect almost 3 year old we get to call son, when we were preparing for empty arms. Our hearts are full because we chose to give him a chance at life.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, we must protect unborn children from cruel suffering, and we must ensure that any survivors get treated like any other premature baby. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 36.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, my Republican colleagues have no interest in preventing abortions after 20 weeks. The motivation behind H.R. 36 could not be more transparent. They want to make abortion after 20 weeks illegal and abortions before 20 weeks impossible.

Consider the story of a young woman named Josephine, who recently moved to Florida from Texas with her two kids after escaping an abusive husband.

While trying to build a stable home for her children, she was raped, and she became pregnant. She couldn't afford an abortion or a trip to her provider who was more than 80 miles away, so Josephine attempted to terminate the pregnancy herself by ingesting poison. She ended up hospitalized, needing several blood transfusions. She was still pregnant. By the time she gathered enough resources to cover her procedure and transportation to a provider nearly 80 miles away, she was 23 weeks pregnant. If this Republican majority were to have its way, Josephine would be denied access to a safe and legal abortion.

From regulating providers out of business, to requiring waiting periods, to mandating counseling and medically unnecessary ultrasounds, this Republican majority has made securing an abortion—has made exercising a woman's constitutional right—a long and expensive process. Let's reject this bill and, instead, work to ensure that all women can control their own bodies, their own health, and their own destinies.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36. Let's call this bill what it is—it is a late-term abortion ban. That is what it is, and a majority of Americans agree, Madam Speaker, that late-term abortions should be illegal in this country.

Whether it is unconstitutional is not up for this body to determine. I believe the Supreme Court will rule that this is constitutional because there is a reason a majority of Americans believe that late-term abortions should be illegal—because that baby is developed at 20 weeks postfertilization, developed

enough to perceive pain. That is how developed. It is developed enough to survive outside the womb. That is how developed. That is why a majority of Americans believe that that baby has rights as well. That is what we are here to do today. H.R. 36 preserves the rights of that baby to survive.

I practiced OB anesthesia for over 20 years. I was always amazed that, in the labor and delivery suite, we would deliver 21-week postfertilization babies and that, down the corridor, they would abort them. This bill says that, if that baby being aborted is born alive, someone is going to actually resuscitate that baby. That is what we need, Madam Speaker. That is why I support H.R. 36.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee and everyone who has worked so hard on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I have sat here for 25 minutes—or for however long—listening to this debate, and I have been struck by the opposition to this bill's constant and consistent argument that this is about leaving these decisions to the mothers and their doctors.

What about the baby? Who is standing up for that baby who cannot speak for himself? That is what we are doing here today.

This is such an important measure on behalf of those who don't have a voice and who can feel pain. It is a shame that such a humane and compassionate measure has opposition at all, especially since great care has been taken to protect women and babies in this bill. If we won't stop abortions at 5 months, when unborn babies feel pain, when will we stop it? There have to be limits. Even those of us who want to end abortion altogether in any form support this restriction. Do you know why? It protects babies. It saves babies. It protects women. It assigns a greater value to human life.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank my good friend from Tennessee.

Madam Speaker, I rise today as a physician, as a father, and as a grandfather in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

It is no surprise that unborn children as young as 20 weeks postfertilization feel, respond to, and recoil from pain. These tiny forming human beings make faces, yawn, stretch, and suck their thumbs. I have my own granddaughter, who is now about 20 months of age. When we viewed her 4–D ultrasound, her face compared to today is almost exactly the same. It is unbelievable how humanlike, how much like a baby, a baby really is in the womb because—let's admit it—it is a child; it is a human life.

We celebrate when our friends and families post these precious ultrasound pictures. In fact, life is always a celebration, and it is only right that we should be vigilant to ensure that the womb remains the most peaceful, protected place for a child to grow and be nurtured. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 36, which will protect children in the fifth month of development from the excruciating pain and intended violent death of an abortion.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Madam Speaker, I was not planning on speaking today. I didn't put my name on the list to speak today. I was actually sitting in my office, listening to the debate about this bill, and I started thinking of my three children. I started thinking about the decisions that we have to make in order to protect them, and I am disappointed that there is even opposition to this piece of legislation.

I want you to know that we, as adults, have a voice. We are able to speak. We are able to speak in opposition to things, but we have children who do not have a voice. Those babies whom we know can feel pain do not have a voice.

Now, I want everyone who is watching today—because I am not trying to convince my colleagues—to think of their children, to think of their nieces, their nephews, their grandchildren—the ones that they love. Would they inflict this kind of pain to keep them from coming into the world?

We have a moral obligation in this country to protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is time that we do our job—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, if people, I think, listen to this debate, they would see one thing clearly in that there is a difference on the two sides—a difference in perspective and a difference as to the facts.

Some say that, clearly, the fetus feels pain. My data shows that the majority of medical opinion says that the fetus does not; and Dr. Anand, whom they cite—my research shows—has retracted his position and doesn't want to be involved in this debate, and he is an outlier.

The bottom line is there are differences—differences as to the facts as well as to the opinions. What that should say to anybody who watches this debate, Madam Speaker, is this issue shouldn't be decided by politicians but by medical experts and by women with the people they trust—medical experts, not politicians—and by women with the advice of the people they trust.

The truth of this debate came down to a lady from North Carolina who testified contrary to what she said in January. In January, she said the bill that came before this House was not a good bill and that it shouldn't come to the House. It was withdrawn because incest is incest, and it shouldn't be seen that people 18 and over couldn't get an abortion if they were victims of incest. This bill allows it. She has changed her position, and at the close of her statement, she said: I will not rest until abortion is illegal.

That is what this is about. It is the beginning of the end of abortion at 20 weeks, at 17 weeks, at 12 weeks, at 1 week, at conception. This is an anti-abortion bill. It is not about fetal pain. It is not about 20 weeks. That is what it is about. American women need to wake up.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, during the course of this debate, we have heard more than a few mischaracterizations against this legislation. In truth, this is just a modest, compassionate bill that does not in any way change abortion law for the first 5 months of pregnancy.

As a nurse for more than 40 years, I know that late-term abortion is not health, and it is not caring. It takes an innocent life we know can feel pain inside the womb and a life that is increasingly viable outside the womb. This is a human rights issue, and we have the responsibility to act. Therefore, I urge a ''yes'' vote on H.R. 36.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

As a father of five children, I understand the precious joy children bring to the world. I firmly believe as a Member of Congress, I should defend the sanctity of life. I believe it is morally imperative to protect those who are unable to protect themselves.

As a cosponsor of the bipartisan legislation, I am confident this is a step in the right direction to protecting unborn children at the moment that they can feel pain. It is important that Congress continue to pursue legislation that protects the right to life.

I believe that most constituents in Iowa agree with me. According to a recent Quinnipiac poll, 62% of Americans support a ban on abortions after 20 weeks or earlier. Of women polled, 68% supported this bill's proposed ban on abortions.

I will continue to defend the lives of the unborn and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to act on this measure.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, there are countless reasons why my colleagues should

reject H.R. 36, the misnamed Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I am unequivocally opposed to the substance of the bill and the process by which it arrived on the House Floor today.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), a little over one percent of abortions that are performed annually are resulting from pregnancies over 21 weeks. There are a variety of reasons why abortion care may become necessary at this stage of a pregnancy. Some may not know that they are pregnant; some, barred by public funding bans on abortion, need time to gather the funds for the procedure; and sadly, a large majority of these abortions are medically necessary due to severe fetal anomalies or risks to the mother's health. Doctors must be allowed to offer their patients the best care possible. Tragically, doctors in violation of this bill, were it to become law, could face jail time. The new version of H.R. 36 puts even more burdens on doctors in an all out effort to prevent them from performing the procedure so women will have nowhere to go for abortion services.

As you'll recall, H.R. 36 was introduced on the very first day of the new 114th Congress and just two months later, the Republican Majority rushed this anti-family bill to the House Floor. However, with Members of its own party rejecting H.R. 36, the bill was pulled from the floor the night before it was to be debated on and another anti-choice bill was put in its place. It has taken over a month to make a bad bill even worse? The revised bill also forces adult rape survivors either to report the crime or to seek medical care at least 48 hours prior to getting an abortion. In order for a woman to comply with this requirement, not only does a woman have to see a provider other than the one providing the abortion, but she cannot see any provider in the same facility where abortions are performed.

While we recently marked the 42nd anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision allowing women to make their own reproductive choices, this legislation is nothing but a transparent attempt to restrict their choices once again. It takes any medical decision that should be made by a woman on the advice of her doctor and puts it into the hands of legislators. Now, I know there are several House Members who are also doctors, but I had no idea so many Members—medical or otherwise—feel empowered to take this decision on to themselves rather than leaving these reproductive decisions to the person doing the reproducing: the individual woman. I am particularly surprised that so many men feel comfortable making personal bodily medical decisions for women.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 36 is simply outrageous. This bill is unconstitutional and a blatant attempt to challenge Roe v. Wade at the expense of the reproductive health of our nation's women. And they claim there is no war on women. How can they say that when they try to pass bills like this?

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the so-called ''Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act''.

I am disappointed that yet again, Congress is debating and voting on this severely flawed legislation. H.R. 36 ignores the health issues and real life situations that women can face during pregnancy.

This bill is not based on sound science. And it is certainly not based on the real experiences of American women and families. This bill is simply yet another attack on women's health.

Women want—and need—to make their own personal health care decisions in consultation with their doctor and spiritual advisor—not their Member of Congress. It is time to start trusting our nation's women and families to make their own personal health care decisions.

Instead of this political attack on women's personal decision making, we should be focusing on empowering women by expanding education opportunities, ensuring equal pay for equal work and increasing access to quality child care—these are the things that really matter to women and their families. And these are the things that are going to strengthen working families and our economy.

We have many critical issues facing this nation that Congress should be focused on and this is certainly not one of them.

Again, I would like to state my strong opposition to this misguided and out of touch piece of legislation and I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 36.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I support the right for women to make their own personal health care decisions and oppose H.R. 36, the ''Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.'' I will vote against this legislation because it imposes the will of an intolerant minority on our mothers, sisters, and daughters. It is a deliberate attack on women and it's wrong.

The new language in H.R. 36 is bad for women's health. It would require adult women who have been raped to receive potentially unwanted medical treatment and proof of counseling before receiving an abortion. This is an attempt to shame and stigmatize rape victims, while doing nothing to provide necessary mental and physical health services to women in need.

While it is couched in the language of protecting unborn fetuses from pain, this legislation is nothing more than a cruel disregard for personal circumstances of women's lives.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation is yet another attempt by conservative lawmakers to dictate a woman's reproductive rights. This bill calls for a nationwide ban on abortion care after 20 weeks of pregnancy. There are 14 similar bans in states.

The bill also makes it much more difficult for sexual assault survivors to obtain abortion care by requiring that she obtain counseling or medical treatment from a list of specific locations. This counseling may not be from a health center that provides abortion care. The bill also requires incest survivors who are minors to provide written proof that the crime was reported to law enforcement or the government. This is extremely limiting and an unreasonable burden to place upon a sexual assault survivor.

The legislation also forces abortion providers to divulge private health information regarding which patients have received abortion care after 20 weeks to the government. This essentially creates a ''hit list'' of providers around the country for anti-choice supporters to target when they are merely providing legal and necessary care.

While the right to choose is of the utmost importance, this bill would also add unnecessary pain and suffering to women who experience fatal fetal anomalies late in pregnancy. It is callous and uncompassionate to deny an abortion to a pregnant woman who knows that her child has no chance of survival.

Banning abortion care based on arbitrary gestational limits decided by federal lawmakers is unconstitutional and unjust. This legislation is extreme and blocks a woman's access to safe health care options such as the freedom to make personal reproductive decisions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 255, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 36 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 6, line 11, insert after ''life'' the following: ''or health''.

Page 6, beginning on line 12, strike ''whose'' and all that follows through ''conditions'' on line 17.

Page 11, line 13, insert after ''life'' the following: ''or health''.

Page 11, beginning on line 14, strike ''by'' and all that follows through ''injury'' on line 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

□ 1645

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 36, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment would ensure that nothing in the bill would prevent a woman from terminating her pregnancy after 20 weeks if her health were at risk. Only 1.1 percent of abortions performed in the United States occur

after the 20-week mark. These rare procedures are often the most medically difficult and dangerous cases where women—many of whom want and have dreamed of being parents—are faced with impossible decisions.

As it is written, H.R. 36 would force a doctor to wait until a condition becomes life threatening before performing an abortion. It shows no concern for the long-term health of the mother, her future ability to bear children, or her right to make her own medical decisions.

It ignores that there are very real and very serious reasons why a woman may need an abortion later in pregnancy. For example, pregnant women with severe fetal anomalies or women whose amniotic sacs rupture prematurely and cannot support the fetus would be forced to give birth. The bill also treats doctors as criminals for providing care that has been the law of the land for 42 years, and it puts doctors' safety at risk by requiring public disclosure of doctors who provide abortion care around the country.

Both the American Medical Association and the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists understand that there is no appropriate one-size-fits-all solution. They oppose bills not based on sound science and that interfere with the physician's ability to provide the highest quality of care.

H.R. 36 does more than endanger the health and lives of women. It also robs rape victims of their constitutionally protected right to choose. The bill's revised rape exception continues to question rape victims' honesty by requiring that adult rape victims obtain counseling or medical treatment 48 hours before obtaining an abortion and prohibits both services from being performed by a woman's regular OB/GYN. By placing these onerous burdens on women, this bill revictimizes women who have already been traumatized and denies women the right to choose their own doctor.

Further, many women, especially victims of abuse, do not report rape for fear of reprisal. The National Institute of Justice estimates that only 35 percent of women report rape. Forcing a survivor to report her sexual assault before she can terminate a pregnancy resulting from rape or incest denies her basic rights.

If we are serious about reducing the number of abortions, we should improve access to birth control and family planning, we should support comprehensive sexual education, we should do anything but pass this misguided, misinformed, and ill-conceived legislation.

Instead of bills that harm women, we should work together on bipartisan legislation to help women and families, including passing legislation that provides equal pay for equal work, access to child care, and paid family leave. We should also pass a transportation bill, fix our crumbling infrastructure, create jobs, and strengthen the economy. Backward bills, not based in science, that fail to respect a woman's right to privacy and right to make her own health decisions have no place in local, State, or Federal legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit, vote ''yes'' to protect women's health, vote ''yes'' for a woman's right to choose.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among these rights are the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The bill before the House today affirms what a majority of Americans believe, that over halfway through a pregnancy, an unborn baby deserves the full protection of the law and the Constitution.

As a mother of three and a legislator, I have always believed that every life has value, every life deserves the opportunity to reach its full potential. We live in an extraordinary time in which we are not bound by the conditions of our birth. We are not sentenced by our circumstance. And we should not be defined by what limits us but empowered by what we can become. As lawmakers, it is our responsibility to ensure that our laws reflect that.

Medical science continues to evolve to create greater potential for life. Emerging research is challenging what we thought to be true of the earliest stages of human life. Just last week, The New York Times highlighted a study that showed a growing number of premature infants surviving after the point at which this bill would make abortion illegal.

As a society, we need to ask whether we want to move forward with a better standard of living or if we want to rely on the outdated scientific research of the past. I want to legislate for the future, and the future will be defined by how we use the advancements taking place today to protect and improve human life.

Those who represent the future are already there. There was a recent poll that 57 percent of millennials support this legislation, and they echo the voice of America. Sixty percent of Americans—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Abortion is really a symptom of larger challenges that exist in our society, and these challenges demand attention of lawmakers. Pretending that there is a one-size-fits-all approach to abortion ignores the complex circumstances that surround each woman who is forced to consider choosing an abortion.

This bill recognizes that at the halfway point of a pregnancy, a baby who has developed 5 months, those circumstances are increasingly more unique. Research shows that abortion becomes riskier to a woman's health the later it occurs in pregnancy.

We should not trivialize the decision to undertake an abortion at 20 weeks by suggesting that it should be made without additional medical or emotional support. We should write laws that empower women to make these decisions. We should support laws that show compassion for women. We should trust individuals to make the best decisions for themselves. We want to empower every single person to reach their full potential.

This country has made great strides in empowering all people, no matter where they started. That is why I am here, to stand as a fierce protector of every life. The human rights and dignity of each person should be reflected in every single piece of legislation we bring to the floor.

This bill asks us to consider whether we, as a society, will tolerate abortion at any point of development, even though we know babies can feel pain at 20 weeks and survive outside the womb. This bill asks us to consider if it is compassionate to maintain a system that does nothing to offer emotional or medical support for a woman facing the most difficult decision of choosing an abortion 5 months into her pregnancy.

These are questions that we must ask, and I am prepared to answer them by supporting the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 36, if ordered; passage of H.R. 2048; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 246, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

YEAS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—246

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Barletta
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Capps
Hinojosa

□ 1721

Messrs. MCKINLEY and MARINO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. MOORE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 184, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

AYES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Hice, Jody B.

NOT VOTING—5

Barletta
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Capps
Hinojosa

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1732

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, this is National Police Week, and Friday is Peace Officers Memorial Day. Today I have with me my two good friends who have served in law enforcement. There are some others, I think, in our body who have had that experience. So I brought some backup today with me.

Every year we take a moment to recognize our law enforcement officers across this great Nation, the men and women who wear the uniform, who wear the badge, who protect our families and our communities.

This year, 273 names will be added to the memorial wall—273 names. Already this year we have lost 44 police officers in the line of duty—44 already this year. That is one police officer dying in the line of duty every 3½ days—every 3½ days.

Madam Speaker, these men and women deserve our praise. They deserve our thanks, and they deserve the recognition that we can give them today on the floor of the House. There are families here who have lost loved ones. At the service on Friday, the President will be there to address them.

We rise today, the three of us together, to ask for a moment of silence to honor those who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise, and the House will observe a moment of silence.

UNITING AND STRENGTHENING AMERICA BY FULFILLING RIGHTS AND ENSURING EFFECTIVE DISCIPLINE OVER MONITORING ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the passage of the bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 338, nays 88, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—338

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg

Walden	Welch	Wittman
Walker	Wenstrup	Womack
Walorski	Westerman	Yarmuth
Walters, Mimi	Westmoreland	Young (AK)
Walz	Whitfield	Young (IA)
Wasserman Schultz	Williams	Young (IN)
Webster (FL)	Wilson (FL)	Zeldin
	Wilson (SC)	Zinke

NAYS—88

Amash	Gohmert	Neal
Bass	Gosar	Nugent
Blum	Graves (GA)	Pallone
Blumenauer	Graves (LA)	Perry
Brat	Grayson	Pingree
Brooks (AL)	Green, Al	Pocan
Burgess	Griffith	Poe (TX)
Capuano	Grijalva	Polis
Clark (MA)	Guinta	Posey
Clarke (NY)	Hanna	Rangel
Clawson (FL)	Harris	Roe (TN)
Cleaver	Hastings	Rohrabacher
Crowley	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Davis, Danny	Hice, Jody B.	Salmon
DeFazio	Honda	Sanford
DeGette	Huelskamp	Schakowsky
DesJarlais	Jones	Schweikert
Doggett	Jordan	Serrano
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Takai
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Takano
Edwards	Lee	Van Hollen
Ellison	Lewis	Velázquez
Emmer (MN)	Lieu, Ted	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Lowenthal	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Lummis	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Woodall
Fleming	McClintock	Yoder
Gabbard	McGovern	Yoho
Garrett	Meadows	
Gibson	Mulvaney	

NOT VOTING—6

Barletta	Brady (PA)	Hinojosa
Boyle, Brendan F.	Capps	
	Castro (TX)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1746

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 224 on H.R. 2048—USA Freedom Act of 2015. I was present for the vote but not recorded due to a mechanical problem with my voting card. I intended to vote ''aye.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes on May 13, 2015 and would like the record to reflect that I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 221: No.

Rollcall No. 222: Yes.

Rollcall No. 223: No.

Rollcall No. 224: Yes.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND DEBATE TIME ON H.R. 1191, PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate under clause 1(c) of rule XV on a motion to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 1191 be extended to 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1735.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 255 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1735.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1750

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to bring to the floor H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This measure was reported by the Armed Services Committee by a vote of 60 members voting for and two members voting against. Of the two members, there was one from each party.

This bill follows the bipartisan tradition of the committee working collaboratively with an integrated staff to support the men and women who serve and protect our Nation.

All members of the committee have contributed to this product, and I am very grateful for all of their efforts throughout the year. I am especially grateful to the efforts of the ranking member, Mr. SMITH, not only for his contributions and for his partnership in the committee but doing so at a time where he has been dealing with surgeries and a variety of things. But it has been a true pleasure and continues to be to work with him for the benefit of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes spending for the Department of Defense at a level that is consistent with the congressional budget resolution and a level that is consistent with the President's budget request. So there have been differences, and there will continue to be some differences about how some of that spending gets categorized, but when you add it all up together, this authorization measure meets exactly what the President has asked for, which is essentially $611.9 billion for national defense.

Included is a program-by-program authorization for all of that spending; whether it is in the overseas contingency account or the base budget, it is all authorized program by program.

This bill also contains some significant reforms, including acquisition reform, to improve the way the Department purchases goods and services. We have been working with the Pentagon and with industry to thin out regulations, simplify the process, and make it easier to hold industry and government personnel accountable for the results.

This bill has overhead reform to reduce the amount of money that we are spending on overhead and bureaucracy so that more resources can be devoted to the men and women on the front lines.

This measure has reform in the area of personnel pay and benefits. Of the 15 recommendations by the personnel commission, this measure does something in 11 of those 15 so that we can be in better shape to continue to recruit and retain the top quality people that our Nation needs for decades to come.

Now, some people say, Well, there is too much reform here. Some people say, Well, there is not enough reform here. There isn't enough if enough means you solve all the problems. But there is a start at significant reform that helps make sure we get better value for the money we spend and also that the Department is more agile in meeting the national security challenges we face.

Mr. Chairman, this morning in reading the papers, I made some notes about the headlines just in one newspaper today, May 13, 2015. Some of those headlines are ''Kerry Meets Putin,'' ''U.S. Weighs Plan to Confront China in the South China Sea,'' and ''Fresh Earthquake Rattles Nepal.''

By the way, Mr. Chairman, I know that the Marines and their families

who were involved in the helicopter, which has not yet been found to my understanding, are certainly in our thoughts and prayers. Our military is called upon to do humanitarian efforts.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

''Somali Men Plead Guilty in Terror Plot,'' ''North Korea Executes Defense Chief,'' and ''Assad Still Has Chemical Arms.'' The list goes on and on. This is the world that we face. This is the world we send our men and women out into to protect us and to defend our Nation. They deserve the best from us. They deserve something other than political games. They should not be used as pawns to make a point.

We should give them our best by doing our job under the Constitution, just as they give us their best in defending this country. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think this bill, H.R. 1735, deserves the support of all Members in this House, and I hope they will do so.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman—this is his first year as chairman—on his hard work on this bill, and there are a lot of very good things in this bill. I think most prominently is the reform the chairman mentioned, the compensation reform. We formed a commission to study how we do personnel compensation and the retirement system. In a very rare move, we actually followed some of the advice of that commission in this bill and made, I think, some very positive reforms to the personnel compensation system. There are a variety of other reforms the chairman has worked on that are important. There is also a whole slew of provisions in there that do, in fact, do an excellent job of providing for the men and women who defend our country. So there are a lot of very positive things about this bill.

I appreciate the hard work of everyone involved.

Unfortunately, for the first time in 19 years, I am going to be opposing the NDAA on the floor for two reasons, but one is really the big one, and it is understanding how our budget has worked.

We have not had a normal budget appropriations process since 2011, and this has affected every single government agency—and keep that fact in mind—not just the Department of Defense. I will talk about the Department of Defense at length. But the lack of a normal appropriations budget process has impacted every single Federal agency: transportation, infrastructure, education, housing, on down the line.

Ever since 2011, Mr. Chairman, they have faced one government shutdown and a succession of threatened government shutdowns and continuing resolutions. This has made it absolutely impossible to plan long term and also has cut a pretty dramatic amount of money out of all of these agencies. It has been particularly hard on the Department of Defense, which tries to do a 5-year plan when they are figuring out what they can procure. This sort of halt, stop, we are going to fund you, we are not going to fund you, we are going to shut down the government, CR, has had a devastating impact on the ability to fund government.

The budget resolution passed by the House and the Senate this year does not fix that because it relies on the overseas contingency operation fund, which is limiting. It is 1 year of money. It, again, does not allow the Department of Defense to be planned. I want everyone to know the Secretary of Defense Ash Carter, in the Senate, testified on why OCO, funding $38 billion of the Defense bill through OCO, is unacceptable, and he doesn't support it and doesn't support this bill.

But the reason we oppose this—and this is very important to understand—to fix the problem, to get us to the point where we can fund Defense and everything else in a reasonable way, we need to get rid of the budget caps from the Budget Control Act. That is the only way. And we do not do that here. We take money out of the overseas contingency operation fund to give Defense 38 billion additional dollars.

But, in one sense, Mr. THORNBERRY is wrong when he says that in all senses what we do here matches what the President did. Within the Defense budget, the number is the same. But the President's budget also lifted the budget caps for the 11 other appropriations bills.

I know we serve on the Armed Services Committee, and I have heard members of the Armed Services Committee say, ''Don't talk to me about that stuff. I serve on the Armed Services Committee. That is not my department.''

□ 1800

I would love to know what district those people are living in because roads and bridges and schools and housing, it affects all of us, and those budget caps remain in place.

What this Defense bill does, unfortunately, is it locks in the Republican budget. It locks in the deal they made with the Senate to continue to provide devastating cuts at the Budget Control Act level for everything else and then let Defense and only Defense out of jail in an awkward sort of backdoor way through the overseas contingency operations.

To agree to this bill is to agree to cuts in those 11 other bills—to cuts in transportation, to cuts in research, to cuts at NIH and CDC, in all of these programs that we care about. If we accept this, then those cuts are locked into place.

Don't get me wrong. I support spending $38 billion more on the Defense budget; I support the President's level; I support this level, but I also support lifting the budget caps for all of the other areas of our government that are facing the same sort of devastating cuts and difficulties that the Defense Department has. If we agree with this, we lock in the budget.

Lastly, I want to point out that the President has said he does not support this process. He opposes all the appropriations bills, and he will oppose this Defense bill. The President hasn't gone away. There is not a sustainable veto override number for those appropriations bills in the House and the Senate.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

Everything that we are doing on this bill and in the appropriations bills between now and October is—and I know the Republican plan is to hope the President just sort of changes his mind and signs all those bills; I consider that highly unlikely—so what is going to happen is we are going to get to October, and this is all going to blow up anyway because the President is not going to sign it.

He is still there. I know the Republicans won the Senate, but the President didn't go anywhere, and the Constitution didn't change, and nothing becomes law unless he signs it.

What I urge is that the President, the House, and the Senate—all three—sit down and come up with a budget solution that ends the budget caps for all of these bills so we can start working on something that is real. I mean, this $38 billion is great, but like I said, between here and when it heads up Pennsylvania Avenue, it is going away, and then we are going to have to double back and try to fix this anyway.

I guess all I am saying is we should start now instead of risking another government shutdown, risking another continuing resolution, and get a true budget agreement that actually addresses the Budget Control Act in its entirety, doesn't just find a sort of awkward workaround through the overseas contingency operations just to take care of Defense.

I support this level, but not this way. It has too devastating an impact on the rest of our budget, and as Secretary of Defense Ash Carter said, OCO funding is no way to fund the Defense Department if it is not legitimately for OCO expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I have enormous respect for the distinguished ranking member. I think, however, it is a very

hard argument to make that we are going to oppose the bill that takes care of our men and women in the military because we want to try to pressure Congress and the President to reach an agreement on spending on other stuff.

How could that possibly happen in this bill? It can't. That requires other legislation. I think that is a poor reason to oppose this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman THORNBERRY and the members of the Armed Services Committee on a very strong mark. I want to especially thank my distinguished ranking member, MADELEINE BORDALLO, for working with me to address some of our most critical readiness challenges.

The FY16 National Defense Authorization Act makes notable strides in restoring full spectrum readiness in helping move us away from what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, referred to as the ''ragged edge'' of being able to execute the current Defense strategy.

Specifically, this year's NDAA prohibits the Department from pursuing an additional BRAC round or any other effort aimed at locking in unwise force structure reductions during a time of accelerated transition and uncertainty, but does task the Department to conduct an assessment of where we may be overcapitalized in facilities so Congress can make informed decisions going forward.

We must be strategic about our long-term decisions, such as how we treat our headquarters and civilian personnel. We need to keep those things in mind. They do important work for this Nation, and on their behalf, we owe it to them to take the time to look at how provisions in this bill could negatively affect their efforts.

This year's NDAA also restores many critical shortfalls across the force. For example, for the Navy, the bill fully funds the operation and maintenance accounts for an 11th carrier and the 10th air wing, aircraft maintenance reset, and ship operations.

For the Army, the bill fully funds collective training exercises resulting in 19 Combat Training Center rotations for brigade combat teams, as well as fully funding the initial entry rotary wing training program and restoring funding to meet 100 percent of the flying hour program requirement.

The bill also provides the Marine Corps with additional resources to meet aviation readiness requirements to ensure adequate numbers of mission-capable aircraft.

For the Air Force, the bill provides additional training resources for high-demand areas such as pilots for unmanned systems, joint terminal controllers, cyber operations, insider threats, and open source intelligence.

Finally, the bill addresses several other shortfalls by resourcing many of the Department's most pressing unfunded requirements.

I am proud of what we have accomplished in this year's bill and encourage all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to myself just to respond briefly to Mr. THORNBERRY's remarks.

The problem, too, why this won't actually fund our troops is it is OCO funding to begin with; and, as the Secretary of Defense said, it makes it very difficult to do it in any sort of comprehensive way.

More importantly, when we get to the end of the process, if the President doesn't agree to it, then we haven't funded the troops at this $38 billion additional level. If that is where he is at on the veto on these appropriations bills, then we haven't done it. We simply run the clock out for another 4 or 5 months.

We have got to get to a budget agreement that the President agrees to, or we are not going to fund the troops at the level that I agree with the chairman that we need to fund them at, and this bill does not do that.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Dr. HECK and the committee staff for working in a bipartisan manner to develop this bill, and I also want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their leadership during this process.

The bill takes important steps toward personnel reform by including recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, and I think we all want to thank them for their work.

A key provision is the modernization of the military retirement system. While maintaining the 20-year defined retirement, a thrift savings plan is added not just for retirees, but for all servicemembers. This will positively impact the 83 percent of the force—I am going to say it again—83 percent of the force that leaves prior to the 20-year mark.

The NDAA continues the committee's critical work towards the prevention of and response to sexual assault. Several provisions will increase access to better trained special victims counsel, prevent retaliation against servicemembers, and increase awareness and training to better aid male victims of sexual assault.

Once again, the bill does not contain the Department's request to administer changes to the commissary system, reductions to the housing allowance, or TRICARE reform, but we must address these issues in some way in the future. Reform of the military healthcare system is crucial to ensure that care is elevated to a level befitting our servicemembers, our wounded veterans, retirees, and their families.

Important issues were addressed in this bill, and I support many of the provisions and all the hard work that went into it. However, national security is borne from many factions, including the education of our people, investment in science and technology, and the support of sustainable resources and infrastructure.

All of these realms, Mr. Chairman, must be funded adequately and properly in order for our military to remain the most elite force in the world. I am disappointed that this NDAA, although meeting the President's budget number request, does not follow the funding rules we have abided by in the past, thereby placing our national security in jeopardy.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES), the chair of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

I want to commend the leadership of Chairman THORNBERRY in bringing this bill to the floor. His leadership has been instrumental in tackling many of the tough issues this committee has had to address and in getting this bill finished on schedule.

That being the case, I am absolutely perplexed by a President that would even suggest that he would veto a bill or Members of Congress who would suggest they would support him in vetoing a bill that gives every dime he requested for the support of the men and women who are fighting to defend this country and for the national security of this country unless he gets everything he wants for the EPA and the IRS and whatever part of his other political agenda he wants to keep.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we put national security and the men and women that defend this country first and leave politics for another day.

As to the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, this bill fully funds the carrier replacement program, two Virginia class submarines, two Arleigh Burke class destroyers, and three littoral combat ships.

It reverses the administration's request to close the Tomahawk production line and keeps the Ticonderoga class cruisers in active service. It also accelerates the modernization of our existing destroyers and increases valuable undersea research and development activity and sustains our next-generation tanker and bomber programs.

I am pleased with the Seapower and Projection Forces' effort in this bill and believe that it is another positive step on a long road to adequately support our national security. Perhaps that is why the bill passed out of committee with such an overwhelming bipartisan margin of 60–2, with so many people on the other side of the aisle being for it before they were against it.

I urge my colleagues to support the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their accepting amendments to address military sexual assault, increase oversight, transgender rights, whistleblower protection, and equal access to contraception for military women; but, despite these improvements and many others from my colleagues, I cannot support this bill in its current form.

Instead of making tough decisions with our limited resources, this bill uses an accounting gimmick to further parochial and political interests above the readiness of the men and women protecting us and the interests of taxpayers we represent.

We chose to address the sage grouse rather than the elephant in the room. By irresponsibly sheltering $38 billion—above the self-imposed budget gap—in the OCO account, this bill attempts to decouple national security from economic security.

In reality, these are one and the same. Our military leadership gets it, but this seems to be lost on us. Admiral Mullen, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, stated that the deficit that we are unwisely adding to in this bill is the single greatest threat to our national security.

Rather than empowering our military to align our force structure with the capabilities we need, we tied their hands; and, rather than addressing wasteful overhead, needless spare parts, or outdated weapon systems, we chose to ensure that corporations that move their headquarters overseas to avoid taxes continue to get Defense contracts.

Provisions of this bill also attempt to force the DOD to keep our detention facility in Guantanamo Bay open. GTMO is a propaganda tool for our enemies and a distraction for our allies. Those aren't my words; they are George W. Bush's and 15 to 20 retired generals and admirals.

Another provision of this bill prevents the military from saving lives by purchasing alternative fuels. Costly refueling operations and convoys are extraordinarily dangerous; yet, because the existence of climate change is a political talking point, somehow, servicemember safety is second rate.

The military is not separate from the rest of the country. Along with defending us, members of the military need to drive on roads that are not crumbling, cross bridges that are not falling, and send their children to public universities that are not bankrupt.

It also makes it difficult to fund basic research, which has been a key element to our global competitive advantage and the source of much of the technology that our military relies on.

We are choosing to spend vast quantities of money on planes that the military does not want, while refusing to address problems that everyone in the Nation, including military members, needs fixed.

We have to face the reality that we can't keep our Nation secure if we let our country rot from the inside.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

□ 1815

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the chair of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Defense Authorization Act and also to thank Chairman MAC THORNBERRY for his leadership and hard work to bring this important bill to the floor.

Committee support was bipartisan—60–2—and politics should not be raised to obstruct. I am honored to serve as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, which oversees some of the most forward-looking and critical aspects of the Department of Defense, including defense-wide science and technology efforts; Special Operations Forces; Cyber Command and the cyber forces of the Department of Defense; and many other programs and activities that deal with evolving and emerging threats, from weapons of mass destruction, to Putin's aggression against Ukraine, to the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, ISIL or Daesh. The Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee has been active in conducting oversight in all of these important areas.

It is also worth noting that much of the oversight conducted by the subcommittee is classified and takes place behind closed doors where we review and remain current on sensitive activities and programs involved in Department of Defense intelligence capabilities, Special Operations Forces, and cyber forces. The subcommittee takes this sensitive oversight role very seriously as we consider Department of Defense authorities and programs that enable these sensitive activities.

Overall, our portion of the bill provides for stronger cyber operations capabilities, safeguards our technological superiority, and enables our Special Operations Forces with the resources and authorities to counter terrorism, unconventional warfare threats, and to defeat weapons of mass destruction.

I thank Chairman THORNBERRY, and I would like to thank my friend and subcommittee ranking member, Mr. JIM LANGEVIN of Rhode Island.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to extend my compliments to the chairman of the committee for his first NDAA bill and for the way he conducted a 19-hour markup that went until close to 5 o'clock in the morning. I also thank the ranking member, who provided just really great leadership in terms of moving that process along, and the strong vote that came out of the committee.

On the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee—and Mr. FORBES ticked off some of the priorities that came through the report—I just want to add one item which, I think, is really important to note. In terms of the future challenges for the shipbuilding of this country, the replacement program for the ballistic submarine program, the Ohio replacement program, is going to cost, roughly, $70 billion to $80 billion. It has been identified by Secretary Carter on down as the top priority of the Defense Department as well as the Department of the Navy. The question is not about whether or not we are going to build that sub. The question, really, is: What is going to happen to the rest of the shipbuilding account?

This year's NDAA bill activates the national sea-based deterrence fund, which is an off-shipbuilding budget account to build this once-in-a-multigeneration program, using clear precedent of the past of the national sea-based deterrence account, which took that program off the shipbuilding budget's shoulders, and we are using that same approach to make sure that, in meeting this critical need, the Ohio replacement program is not going to suffocate the rest of the shipbuilding account. $1.4 billion is going to be infused into this fund with the Defense Authorization Act, and that is going to provide a path forward to make sure that we meet this critical need as well as to make sure that we have a viable, 300-plus-ship Navy, which every defense review over the last few years or so has identified as critical.

This is an important item which, I feel, as part of this evening's debate, should be identified, and it is something that was a bipartisan effort on

both sides of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee. I look forward to a vigorous debate over the next 2 days.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

I had the privilege of serving as the chairman of the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee. I want to thank my ranking member, LORETTA SANCHEZ, for her support in completing the markup of this bill, and I want to extend my thanks to the subcommittee's vice chairman, PAUL COOK. I also want to thank our chairman, Chairman THORNBERRY, for his leadership and his bipartisan work.

Now, I had a sentence here where I said I was thanking Ranking Member SMITH for his work on a bipartisan basis because of his support for this bill when it came out of the committee, but due to his recent opposition to this bill, I am going to cross that part out.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's focus, though, has been on a bipartisan basis, and you will hear the members stand and talk about the provisions that we worked on on a bipartisan basis, and that is why it actually deserves, I think, everyone's support.

It supports the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families. It provides the equipment they need and the support that they deserve. I believe that the committee's bill strikes the appropriate balance between equipping our military to effectively carry out its mission and providing oversight.

Under this bill, Congress provides additional funding for new National Guard Blackhawk helicopters, F–35 Joint Strike Fighters, Navy strike fighters, unmanned aerial systems, lethality upgrades for Stryker combat vehicles, improved recovery vehicles, Javelin antitank missiles, and aircraft survivability improvements for Apache attack helicopters.

We support the National Guard and Reserve component. This bill provides additional funds as part of a National Guard and Reserve equipment account to address significant equipment shortages and modernization equipment for the Guard and Reserve.

This bill also calls for continued action to eradicate sexual assault in the military. I want to thank Congresswoman TSONGAS, Chairman WILSON, my ranking member, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Ranking Member SUSAN DAVIS for working on a bipartisan basis for these provisions. This bill provides greater access to Special Victims' Counsel for Department of Defense civilian employees. It addresses issues of retaliation against victims and those who report sex crimes. It enhances sexual assault prevention for male victims. It prohibits the release of victims' mental health records without an order from a judge, and it provides additional training for our military leaders.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Ranking Member ADAM SMITH and my dear friend, Chairman WITTMAN, for working collaboratively with me on the readiness section of the NDAA.

I believe that this bill provides our servicemen and -women with what they need to be prepared to face the challenges that are constantly thrown at them by a dangerous and unpredictable world. However, as Chairman THORNBERRY often likes to remind us, this gets us to the bear, ragged, lower edge of what is required to respond to the full spectrum of the challenges we face.

In addition to funding our readiness requirements, our bill looks to the future by requiring GAO reports on Army and Air Force training requirements, a review of the Army's Pacific Pathways program, and an assessment of the adequacy of support assets for the Asia-Pacific rebalance. These reports will provide the information necessary to enable us to determine whether the programs are achieving their intended purposes or will allow us to take corrective action if they are not. The bill also authorizes a 2.3 percent pay increase for all servicemembers.

The bill continues our strong tradition here in the House of supporting the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region. I am pleased that this bill authorizes funding for the relocation of marines from Okinawa to Guam and authorizes the improvement of critical infrastructure on Guam. Further, we have provided clear language that, for the first time ever, shows support from Congress on the need for continued progress on the development of a Futenma replacement facility as the only option for the marines on Okinawa. This bill also requires the administration to develop a Presidential policy directive that would provide guidance to each of the agencies and departments on how to resource and support the rebalance strategy.

As I have been saying for some time, the best thing we could do to increase our readiness above the minimum threshold that we are on is to eliminate sequestration and get away from the gimmick of using OCO funding, which adds to our Nation's credit card bill. I agree with the President and with the Secretary of Defense that OCO funding is not a permanent solution and that it hampers DOD's ability to utilize funding in a responsible manner and to plan for future years. I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress can, once and for all, find a solution and fix this bill to end sequestration across the board.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1735, the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, the 54th consecutive Defense Authorization Act, which recently passed out of the Armed Services Committee by a vote of 60–2.

I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his leadership in getting us here today. Without his guidance, we might have been here with a bill that failed to provide the $612 billion requested by the President for national defense. I wouldn't have been able to have supported that bill. Instead, we do have one that does meet the minimum needs as outlined by Chairman Martin Dempsey.

I am also particularly proud of the provisions of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee's jurisdiction:

We authorize $475 million for the Israeli missile defense, including the U.S.-based coproduction;

We direct development of U.S. military capabilities to counter Russia's violation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. Putin must recognize that his illegal actions will have real consequences;

We require the adaptation of the Aegis Ashore missile defense sites the U.S. is deploying in Romania and Poland so that they are capable of self-defense against airborne threats. It is simply immoral to deploy U.S. personnel to these sites and then remove an intrinsic self-defense capability;

We strengthen our decision made last year to end U.S. reliance on Russian rocket engines by putting real money behind a new rocket engine program;

We set priorities in NNSA by controlling the size of the bureaucracy, ending ineffective nonproliferation programs, and seriously tackling the $3.6 billion deferred maintenance backlog that we suffer at our nuclear weapons complexes. We can no longer ask the best and the brightest we have to work in decrepit infrastructure.

I am also pleased that language was included to prohibit furloughs at Working Capital Fund facilities, like the Anniston Army Depot, provided there is funded workload. Also included was my amendment with Congressman ROB BISHOP that would exempt civilian jobs funded by the working capital fund, like those jobs at the depot, from the planned 20 percent reduction at headquarters.

The Anniston Army Depot is one of the largest employers in east Alabama and is the most efficient production

and maintenance facility the Army has.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2016 NDAA, and I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY for bringing this important bill to the floor.

We have a proud tradition in the Armed Services Committee of supporting our national defense in a bipartisan manner, and I hope that tradition will continue this year.

This country is facing a vast array of threats, both from state and nonstate actors, and I am pleased that the NDAA provides for the resources needed to address those threats today while also preparing for those of tomorrow.

As Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee chairwoman, I am proud of the provisions included to address issues related to detainee transfers. I remain frustrated and concerned with the administration's lack of cooperation in the investigation of the Taliban Five transfer. I consider it prudent to withhold funding from DOD until more information and support is given so that we may continue proper oversight.

This bill is good news also for the men and women at Fort Leonard Wood and Whiteman Air Force Base. One of my top priorities since I got to Congress has been to support Whiteman commanders' requests for the construction of the Consolidated Stealth Operations and Nuclear Alert Facility. This facility is included in this NDAA, and it will bring substantial, immediate, and long-term benefits to the base and to its B–2 operations. Additionally, I requested the provision to authorize 12 additional F/A–18F Super Hornets. These aircraft will fill an immediate need in the fight against ISIL and allow them to be converted to airborne electronic attack Growlers later, if necessary.

After a marathon 18-hour-long debate throughout the day and night, my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee and I have produced a bipartisan bill that allocates vital funds for our Nation's defense. I am proud of this bill, and I urge Members to support its passage.

□ 1830

Mr. COURTNEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), chair of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, the military personnel provisions of H.R. 1735 are the product of an open, bipartisan process. The mark provides our warfighters, retirees, and their families the care and support they need, deserve, and earned.

Some highlights from this year's proposal include continued emphasis on the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program by addressing shortfalls in the program identified in the Judicial Proceedings Panel initial report.

There is also rigorous oversight and consideration of the recommendations made by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. Specifically, the mark would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a joint formulary that includes medications critical for the transition of an individual undergoing treatment related to sleep disorders, pain control, and behavioral health conditions.

It requires the Secretary of Defense to establish a unified medical command to oversee medical services to the Armed Forces and other DOD health care beneficiaries.

And it modernizes the current military retirement system by blending the current 20-year defined benefit plan with a defined contribution plan allowing servicemembers to contribute to a portable account that includes a government automatic contribution and matching program.

It also requires the Secretary of Defense and the military service chiefs to strengthen and increase the frequency of financial literacy and preparedness training, establishing a more robust training and education program for servicemembers and their families.

I want to thank Ranking Member DAVIS and her staff for their contributions to this process. We were joined by an active, informed, and dedicated group of subcommittee members, and their recommendations and priorities are clearly reflected in the NDAA for fiscal year 2016.

Mr. Chairman, I have always said that I felt myself lucky to serve on the Armed Services Committee because I thought it was the most bipartisan committee in Congress. We, over at least the past 4 years, have been unified in making sure that our men and women in uniform have the resources they need to keep themselves and our Nation safe.

That is why today I find myself very confused and disappointed by the comments made on the floor. This is the National Defense Authorization Act, whose sole purpose is to provide for the common defense, not education, not transportation, not any other government function.

To vote against this bill is to breach the faith that we have with our men and women in uniform and is unconscionable. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COURTNEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), the distinguished vice chair of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join in this chorus of support for the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. I want to sincerely congratulate Chairman THORNBERRY in this, his inaugural bill as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, which passed with a small vote of 60–2.

While this bill sets DOD policy, it also reflects the House-passed budget figure for authorized spending at the Department of Defense. It represents the will of Congress that we ought to be spending more on national security, as nearly every corner of the world has become less safe under President Obama's continued foreign policy failures.

The fiscal year 2016 NDAA makes needed reforms to strengthen civilian retiree packages and begins to reform the way that we buy weapons and other systems at the Pentagon, which will save tax dollars for years to come.

I also want to thank the chairman and the committee for including some of my amendments to reestablish the EMP Commission, beginning an initial concept for development of a space-based missile defense system, and guaranteed assistance to the Kurdistan regional government.

As we know, President Obama has, unfortunately, issued a veto threat toward this bill. Mr. Chairman, the NDAA has been passed year after year for 53 straight years, under both Democrat and Republican administrations.

Among the provisions the President stands ready to reject are a joint formulary to ease troop transition from the Department of Defense to the VA; providing aid to Ukraine in the midst of Russian-backed attacks; providing full funding to the Department of Defense which he, himself, requested; a stronger missile defense and cyber capabilities; a greater accountability for political reconciliation in Iraq; greater protection of our troops from sexual assault; and better pay and benefits to those who serve us so that we may stand here and debate this bill today. These are among the provisions of this bill Mr. Obama opposes.

I want just to reiterate to my colleagues that this bill did pass out of the Armed Services Committee 60–2, and this list of accomplishments is too long. So I will just express congratulations again to Mr. THORNBERRY for his leadership under this massive undertaking. I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond briefly when basically it is called unconscionable to oppose something. Aside from being unbelievably arrogant, it is wrong to say that there is no reason whatsoever to vote against this bill.

I mentioned earlier that there were—I am sorry, if he can call me ''unconscionable,'' I suppose I can call him ''arrogant.'' I don't know; it seems fair.

At any rate, there is another reason not to vote for this bill, and that is that it underfunds readiness once again. It says this matches the President's budget, and overall it does, but it has $2.4 billion less in money for readiness. Last year's bill had $1.5 billion less in readiness. Why?

Because every effort that the Department of Defense makes to cut just about anything—the movements that they wanted to make to start a BRAC, the changes that they wanted to make to the National Guard to save money, the plan they had to lay up 11 cruisers, the efforts to get rid of the A–10—efforts to move anything around are blocked by this committee, and they take that money out of readiness to fund what really amounts to a personal priority.

What does it mean to take money out of readiness? It means that our troops do not get the training that they need to be prepared to fight. It is just that simple. Readiness money is the money for the ammo. It is the money for the fuel. It is the money for the mechanic to fix equipment. That has been going down and down and down and down as we block every effort to save money anyplace else because just about anything the Pentagon is going to do is going to affect somebody's district. The A–10 is in somebody's district. Every other project is made in somebody's district.

We protected all that at the expense of readiness, and I think that is the worst thing that we can do. It has created a situation where we may well be sending our men and women off to fight unprepared and untrained. And you talk to the people who are serving. They are not able to fly as much as they used to. They are not able to train as much as they used to. They are not able to use their weapons as much as they used to because of those continuous cuts to readiness, because we fund other priorities. That is number one.

Number two. Funding through OCO, as the Secretary of Defense has said, is not the same as actually funding the Department of Defense through a regular appropriations process. It is one-time money. What the Secretary of Defense has said is:

Giving us this one-time money makes it impossible to plan. We don't know if it is going to be there next year. You can't have a 5-year plan under OCO money. You are restricted in where you can spend it and how you can spend it. So this is not adequately funding our troops.

I do take offense at the notion that opposition to this bill means that you just don't support our troops. That is the bumper sticker—sorry, I won't use that word. It is wrong to say that about anyone who opposes this bill. I oppose this bill because I don't think it does adequately fund our troops. It doesn't take care of the budget problems that are in front of us.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The only way to adequately fund our troops is to get rid of the Budget Control Act, so we can actually fund it under regular order with a normal amount of money that allows them to plan for over 5 years.

Lastly, I am sorry, but the infrastructure of this country matters. The fact that bridges are falling down matters. The fact that we don't have enough money to do research on critical disease matters. Yes, it is important to defend this country. Yes, that is the paramount duty. But if the country itself crumbles while we have a military to defend it, that too is a problem and one I think worth fighting for, worth standing up and saying we are not going to accept a budget that guts all of these other things and uses the overseas contingency operation as a work-around to fund defense.

It is basically acting like this is free money. Well, it is not free money. It costs, and it undermines the entire rest of the budget. Let's get rid of the Budget Control Act. Let's get rid of the caps. Let's get rid of sequestration. We don't do that in this bill, and it is my contention that if we don't do that, then we are not adequately funding our troops and adequately funding our defense.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I will just make two brief points. One is the extra OCO funding that has been so criticized is 100 percent for operations and maintenance, for readiness. That is what it all is devoted to in this mark.

Secondly, if we start holding our troops hostage because we want more spending over here or we want some other change in law over there, where does that stop? Where does that stop? What are we not going to hold our troops hostage to because a Senate and a House and a President can't agree on some other issue? I think it is dangerous to start down that road.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman of the committee for his great work on this bill and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2016. This is an important bill that provides funding and authority for the men and women in uniform who are willing to go in harm's way to keep our country safe. This bill takes some of the important steps to reform the Department of Defense, both in acquisition and in retirement benefits. It includes a number of provisions that I worked on regarding military space, missile defense, and tunnel detection, to name just a few.

This is a bipartisan bill. Dozens, if not hundreds, of provisions were authored by Democrats. It came out of committee by a vote of 60–2. Only one Democrat voted against it in committee. Nothing substantive has changed; only now NANCY PELOSI is calling the shots, and Democrats have flip-flopped.

I understand that NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats want to increase taxes and increase spending on domestic programs, but that debate should not be fought on the backs of our troops. If you vote against this bill, it is a vote to cut our defense budget. It is even a vote against President Obama's requested defense budget.

Today we have troops doing humanitarian relief in Nepal, dropping bombs on ISIS, fighting the Taliban, deterring Iran in the Straits of Hormuz, and supporting our European allies in the face of Russian aggression. Now is not the time to cut the defense budget. Let's support our troops, not NANCY PELOSI's partisan agenda. Vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1735.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Connecticut has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, and I would like to first thank and applaud Chairman THORNBERRY on his leadership and commitment to this thoughtful and comprehensive bill. Additionally, I am grateful to our subcommittee chairs for their exhaustive efforts.

While the end results may not be perfect, it is a strong, bipartisan piece of legislation that I am proud to support. Our committee spent 19 hours debating this bill, and all members put forward their ideas. We worked together across the aisle, which led to significant

strides in maintaining and establishing our Nation's defense policy.

In today's unstable global environment, we are asking our Armed Forces to do more with less over and over again, and as a representative of Fort Drum, home of the 10th Mountain Division, such a high operational tempo unit, I too am concerned about long-term impacts due to the budget cap constraints.

Recently, I had the honor to attend a small congressional delegation visit to CENTCOM's AOR. On this trip, I was able to get a firsthand perspective on the detrimental effects these budget caps have on our Nation's overseas missions.

Thankfully, the fiscal year 2016 NDAA provides our U.S. Armed Forces with the tools and resources to maintain current efforts, and it passed out of our committee on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 60–2. I want to remind my colleagues, 60–2.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for putting forth a great bill that I am pleased to support. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, particularly those colleagues on the committee who already have.

Mr. COURTNEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

□ 1845

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the National Defense Authorization Act. It is a bipartisan bill that passed the full Armed Services Committee with nearly unanimous support, as we have already heard.

This bill meets our national security needs; it cares for our troops, invests in next-generation weaponry, and brings necessary reforms to the Pentagon.

No bill is perfect, and I urge my colleagues not to allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. And there is certainly a lot of good in this bill.

As vice chairman of the Military Personnel Subcommittee, I am especially proud of our work to care for our troops and their families. This bill acts on 11 of the 15 recommendations of the Commission on Military Pay and Benefits, including things like revamping our military retirement system to bring it into the 21st century, providing increased financial literacy for our troops.

I am especially pleased that the bill includes an initiative I proposed to help our retiring military personnel transition to civilian jobs.

Importantly, this bill precludes another round of base realignment and closure, or BRAC, which threatens to shutter military bases around the country. We have seen that BRAC is simply not cost effective. In my home State of New Jersey, we have seen the devastation it brings to local communities. The last round of BRAC cost $14 billion more than it was supposed to, and the savings were reduced by 73 percent. It doesn't even break even for 13 years.

I am a businessman, and spending more to save less while you ruin local economies and weaken our military just makes no sense.

Finally, this bill fulfills our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense of our Nation. We face new threats like the Islamic State, a newly resurgent Russia, and our military has to be ready to face them head-on.

This bill funds the Pentagon at the level it needs and avoids the disastrous blind cuts of sequestration that hurt our military's capability and readiness.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me emphasize again that there are a lot of good things in this bill. I won't disagree with anything that was said. The reform agenda that Mr. THORNBERRY has, I think, taken a leadership role on is incredibly important, and I think that is a huge positive.

There are a lot of programs in this bill that are absolutely critical to our national defense, but the most critical thing, I think, to our national defense is getting us back to the normal budget process, getting us out from under the Budget Control Act, out from under the budget caps, and having a normal appropriations process. If we vote for this bill, we allow that unnatural process where the Pentagon does not have long-term funding and long-term predictability to continue.

The biggest thing that has changed since we were in committee is, number one, the President did not issue a veto threat. I actually had a conversation with leadership before we went to committee as to where they were at on that. The fact that the President has now said that he will not support this bill with the additional OCO funding is a major change. It means that what we are working on here is not going to happen. And that is not political; that is substantive. We have to have a bill that the President will sign if we are, in fact, going to fund our troops.

The second thing that happened was the budget resolution, which was being debated back and forth. The House passed one and the Senate passed one, but they came together and it became clear that the budget resolution was the budget resolution, and they were locking in place the budget resolution that I have described that takes advantage of the OCO fund to basically create free money—money that doesn't count under the Budget Control Act—to plus-up defense and keep everything else where it is at.

Once that was locked in and the President looked at that and said he would not support that appropriations process, we created a situation where what we are doing here is not going to pass. It is not going to be sustainable. We are not going to fund our troops doing it this way. Unless we make those other changes in the budget process, we are just not going to get there.

On the gentleman's comments about the BRAC round, the military said they are over capacity in facilities. They are spending money on facilities that they don't need to spend just because they can't close those bases. Yes, in the short term it costs more money, but in the long term, the first four rounds of BRAC have saved us hundreds of billions of dollars over the long term.

So not being willing to do BRAC, not being willing to make cuts in certain programs, is undermining readiness.

Yes, it is good that we took the OCO money. And because OCO money is so fungible, you can do it this way. You took the rest of the money and you funded all of these programs that the Pentagon was trying to cut, and then you tried to backfill as much as you possibly could with the OCO money and readiness. And that is better than not, but it is still less to $2.4 billion short of what the President's budget was on readiness.

And I still contend that we are short-changing readiness to fund the priorities that are more parochial and more political, and that is something that I mentioned last year that put me on the edge of whether or not I could support last year's bill. Because at the end of the day, the one thing I think we owe our troops is that if we send them into battle, they are ready. They are trained and they are ready to fight. If they don't have the equipment and they don't have the readiness dollars, then they won't be. So for those two reasons, I am opposing this bill.

I am hopeful between now and when we come back from conference that we can reconcile this issue and that we can actually adequately fund the military and work through this, because I totally agree we need to do this. But where we are at right now is a bill that I don't think does adequately fund our troops in a predictable enough way to give them the training they need and to give the Pentagon leadership the predictability they need in terms of budgeting to have a defense budget.

So, reluctantly, I will oppose this bill. And I hope we continue to work to get to a bill that we can support in the end. I do not view this in any way as the end of the bipartisan tradition of our committee. We worked very closely together on putting together this bill, and we will continue to work closely together to find a bill that did actually pass through the entire process.

Again, if the President doesn't sign it, then all of our work is for naught,

and it is the troops who suffer. So we are going to have to work on finding a way to reach an agreement with all the people who need to approve this bill before it becomes law. I pledge to continue to do that.

I do want to thank the chairman and the Republicans on this issue. I think they have done a fabulous job of working on this bill. I just disagree on that one fundamental point that, frankly, has more to do with the Budget Committee than it does with our committee, but it does have a profound impact on our product.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just take up where the gentleman from Washington left off.

You have heard from a number of speakers that the product before us is a bipartisan product, that our committee works in a bipartisan way. Just to put a little bit of quantification on that, over the course of our markup in committee, 96 amendments sponsored by Democratic members of the committee were adopted; and prior to that, at least 110 specific requests by Democratic members of the committee were incorporated into the committee and subcommittee marks. So it leaves one wondering: If Democratic Members are forced to oppose the bill because of something the Budget Committee hasn't done, how can this bipartisan tradition continue?

That is one of the things that concerns me, because it is something that I think we are all very proud of, that we worked together, that we put the national defense interests ahead of these other differences that we have.

This makes it harder when we don't fix the budget or we don't fix health care or we don't fix the environment or we don't fix taxes. There is no end if that is the way that this is going to go.

I think it is ironic, Mr. Chairman. I believe we need to find a better way to impose fiscal responsibility in our government than the Budget Control Act, and I am absolutely anxious to work with any Member who wants to find a better way to go ahead. But we can't do it on this bill. It is impossible.

And so what we are doing, for those who would oppose this bill, is to hold the pay and benefits of our troops, all of these decisions, we are holding that hostage to something that we can't resolve here in this measure.

As the gentleman from Washington said at some point, this is not the end of the process. This is a step in the process. There are a lot of things to go with appropriation bills and conference reports and so forth before the President ever has an opportunity to veto a bill. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, this President has threatened to veto, I think, pretty much all the defense authorization bills at some point in the process. That is not a reason for us not to take the next step.

I think we should build upon the bipartisan work that came out of committee. I suspect there will be bipartisan work with amendments from Republicans and Democrats on the floor and that we should pass this measure, go to conference with the Senate, and keep working towards the end of the process where, hopefully, we can have something better than the Budget Control Act. But to say I am not going to support our troops unless we do that first I don't think is the proper way to go.

This is a normal budget process. We have a House and Senate budget resolution for the first time in years.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. It is not a matter of not supporting our troops. To say that the decision to oppose the defense bill is because you don't support the troops I hope the gentleman would agree is not where we are coming from.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Reclaiming my time, I do not mean to say that is the intention of the gentleman or those who might oppose this bill. It is the effect, however, because there are 40 essential authorities that have to be in a defense authorization bill. One of those authorities is to pay the troops. Without those authorities, it doesn't happen.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill should be supported, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be submitted during consideration of H.R. 1735:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, April 28, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I am writing concerning H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

This legislation contains provisions within the Committee on Agriculture's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Agriculture will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Agriculture has a valid jurisdictional claim to a provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Agriculture is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to HR. 1735 on those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 1735, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my Committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 1735 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters

will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.'' While the legislation does contain provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee will not request a sequential referral so that it can proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Committee takes this action with the understanding that its jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as such legislation moves forward. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on such legislation and requests your support when such a request is made.

Finally, I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. 1 agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be submitted during consideration of H.R. 1735:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, which contains substantial matter that falls within the Rule X legislative jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I appreciate the cooperation that allowed us to work out mutually agreeable text on numerous matters prior to your markup.

Based on that cooperation and our associated understandings, the Foreign Affairs Committee will not seek a sequential referral or object to floor consideration of the bill text approved at your Committee markup. This decision in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdictional interests of the Foreign Affairs Committee in this bill, any subsequent amendments, or similar legislation. I request your support for the appointment of House Foreign Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Finally, I respectfully request that you include this letter and your response in your committee report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in matters being considered in H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1735 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In recognition of the importance of expediting the passage of H.R. 1735, the ''Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Bill'', the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence hereby waives further consideration of the bill. The Committee has jurisdictional interests in H.R. 1735, including intelligence and intelligence-related authorizations and provisions in the amendment.

The Committee takes this action only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's jurisdictional interest over this bill or any similar bill and will not be considered precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee in the future, including in connection with any subsequent consideration of the bill by the House. In addition, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will seek conferees on any provisions in the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during the House debate on H.R. 1735. I appreciate the constructive work between our committees on this matter and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a

sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be submitted during consideration of H.R. 1735:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding several provisions contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill on the following provisions.

Title	Section #—Name
5	Section 562—Availability of Additional Training Opportunities under Transition Assistance Program
5	Section 565—Recognition of Additional Involuntary Mobilization Duty Authorities Exempt from Five-Year Limit on Reemployment Rights of Persons who Serve in the Uniformed Services
5	Section 566—Job Training and Post-Service Placement Executive Committee
5	Section 592—Honoring Certain Members of the Reserve Components as Veterans
7	Section 701—Joint Uniform Formulary for Transition of Care
7	Section 721—Extension of Authority for DOD-VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund
7	Section 722—Extension of Authority for Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund
12	Section 1251—Sense of Congress Recognizing the 70th Anniversary of the End of Allied Military Engagement in the Pacific Theater
14	Section 1431—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois

The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JEFF MILLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. JEFF MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY, I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made.

Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chair, I rise to discuss several important provisions included in H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. The bill provides critical authorities to support our men and women in uniform.

In particular, I appreciate the leadership of Readiness Chairman, Rep. ROB WITTMAN of Virginia, and the way we have worked together to address the readiness of our United States military. The underlying bill takes important steps to provide authorities and funds to support for the readiness of our military to meet the full spectrum of threats.

However, I have concerns about an amendment that is in en-bloc package 1 and sponsored by Congressman HANNA of New York. While I do not oppose the entire en-bloc package I am concerned about the potential impacts of Mr. HANNA's amendment on reverse auctions. In last year's defense bill we carried a provision that provided a framework to conduct reverse auctions in the Department of Defense. I am concerned that Mr. HANNA's amendment, as offered, is too broad and does not allow ample time for the DoD to implement what we required just months ago.

The amendment would restrict the use of reverse auctions on procurement of certain items for the protection of Federal employees or members of the Armed Forces. Such broad language could include items that are more appropriately procured through reverse auctions. There is also no evidence that reverse auctions have been harmful in the procurement of any personal safety devices including bullet-proof vests.

Finally, the amendment includes a definition of design and construction services that is overly broad and could preclude contracting officials from using reverse auctions to save the government significant funding. For example, it defines design and construction services to include interior design and landscape design. Use of reverse auctions may be an appropriate way to save the government significant funding.

Ultimately, I appreciate the gentlemen's intent to provide a government-wide framework for reverse auctions but I am concerned the language is overly broad and could have the unintended consequences for contracting officers and potentially add costs instead of save the government valuable funding. I look forward to working with Mr. HANNA of New York and Ms. MENG of New York to address their concerns during Conference Committee on the FY16 NDAA.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I want to first thank the Chairman, the Ranking Member, and the committee staff for their hard work and effort that the bill before us represents. I particularly want to express my sincere thanks to Chairman WILSON and the members of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities subcommittee for what I believe are very fine contributions to the final bill. These initiatives span a variety of important areas, including cyberspace programs and authorities; technology transition and reauthorization of the Rapid Innovation Program; and research, development, and integration of advanced technologies such as railgun and directed energy. Also included in this legislation are critical provisions that address Special Operations, Counter-Terrorism, and Unconventional Warfare, including increasing Congressional oversight of sensitive operations, and the threats posed at home and abroad by weapons of mass destruction.

I also applaud the bill's investment in critically important undersea capabilities such as the peerless Virginia-class submarines, the Virginia Payload Module, the recapitalization of our national deterrent through the Ohio Replacement Program, and cutting-edge autonomous and unmanned systems.

These provisions demonstrate a shared, bipartisan commitment to the defense of our nation and support for our troops.

However, as we move forward with this bill, I note with great concern that it reflects a

budget approach that locks in sequestration and severs that critical link between our national and economic security. I'm sure that dedicated public servants fighting organized crime at the Department of Justice, combatting terrorist financing mechanisms at the Treasury, or securing our borders and defending our critical infrastructure in cyberspace at Homeland Security would be shocked indeed to find out that what they did wasn't a matter of national security. One could just as soon tell the brilliant scientists and engineers at our national labs, or the teachers educating future generations that what they do isn't important to the future competitiveness of our nation. National security is not just tanks, ships, and airplanes.

The one-year nature of the approach in the bill is a flagrant abuse of a system designed to fund incremental and unpredictable costs of overseas operations, not to get around politically difficult votes for Members of Congress. It's bad management and worse policy; it doesn't live up to our commitment to the troops; it undermines our capability to conduct long-term strategy; and worst of all, it sets us up to have yet another round of budgeting by brinksmanship in a matter of months. Ducking debates is not why our constituents sent us here.

While I support the important policy measures contained in the bill, and I ultimately support its passage, it is so unfortunate that the one piece of legislation that has historically been the pinnacle of bipartisanship and one of the last vestiges of regular order has been taken hostage by a refusal to address the Budget Control Act. I applaud the bill's recognition that the President's budget accurately reflects the level of investment needed, but that is true across all departments and all of the elements of national power that together make the United States great. Let's take that realization to its logical conclusion and use the seeds of bipartisanship that the Armed Services Committee has worked so hard to preserve to build a long-term agreement that can finally unshackle us from the tyranny of budgetary uncertainty.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be submitted during consideration of H.R. 1735:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology takes this action only with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write concerning H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 1735 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has a valid jurisdictional claim to a provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be submitted during consideration of H.R. 1735:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. That bill, as ordered reported, contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Natural

Resources Committee, including those noted in addendum A.

In the interest of permitting you to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this very important bill, I am willing to waive this committee's right to a sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that the Natural Resources Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of the Natural Resources committee to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1735 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you and your staff have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees, and congratulations on this significant achievement.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

Addendum A:

PROVISIONS

TITLE	SECTION #—NAME
6	Section 601—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances
6	Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces
6	Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals
6	Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities
6	Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays
6	Section 631—Full Participation for Members of the Uniformed Services in Thrift Savings Plan
6	Section 632—Modernized Retirement System for Members of the Uniformed Services
6	Section 633—Continuation Pay for Full TSP Members with 12 Years of Service
6	Section 634—Effective Date and Implementation
10	Section 1083—Navy Support of Ocean Research Advisory Panel
28	Section 2841—Withdrawal and Reservation of Public Land, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California
28	Section 2851—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio
28	Section 2852—Extension of Authority for General Francis Marion establishment of Commemorative Work in Honor of Brigadier
28	Section 2862—Protection and Recovery of Greater Sage Grouse

AMENDMENTS

Mark	Log	Sponsor	Description
RDY	089	Bishop	Provision would permanently extend the land withdrawals for certain military reservations.
RDY	092	Wilson	Amend existing law to allow an agency to object to the inclusion of certain property on the National Register or its designation as a National Historic Landmark for reasons of national security.
ROY	324	Knight	The provision would add a new section to title 10, United States code to provide for the conservation needs of the Southern Sea Otter while continuing the protections for military readiness activities at important offshore islands in the Southern California Bight.
MLP	181r2	Takai	This amendment would prohibit per diem allowance reductions for civilian employees on TDY.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business pursuant to Rule X(q) of the House of Representatives.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Armed Services to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive the right of the Committee on Small Business to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Small Business does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X(q) jurisdiction, including future bills that the Committee on Armed Services will consider. I request that you urge the Speaker to appoint members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1735 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this issue and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Small Business has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1735, the FY16 National Defense Authorization Act.

The National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation that this body votes on each year. While this bill does authorize much needed funding for our men and women in uniform, ultimately it ignores the current budget landscape that our military is facing.

Consistent with the Republican budget, this year's defense authorization bill uses the Overseas Contingency Operations budget as a backdoor loophole to get around sequestration by funding $38 billion of the Pentagon's regular base budget activities with war funds—a blatant abuse of the budget process. Just one year ago, House Republicans criticized the abuse of the OCO loophole in their budget report, stating that it ''undermines the integrity of the budget process'' and that the Budget Committee would ''oppose increases above the levels the Administration and our military commanders say are needed to carry out operations unless it can be clearly demonstrated that such amounts are war-related.''

Moreover, in following the strategy of the Republican budget, the NDAA begins the process of locking in sequestration for nondefense programs, which will have a devastating impact on investments critical to the nation. We need to get back to the table to have an honest debate about our budget and renegotiate the funding caps for both defense and nondefense. Only then will we be able to provide the necessary resources for our national security needs and to ensure we keep the nation's commitments to education, research, infrastructure, and other crucial drivers of economic prosperity.

I also have many problems with a number of misguided provisions in this year's NDAA. Once again, this year's NDAA includes a provision to continue funding restrictions on the construction or modification of detention facilities in the United States to house Guantanamo detainees. I strongly opposed Rep. Walorski's amendment to keep Guantanamo

open for at least two more years beyond FY16 and was disappointed that an amendment offered by Ranking Member Smith to provide a framework for closure of Guantanamo by the end of 2016 was rejected.

I also oppose efforts by Republicans to strike an important provision in this bill which would have stated that it was the sense of the House that our military should review whether "DREAMers" should be allowed to enlist and serve in the Armed Forces. In addition, I object to provisions that prohibit the Pentagon from entering into contracts to construct alternative fuel refineries and prevent our military from developing alternative energy sources that have the potential to save money and enhance our energy security. Finally, I object to the inclusion of unrequested funding for many weapons systems, including an extra $1.15 billion for extra F/A–18 aircraft and $128 million for extra UH–60 helicopters.

Despite my opposition to the overall legislation, I was pleased that a bipartisan amendment I introduced with Congressman Mulvaney was adopted and will require Congress to report on how funds authorized for overseas contingency operations were ultimately used. I also support the increased 2.3 percent pay raise for our troops and their families.

While this legislation does authorize much needed funding for programs that benefit our men and women in uniform, ultimately, this bill falls short in too many areas. It is my hope that many of my objections to the NDAA will be resolved in Conference with the Senate but I can't support it in its current form.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BABIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

JOINT REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives and the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate, their joint reappointment, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), as amended by Public Law 114–6, of the following individuals on May 13, 2015, each to a 2-year term on the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance:

Ms. Barbara L. Camens, Washington, D.C., Chair

Ms. Roberta L. Holzwarth, Rockford, Illinois

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42–43), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. BECERRA, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2004(b), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation:

Mr. DEUTCH, Florida

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. ISRAEL, New York

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mrs. DAVIS, California

Mr. SHERMAN, California

Mr. RICHMOND, Louisiana

□ 1900

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 8162 of Public Law 106–79, as amended, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission:

Mr. BISHOP, Georgia

Mr. THOMPSON, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. WALZ, Minnesota

Ms. KAPTUR, Ohio

Mr. HONDA, California

Mr. LIEU, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. HASTINGS, Florida

Ms. SLAUGHTER, New York

Mr. COHEN, Tennessee

Mr. GRAYSON, Florida

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MAY 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, United States Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2081, I am pleased to reappoint the Honorable Marcy Kaptur of Ohio to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

Thank you for your consideration of this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MAY 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 4(c) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, I am pleased to reappoint The Honorable James P. McGovern of Massachusetts as

Co-Chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MAY 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b) note), I am pleased to reappoint The Honorable Betty McCollum of Minnesota to the National Council on the Arts.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

PASSAGE OF THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it has been an amazing day. We passed a major bill today, Mr. Speaker, that I think is going to have some significant reverberations in this country for a long time.

I know that whenever the subject has been abortion that, somehow, the rules always change. Somehow, we don't see it the same way that we do other issues. We don't apply the same principles of logic and reason and even compassion. It seems like that gets lost in it all. It seems like we sort of overlook the reality of it all.

The real question with abortion, Mr. Speaker, really is: Does abortion really kill a baby?

If it doesn't, then people like me would be completely satisfied to never bring up the subject again; but, if it really does take the life of a child, then those of us living here in the seat of freedom, in the freest country in the world, are living in the midst of a great human genocide, and it is something that we cannot and must not turn our backs upon.

Mr. Speaker, I know that it has been a long time that we have debated in this country. I remember in 1965 the Governor of Colorado signed a bill that would allow abortion in rare circumstances, and it created a great outcry because people knew that that might lead to more widespread abortion on demand.

At the time, those who were concerned about that were ridiculed and ignored many times; yet that is, in fact, what the Supreme Court did in 1973, when seven Justices decided, for all Americans, that there was a constitutional right to hire someone to take the life of a child.

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder how we miss the reality of it all. I know that there are sincere people on both sides of the issue, but it just seems like that, ultimately, we keep coming back to that central question: Is there another life here?

Because if there is, in order for America to be true to her greatest ideals, then the American people are going to have to precipitate a change, either in their leadership or to convince their leadership to precipitate a change in their own hearts—after all, I believe there are only two ways that we can change public policy in this country, and that is that the people either have to elect the right leaders, or somehow, they have to beg the wrong ones to do the right thing.

For a long time, our people have tried desperately to get their leaders to do the right thing on this issue, but we have been hamstrung by a Supreme Court decision. Once again, the Supreme Court was never meant to make law for the country. They were meant to decide cases, not issues.

Even though we have put the Supreme Court in the position of deciding those cases and giving us opinions on constitutional analysis, when each of us as Members of Congress swore to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States, we put our hand, as we swore to do that, to support and defend the Constitution.

We didn't say that we will support and defend the Constitution if the Supreme Court says it is all right. We said we would do that. The Founding Fathers knew that there had to be this tension between the three branches of government and that each one of those branches had a responsibility and a sworn oath to defend the Constitution the best they knew how on their own.

Certainly, we give deference to opinions of the Court on cases, but if this body says that the Supreme Court is the ultimate arbiter of the Constitution, then we have to quit taking that oath.

If this body says that the Supreme Court is the ultimate arbiter because of their ability and the power that we would ostensibly give them to answer all constitutional questions, if we say that, then, Mr. Speaker, we can go outside here and board these windows shut, and the Congress can go home, and we can finally quit pretending to be that great Republic that the Founding Fathers dreamed of because we will have become, at that time, a judicial oligarchy, where unelected judges have arrogated unto themselves the power to answer really all legal questions, and then this magnificent dream that the Founding Fathers had would be vitiated completely.

I just, somehow, hope that we understand that the Supreme Court of the United States is a critically important part of our Republic, but it is not the sole arbiter of the Constitution. Again, if it is, the Republic is dead.

Mr. Speaker, today, we debated the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and it kind of occurs to me that we have had to parse this out in ways that the opposition could finally understand.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act doesn't protect any children in the first 5 months, even though I think they should be protected; and, if we don't protect them, then what will we find, in terms of political courage, to protect any kind of liberty for anyone?

This act today only protected children beginning at the sixth month until birth. Now, that shouldn't be a hard question. That it got any dissenting votes is a disgrace that beggars my ability to express.

I truly believe that those who voted against a bill that would simply have protected children in the sixth month, beginning at the sixth month and beyond, that when they lay their head down on that pillow in the nursing home, if there is any conscience remaining, that there will be great regret for such a vote because, in coming years, I believe that we will understand more and more how real and how human these little babies really are.

We will begin to understand, as a people and as a country, that we overlook them, that somehow these little forgotten children of God just escaped our notice.

With all of the new technologies and all the new ways that we do things, Mr. Speaker, I foresee a day when we will be able to have such a clear look into the lives of these little children, and we will see this as we have so many times before in past days, where there was a victim and no one was really paying much attention to them.

I hope that, somehow, we can consider our own history and back up a little bit and say, You know, we don't have to continue to let ourselves be blind.

Mr. Speaker, for too long, a great shadow has loomed over America. More than 42 years ago, the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, because of that decision, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of more than 55 million of its own little children.

Exactly 2 years ago today, one Kermit Gosnell was convicted of killing a mother and murdering innocent, late-term, pain-capable babies in this grisly torture chamber they called an abortion clinic.

Now, when authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

According to the grand jury report—now, this is a quote from the grand jury report, Mr. Speaker: ''Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies. He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it 'ensuring fetal demise.' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it 'snipping.' Over the years, there were hundreds of 'snippings.' ''

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth but, in her words, was making like this ''screeching'' noise, and it ''sounded like a little alien.''

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, is this who we truly are?

Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent children, just like the one I described; yet there was and is no Federal protection for any of them.

If Dr. Gosnell had killed these little pain-capable babies only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in many of the United States of America.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, we may have sanitized Gosnell's clinic, but we can never sanitize the horror and inhumanity forced upon the tiny little victims. And if there is one thing that we must not miss about this unspeakable episode, it is that Kermit Gosnell is not an anomaly; he is just the face of this lucrative enterprise of murdering pain-capable unborn children in America.

More than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year. It places the mothers at exponentially greater risk, and it subjects their pain-capable babies to torture and death without anesthesia. This, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

According to the Bartlett study, a woman seeking an abortion at 20 weeks is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she was in the first trimester; at 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die than she was in the first trimester.

Regardless of how supporters of abortion on demand might try to suppress it, it is undisputed and universally accepted by every credible expert that the risk to a mother's health from abortion increases as gestation increases. There is no valid debate on that incontrovertible reality.

Supporters of abortion on demand have also tried for decades to deny that unborn children ever feel pain, even those, they say, at the beginning of the sixth month of pregnancy, as if somehow the ability to feel pain magically develops the very second the child is born.

Mr. Speaker, almost every major civilized nation on this Earth protects pain-capable babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in support of protecting these children. Yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary pain and cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act. It is a tragedy that beggars expression.

But today, Mr. Speaker, I am filled with hope. The winds of change are beginning to blow, and the tide of blindness and blood is finally beginning to turn in America. Because today, Mr. Speaker, we voted to pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber.

And no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions or deceptive what-ifs or distractions or diversions or gotchas, twisting of words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, this bill and its passage today are a deeply sincere effort—beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy—to protect both mothers and their pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand; and ultimately, it is a bill that all humane Americans will support when they truly understand it for themselves.

The voices who have hailed the merciless killing of these little ones as freedom of choice will now only grow louder, especially the ones who profit from it most. When we hear those voices, we should all remember the quote of President Abraham Lincoln, when he said: ''Those who deny freedom to others, deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, can not long retain it.''

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of all of those who founded and built this Nation and dreamed of what America could someday be, and for the sake of all of those since then who have died in darkness so Americans could walk in the light of freedom, it is so very important that those of us who are privileged to be Members of the United States Congress pause from time to time and remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Do we still hold these truths to be self-evident?

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think sometimes we forget the majestic words of the Declaration of Independence: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men.''

Oh, I wish so desperately that every Member of Congress could truly absorb those words in their hearts because it is very clear that it is almost a theological statement because it recognizes all of us to be created in the image of God, that we are created. And that makes all the difference, Mr. Speaker, because if we are created, if we have a purpose, if there is something miraculous about this magnificent gift of life, then we all should pay very close attention to what that purpose is. And if our rights don't come from government, if they don't come from the hand of men, if they, indeed, come from the hand of God, then we have a great responsibility to try to protect them from one another and for one another.

Mr. Speaker, the Declaration goes on to say: ''That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men.'' That is why we are here.

Mr. Lincoln called upon all of us, Mr. Speaker, to remember that magnificent Declaration of America's Founding Fathers and ''their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows.''

He reminded those he called posterity that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that ''their posterity''—that is us, Mr. Speaker—''their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their Fathers began.''

Wow.

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation, said, ''The care of human life and its happiness, and not its destruction, is the chief and only object of good government.''

The phrase in the Fifth Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says, no person shall ''be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.''

And the 14th amendment says no State ''deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.''

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights, especially those who cannot protect themselves, is why we are all here. It is why we came to Congress.

You know, not long ago, I heard Barack Obama speak very noble and poignant words that, whether he realizes it or not, so profoundly apply to this subject. Let me quote excerpted portions of his comments.

He said: ''This is our first task, caring for our children. It's our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That's how, as a society, we will be judged.''

President Obama asked: ''Are we really prepared to say that we're powerless in the face of such carnage, that the politics are too hard? Are we prepared to say that such violence visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of our freedom?''

The President also said: ''Our journey is not complete until all our children . . . are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.''

''That is our generation's task,'' he said, ''to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American.''

Mr. Speaker, never have I so deeply agreed with any words ever spoken by President Barack Obama as those I have just quoted. And how I wish—how I wish with all of my heart—that Mr. Obama and all of us could somehow open our hearts and our ears to this incontrovertible statement and ask ourselves in the core of our souls why his words that should apply to all children cannot include the most helpless and vulnerable of all children. Are there any children more vulnerable than these little pain-capable unborn babies we are discussing today?

You know, Mr. Speaker, it seems like we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the crimes of a past generation. But, oh, how we often become so staggeringly blind when it comes to facing and rejecting the worst of atrocities in our own time.

What we are doing to these little babies is real, and the President and all of us here know that in our hearts. Medical science regarding the development of unborn babies beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy now demonstrates irrefutably that they do, in fact, experience pain. Many of them cry and scream as they are killed, but because it's amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we don't hear them.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States of America today.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me close with a final contribution and wise counsel from Abraham Lincoln that I believe so desperately applies to all of this in this moment. He said: ''Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.''

Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 36 will be remembered. It will be considered in the annals of history and, I believe, in the counsels of eternity.

Protecting little pain-capable unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue. It is not a Democrat issue. It is a basic test of our humanity and who we are as a human family.

Today we began to open our eyes and allow our consciences to catch up with our technology. Today Members of the United States Congress began to open their hearts and their souls to remind themselves that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are really all here.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it sparks a little thought in the minds of all Americans so that we might all open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little unborn children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

I don't know if that will happen or not. But, Mr. Speaker, as of today, when we passed the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, we have come a step closer, and for that, I am grateful.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FUTURE FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are back with the Future Forum, a group of young Members of Congress here to discuss an issue that is near and dear to our hearts and one that is on the minds of each of us on a daily basis, and that is the issue of our veterans.

We are joined tonight by some Future Forum members. And we are going to start by asking everyone who is watching across the country to tweet at us or find us on Instagram or Facebook under #futureforum to give us your suggestions and your ideas about challenges facing veterans and what we can do here to address it—#futureforum.

The first person we are going to hear from tonight is a veteran himself from the Boston area. He is a first-term Member of Congress who served four tours of duty in Iraq, is a Marine infantryman. So I am going to have SETH MOULTON of the Boston area talk about his experience as a 9/11 veteran and what he is hearing in the Boston area and what we can do here in Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Thank you, Congressman SWALWELL.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans are coming home from our wars, and they want to serve again. And that is one of the most amazing things about today's veterans and about millennials in general is that there is a supreme desire to serve, to serve their country.

You know, one of the toughest jobs to get out of college now is not a job in investment banking on Wall Street; it is a job serving in Teach For America.

One of the amazing things that I have found about those who have served, both in civilian service and veterans from our military services, is that we get out and we actually want to serve again.

Frankly, when I went into the military, I thought I would do my 4 years and kind of check that box and no one would ever question for the rest of my life whether I wanted to serve the country again. Yet then I got out and found I really missed it. I missed that sense of public service, that sense of duty, that sense that every single day my work impacted the lives of other people.

So veterans come home, and they don't just want a paycheck. They don't just want a retirement. They don't just want health care. They want to actually contribute to the country back here at home. But in order to do that, they have got to be able to transition into life back here as a civilian.

□ 1930

That is tough. That is tough today because many of the basic health care needs of veterans are not being taken care of. They are not given the opportunities to pursue jobs in the private sector. So that great opportunity for our Nation's veterans to serve again is squandered because we are not taking care of them when they get home.

There are some fascinating statistics about how successful veterans are in the civilian workforce. Fortune 500 CEOs are disproportionately veterans. And yet veterans are also disproportionately homeless. So how does that happen?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. MOULTON, we asked some of our followers of Future Forum on Twitter to chime in with their own thoughts. Shawn Van Diver of the San Diego area, a veteran himself @ShawnJVanDiver, said, ''Let's leverage veterans toward rebuilding our infrastructure.'' Do you see a role for veterans as we try and repair and rebuild America's infrastructure?

Mr. MOULTON. Absolutely. There is so much that veterans can do back here at home. The point with my story about how veterans are disproportionately successful and yet also disproportionately homeless, I think it all comes back to that transition. Because if you are a veteran who can come home and navigate the transition to work in the civilian sector successfully, because you get the health care that you need, if you have post-traumatic stress—which is an entirely treatable condition—you get it taken care of. Then you can use all those skills and experiences that you had in the military, that leadership training, that experience performing under the toughest circumstances on Earth, you will use that for success in the business world and back here at home in whatever you do.

But if you don't make that transition successfully, if you don't get the health

care that you need to take care of whatever conditions you have from your service, then you can literally become homeless. And that is why this transition is so important.

The point is that veterans have a lot to give back to our country. So I think most Americans understand that we have a moral obligation to take care of our veterans, that for all they have done for us overseas risking their lives, we ought to take care of them when they get back. And most Americans get that. But it is also just a smart investment. It is a smart investment in our economy, and it is a smart investment in America's future to take care of our veterans.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. You talked a little bit about the leadership training that you get when you are serving your country in the military. In this job, I had the pleasure of going to Afghanistan. I went with Mr. KILMER back in August of 2013, and just a couple of weeks ago, I was in Baghdad. I observed our troops in theater. What I observed was, of course, the military training and the leadership training that they are getting, but they are also using everyday software applications to carry out their duties.

How do you see their knowledge and experience with the various technologies they are using in the field, how can that translate at home when they try to go into the workforce?

Mr. MOULTON. We live in an information economy. You are from Silicon Valley, you represent Silicon Valley. There is so much need for tech savvy, technically trained employees in our workforce. You get extraordinary training in the military, whether you are in the infantry, you are on the ground in one of those toughest jobs where your ability to lead in the most difficult circumstances imaginable is critical, or even if you are sitting controlling a drone back in Arizona and just understanding how our most advanced technology works, if you are able to manage that, then you are going to be incredibly valuable back home.

We have got to take care of our veterans to get there. A lot of veterans have post-traumatic stress, and it has kind of created this stigma that if you hire a veteran, you might get someone who has some mental issues. But the reality is that post-traumatic stress, first of all, is a pretty normal thing to expect after what many veterans have gone through overseas, but it is entirely treatable. It shouldn't be unusual to think that someone who went through the rigors of combat, the tragedy of war, would be affected by that. But we know that we can take care of that condition and treat it appropriately, and then veterans can serve again when they get back home.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We got a question just a moment ago from Lee Hawn, @LeeAhawn, and he said, ''How are the new VA Director's changes coming along?'' I would ask more broadly, what would you like to see in treating post-traumatic stress to make sure that it is not a stigma in the workforce, and that our veterans are able to seamlessly go from theater or their service to coming home and having a job?

Right now we look at the veteran unemployment rate for those who have served since September 11 and the Iraq war, and it is today 6.7 percent. Just last year it was as high as 7.2 percent. It has been as high as 9.9 percent in the last 2 years, always above what the national unemployment rate is.

So what can we do with the VA as we fund and authorize programs there to treat PTSD and make sure veterans aren't losing jobs or losing opportunities in the workforce?

Mr. MOULTON. First of all, we need a lot of reform at the VA, and this has been much publicized across the country. Of course, there are some VA's that are doing all right, doing fairly well. There are others that are completely failing our veterans. It shouldn't matter where you are from or where you live. You should be able to go to a VA facility and get the care that you need, the care that you have earned, and the care that you deserve. A lot of veterans just aren't seeing that.

Some people ask me how often do I hear from fellow veterans who are struggling to get the care that they need at the VA. I can tell you I have heard from two marines in my second platoon just in the past week. They have asked for my help as a new Congressman just getting the access to care that they need. You shouldn't have to go to your Congressman to be able to get the care that you need at the VA.

Some interesting statistics about the VA: the peak of claims from World War I, the year when the most World War I veterans sought care at the VA, was not 1920 or 1925. It was 1969—1969. So that tells us two things. First, it says that the VA as we know it today was really built to deal with a different generation of veterans, not Iraq and Afghanistan veterans, not even Vietnam veterans. The second thing it tells us is that if the VA can't take care of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans today, we haven't even begun to see the beginning of the problem. A lot of Vietnam veterans are just now coming to the VA because they realize that their cancer or Parkinson's has to do with the Agent Orange exposure they received some 40 years ago.

So we have a lot of changes to make at the VA, and I think that the new Secretary, to the question, is doing a good job, and he is certainly moving in the right direction. But we need radical change, and it remains to be seen just how effective his work will be.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you, Mr. MOULTON.

I am hearing right now from Duncan Neasham @DuncanN, and he said, #millennial vets stood up when the country needed them. We need those problem-solvers to run for office and change our cynical politics.

I think he is right, and I am grateful that you are a colleague of ours, Mr. MOULTON. Also in the Future Forum we have some other post-September 11 veterans in Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD of Hawaii, Representative RUBEN GALLEGO of Arizona, and also yourself. So thank you for participating this evening.

Mr. MOULTON. I love the question because we have never had fewer veterans in our Congress in our Nation's history than we do today. I don't think it should be a litmus test you have to be a veteran to run for Congress, not at all. But at a time when we face unprecedented challenges across the globe, when we are involved in so many challenges overseas, that perspective of veterans is critically important. We can't just have the perspective of older veterans. We need younger veterans too, veterans of the wars in the Middle East, veterans who have had to fight counterinsurgencies, veterans who faced terrorists across the globe. Those are the challenges that we are figuring out how to meet in Congress. I think it is important that we have the perspective of veterans.

So I will tell you, if there are veterans out there who are listening to this right now, I hope you will consider running. We need you. We need new leaders. We need your perspective, and we would love to see you serve the country again.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I couldn't agree with you more. I know it is an issue that you are very passionate about, and I think this is a richer body because we have veterans like you serving it.

Mr. MOULTON. I am honored to serve with you.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. KILMER, you and I went to Afghanistan back in August of 2013. I know you have a number of servicemembers in your district and people who were servicemembers. I am just wondering, you look at this number, 6.7 percent higher than what the average unemployment rate is, and what are you hearing out there in the Tacoma area in Washington, and what can we do in Congress?

Mr. KILMER. Sure. Well, one, I thank you, Mr. SWALWELL, for your leadership in the Future Forum and your focus on these veterans issues. I actually represent more veterans than any Democrat in the United States Congress. Actually, I think my region is a whole lot stronger as a result of that because we have men and women who have served our country who

choose to make the Olympic Peninsula or the Tacoma area their home.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Approximately how many veterans do you represent?

Mr. KILMER. I don't know the exact number, but we have got a slew of them. Between Naval Base Kitsap and our joint base, people serve in our area, and it is a glorious place to live. So after their service, they choose to make it their home.

Frankly, my background was working in economic development. When you talk to employers in our region, by and large they get it that the veterans bring a lot to the table, that they bring a skill set, a unique skill set from their prior experience, they bring a work ethic, they bring a sense of patriotism, and so our workforce is a stronger workforce because of the service of those men and women who want to attach into the civilian workforce.

Certainly, there are some challenges in that regard. That means we ought to be focused on that. For example, embracing programs like Helmets to Hardhats, which you heard the reference earlier to trying to deploy our veterans to build up America's infrastructure.

It means ensuring that our veterans don't face discrimination when they pursue employment. In fact, in my State we added military and veteran status to our State's nondiscrimination statute to ensure that when someone was seeking employment that their military status wasn't used against them either for the reasons that Mr. MOULTON suggested around concerns about PTSD or something like that, but also our Guard members and Reservists who, when we had hearings on that legislation at the State level, we were told, Well, I am concerned about hiring you because what happens if you get called up again?

That is not right. People who choose to serve our country, people who fight for our country overseas shouldn't have to fight for a job when they come home. I think that should be a focus of this Congress as well.

It also means applauding those firms large and small who make it a priority to hire our veterans. We have plenty in my neck of the woods that have really made a strong effort to hire veterans.

Legislatively there are also things that we could and should do to make sure that those who have served overseas and who have served in the military, period, are able to translate the experiences and the skills they have learned into a civilian job.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. On that one I want to ask you if you could expand because I have heard, and Mr. MOULTON and I were talking about this earlier, medics, people who serve in the military and they have medical training to help others who are wounded or get sick, they are having a hard time—and I am hearing this in the Bay Area—when they come home and they want to work naturally as an EMT or a paramedic, and they are finding by and large their training is not being accepted by the local schools or the State requirements.

Are you hearing about that?

Mr. KILMER. Absolutely. A few years back when I served in the State legislature, I visited Clover Park Technical College, which is in the 10th District of Washington, DENNY HECK's district. When I was in the legislature, I visited that college, and I was meeting with a group of students. One said, ''I was a battlefield medic, and I wanted to enter the nursing program. My prior experience didn't count towards the pursuit of that college credential.'' So we actually changed our State law requiring our State colleges and universities to acknowledge that prior military experience, whether that be in the medical profession or you talk to folks who drove a truck as part of the logistics efforts through the battlefields of Afghanistan and want to get a commercial driver's license. We also passed a law that directs our State Department of Licensing to acknowledge that prior military experience and have it count towards some of their requirements for pursuing either a college degree or a professional license or certification.

That is something that I think we really have to rededicate ourselves to, to ensure, again, that that transition is a smooth one.

I did want to share with you that some veterans in our area are doing some pretty cool stuff. I was at the University of Washington-Tacoma. They stood up a veterans incubator for veterans who are looking to start a business. One of the businesses that was started was from a young veteran, a guy named Steve Buchanan from my district. And I actually invited him to the State of the Union because Steve had a cool idea for a company, and he made it happen. He worked with his CFO, who is also a veteran, Chris Shepherd. They hit upon a simple way to connect veterans with flexible jobs.

Their idea was to create an online marketplace for veterans who had skills on one side of the equation to people who had something that needed to get done, sort of an online marketplace for anything from remodeling their landscaping to IT work. Anyone can visit their Web site, and you can plug in your task of what you are looking to get done, and you can find a veteran with those skills and a desire to work. It is a great way to give veterans a chance to get some flexible work directly from folks who need their help, and it is a great platform from the community to show their support for our Nation's heroes.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. You are hitting on Stephen Brown @StevBrown_. He asked, ''Can our government offer incentives to veterans who want to start small businesses?'' He just asked that on Twitter. What do you think about that? Can we do more?

Mr. KILMER. Sure. I think it is always good to look at that, whether that be through our SBA programs and the availability of access to capital.

□ 1945

One of the things that we are looking at doing is focused on businesses who hire our veterans; already through things like our procurement process, there are some advantages for veteran-owned businesses, but one of the things we are looking at is could you create an incentive for those who hire a whole lot of veterans so that they have some incentive to do that hiring as well.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you, Mr. KILMER. I appreciate your continued participation in Future Forum. I know the veterans in your area are very grateful to have you standing up on the House floor tonight to champion their issues and getting them into the workforce.

Mr. KILMER. We are lucky to have them. Thanks so much.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We are now joined by JARED POLIS of Colorado. My question for JARED comes from Ruchit @ruchithmajmudar, and he says: ''Veterans took care of us. We need to take care of them.''

What do you think about that?

Mr. POLIS. I think that is what brings us here tonight. It is what brings champions of veterans issues like DEREK KILMER and yourself and SETH MOULTON here. This is an opportunity for us to talk about what we as Democrats want to do to make sure that we honor and support those who served our country.

I had a wilderness roundtable last week. We had RAÚL GRIJALVA in town. He is the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee. We are working on designating some of our beautiful public lands in Summit and Eagle Counties as wilderness. We were having a meeting in Vail. Come visit Vail. I want everybody to know that Vail is a wonderful place to visit. We had a roundtable.

We had one of the people at it—in addition to hikers, bikers, a lot of local merchants that sell equipment, we had a veteran who served in the Middle East.

He got up, and he said that, when he was serving overseas in Afghanistan and he went to a visual display and they had the national anthem and what they showed—the images on the screen were not our tall buildings, were not our politicians or our actors; it was our beautiful public lands.

It was the Grand Canyon; it was the mountains of Colorado; it was the great coasts of California, and that was

what he and his fellow servicemembers drew their pride from.

He further expressed such an excitement about the wilderness bill we were working on. He said the public lands were a place of healing for veterans. He said: If we don't protect these beautiful lands, what the hell did I fight for?

It really moved everybody at the entire table just to say, do you know what, that is that part of that American spirit that we derive from the spirit of conservation.

It was really one of those moments where it made me and those of us working on some of those public land issues glad to know that we were helping to heal some of the veterans that had served us under difficult circumstances overseas.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. This week, we are considering the National Defense Authorization Act. We have done VA funding in the past couple weeks.

What are you hearing specifically in your congressional district about whether we are taking care of our veterans? Especially tonight, we are talking specifically about post-9/11 generation veterans who have just, by and large, been underemployed at a much higher rate than the rest of the country.

What are you hearing at home, any stories that you can share?

Mr. POLIS. Well, we really need to do a lot more. That is one of the reasons that I recently introduced a post-9/11 conservation corps bill, which would actually help employ some of our post-9/11 veterans to protect our public lands and water, so it can be part of their healing and part of making sure that our public lands are well maintained.

It would help veterans restore and protect our national, State, and tribal forest parks; coastal areas; wildlife refuges; and cemeteries—allowing us to attack the jobless rate among our returning veterans and help address the enormous maintenance backlog at our national parks.

That is the kind of idea which I think a lot of veterans get excited about. They want to see something that shows that we deeply respect the work they did defending our country, that their work is valued here at home.

It is the absolute wrong message to send when we are slashing veterans benefits; when we are not funding, for instance, our new VA hospital that needs to be built in Aurora, Colorado; when we are slashing the benefits that people get beyond the impact of those financial dues that they receive.

It is the message they are getting that somehow, do you know what, instead of returning to a civilian service corps, towards helping job placement, towards the counseling and health support services we need, we are returning to a thankless America.

I think that we Democrats want to do something about that. That is why we have a great package of bills to show that we do honor and respect, and we want to show that in word and deed to those who served us in post-9/11 wars.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I talked to a number of my veteran groups in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties at home, and not until I took this job had I heard the phrase of a ''ghost veteran.''

It was explained to me it is the servicemember who has come back from Iraq or Afghanistan and has completely fallen off the radar. They are not associated at all with the VA. They are not signed up for any of the benefits that they are eligible for. They are not participating in the American Legion or the VFW.

The theory is that, because we have done such a poor job of fully funding the VA and giving benefits and time to people who deserve it, having issues with the hospitals and the back claims, as well as the GI benefits not fully taking care of people—do you think that makes people pessimistic when you get out of your service and you return to your community? Is that going to make you more or less willing to participate in some of these programs that we have put out there?

Mr. POLIS. I have not heard that term before, ''ghost veteran,'' but I have met so many veterans that meet that exact definition.

I think it is a combination of things. I think you are right. It is part of the fact that they don't think they are going to get anything anyway because it has all been cut. It is also part of the need that we have and the VA has to adapt our veteran-serving institutions to meet the real-life needs of a new generation of veterans.

The truth is the returning 9/11 veterans are not interested in piles of paperwork and filling it out. That is understandable. They are not interested in beating their head against the wall to try to get some benefit that they may or may not get. They have served our country. They have a lot of great capacity in them to do great work again.

They want our help in enabling them to be able to live great lives, whether it is going back to school under GI Bill—and, of course, we passed the post-9/11 GI Bill—whether it is working on something like the veterans conservation corps that, if my bill passes, it would set up, whether it is making sure they have support to start their own small business as entrepreneurs.

What they don't want is to wait in line down at some facility to fill out more forms that may or may not result in them getting something, someday. That is really what I hear in so many of the returning post-9/11 veterans that in my district really meet the definition of what you are talking about, ghost veterans.

Once they got out, they just didn't want to deal with what they see as a bureaucratic, out-of-touch apparatus that doesn't give them the support they need.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. In the GI Bill, it works when we fund it and we give opportunity to veterans. It provides eligible veterans up to 36 months of education benefits. Frankly, I think you and I probably would like to see that greatly expanded to include a full education; 1700 colleges and universities are supplemented by post-GI Bill benefits.

Fifty-one percent of student veterans earn their degree from an institution of higher education. From 2009–2012, there has been an increase of veterans using their benefits by 67 percent. When we are faced with the question when it comes to veterans funding or NDAA considerations that we make, should we be expanding the educational opportunities for our veterans, or should we be reducing it?

Mr. POLIS. I am just so excited and honored to represent a district that has two of our State flagship universities: Colorado State University in Fort Collins—go Rams—and University of Colorado Boulder—go Bucks.

We have had interns in our office that were only able to attend those institutions because of the GI Bill, returning post-9/11 veterans who were able to fulfill their dream of getting a higher education at a time where you and I know it is increasingly costly to get that education.

My goodness, you Californians pay $35,000 a year to come to CU; but even our instate folks are paying $9,000 a year just to go to college. Not a lot of families can afford that in discretionary income when you add in food and lodging and everything else.

Those who have served our country are able to avail themselves of this tremendous opportunity, the GI Bill. We need to renew our commitment to those folks. We need to make sure that it is there to fund their education, in an increasingly costly educational environment, that they can have the skills they need.

I would like to see more ways where they can get credit for some of the skills they learned in the military. Some of those convey over and appropriately should be granted credit at institutions of higher education, so there is a lot more we can do.

So many veterans that I have interacted with on both campuses are just so grateful. I want to make sure that we defend and I know Democrats here are standing in the line of defense of the post-9/11 GI Bill.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Others that were in the last Congress—and I was a big supporter of the Veteran Employment Transition Act that made

permanent the work opportunity tax credit for qualified veterans and also the Troop Talent Act by our colleague, a veteran herself, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, which would direct the Department of Defense to make information on civilian credentialing opportunities available to members of the Armed Forces at every stage of their training for occupational specialties.

The Future Forum we just launched last month, we went to New York and Boston and San Francisco.

Mr. POLIS. We are coming to Denver soon, right?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We are coming to Denver soon, yes.

Mr. POLIS. I am looking forward to it.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. You are going to host us out there in Denver. We are going to make a mile-high difference there for young people, and I very much look forward to that.

At these conversations that we have had under the #futureforum, whether they are in the audience or they are tweeting at us, what we have learned is that young people today—veterans and just millennials alike—right now, their top issues, I believe, from what we have heard, are student loan debt, access to entrepreneurship, equality and making sure that we have equal pay for equal work, as well as climate change.

When it comes to veterans, every audience we were in front of had a veteran there, and every audience thought we weren't doing enough to take care of our veterans.

I think the message I want to put out there tonight—and continue the conversation on social media under #futureforum—is we must stand up and serve our veterans as well as they have stood up and served us as a country.

Mr. POLIS, I will leave it to you for any closing thoughts on how we can best serve our veterans.

Mr. POLIS. Well, I just wanted to add, again, particularly in the West, in districts like mine, many veterans who have settled in Eagle and Summit Counties or in the Boulder area really have seen their experiences and interactions with the outdoors and our environment as an important part of their healing experience.

That is why we see such great support for a number of nonprofits that help get veterans out hiking and biking; why the young veterans, in turn, are strong supporters of wilderness proposals; and why I think so many returning veterans would benefit from a veterans conservation corps that really got them out there working with their hands and their hearts, preserving some of that same natural heritage that, when they saw displayed on the movie screen while our national anthem played in Afghanistan or Iraq, gave them the inspiration that they needed to be able to continue to serve our country so well for another day.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you, Mr. POLIS. Thank you, Mr. MOULTON, a veteran himself. Also, thank you to Mr. KILMER.

The Future Forum, we will be back in a few weeks talking about a variety of issues that are facing young people; but this is not us talking to you. As you saw tonight, I read a number of tweets live here on the House floor and was tweeting as we were having this conversation.

Our goal is to talk about the issues, have a conversation, but really listen to you and what you care about as millennials. We look forward to being back here on the floor and out across America as the Future Forum, looking out for what is best for millennials and standing up here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 11 p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–112) on the resolution (H. Res. 260) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today (second series) on account of official business.

Mrs. CAPPS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for May 12 through May 21 on account of medical reasons.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office''.

H.R. 1075. An act to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the ''Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry''.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 14, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1455. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado and Imported Irish Potatoes; Relaxation of the Handling Regulation for Area No. 2 and Import Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0073; FV13-948-3 FR] received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1456. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Avocados Grown in South Florida and Imported Avocados; Change in Maturity Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0051; FV14-915-1 FIR] received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1457. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Southeastern States; Suspension of Marketing Order Provisions [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0011; FV14-953-1 IR] received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1458. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Fruit and Vegetable Program, Promotion and Economics Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Honey Packers and Importers Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Information Order; Assessment Rate Increase [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0045] received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1459. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating authorization for 15 officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or

brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1460. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Restrictions on Sale of Assets of a Failed Institution by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (RIN: 3064-AE26) received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1461. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Norway, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-31; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1462. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-34; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1463. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 40 [Docket No.: 140818679-5356-02] (RIN: 0648-BE47) received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1464. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Grouper Recreational Management Measures [Docket No.: 150105013-5291-02] (RIN: 0648-BE62) received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1465. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Island Fisheries; Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument Expansion [Docket No.: 141110950-5227-02] (RIN: 0648-BE63) received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1466. A letter from the Project Manager, Office of Policy and Strategy, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Employment Authorization for Certain H-4 Dependent Spouses [CIS No.: 2501-10; DHS Docket No.: USCIS-2010-0017] (RIN: 1615-AB92) received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1467. A letter from the ICE Regulatory Coordinator, ICE Office of Policy, Regulatory Division, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustments to Limitations on Designated School Official Assignment and Study by F-2 and M-2 Nonimmigrants [DHS Docket No.: ICEB-2011-0005] (RIN: 1653-AA63) received May 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1468. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties Activities Quarterly Report covering April 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014, pursuant to Sec. 803 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, Pub. L. 110-53, 121 Stat. 266, 361-62 (codified at 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1(f)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 260. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–112). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2285. A bill to improve enforcement against trafficking in cultural property and prevent stolen or illicit cultural property from financing terrorist and criminal networks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 2286. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a priority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in processing certain claims for compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULVANEY (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2287. A bill to require the National Credit Union Administration to hold public hearings and receive comments from the public on its budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2288. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 2289. A bill to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 2290. A bill to amend the Volunteer Organization Protection Act of 1997, to provide for liability protection for organizations or entities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 2291. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transport individuals to and from facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs in connection with rehabilitation, counseling, examination, treatment, and care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2292. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rehabilitation innovation centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 2293. A bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2294. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make memorial headstones and markers available for purchase on behalf of members of reserve components who performed inactive duty training or active duty for training but did not serve on active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2295. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to identify and designate National Energy Security Corridors for the construction of natural gas pipelines on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 2296. A bill to establish a Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program in the Department of Energy to provide financial assistance to promote energy efficiency and onsite renewable technologies in manufacturing and industrial facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 2297. A bill to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 2298. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for programs to prevent prescription drug abuse under parts C and D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2299. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for site-of-service price transparency under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GUINTA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. YODER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 2300. A bill to provide for incentives to encourage health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Rules, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 2301. A bill to designate Union Station in Washington, DC, as the ''Harry S. Truman Union Station''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 2302. A bill to require that States receiving Byrne JAG funds to require sensitivity training for law enforcement officers of that State and to incentivize States to enact laws requiring the independent investigation and prosecution of the use of deadly force by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2303. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act to provide that meat, poultry, and egg products containing certain pathogens or contaminants are adulterated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2304. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to create a special motion to dismiss strategic lawsuits against public participation (SLAPP suits); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2305. A bill to reform the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the marriage penalty in, and reduce the eligibility limitation on, the tax credit for health insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 2307. A bill to validate final patent number 27-2005-0081, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 2308. A bill to designate a peak located in Nevada as ''Mount Reagan''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2309. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sexual orientation or gender identity when extending credit; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 2310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a standard home office deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2311. A bill to expand the research activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to functional gastrointestinal and motility disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2312. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2313. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance and expand infrastructure and activities to track the epidemiology of hydrocephalus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2314. A bill to ensure the humane treatment of persons detained pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr.

RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.J. Res. 51. A joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FARR, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GRAYSON):

H. Res. 261. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should work with the Government of Nepal to ensure that the unique needs, vulnerabilities, and capacities of women and girls are considered and addressed in efforts to provide humanitarian relief and assistance in reconstruction in the aftermath of the April 25, 2015, earthquake; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 2286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sections 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 2287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. ''To regulate Commerce . . .''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14. ''To make Rules for the Government . . .''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Property Clause of Article IV, Section 3—The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulation respecting the Territory or other Property belong to the United States.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 2289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, Congress has the authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 . . . ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 . . . ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, known as the Commerce Clause, provides Congress with the authority regulate interstate and foreign commerce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 2295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Consistent with Congress's power to tax, the authority to enact this legislation is also found in Clause 1 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 2301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislatioin is provided by Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in an Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII Clause I: The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the

debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the Unites States.

Article I Section VII Clause XVIII. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 2307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution''.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 2308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution''.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 2310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.J. Res. 51.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 151: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 169: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 232: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 244: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 304: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 346: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 353: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 456: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 511: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 531: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 532: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 540: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 546: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 572: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. POLIS, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 578: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 581: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 592: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BARR, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 594: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 605: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 612: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 613: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 614: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 619: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 649: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 686: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 699: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 704: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 711: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 771: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 774: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 784: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 789: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 793: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 800: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 855: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 865: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 868: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 879: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 885: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 921: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 923: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 924: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 953: Mr. TONKO and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 970: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 971: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 973: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 980: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 985: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. COLE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 991: Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 997: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NUGENT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1062: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1073: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1086: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1090: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1091: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1096: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1100: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1101: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 1112: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1116: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1117: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1121: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1139: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1142: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1170: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1171: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1178: Mr. FLORES and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1181: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1188: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1190: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1192: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1197: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 1210: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1211: Mr. FARR and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1283: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1299: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1300: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1331: Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1332: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1344: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1371: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1375: Mr. BEYER and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1384: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 1389: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1399: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1421: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1427: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1431: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1432: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1461: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1464: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1466: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1475: Mr. COLE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1493: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1496: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1498: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1516: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1519: Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1523: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1545: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1550: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1552: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1559: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1568: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1594: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HIMES, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1599: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1602: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1605: Mr. BRAT and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 1614: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1624: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1633: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1644: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1666: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1671: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1699: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1707: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1736: Mr. BLUM, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1737: Mr. KIND and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1742: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1745: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1752: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 1769: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1775: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1786: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1800: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1807: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1814: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1817: Mr. BABIN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1818: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1821: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1844: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 1852: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1854: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1861: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1869: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1908: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 1921: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1936: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1942: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1948: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1994: Mr. PETERS, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2008: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2025: Mr. FARR and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2031: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2032: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2035: Ms. DELAURO and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2046: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2061: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2072: Mr. POLIS and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2100: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2109: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2130: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2132: Mr. PETERS, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2135: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2139: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2150: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2152: Mr. JONES and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2156: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2177: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2178: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2193: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2207: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2216: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2230: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2243: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2247: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2248: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. KATKO and Ms. STEFANIK.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 56: Mr. KLINE and Mr. CLEAVER.
H. Res. 110: Mr. KIND.
H. Res. 130: Mr. GUINTA.
H. Res. 174: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 193: Ms. MCSALLY.
H. Res. 208: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 209: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 210: Mr. KLINE.
H. Res. 220: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H. Res. 246: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 248: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H. Res. 253: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H. Res. 256: Ms. HAHN and Mr. PAYNE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

Amendment No. 1 to be offered by Representative MAC THORNBERRY to H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A SERVICE OF THANKSGIVING TO GOD FOR THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF THE HONORABLE JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., 12TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS, SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James Claude Wright, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, died on May 6, 2015. On that day, I issued the following statement:

The whole House mourns the passing of Speaker Jim Wright of the state of Texas. We remember Speaker Wright today for his lifelong commitment to public service, from flying combat missions over the South Pacific to fighting for Fort Worth on the House floor. Speaker Wright understood as well as anyone this institution's closeness to the people, calling the House 'the raw essence of the nation.' It is in this spirit that we send our deepest condolences to his family and community.

The House took several steps to honor the former Speaker. The Speaker's chair on the rostrum was draped in black—the same mark of respect first made upon the death of Michael Kerr of Indiana, Speaker of the House in the 44th Congress and most recently for Thomas Foley. The Speaker's gavel rested on the rostrum during this period. Outside the House Chamber, Speaker Wright's official portrait in the Speaker's lobby was draped in black. A book of condolences was made available for the remembrances of friends and colleagues. On May 12, 2015, the House adopted House Resolution 245, expressing the condolences of the House upon his death, and the House adjourned on that day as a further mark of respect to his memory. A funeral was held on May 11, 2015, at First United Methodist Church in Fort Worth, Texas. The following is a transcript of those proceedings:

A SERVICE OF THANKSGIVING TO GOD FOR THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JAMES CLAUDE WRIGHT, JR., DECEMBER 22, 1922–MAY 6, 2015

Prelude—(Ms. Peggy Graff, organist)

Processional—''Joyful, Joyful, We Adore Thee''

Call to worship

(The Reverend Dr. Tim Bruster, First United Methodist Church, Fort Worth, Texas)

Reverend Bruster: Please be seated.

Hear these words of Jesus: I am the resurrection and the life. Those who believe in me, even though they die, will live, and everybody who lives and believes in me will never die.

Christ said: I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. Do not be afraid. I am the first and the last and the living one. I was dead, and now I am alive, forever and ever.

Friends, we have gathered here to praise God and to draw comfort from our faith and to give thanks as we celebrate the life of Jim Wright.

We come together in grief, of course, acknowledging our human loss. But we also come together in gratitude, acknowledging and giving thanks for his life and his legacy and for everything in his life that was a reflection of the love and the grace of God.

May God grant us grace in this time that in pain we may find comfort, in sorrow we may find joy, and in death, resurrection.

Let's pray.

Our gracious and loving God, we bow in awe of Your greatness and Your love. You have spoken words of life to us in so many ways. You've given form and beauty to our world, and all of creation sings Your praise.

You have given us one another to love and receive love, a reflection of Your gracious love for us. And You have spoken to us in the words of Scripture and in Jesus, the Word made flesh, the Author of life.

As You speak to us now, in this service of worship, help us once again to hear Your words of life as we celebrate the life and legacy of Your servant, Jim.

In Jesus' name.

Amen.

I invite you now to turn in your worship guide to the words of the 23rd Psalm as we say them together:

''The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.

''He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters.

''He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

''Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.

''Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

''Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

The words of Psalm 46:

''God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore we will not fear, though the Earth should change, though the mountains shake in the heart of the sea; though its waters roar and foam, though the mountains tremble with its tumult.

''There is a river whose streams make glad the city of God, the holy habitation of the Most High. God is in the midst of the city; it shall not be moved; God will help it when the morning dawns. The nations are in an uproar, the kingdoms totter; He utters His voice, the Earth melts. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge.

''Come, behold the works of the Lord; see what desolations He has brought on the Earth. He makes wars cease to the end of the Earth; He breaks the bow, and shatters the spear; He burns the shields with fire. 'Be still, and know that I am God! I am exalted among the nations; I am exalted in the Earth.' The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge.''

The words of the prophet Micah:

''With what shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before God on high? Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings, with calves a year old. Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?'

''He has told you, O mortal, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?''

God speaks to us in the reading of Scripture.

Solo—''Let There Be Peace on Earth'' performed by Mr. Christopher Auchter.

(The Honorable Martin Frost, United States House of Representatives, 24th District of Texas, 1979–2005)

Mr. Frost: Well, in the words of President John F. Kennedy about Jim Wright:

No city in America was better represented in Congress than Fort Worth.

I'm here today to speak on behalf of the scores of people—many of whom, Texans—that Jim Wright helped along the way with their careers. He was our mentor, our colleague, and our friend. And we were better public servants because of Jim Wright, and many of those Members, past and present, Democrat and Republican, are here with us today to honor Jim.

In a minute, I'm going to speak about what Jim did for my career, but it really speaks volumes for what he did for a lot of others, too.

Jim Wright was an extraordinary leader both for the people of Fort Worth and for our Nation. He always remembered the people who sent him to Washington and worked tirelessly to make our country even better every day he was in office. Few Congressmen in recent times have had a greater impact than our friend Jim Wright.

I met Jim Wright 57 years ago, in 1958, when he was a young Congressman beginning his second term and I was a 16-year-old. Jim was the guest speaker at the Temple Beth-El youth group in the basement of the old synagogue building on West Broadway, near downtown. I had never met a national politician before, and he made a deep impression on me that day. I remember to this day some of what he said, and more of that a little bit later.

Seven years later, in 1965, I showed up in Washington as a young reporter covering Congress for a magazine, and the first thing I did was to go see my hometown Congressman, Jim Wright. Jim and his chief of staff, Marshall Lynam, were very helpful to this young reporter, suggesting who I should get to know on congressional committee staffs. Three years later, in the summer of 1968, Jim helped me get a job on Hubert Humphrey's national Presidential campaign staff while I was a student at Georgetown Law School.

The last two people I saw before I headed back to Texas following graduation in 1970 were Jim and Marshall. I told them that I hoped to come back to D.C. some day as a Congressman—in a neighboring district. I had no intention of ever running against Jim Wright.

Fast forward to 1976 when I was north Texas coordinator of the Carter-Mondale Presidential campaign. The Carter campaign wanted to come to Texas the weekend before the general election when carrying Texas was still in doubt. They wanted to only stop in Dallas. As a Fort Worth boy, I told them they also had to come to Cowtown and that I knew that local Congressman Jim Wright would put on one hell of a show for them, and that's exactly what Jim did. He filled the downtown convention center with more than 10,000 people early in the afternoon that Sunday. It made great television, and Carter became the last Democratic Presidential candidate to carry Texas.

Shortly after that election, Jim Wright became House majority leader by one vote in a hotly contested secret ballot election. He certainly knew how to count. Two years later, I was elected to Congress from the 24th District, which, in fact, adjoined the 12th District that Jim represented. Jim went to Speaker Tip O'Neill and made sure I was named to the powerful House Rules Committee, an appointment that almost never went to a freshman Member.

From that day on, Jim Wright and I became both colleagues and friends. He was my mentor during the 11 years we served together, and I learned an enormous amount just watching him in action. And when I inherited the Black community in southeast Fort Worth following the 1991 redistricting, I only used one picture in my mailing: a photo of Jim Wright and me. There wasn't anything else the voters in that part of my district needed to know.

They continued to be my base for the remainder of my 26 years in Congress, and just to make sure people in Fort Worth knew that I had strong ties to Fort Worth, even though I now lived in Dallas, he used to tell anyone who would listen that I went to high school in his district in Fort Worth's Paschal, and he went to high school in my district in Dallas' Adamson.

When Jim taught a course at TCU on Congress for 20 years after leaving the Congress, I was proud to be a guest lecturer for him every single year. The last time I saw Jim was in the spring of 2014, when I was working on a book about Congress. We visited for about an hour in his office at TCU. His body was frail, but his mind was as sharp as ever.

I learned how to be an effective Congressman by observing Jim as a colleague and as a junior partner on a variety of matters that helped Fort Worth. He never forgot the people who sent him to Washington. He was a stalwart in his work on behalf of defense workers at what is now Lockheed Martin, which was General Dynamics, and Bell Helicopter in Fort Worth.

He played a significant role in the decision by American Airlines to move its corporate headquarters from New York to the Metroplex, and he was a strong supporter of DFW airport, the jobs magnet for this part of the State.

We worked together—and by the way, he did the heavy lifting—to convince the railroad to make its right-of-way available for the Trinity River Express connecting Fort Worth and Dallas. No request from anyone in Tarrant County was too small to win Jim's help.

Also, Jim's role in promoting the careers of promising African Americans from Fort Worth was of great significance. He brought Lorraine Miller, a young woman from the southeast side of Fort Worth, to Washington to work on his staff. Years later, she became the first African American to serve as Clerk of the U.S. House and recently served as interim national president of the NAACP. And just a few years ago, Jim played a key role in the election of Mark Veasey, who became the first Black Congressman from Fort Worth.

One of Jim's greatest strengths was molding a disparate group of Democrats into an effective majority when he became Speaker. During his first year as Speaker in 1987—and Tony and Steny, you will remember this—Congress passed all 13 appropriation bills before the start of the new fiscal year on October 1, something that is almost never done today.

I remember his response to a question from the audience at that speech at Temple Beth-El in 1958. He was asked what a Congressman does when he feels one way about an issue and his district feels the other way. He responded that the job of a Congressman was to reflect the views of his district as often as he could. He then added that he reserved a small percentage of votes, perhaps 10 percent, to vote against the majority of his district if he felt something was vital in the national interest. And he then added that it was his responsibility to go back to his constituents to explain his vote and hopefully convince them that he was right and they were wrong. He added that if a Congressman couldn't successfully do that, he wouldn't be reelected, and that was as it should be.

He did a very good job following his own advice. I did the same and found that he was exactly correct.

Fort Worth is a great city today because of Jim Wright. We all owe him an enormous debt of gratitude. We will never see his like again.

(The Honorable Bill Alexander, United States House of Representatives, First District of Arkansas, 1969–1993)

Mr. Alexander: Jimmy and Ginger, Kerry, Lisa, and all the Wright family, I feel that we are kin.

And to all of his friends who are here today, I join you in tribute to one of my dearest friends.

I kept up with Jim through the years, even after he left Washington and returned to Texas; and following his recovery from surgery, I gave him a call one day, and he invited me to come to Fort Worth. So my son and I—Alex, who is here—with his sister Ashley, who came to TCU at a later time, boarded our plane and came to DFW. At those days, Jim was driving, and so he met us at the airport. I'd never been outside of DFW before, so I didn't know what to expect.

And so as we left the terminal, I noticed all of the concrete infrastructure that supports the airport: the entrance ramps, the exit ramps, the overhead bridges, the long ride to the interstate. I never saw so much concrete in all my life. So I turned to Jim, who at one time, as most of you know, was chairman of the Public Works Committee, and I said to him, ''Jim, how much money did the Public Works Committee spend on this airport?'' And he looked at me and rolled his brow and lifted his big bushy eyebrows and he said to me, ''Not a penny more than the law allowed.''

Jim was probably one of the most successful chairmen in Congress; and with that success, people encouraged him, and he ran for majority leader. As all of you probably followed in the news, it was a very contentious race, and on the day of the vote, I was appointed to be a judge. And so after the votes were cast, I adjourned with the other members of the election group and counted the votes. We counted them twice, and Jim won by one vote.

I got up from the chair in the Speaker's lounge—the Speaker's lobby, we call it—rushed through the door to the House Chamber, and Jim was sitting on the second row on the Democratic side in the Hall of the House. I rushed up to him and I said, ''Jim, you won.'' He was surprised because no one knew the outcome of that election. He looked at me, and he said, ''Are you sure?'' And I said, ''Jim, I counted the votes, and if you hadn't won, Phil Burton said he would send me to Alaska.''

Following in the footsteps of Sam Rayburn and Lyndon Johnson, Jim asserted leadership in Congress at a time of confusion in the Senate and the White House, demonstrating a unique ability to command our Nation's political resources to get things done. And this went across the aisle to the Republicans and even down Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House, which is a million miles away if you serve in Congress sometimes.

Jim Wright had fought in World War II to defend the values of the Greatest Generation, as Tom Brokaw describes this generation, a generation of men and women united in common purposes of family, country, duty, honor, courage, and service. During World War II, he flew many combat missions. I haven't really been able to discern exactly how many yet because there's such a debate over it. Maybe somebody will tell me before I go back to Washington. And he served as a bombardier and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for his bravery.

Jim believed that government should serve the people as well as the economic interests, which also must be represented, and provide Federal assistance to communities and States like Arkansas, where I'm from. It's in need of capital development in order to provide infrastructure to try to attract industry and jobs for our people. That was, in his view, providing building blocks for the foundation of the economic development that benefits all of us. All you've got to do is look around in Texas a little bit to find out if it works.

The criticism of Speaker Wright, which is in the news, instead of all of the accomplishments that we know he achieved, his strong leadership came from a changing Congress. Some of my former colleagues from Congress are here today, and they know what I'm talking about.

Beginning with the 1968 election, which was my first election to Congress, the ideals and values of the Greatest Generation began to evolve. A Congress run by Southern Democrats, who chaired mostly the important committees in the Congress, was gradually replaced by a younger generation of Congressmen and Senators, many of them in the other party. And when he left Congress, even his political enemies often remarked that, had he stayed in Congress, he would have been the greatest Speaker since Henry Clay.

His time as Speaker laid down historic markers. He was the last great figure in Congress to keep alive the idea of development—that came from the New Deal—that would help our economy.

After him came what we call Reaganomics and the tidal wave of polarization of our two political parties and the continuing mindless cannibalism which we can still see evident today between the parties and even in the parties in Congress.

Criticism of Speaker Wright's forceful leadership came from Republicans and Democrats alike; although, at the time he stepped down, the principal antagonists came from within our own party. I was there, and I know who they are.

What followed was a profound change in the power structure in Congress, shifting away from the power and authority lodged in a handful of key Southern committee chairmen to a dispersion of power among proliferating committees and subcommittees, encouraging intensifying rivalries and even political fratricides throughout the House. His departure marked the end of an era when Southern Democrats dominated in both the House and the Senate, along with a gradual evolution of the Congress toward social issues.

It marked the transition from Southern leadership of Congress to a growing concentration of power of the Democratic Party in our Nation's biggest cities, many of them in the North, opening a widening rift between our Nation's small towns and rural areas and the political interests of the inner cities. The way was opened for lobbyists to shift attention away from schools and roads and bridges and water systems that helped our people to special interests of Wall Street banks and a commercial agenda.

A fluent speaker of Spanish, he took the initiative to intervene in the political crisis in Nicaragua and crafted peace talks that laid the foundation for elections. When I assisted him in this so-called ''junket,'' in his endeavor I found that what we tried to do generated much consternation among President Reagan's White House staff. Later, another great Texan, James Baker, observed that what Jim Wright did with his intervention in Nicaragua turned the corner for that nation and helped the U.S. and Nicaragua to come to better terms with one another.

Jim Wright was not only a master of the political structure and the rules in Congress, he also was an author, a professor. He lectured at Texas Christian University with eagerness to inspire and guide our Nation's youth.

In the tradition of Sam Houston and Sam Rayburn, Jim Wright was a giant. I was his chief deputy whip in the Congress, the worst job in the House of Representatives, but it was worth all the knocks and the cuts and the bruises and the criticism that I endured to fight for the values established by the Greatest Generation until the ideals were changed by a new breed of voter who believes that Washington is not a solution, rather, Washington is the problem.

He was my dear friend, and I stood with him in every fight for the values that won World War II and provided the building blocks and foundation for the greatest economy on Earth.

God bless Jim Wright.

(Mr. Paul Driskell, Special Assistant, Majority Leader James C. Wright, Jr.)

Mr. Driskell: Martin, Bill, Betsy, Mike, Kenneth, Mr. Leader, Steny Hoyer—the one man in this sanctuary today who knows the full weight and measure and the responsibilities of the job this prince of peace executed so beautifully for so many years. Dear Steny, thank you for your presence today. How very, very special, how honored he would be, how much he would love this congregation today. This is a delegation of community builders.

Mr. Wright loved Sam Rayburn dearly, and he often quoted him; and of course many people wondered why Mr. Rayburn went back to Bonham, Texas, after announcing he was going to leave the House, and his answer was simple:

Bonham, Texas: the people there know when you're sick, and they care when you die.

You have validated Jim Wright's recitation of that quote, all of you today, by honoring him in coming here. You knew he was ill, and you cared that he died. Oh, how he would celebrate you. Oh, how he must be enjoying this. He loved people of accomplishment. He loved people who contributed and built.

Mr. Rayburn used to always say: A jackass can kick a barn down; it takes a carpenter to build one. It's no accident that our Lord was fathered by a carpenter—and parented by a carpenter in his early years.

I'd like to give you a sense of Speaker Wright, Jim Wright, and my friend. It may be very, very unique. And as I have thought about him so much and as I visited him in those final days, things came to me that I would have never imagined. He was, in fact, the first gifted multitasker. Now, if you know anything about Jim, he despised anything to do with technology, but he was a multitasker. Let me explain what I mean.

February 7, 1985, 11 o'clock in the morning, after about 30 days, some of the people in this room—Tony, John—had been working diligently because Mr. O'Neill had told us privately he was going to retire. So we were trying to collect the requisite number of votes for him to become Speaker of the House 2 years out.

February 7, 1985, 11 o'clock in the morning, a national press conference was held in the office that Steny Hoyer's offices are in today. He met the national press. He was surrounded by his colleagues. He was surrounded by people who loved him and wished well for him, and he made the announcement that he had achieved the requisite number of votes to capture his dream, to be Speaker of the House. He put a peace, if you will, in a body that's not given to peace easily about the next years and how things would follow.

Fifteen minutes later, he grabbed me by the arm and escorted me and my wife, Donna, up the back stairs with 31 other people to the House Chaplain's office where Chaplain Ford married us at Henry Clay's desk, the great compromiser. And then, he walked back downstairs with us. We had a reception in the office. He pulled Donna and me aside and he said, ''I only have two things to tell you two: Paul, always hold her hand, and never go to bed mad.''

Mr. Speaker, sometimes you set the bar too high. I have removed pillows from my bed so as not to elevate the temptation for Donna to smother me.

There are so many things privately that I loved about him and that we shared. He had a passionate love for boxing. He knew boxing. He knew boxing like Nat Fleischer, the famous author who recorded almost everything of significance about American heavyweight boxing. We went to a fight. We went to Golden Gloves. We went to the Olympic trials. We went to tons of professional fights. It was like going to that fight with Nat Fleischer, and he would be sitting there and he would be reciting to you the ring scores of the Firpo-Dempsey fight. He knew—every—every hobby and interest he had, he wanted to know everything there was to know about it. If you ever saw the roses that he cultivated, you'd understand that in spades. He was a gifted horticulturist. He was a great teacher.

Kay, you and I sat just about where Steny was sitting 2 years ago, 2½ years ago, and you told me how he taught you and Ginger, Jenny and Lisa about God. In fact, he used a wagon wheel and said that was the universe and God was, indeed, the hub; and the spokes represented the people, and, of course, the rim, where all the damage and impact takes place, was the furthest from God. And he admonished you that it was your job, it was your responsibility, it was a testament of your faith to move closer down those spokes because you would be closer to more people, and as you were closer to more people, you'd be closer to God. What a gift.

I've often wondered, and I think everyone in this sanctuary today wonders, why God lets us see certain things at certain times. It seems rather odd. Last week, just the day before his passing and only a few days after my last visit with him, there was a documentary on about George Foreman. I happened to turn it on the other night. George Foreman, the famous heavyweight, struck fear and terror in everyone's heart—undefeated, knocked poor Joe Frazier down eight times. And the interviewer asked him a question. He said, ''Who was the greatest champion of all time in your estimation?'' And George Foreman didn't hesitate. He said, ''Muhammad Ali.'' That stunned the interviewer.

Muhammad Ali had defeated George Foreman in Zaire, Africa, and usually when a boxer loses to another one, it was a lucky punch or you're just a little better that night, not the greatest champion that ever lived. He didn't hesitate. He said, ''Muhammad Ali.''

The interviewer said, ''Why? Why do you choose him?'' He said, ''Well, if you saw the fight in the eighth round, he hit me twice in the face.'' And if any of you remember or happened to have seen it, George Foreman began to cartwheel. He began to turn and fall to the floor. And as he was falling, Muhammad Ali, as all boxers are trained all their life to do, cocked his arm to hit him with what is known as the ''killing punch.''

And George Foreman said, ''I looked up out of my left eye, just partially conscious, knowing I was going to the floor, and he never threw that punch. So for me, he's not the greatest champion that ever lived for the punches he threw; it's for what he didn't do. It's the punch he didn't throw.''

And the very people who besmirched and impugned this prince of peace at the end of his public career, when they fell on hard times and they fell by the sword they had so recklessly wielded, not once in private—and certainly never in public—did Jim Wright throw that punch. He could not retaliate. He didn't just talk Christian forgiveness; he lived it. His higher calling at that time was to find a way to inspire students at TCU to engage in public service and to think about the possibilities of what they could build, like the beautiful people in this room today. He didn't throw that punch.

I was 15 years old, standing in front of a black-and-white TV, and I watched Robert Kennedy say, ''When he shall die, take him and cut him out into stars, and he shall make the face of Heaven so fine that all the world will be in love with night and pay no worship to the garish Sun.''

I didn't know at 15 just what that meant. At 65, I marvel how Bobby Kennedy could have mustered the strength and the insight to say that about the brother he loved, in some ways his best friend, and, oh, by the way, in passing, the President of the United States.

I understood because of this church and because of my association with him that all of us have a spark of divinity. We are all made in God's image, and that spark is there, but what I didn't understand was that there are a special few who possess a flame, a torch. It's bigger. It's more committed. It's something we can appreciate. It's not necessarily something we readily understand.

It's not by accident that there's an eternal flame that burns at John Kennedy's grave

and why, for all the accomplishments: the Peace Corps, the space program, all of those things—no. That's part of it. That's why millions go there to pay respects. The part of it is that during the most sensitive time in our Nation's history, when we were the closest to engaging in a nuclear holocaust, when every adviser that that President had was admonishing him to take advantage of the tactical and strategic position we occupied for those precious few days and strike Cuba with nuclear weapons, he didn't throw that punch. And we're all breathing good air and loving our friends and conducting our lives because of that divine torch.

The thing I think I will miss most is a private passion that Jim had and I shared. He loved movies. The singular thing that we really appreciated together was we happened to think that Robert Duvall was the greatest American actor that's ever lived.

Jim's favorite movie was ''Tender Mercies,'' and my favorite film was ''The Natural.'' And in ''The Natural,'' there's a scene—of course, all the ladies in here know Robert Redford was the natural. He was Roy Hobbs, the gifted baseball player. Robert Duvall was the cynical sportswriter; Wilford Brimley was the crusty old coach.

And there's that beautiful soliloquy where the coach walks in and he says—I mean, pardon me, Robert Duvall walks in and says to the coach, ''Coach, who is this Roy Hobbs?'' And the coach turns on his heels and says, ''I don't know who Roy Hobbs is. I just know he's the best there is and the best there ever will be.''

Jim Wright, you are the natural.

There probably has never been a man in American history who I can recall that so eloquently used the English language. He helped those of us who only have sparks appreciate the flame with his application of our language.

And it seems a shame that I can't find words in my language to encompass all that he was, and yet he will always be. Only in Spanish: Vaya con Dios—go and be with God. Light of our land. Vaya con Dios, friend of my life.

Congregational Hymn—''This is My Song''

Reverend Bruster: I invite you to hear now the words of the Apostle Paul from the first letter to the Corinthians, Chapter 13:

''If I speak in the tongues of mortals and of angels, but do not have love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing. If I give away all my possessions, and if I hand over my body so that I may boast, but do not have love, I gain nothing.

''Love is patient; love is kind; love is not envious or boastful or arrogant or rude. It does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice in wrongdoing, but rejoices in truth. Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.

''Love never ends.''

And Paul ends that chapter with the words:

''And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love.''

The words of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke, a sermon on the plain:

''But I say to you that listen, Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you. If anyone strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also; and from anyone who takes away your coat, do not withhold even your shirt. Give to everyone who begs from you; and if anyone takes away your goods, do not ask for them again. Do to others as you would have them do to you.

''If you love those who love you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners love those who love them. If you do good to those who do good to you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners do the same. If you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what credit is that to you? Even sinners lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love your enemies, do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return. Your reward will be great, and you will be children of the Most High; for He is kind to the ungrateful and the wicked. Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful.''

Jim had a wonderful, quick wit as we all know. His responses to glowing introductions illustrated that point. Two years ago, when Cissy Day was introducing him to a Sunday school class where he was about to speak, she told a story at the end of her introduction of something that he had done that was very kind and a note that he had written to her that was a kind note that she treasured. When he stood up then to speak, he looked over at her and he said, ''Uh, I had forgotten how nice I used to be.''

After a glowing introduction at another event, he said, ''An event of this dimension is just terribly hard on one's humility. Try as I might to look and sound humble, I just can't quite pull it off.''

And then he quoted Jesus: ''Let your light so shine before others that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in Heaven.''

And he said, ''You know, when I read that, I realized he doesn't say, 'Let your light so shine so that others may see your good works and think what a great guy.''' And then he went on to say, ''The purpose of good works is not to get bragged on.'' But then he said this: ''But if I'm honest with you, I guess I'm going to have to let you in on a little personal confession. Being bragged on, I like it,'' he said. ''I eat it up.''

And on another occasion, he said after an introduction, ''Undeserved as though an introduction like that is, indeed I want you to know that I liked it. I liked every word of it.''

And then he said, ''There are two kinds of people who appreciate flattery: men and women.''

So since Jim made that confession, I guess it's okay that we tell of his good works and that we laud him. And I hope that he would appreciate that we do it not just pointing at Jim, but pointing at the source of all of that for Jim; pointing not just to Jim, but beyond to the legacy that he received from other people, and beyond Jim to his faith and his commitment to Christ that guided his life.

He leaves a great legacy, and our words hold up those great attributes not to point just to Jim, but to also point to his faith and commitment and the One in whom he had faith and the One that he sought to follow, and also to see Jim's life as an example to all of us.

I want to think about that with you for just a few minutes. Jim was an encourager. As he sought to be a follower of Christ and as he put that into practice in his life, he knew the importance of encouragement. He was an encourager.

In the book of Acts, we meet a man named Joseph. He was from Cyprus. But we don't know him as Joseph. We almost never hear that. After his first introduction in the book of Acts, he's known by his nickname, and his nickname was Barnabas. The disciples, the apostles, nicknamed him Barnabas because Barnabas means ''son of encouragement.'' He was an encourager. Imagine having your nickname mean one who encourages. We could call Jim that, a Barnabas, because he was. He was a son of encouragement.

How many of us in this room, I wonder, have, in our possession, notes of encouragement from Jim Wright? I would guess a lot of us. Those notes arrived at a time of discouragement, perhaps, or a time of grief or a time of uncertainty or a time of failing confidence or a time of waning courage. A note of encouragement arrived at just the right time.

What is the value of those notes? I was thinking about that and thought, you know, the law of supply and demand would say those notes are not worth anything at all; there are too many of them on the market. But the value of those notes goes far beyond that. They're valued in a different way. One person told me that she had such a note in a plastic sleeve and carried it with her for a long time.

What an encourager, not just the notes, but the right words spoken at the right moment.

We give thanks to God for Jim because Jim was a peacemaker, and we have heard our speakers talk eloquently about his peacemaking efforts. He often quoted Jesus, again, from the Sermon on the Mount: Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.

And he was a peacemaker. He was a man of strong convictions but yet able to see and to respect the perspective of another and to bring people together in ways that make for peace. He was, as a peacemaker, a child of God, as Jesus said.

Now, peacemaking extended beyond what you may know about to his role as a parent. His daughters, Ginger and Kay, were fighting one time as sisters do, and Jim intervened as the peacemaker. And he made each one of them go to her room and write an essay, entitled, ''Why I Love My Sister.'' And he held on to those essays for 30 years, and then he gave them back to the girls so they could read them.

Kay wrote this: ''Well, I suppose she's nice. Her friends seem to like her.''

Ginger wrote: ''Well, she seems to like my clothes because she wears them all the time.''

He closed the door after reading those essays and guffawed, as you can imagine.

Ginger's comment, when she was telling me about it, was, ''And he thought the Sandinistas and Contras were tough.''

Jim was a servant leader; we know that. His accomplishments were many. In serving his beloved Weatherford and his beloved Fort Worth and his beloved Nation, he was a servant leader. Whether that was as a father, a grandfather, a great-grandfather, a soldier, a State legislator, a Scout master, a golden gloves boxing coach, a Sunday school teacher, a church leader, a mayor, a Congressman, a majority leader, a Speaker of the House, a teacher, or a friend, he was a servant leader—again, following the words of Jesus that we are to be servants of one another if we're ever to be called great.

His life was committed to compassion and justice. I read those wonderful words from Micah a moment ago. Micah was writing to a nation, to his people, who had lost their way, who had lost sight of that which was most important. They had the right words. They had the right rituals. But Micah wrote that that was all empty and reminded them

of what was most important that they should have known already.

He said, ''What has he told you, O mortal, but what is good, and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God.''

On so many occasions, I saw Jim share his faith; I saw Jim share his values, heard him speak in this pulpit. A number of years ago—I think it was in 2006—my wife, Susan, who was working at William James Middle School as academic coordinator, shared that with Jim, and he said, ''I used to go to William James Middle School.'' And she invited him then to come and speak to the students, and she had Jim Wright Day, and he spent most of the day at the school. And he talked with those students, and he had a reception in the library where he shared with them.

There was a big assembly in the auditorium, and it's one of those old classic schools with a big auditorium, a balcony in the back, and it was packed with middle school kids. And I couldn't believe my eyes and my ears when he spoke to them. You could hear a pin drop. He was a master.

And he shared with those kids the story of the Good Samaritan. I remember how he started into that. He said, ''There are a lot of different beliefs.'' He said, ''There is a man who lived a long time ago. His name was Jesus. He was a very good man, and a lot of different people believed a lot of different things about him. But he told some stories that taught some important values, and everybody agrees on that,'' he said.

He told the story of the Good Samaritan. You know the story. The man is beaten and robbed, lying on the side of the road. Along come two people who pass by on the other side, and then comes the Samaritan who is the outsider in the story, and he's the one who helps the man. And I remember Jim said to those kids, ''This illustrates really three philosophies of life, the three ways of approaching life.''

He said, ''There is the philosophy of the thieves, and their philosophy is what's yours is mine, and I'll take it.'' He said, ''That philosophy still lives in attacking others and cheating people and greedy business practices and being envious of others and whatever belittles or injures or degrades another person. It's not always physically violent,'' he said. He said, ''We rob others by slander or gossip when we injure their reputations.''

And he said, ''The second philosophy is that of the two men who saw the wounded man but offered no help.'' He said, ''Their central operating principle is what is mine is all mine, and I'll keep it for myself.'' He said, ''That's less violent, but in its own way it's as selfish as the first.'' He said, ''We can come up with all kinds of excuses to justify not helping those injured along life's highway. We deceive ourselves and ignore their suffering by saying that they're not our responsibility.''

Then he said, ''Then there's the Samaritan. This was Jesus' model for humanity. He was a stranger and a child of another religious heritage, but he extended himself freely to help one in need. And his philosophy is what's mine is yours if you need it, and I'll share it with you.''

And then he said, ''Jesus told that story in answer to a question. The question was, Who is my neighbor?'' And then he told those kids, ''There are these three philosophies of life, and there's only one that makes the world a better place. There's only one that makes your relationships better, and it's that of the Samaritan. And we each can choose how we live.''

Now, that illustrates so much how Jim lived and how he wanted to pass on that legacy to those who came after him.

Much has been spoken about his ability to forgive, and I cannot but think, as we meditate on those words of Jesus, the words of Paul about love, Jesus' words about forgiveness, and I can't help but think of the quote that he often gave from Abraham Lincoln.

Someone once asked Lincoln if he believed in destroying his enemies, and Lincoln replied, ''Of course, I would like to destroy my enemies because I've never wanted enemies. The only way I know satisfactorily to destroy an enemy is to convert him to a friend.''

The Fetzer Institute has done a lot of research on forgiveness, and they define it in a way that I think is so meaningful, and that is, forgiveness is the difficult, intentional process of letting go of an old reality and opening up one's self to a new one. And Jim lived that difficult, intentional process of being able to let go of an old reality and opening up and living a new one.

One friend emailed me and said, ''He was the poster child for amazing grace.''

That's the legacy that we celebrate today, and there's so much more that could be said. The challenge for all of us today was how do we winnow it down. But you know what? You carry those stories of Jim; you carry those memories; you carry that legacy. Share it; share it with one another; and do your best. Let us all do our best to live it—to live it.

In the obituary that you were handed as you came in, there is a favorite quote of his from Horace Greeley:

''Fame is a vapor, popularity an accident, riches take wings, those who cheer today may curse tomorrow. Only one thing endures—character.''

Well done, Jim Wright, good and faithful servant. Let's pray.

Gracious God, we give You thanks for the hope that faith in You gives. For all Your people who have laid hold on that hope, especially we thank You for Your faithful servant Jim Wright. We thank You for all Your goodness to him and for everything in his life that was a reflection of Your love and Your grace. We give You thanks for his faith, for his love for and his commitment to You and to his family and to his friends, to his Nation.

We give You thanks for his kindness, his passion for justice, his courage, and his strength of character. Loving God, hold us and all who mourn in Your love, and comfort this loving family and comfort us, his friends. Help us all to be ever mindful of Your sustaining presence.

We offer a prayer in the name of Jesus.

Amen.

In just a few moments, the family will process out, and you're invited to Wesley Hall, which is across the garden in that adjacent part of the building, for a reception with the family. Please note the instructions that are on the back of your bulletin, and I invite you to please remain seated, if you will, until the ushers direct you.

Ginger shared with me one of her favorite memories of opening of the Presidential display, the new Presidential display in the early 1990s, a room turned into a replica of LBJ's office there in Austin. There was an antique pump organ there signed by all the Members of Congress, and Jake Pickle sat down at the organ and started playing a hymn. And the congressional Members and former Members there started singing the hymn, and it's the hymn that we're going to sing in just a moment after Jim's great-grandchildren give us our benediction.

A benediction isn't really a prayer. It can be a prayer of course, but traditionally, it is not. The word ''benediction'' literally means ''a good word.'' The great-grandchildren, led by the oldest, Campbell, will give us their good word.

Will you come now.

(Campbell Brown, Jim Wright's great-granddaughter, and Jim Wright's great-grandchildren)

Miss Brown: Hi, my name is Campbell Brown. Everyone on stage with me is a great-grandchild of Jim Wright or, as we like to call him, ''Great Pop.''

None of us were born when he was in Congress, but we all knew his love for this great country, especially Fort Worth. We are told by many people that he often said, ''I want to make the world a better place for my children, their children, and their children's children.'' Well, that's us. Next to me are the children of the grandchildren. We are the next generation.

We would like to ask you to honor our Great Pop for the rest of the day by thinking about how you can make the world a better place. As you walk out of the church and for the rest of today, think about peace, not war; think about abundance, not scarcity; think about love, not hate, and hope, not despair.

Please help us lift Great Pop to his next roll call by singing the final hymn.

Thank y'all for coming today.

Congregational Hymn—''When the Roll is Called Up Yonder''

Recessional—''For All the Saints''

HONORING NEW HOPE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable church, New Hope First Baptist Church.

In the year 1878, Rev. G.W. Gayles, a traveling missionary became pastor of the Mt. Horeb Missionary Baptist Church after the dismissal of Rev. H.M. McIntyre. Although his pastorship was that of outstanding achievements in the church, there arose feelings of rebellion. Eventually, Rev. Gayles with some of his deacons were disbarred from the church. Out of this band of members was born the now New Hope First Baptist Church.

The first modern day pastor of the New Hope First Baptist Church was Rev. H.H. Humes who began pastoring the Church in 1927. Rev. Humes began a long tenure in 1927 which lasted until 1941. During the period of Rev. Humes' tenure in 1940 the church was completely torn down and rebuilt. Earlier the first floor was completely remodeled after the 1927 Flood. The structure completed in 1940 remained the home of New Hope First Baptist Church congregation until 1977. Rev. Humes left the church in 1941 only to return again as the pastor in 1954 and remained in that position until his death in January of 1958.

In 1954, New Hope First Baptist Church began its long relationship with Rev. J.M. Kimble. Rev. Kimble served from 1958 until July of 1969. With his sweet spirit and general

manners, Rev. Kimble typified the Christian spirit by his continued visits to the sick in homes and in hospitals. When Rev. Kimble initially left New Hope First Baptist Church in July of 1969, he was followed by Rev. Albert Jenkins who came in the autumn of 1969 and remained pastor until the early part of 1971.

During Rev. Kimble's first tenure as pastor, the church purchased additional land and property on the corner of Theobald and Nelson Streets. At that time the Trustees included Constance W. Watson, Herbert Caver, Joe Hillard and Jessis Winters.

Rev. Kimble returned to New Hope in the early part of 1971 and is presently the pastor. He, like those who preceded him, again took up the challenge of a progressive and assertive Christian force in Greenville. The progress of the church was remarkable as exemplified by the newly constructed building which was made available for services in May of 1978.

The Sunday School, Bible Class, Christian Education, N.B.C., Ushers, Deaconess Broad, Deacons, Pastor's Aid Club, Senior Mission, J.M.A., Red Circle, Choirs, and Trustee Boards have played an important part in the growth and development of this church.

On January 1, 1987, New Hope started commencing full-time service. In recognition of the same, Pastor Kimble and all other New Hopers are very, very grateful to God and the members of the organizational structure committee for having made a giant step toward providing opportunities for all members of New Hope First Baptist Church to become involved in the church's total program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing New Hope First Baptist Church for its longevity and dedication to serving others.

HONORING JANICE BARLOW

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Janice Barlow, who officially retired on May 7, 2015, from her position as the Executive Director of Zero Breast Cancer. For the past fifteen years, Zero Breast Cancer has thrived under Ms. Barlow's leadership, growing beyond the local grassroots to become a regionally and nationally recognized model for communities interested in prevention and elimination of breast cancer.

Janice Barlow has skillfully guided Zero Breast Cancer's development by actively engaging the local community and continuously pursuing research partnerships and opportunities. Over the past 15 years, Janice Barlow has helped Zero Breast Cancer adopt innovative technologies and outreach strategies to engage new demographics and increased revenue despite the recent economic downturn. During this time, Ms. Barlow also personally co-authored two groundbreaking reports: The California Breast Cancer Mapping Project: Identifying Areas of Concern in California and Breast Cancer and the Environment: Prioritizing Prevention.

Under Janice Barlow's leadership, Zero Breast Cancer has successfully partnered with senior academic scientists on more than a dozen research grants, bringing over 20 million research dollars to Marin County and the greater San Francisco Bay Area. Ms. Barlow has been a particularly strong advocate for increased funding for breast cancer prevention research, which currently comprises only a small portion of overall breast cancer funding. Zero Breast Cancer is a national leader in supporting research on the role of environmental risk factors behind breast cancer and continues to advocate for research that specifically investigates prevalence of breast cancer in Marin County and the Bay Area. By helping to lead a study that investigated the relationship between pubertal development and breast cancer, Ms. Barlow paved the way for breakthrough science focused on youth.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we honor and thank Janice Barlow for her years of dedicated service to the people of Marin County and the extended Bay Area community, and for her advocacy on behalf of all whose lives have been impacted by breast cancer. On behalf of the many individuals and organizations she has served, I am privileged to express our deep appreciation to Ms. Janice Barlow for her exemplary leadership, and convey our best wishes as she pursues new endeavors.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR. JAMES ECONOMOS

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my dear friend and lifetime Warren, Ohio resident Mr. James Economos. Mr. Economos was highly regarded within the Warren community for his passion for local businesses, community service, and his unwavering dedication to both the Warren G. Harding High School Football Team and the Ohio State Buckeyes.

Mr. Economos was born in Warren, Ohio in 1938 and dedicated his life to his family, his church, and his family business. He was a proud graduate of the Warren G. Harding High School and Youngstown State University. Mr. Economos joined the United States Army in 1960 and after nine hard years of commendable service, he was honorably discharged with the rank of Captain in 1969.

He married Joan Pompos in May of 1961 and the two were happily married for thirty-three years until her passing in 1995. From 1960 until his passing, Mr. Economos was the owner of Saratoga Restaurant and Catering in Warren, Ohio. His family purchased the business back in 1935. And next year Saratoga Restaurant and Catering will be celebrating its 100th anniversary.

In addition to building a successful business, Mr. Economos was very active in his local church and community. He was a member of Parish Council and served three terms as president of the church council at St. Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church in Warren.

James's service to our country, his dedication to his business, his love for family and friends, and his passion for the Warren G. Harding High School Football Team and the Ohio State Buckeyes, all demonstrate the qualities that made him so special to us. James's life and legacy contribute to Warren being a better place to live and call home. He is survived by his sisters Dorian, Chrisi, and Jennifer; his son, Eric; his sister Demetra; and four wonderful grandchildren. James was a beloved part of the Warren community and he will be deeply missed.

RECOGNIZING THE 946TH FORWARD SURGICAL TEAM

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the 946th Forward Surgical Team as they prepare for their next deployment.

The 946th was constituted on January 23, 1997 and activated at Fort James H. Wright Reserve Center in Mobile, Alabama. The unit began with six officers and six enlisted soldiers. The 946th has been deployed into active theater in Afghanistan on multiple occasions. The 946th has attended multiple training programs and has received several accolades, including recognition as an ''outstanding unit'' during Joint Thunder in 2007.

During their deployments, they withstood multiple mortar attacks while supporting major combat missions. While providing medical coverage during combat operations, the 946th performed everything from appendectomies to amputations to open-heart surgery related to trauma. During one deployment, the unit treated over 500 patient traumas, 380 surgical patients, oversaw the conduction of 750 x-rays and laboratory procedures, and coordinated over 300 MEDEVAC transfers.

In April of 2012, Major Forrest L. Neese assumed command of the 946th. In March of 2014, the 946th received honors for its role in WAREX 2014 at Fort McCoy in Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, as the 946th prepares to deploy in support of Operation Freedom's Sentinel, I want to applaud them for their commitment and service to our nation. They provide such a unique and critical role in supporting our men and women who are working to preserve democracy in a very dangerous part of the world.

So on behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District, I wish them safe travels in their deployment and I ask God to bless the 946th, their families, and all those who serve our great nation.

HONORING POLICE SERGEANT CARL D. PILCHER

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Sergeant Carl Pilcher, a man who has truly devoted himself to public

service. Carl was hired as a Police Officer by the Fairfield Police Department on April 11, 1988 and over the duration of his career worked in various capacities which included: Field Training, Patrol, Special Operations, Special Activity Felony Enforcement (SAFE) Team, and Youth Services. On December 31, 1999 he was promoted to Police Corporal where he served in the Patrol Bureau for two years before being promoted to Police Sergeant on December 28, 2001.

As a Police Sergeant, Carl supervised the Youth Services Unit, investigators in the Major Crimes Unit, and several Patrol teams. Most recently, Sergeant Pilcher spent the past four years running the Personnel and Training Unit, where he ensured the Fairfield Police Department upheld the highest standards in the recruitment, hiring and training of the next generation of law enforcement Officers.

Sergeant Pilcher is a skilled team leader who has received numerous commendations including an Exceptional Performance Citation for his decisive and exemplary leadership. He has been a valued public servant where his hard work and commitment to the community have made him a model representative of the law enforcement community.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA STUDENTS

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate the University of Central Florida for winning their second national title at the 2015 National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition (NCCDC). Presented in partnership with Raytheon Company and organized by the Center for Infrastructure Assurance and Security (CIAS) at the University of Texas, the NCCDC held April 24–26 in San Antonio, Texas featured finalists from 10 regional competitions nationwide.

The NCCDC, started in 2005 to increase interest in the cyber security field, was the first national cyber security competition designed to test how well college students operate and protect a corporate network infrastructure. Utilizing real world scenarios, students must secure and defend the network infrastructure and business information systems. In addition to scoring the highest in the competition and winning their second NCCDC Alamo Cup, the University of Central Florida team, on behalf of Raytheon, will be coming to Washington, D.C. this summer to visit some of our nation's premier national security sites.

Again, congratulations to the University of Central Florida team for bringing home their second NCCDC national title and establishing the University of Central Florida as a leader in cyber security.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF AARON DUNN ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Aaron Dunn of Toledo, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Aaron's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2019. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education, while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Aaron brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2019. While attending Toledo Christian School in Toledo, Ohio, Aaron was a member of the National Honor Society and Honor Roll. He also played in the marching band, was a class representative and student council member.

Throughout high school, Aaron was a member of his school's cross country, baseball and basketball teams, earning varsity letters in cross country and baseball. I am confident that Aaron will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Aaron Dunn on the offer of his appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Aaron will excel during his career at the Naval Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

HONORING MAJOR ANDY SHIELDS

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major Andy Shields, Chief Deputy of the Macon County Sheriff's office, who will retire on June 30, 2015.

Major Shields began serving as a patrol officer in Macon County on March 1, 1984, where he was promoted to Sergeant just two years later in 1986. In January of 1990, he began his work as an investigator, serving as the only detective in the Sheriff's office for several years. As more investigators joined the force, Major Shields' leadership as Chief Investigator was instrumental in maintaining a standard of excellence in Macon County law enforcement. After serving overseas with the United Nations Peacekeeping force in Kosovo for two years, Major Shields returned to the Macon County Sheriff's Office in September 2001, where he was eventually promoted to Chief Deputy and has remained in that position since. His training and experience has proven to be exemplary throughout his career. Upon his retirement, Major Shields will be the first employee of the Macon County Sheriff's Office to retire with a full thirty years of service.

Major Shields' unwavering dedication and leadership is something that all of us can admire and respect. As such, I am proud to honor Major Andy Shields for his faithful service to the people of Macon County and congratulate him on his retirement.

PEARLAND FFA STATE TITLE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Turner College and Career High School's (TCCHS) horse judging team who recently claimed the first-ever state title for Pearland Future Farmers of America (FFA).

The team comprised of Rachel Golla, Jessica Harper, Andrea Skweres, and Evann Wehman, competed against 72 other teams at the State Horse Judging Career Development Event. The teammates evaluated and ranked four horses in eight classes. After evaluating the horses, the team answered a series of questions. Their knowledge of appearance, breed characteristics, and athletic ability were really put to the test. This is a great victory for their veterinary science teacher, Jessica Koetting, and the rest of TCCHS. We are excited to see you represent Texas this October in the national competition.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the TCCHS horse judging team for bringing home a state title for Pearland FFA. You have made your community proud.

HONORING DR. DAVID MATTHEWS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Dr. David Matthews. A native of Indianola, Mississippi, Dr. Matthews left an impact on all whom he encountered through his work as a pastor, teacher, and elected official.

A World War II Veteran, Matthews returned to Indianola Colored High School in 1946 to complete his high school diploma. Upon completion of his diploma, Dr. Matthews completed his studies at Morehouse College in 1950, and continued his studies at the Atlanta University, Memphis Theological Seminary, Delta State University, and Reformed Theological Seminary.

Matthews served as pastor at Bell Grove Missionary Baptist Church and Stranger's

Home Missionary Baptist Church in 1958, where he served until his death. Matthews also worked as a teacher for thirty-three years. He also served as the first Black Democratic Election Commissioner for Sunflower County, first Black Deputy Chancery Clerk of Sunflower County, first Black Honorary Deputy Sheriff and an original member of Indianola's biracial committee formed during the Civil Rights Era. He also served on the Governor's Commission of Mississippi.

Dr. Matthews received his honorary Doctorate of Divinity from Natchez College, Doctorate of Humanities from Mississippi Industrial College and Doctorate of Divinity from Morris Booker College. On April 15, he left behind a loving and devoted wife of 64 years, Lillian, one daughter, and five grandchildren. Dr. David Matthews spent the entirety of his life serving others for the benefit of his greater community. He is one of the finest Mississippians, and he will be missed.

COMMENDATION FOR THE LIFE OF CALVIN PEETE

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and work of Calvin Peete. Mr. Peete was one of the most successful black professionals in the history of the PGA. Mr. Peete won 12 PGA tournaments over a 25-year career on the tour that began in 1976, and continued on the Champions Tour until 2001. His most successful year was 1982, when he won four tournaments.

Calvin did not begin playing golf until he was in his 20s, but immediately excelled at a game most pros learn as young children. He learned the game while peddling goods to migrant workers in Rochester, New York, playing on the public course at Genesee Valley Park. He was in the top 10 of the Official World Golf Ranking for several weeks when they debuted in 1986. He was the leader in driving accuracy for 10 straight years. This is even more incredible due to the fact that he could not straighten his left arm.

In addition to his playing accomplishments, Mr. Peete supported The First Tee and junior golf in Jacksonville, in addition to other charities.

Mr. Peete passed away after a long battle with lung cancer on April 29, 2015. He was exemplary as a golfer and even more as a person. Throughout his life, he displayed grit and determination in relentless pursuit of his goals. Calvin is survived by his wife, Pepper, and seven children.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF MARY BAHR ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Mary Bahr of Waterville, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Mary's offer of appointment poises her to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2019. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education, while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Mary brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2019. While attending Anthony Wayne High School in Whitehouse, Ohio, Mary was a member of the National Honor Society, Honor Roll, and received scholastic honors. In addition, she was actively involved in her church choir and youth group.

Throughout high school, Mary was a member of her school's cross country and basketball teams, earning her varsity letters in each. I am confident that Mary will carry the lessons of her student and athletic leadership to the Military Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mary Bahr on the offer of her appointment to the United States Military Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Mary will excel during her career at the Military Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to the Nation.

HONORING 22 TEACHERS OF THE GREATER BOCA RATON AREA AWARDED TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 22 outstanding teachers from my district who have been awarded the Teacher of the Year award from the Rotary Club of Boca Raton Sunrise. These exemplary teachers continue to make a profound impact on our students through their caring, commitment, and professionalism. They are a cohort defined by integrity, excellence, and the highest marks in all they do.

For the past 28 years, the Rotary Club of Boca Raton Sunrise has offered this annual distinction to a teacher at each of the 22 schools in the Greater Boca Raton area. Each awardee is selected by his or her school's principal. These teachers have dedicated themselves to inspiring and empowering the next generation of young South Floridians. The amount of time and effort these individuals have expended for the betterment of their community is truly admirable and exhibits a level of passion worthy of recognition.

Congratulations to Chris Amico, Jonathan Benskin, Charisse Cason, Katie Delucia, Lisa Drescher, Lori Eaton, Dawn Esposito, Jennifer Hammer, Alicia Kaucher, Alexandra Laing, Courtney Lockhart, Ana Millet, Suzette Milu, Charna Rosenfeld, Beth Rubin, Denise Rudy, Jane Simonsen, Doris Vaillancourt-Milano, Kristy Verzaal, Lori Vetter, Cheryl Walling, and Ellen Winikoff on receiving this year's Teacher of the Year Award. I am happy to honor them, and I know that they will continue to inspire South Floridians to live by their example.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD ''DANNY'' DANIELSON

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Donald ''Danny'' Danielson, a devoted family man, respected Hoosier business leader, military veteran and longtime philanthropist. Danny leaves behind his three daughters and eight grandchildren and was preceded in death by his wife of more than six decades, Patricia.

Danny attended Indiana University and graduated with a bachelor's degree in education in 1942. But, instead of launching a career in education, Danny decided to enlist in the U.S. Navy, right in the middle of World War II. He served in both the Pacific and Atlantic Theaters until 1946, when he was discharged with the rank of Lieutenant.

After his service in the military, Danny was invited to attend training camp with the Brooklyn Dodgers, but instead, he took a different route. He worked for the Alumni Association at IU for a while before starting his career at City Securities in 1976. By 1981, Danny was elected Vice Chairman of the board there.

Although busy in his professional and personal life, Danny was a big believer in the importance of community service and giving back. He spent a lot of his time and money working to make Henry County and the state of Indiana a better place for its residents. He and his wife led the effort to relocate the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame to New Castle in 1990, and they also championed for the development of the new Henry County YMCA in 2003. Danny also served on the IU board of trustees for many years and donated $1.3 million to the Indiana University School of Medicine. He was also chairman of the Walther Cancer Foundation for a time, chaired the Fellowship of Christian Athletes' national board, and served as a director of New Castle's Americana Bancorp.

Because of his outstanding leadership and service to his community, Danny received the

Sachem award in 2009, which is the highest honor given by the great state of Indiana. He also received the prestigious Sagamore of the Wabash award and was named a ''Living Legend'' by the Indiana Historical Society in 2014.

Danny was also my friend. I will always be grateful for the encouragement and support he gave me early in my political career. And, I know the city of New Castle and the State of Indiana will always be grateful for his selfless contributions.

Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of Danny Danielson. My thoughts and prayers go out to Danny's family, and may God comfort those he left behind with his peace and strength.

HONORING THE MARSHALL CHRISTIAN ACADEMY TCAL 1A STATE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride to come before you in acknowledgement of the exceptional performance of the Marshall Christian Academy Guardians varsity boys basketball team, who recently claimed the 2015 Texas Christian Athletic League 1A state title. This achievement makes this the third consecutive season that the Guardians have dominated the state championship.

Marshall Christian Academy began its playoff performance with an impressive display of athletic prowess. The Guardians' first game of the 2015 playoffs resulted in a win over Humble Christian School with an astounding score of 80–51. This victory gave the Guardians new energy and inspiration which would carry them victoriously through the two remaining playoff games.

The second playoff game proved to be a difficult obstacle for the Guardians, who were challenged by their 2014 rivals and toughest opponents from Stephenville Faith High School. The score remained close until the final moments of the game. In the last minute of the game, the Guardians proved their commitment and skill by scoring and winning the game with a final score of 52–46. This hard-won victory earned the Guardians a spot in the final playoff game.

The Guardians began the final playoff game confident in both the team's ability and as individual team members. The championship game pitted the Guardians against the San Antonio Sunnybrook Lions. Working together, the Guardians were able to effectively outscore the Lions, and ultimately, Marshall Christian completed the quest for a third straight state championship title with a score of 61–53.

The skilled and committed players who worked so diligently to earn this esteemed honor were David Florence, Dylan Alford, Stephen Florence, Andrew Stokell, Ryan Stokell, Jordan Sammons, Dawson Rapsilver, Jairus Allen, Joshua Florence, William Hency, Matthew Stokell, and Caleb Beesinger. In addition to playing on the state champion team, four players were selected for the All-Tournament Team, and the Guardians were able to count the Tournament MVP within its ranks. Also, the team was honored to have three of its players selected for the All-Star Team.

The coaches and staff who led this accomplished team to victory were Head Coach Jeff Arrington, Assistant Coach James Allen, Assistant Coach Robert Stokell, High School Principal Duane Shultz, Junior High School Principal Raymond Bade, along with Athletic Director and Elementary Principal Guy Barr III.

The Guardians' success has been attributed to their exceptional ability to work as a cohesive unit, and through an incredible display of this teamwork combined with the team's experience and passion, the Guardians prevailed over their skilled opponents and ultimately finished the season with an outstanding record of 22–6.

Please join me and all of the First District of Texas in congratulating the achievements of the Marshall Christian Academy Guardians. This exceptional illustration of teamwork and sportsmanship should be praised and emulated. It is a distinct honor to share the story and example of these outstanding young men, a story which is now recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, due to airplane equipment problems, I was unavoidably detained and I missed the following votes:

Roll Call Vote No. 216, passage of H.R. 606, the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Roll Call Vote No. 217, on agreeing to the Edwards Amendment to H.R. 1732. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Roll Call vote No. 219, passage of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Roll Call Vote No. 220, passage of H.R. 2146, the Defending Public Safety Employees Retirement Act. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REMOVE THE RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN LAND TRANSFERRED TO ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation to transfer land from the U.S. Department of Interior to Rockingham County, Virginia. For over 25 years, Rockingham County, Virginia has managed a small area of land in my congressional district as if it belonged to the County to meet the needs of the community and serve the public good. Although this land was already transferred from the Federal Government to the County, it was not done effectively. This legislation will finalize the efforts of a previous Congress and fully transfer this land to the County, while continuing to meet public needs.

Since 1989, a little over 3 acres of land and its associated buildings, previously wholly held by the Federal Government, have been maintained by Rockingham County and the Plains Area Daycare Center. In that year, the Department of the Interior deeded this land, which it no longer used, to Rockingham County for public good.

Prior to this official declaration, Rockingham County had already been maintaining the lands around the facility. The land and building had been used as a garage and maintenance facility for the National Forest Service. However, it was no longer being utilized, and the County was performing upkeep on the land.

PL 101–479 was approved in the 101st Congress to allow the buildings on this land to be used for the particular use of a non-profit day care that serves the County. Unfortunately, because of the narrow way Public Law 101–479 was drafted, any extension or maintenance of the physical structures has required approval by the Department of the Interior. Given that the building is used for a child care facility, this impedes the ability of the day care to move efficiently to make any necessary upgrades. The building is currently in need of repairs; however, because of the terms of the deed, the daycare center has been unable to get a loan to complete the needed renovations.

To be clear, the center and the playground are the sole reason that this previously abandoned government land is being used by the public today. The Federal Government no longer has a vested interest in the land.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation, which was approved by the House of Representatives in nearly a unanimous manner in the 113th Congress as H.R. 5162, is a simple formality. I have been pleased to visit the Plains Area Daycare Center on many occasions. By passing this legislation and allowing Rockingham County more authority over the land, it will ensure that more children and more of the community will be served by this land.

I urge swift consideration of this bill in the 114th Congress.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF MICHAEL GRINDLE ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Michael Grindle of Holland, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Air

Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Michael's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Air Force Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2019. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education, while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Michael brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2019. While attending Springfield High School in Holland, Ohio, Michael was a member of the National Honor Society, Principal's Honor Roll, Foreign Language Club, and served as class secretary.

Throughout high school, Michael was a member of his school's swim team, cross country team, and football team. He was also a member of men's gymnastics at the Toledo YMCA. I am confident that Michael will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Air Force Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Michael Grindle on the offer of his appointment to the United States Air Force Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Michael will excel during his career at the Air Force Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following Roll Call vote on May 12, 2015 and would like to reflect that I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call #216: YES
Roll Call #217: YES
Roll Call #218: YES
Roll Call #219: NO
Roll Call #220: YES

HONORING OLEXIS BRIANNA HAYMON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a goal oriented student, Olexis Brianna Haymon.

Olexis is the daughter of Otha and Debra Haymon, longtime residents of Pickens, Mississippi.

Olexis Brianna Haymon possesses a 4.0 grade-point average since she was in kindergarten. Currently a 12th-grader, Olexis Brianna Haymon is no stranger to community service. Whenever the town of Pickens, Mississippi has its cleanup days, Olexis is always right there doing her part to help her community.

In additional to that, Olexis often volunteers to help her mother, Debra Haymon, an employee of Mid-Delta Home Health, with community health fairs. She is also an active participant in the Leadership program of the Mississippi State Extension Service for Holmes County, Mississippi.

Olexis has made history as the first queen of the recently merged Holmes County Central High School of 2014–2015. The Holmes County School District merged all three of its high schools into one newly-named school for educational enhancement. Olexis is Miss Holmes County Central High School.

Not only is Olexis active in her community, but also active in her school as well. She is a member of the PTSA (Parent Teacher Student Association) in which she is responsible for the school membership drive. According to one of her teachers, ''She encourages and provides help to fellow classmates because she believes in helping everyone succeed.'' She definitely tries to be a role model for the 9th graders. Her high school counselor commented in a letter of reference that ''Olexis is a well-rounded person. She is well behaved, has great personality and has many leadership qualities.''

Olexis also actively served as the 2014 president for her school's Jobs for Mississippi Graduates (JMG) program. Recently, she earned first place in the Community Students Learning Center's Annual Essay Writing Contest and thereby was the recipient of the Community Students Learning Center's Scholarship Award in the amount of $500.00. Olexis plans to use her CSLC scholarship winnings toward her college pursuit in nursing at Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Olexis Brianna Haymon, as a student who is goal oriented and making a difference in her community.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,152,456,926,656.13. We've added $7,525,579,877,743.05 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE HONORABLE PATRICIA WALSH

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the public service of the Honorable Patricia Walsh, member of the Somerset County Board of Chosen Freeholders, as she is honored by the Boy Scouts of America during the 2015 Tribute to Women Awards.

Freeholder Walsh has for years been a dedicated public servant to the Somerset County community and her native Green Brook. Her many accomplishments and contributions to the county, its residents and New Jersey have improved the lives of many. As a member of the Somerset County Board of Chosen Freeholders, she has held various positions, including director of board, deputy director and liaison to many community programs and departments serving the 21 municipalities in Somerset County. Prior to her service as a Freeholder, Pat was Mayor of Green Brook and a member of the governing body.

Freeholder Walsh has been of service to many public interest groups and volunteer organizations, political campaigns and party political activities and has earned numerous awards honors for her time and service to each.

Freeholder Walsh and her colleagues on the Board of Chosen Freeholders have worked tirelessly for years to ensure that Somerset County is a wonderful place to live and raise a family. Their management of the county finances, parks, health care system, education and public works has made Somerset one of the best counties in America.

I congratulate Patricia Walsh for her well-earned recognition.

TRIBUTE TO DR. RAYMOND M. MADDOX

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Dr. Raymond M. Maddox, a well-known dentist and respected member of the Rushville community.

Dr. Maddox was a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. He was married to his wife Kay Maddox for 43 years. Together, they had two children and four grandchildren. A lifelong Hoosier, Ray attended Taylor University and graduated with a bachelor's degree in both biology and chemistry in 1971. After college, he attended and graduated from Indiana University's School of Dentistry in 1975 to pursue a professional dental career. Dr. Maddox then practiced dentistry in Rushville and Hartford City for several decades.

In addition to his practice, he served in many leadership roles in the dental community. He was the past president of the Indiana Dental Association, delegate to the American

Dental Association caucus 7th district, fellow of the American College of Dentists, president of the American College of Dentistry-Indiana Foundation, vice speaker of IDA House of Delegates, and Parliamentarian of IDA House of Delegates.

Although Ray was known as a great dentist and as someone dedicated to his profession, he was respected and loved for much more than that. Members of the community, his family and friends loved him for his ability to create meaningful relationships and brighten the lives of all those with whom he came in contact.

Ray Maddox was my friend. I will never forget his smile, his positive attitude and his strong support of my own career in public service. They don't come any more loyal than Ray Maddox.

Today, it is my privilege to honor his life and legacy. My thoughts and prayers go out to Ray's family, and may God comfort those he left behind with his peace and strength.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF MASON JESSING ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Mason Jessing of Delta, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Mason's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2019. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education, while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Mason brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2019. While attending Delta High School in Delta, Ohio, Mason was a member of the National Honor Society, Honor Roll, and Academic Excellence Award recipient.

Throughout high school, Mason was a member of his school's football, track and powerlifting teams, earning varsity letters in football. He was also an MRA motocross rider. I am confident that Mason will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mason Jessing on the offer of his appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Mason will excel during his career at the Naval Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

HONORING PHOEBE CLYDE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Phoebe Clyde of Logos Prep Academy for winning the gold medal in the 300-meter hurdles event at the Texas Association of Private and Parochial Schools (TAPPS) 3A state track team championships.

Ms. Clyde defended her state title in the 300-meter hurdle event by running an impressive time of 47.14 seconds. She then anchored the 1600-meter relay where her team earned the silver medal. What an excellent performance to end her senior year.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Phoebe Clyde for winning the District TAPPS 3A gold medal in the 300-meter hurdle race. We look forward to seeing what you will accomplish in the future.

CONGRATULATING THE PARISH EPISCOPAL SCHOOL FOR THEIR SELECTION AS REGIONAL WINNERS OF THE 2015 TOSHIBA/NATIONAL SCIENCE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION EXPLORAVISION AWARD

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Rishul Rai and Pavitra Kumar of the Parish Episcopal School in Dallas, Texas, in my district, for their recent selection as the Region 5 winner of the Grade 4–6 age group of the 2015 Toshiba/National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) ExploraVision Award. With 5,000 teams entered within 6 regions, this is an incredibly impressive accomplishment.

The Toshiba/NTSA ExploraVision competition goes beyond a typical student science competition. Teachers guide groups of 2–4 students through a simulation of real research and development as they pick a current technology and envision how it will look in 20 years, as well as the breakthroughs necessary to reach that point. Rishul and Pavitra's entry, Dehydra DH, uses wearable technology to determine the dehydration level of athletes by monitoring the level of salt in a player's sweat. The device would then alert the player, coaching staff, or medical personnel if severe levels are reached. The focus on the STEM field is growing increasingly important, and competitions like these that foster that development inherently improve our nation and its future. The Dehydra DH entry for the ExploraVision Award by the Parish Episcopal School is truly impressive, and these students are very deserving of this honor.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring this great achievement by Rishul Rai and Pavitra Kumar of the Parish Episcopal School of Dallas.

HONORING JEFFREY BUJER AND HIS WORK WITH SABAN COMMUNITY CLINIC

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jeffrey Bujer.

Jeffrey Bujer is the current Chief Executive Officer of Saban Community Clinic. He began working for Saban Community Clinic in 1998, when it was known as the Los Angeles Free Clinic. He joined the organization as its Chief Financial Officer and moved into a co-CEO role before becoming the sole Chief Executive Officer in 2012.

Under his leadership, Saban Community Clinic has greatly evolved in its structure and brand. It has moved from a free clinic structure to a Federally Qualified Health Center and has grown from a staff of 62 serving 9,000 patients each year to a staff of over 200 serving 20,000 patients each year. The Clinic has expanded its services to include both primary care and mental health treatment. Jeffrey led the Clinic in expanding to three locations in Los Angeles and implementing an electronic health record system. In 2007, Jeffrey oversaw the capital campaign that raised $17 million in honor of Saban Community Clinic's 40th anniversary.

Jeffrey has touched countless lives in his leadership role and will be missed by all when he leaves his position this year. His passion for serving others and commitment to health care for all is an inspiration. Our community owes a debt of gratitude to Jeffrey Bujer for his hard work and dedication.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Jeffrey Bujer and wishing him well for the future.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOROUGH OF MAGNOLIA

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the One-hundredth Anniversary of the founding of the Borough of Magnolia in Camden County, New Jersey.

On April 14, 1915, the citizens of the future Borough of Magnolia were formally recognized by the New Jersey Legislature as an independent borough out of Clementon Township. However, history for this small town did not begin in 1915. Settled in 1685, the area we know today as Magnolia, New Jersey has a deep history of rich involvement in the South Jersey community as one of the first settled communities of colonial New Jersey.

The land that makes up Magnolia was once inhabited by the Native American Tribe of

Lenni-Lenape who lived peacefully alongside Quaker farmers. William Penn, the future founder of Pennsylvania, worked diligently with this dedicated group of Quakers to settle in the southern section of colonial New Jersey. These settlers practiced a modest way of living based on agriculture and timber production. Over the next three hundred years, the community in the Magnolia area thrived, and in the past century, the population of Magnolia has quadrupled to over 4,000 today.

Mr. Speaker, the Borough of Magnolia is small in size, but it is enormous in heart and community, a feeling that is best encapsulated through its motto: ''One Square Mile of Friendliness.'' This week, as the people of Magnolia celebrate their Centennial celebrations, I congratulate the citizens, Mayor BettyAnn Cowling-Carson, and council of Magnolia on their past one hundred years of experiences and accomplishments and wish them another hundred years of richness and good fortune.

25TH ANNUAL LOCAL COLORS FESTIVAL

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, as the Roanoke community prepares to celebrate the 25th Annual Local Colors Festival, I want to take this opportunity to express my deepest thanks to my constituent, Pearl Fu, for her leadership of the Roanoke Valley's annual celebration of our diverse heritage.

Pearl is a truly special individual and has played an instrumental role in bringing the Roanoke Valley together over the last quarter century. She has offered Local Colors as a special event to remind us that, as Americans, we are one country out of many nationalities that have preceded us on these shores. In Local Colors, she solidified a celebration of the varied cultures that make up the Roanoke region. She helped increase awareness of our history—a melting pot of origins, races, and ethnic backgrounds.

Late last year, Pearl marked the culmination of her leadership of this event. Local Colors is known by many for what they encounter at the festival—a day to share food and fellowship; enjoy music, arts, and crafts; and, experience the languages, attire, and traditions of the more than 100 countries whose roots have been planted in Roanoke and its neighboring cities, towns, and counties.

However, I also want to recognize Pearl for what she did day in and day out for so many years. Through Local Colors, she worked with many other individuals and organizations to offer language translations and conflict resolution, publicity in the local media, and multicultural education for schoolchildren, community organizations, government officials, and businesses. Without Pearl at the helm, none of this would have been possible.

I fondly remember selecting Local Colors as a ''Local Legacy'' project in 1999, bringing national recognition from the Library of Congress that has permitted so many people around our nation and around the world to experience what Local Colors is all about. They can visit the Library of Congress, view the digital recognition on the Internet, or visit the festival to see all that it has become.

Local Colors is truly one of America's proud traditions. Pearl can stand assured that she has been responsible for its success and the community is thankful to her for helping them experience such a memorable event over so many years.

As Pearl steps away from the leadership of Local Colors, I and so many others will continue to support and experience Local Colors as a way of showing the world that we are truly one nation. I extend my gratitude to Pearl for making it all possible for us and for her deep spirit of goodwill.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF JOSHUA MOSSING ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Joshua Mossing of Sylvania, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Joshua's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Air Force Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2019. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education, while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Joshua brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2019. While attending Central Catholic High School in Toledo, Ohio, Joshua was a member of the National Honor Society, Summa Cum Laude Honor Roll, and was top ten in class rank.

Throughout high school, Joshua was a member of his school's wrestling and football teams, earning varsity letters in wrestling and voted team captain of the wrestling team. I am confident that Joshua will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Air Force Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Joshua Mossing on the offer of his appointment to the United States Air Force Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Joshua will excel during his career at the Air Force Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

HONORING BAHATI S. HARDEN, MD

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bahati S. Harden, MD, who has achieved remarkable success and has been exemplary as a physician and a public servant.

Dr. Harden was born in Adams County in Natchez, MS on June 24, 1979 to the late George Harden and Deborah Harden. Being the baby girl, she was a godly child who called her father her best friend at an early age and grew up in a household of love and support.

Bahati finished high school and received a scholarship to Spelman College in Atlanta, GA where she completed her studies in Biology in 2001. After graduating with a Master's of Science in Public Health from Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, she accepted a fellowship in Bioterrorism Preparedness with the Centers for Disease Control and prevention.

Having a desire to pursue a medical degree, she entered the University of MS Medical Center's Inaugural Professional Portal Track. Having received a Master's of Science in Biomedical Science, she completed her Doctorate of Medicine also at the University of MS Medical Center. After completing a residency at LSU Health (Shreveport, LA) in Rural Family Medicine, Dr. Harden accepted a position in MS Delta with the Greenwood Leflore Hospital in Greenwood, MS where she continues to practice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Bahati S. Harden, a Doctor and Public Servant, for her dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MRS. CARRIE 'GRANDMA REIGLE' (RIZZI) REIGLE

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mrs. Carrie Reigle, who passed away peacefully in the presence of her family on Easter Sunday. Carrie was known to all of us as Grandma Reigle. She was born on October 24, 1917 to her loving parents Vincenzo and Angelina Rizzi. She attended Niles High School and after graduating she attended the Choffin School of Nursing, completing her degree in 1960.

It came as no surprise that Carrie spent her life's work as a nurse mending the broken. To all who knew her she was a caring person whose love and compassion stemmed beyond measure.Carrie's early career consisted of her hard work in the Intensive Care Unit as a nurse at Northside Hospital. She spent twenty-two years at her post until retiring in 1983. Even in retirement Carrie's commitment to helping others led to her return to nursing in

1984 at the Shepherd of the Valley Nursing Home in Niles, Ohio.

In 1996, she retired from Shepherd of the Valley, but still decided she had more to give. She later returned to nursing part-time with Dr. Pokabla at his office in Howland, Ohio until 2002 where she fully retired at the age of 84. She was very proud of her nursing career as it brought her so much happiness.

Carrie's greatest pride and joy were her family and friends. She married the love of her life, Sam ''Kinger'' Reigle on October 19, 1937. The two spent over forty years happily married until Mr. Reigle's passing on Christmas Day in 1980. Carrie enjoyed life to the fullest and took pleasure in cooking her famous Italian meals. I grew up with Grandma Reigle's grandson Sammy. And almost every day as a young boy, I would stop by Sammy's house to see what Grandma Reigle had cooked. She always had homemade Italian pizza, or soup, or pasta fagioli. She loved to cook and then watch us eat. We would sit around with our friends and play games and Grandma Reigle would feed us. She was always warm and caring and she was a most wonderful Grandma.

Carrie is preceded in death by her husband Sam, parents Vincenzo and Angelina, brothers Sam, Anthony, and Joseph, sisters Elizabeth, Mary, Lucille, and Angie, as well as her dear friend Jane Logar. Carrie leaves behind her son Richard, grandson Sam and wife Lori, two great-grandchildren, Isabella and Sammy, her nieces and nephews, and her great-nieces and nephews. Carrie made our community a better place to call home. She warmed the hearts of many and will be remembered as sweet Grandma Reigle. I am deeply saddened by her passing and will miss her. We all are better people because Grandma Reigle touched our lives. Thank you Carrie for all of your hard work and service, your compassion for others will continue to live on through the many lives you have touched.

IN RECOGNITION OF RAY MILLER'S RETIREMENT

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ray Miller, a thirty year veteran of the Coast Guard Reserves and the Commander of the American Legion post in Hanover, Massachusetts.

Mr. Miller's career in the Coast Guard Reserves led him to serve this great nation in her darkest moments. In the days immediately following the September eleventh terrorist attacks, Mr. Miller was called into active duty to help secure our shores against those who sought to sow continued chaos. In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, Mr. Miller once again answered the call of duty by deploying to Mobile, Alabama to help restore normalcy to the lives of those residents of the Gulf. And when that normalcy was disrupted once more in the Deep Water Horizon crisis, Ray Miller did not hesitate to once again help the residents of the Gulf of Mexico.

Closer to his home, Mr. Miller helped keep Boston safe during the Democratic National Convention in the summer of 2004. And then again in 2012, he served the people of this region by aiding the recovery efforts in the devastating aftermath of Hurricane Sandy. The veterans and members of the American Legion community in Hanover have been well served because of his work as Legion Post Commander.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Mr. Ray Miller on this remarkable occasion. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing him a wonderful retirement and many years of happiness.

HONORING JEFF CARDWELL

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jeff Cardwell for his work as the North Carolina Emergency Management Area Coordinator and congratulate him on his retirement.

Mr. Cardwell began his career serving as a Fire Officer for the Gamewell Fire Department, where he still serves today. He served as a firefighter for the city of Lenoir from 1986 to 1991 and for the City of Hickory from 1991 to 1993. In 1993 Mr. Cardwell began his career with North Carolina Emergency Management, serving as an Area Trainer and working his way toward an administrative role. During his time with North Carolina Emergency Management, he worked on twenty-six FEMA disaster declarations and eight of North Carolina declarations, including every major disaster in North Carolina since 1993. Mr. Cardwell has been recognized for his outstanding service several times, receiving awards including the Western North Carolina Firefighter Association Officer of the Year in 2001 and the Colonel William A. Thompson Award as the North Carolina Emergency Management Employee of the Year.

Mr. Cardwell has demonstrated a steadfast commitment to serving the people of North Carolina in emergency management. As such, I am proud to honor Mr. Jeff Cardwell for his faithful service to the people of North Carolina and I wish him the best on his retirement.

TOGETHER CONGRESS CAN COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a miraculous thing happened recently in Washington. Both parties came together to negotiate important legislation, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, moving beyond partisan attacks and rhetoric to find common ground. Their compromise passed the Senate by a vote of 99–0. This is not only important from a procedural, functional standpoint, it's important because it will help fight a major problem in our society: human trafficking, one of the fastest growing criminal enterprises in the United States. We urge the House to bring the Senate bill up for a vote without delay.

Many of us do not realize that in this nation, and in our own backyards, individuals are held against their will, their bodies sold repeatedly day in and day out. This modern-day form of slavery is an enormous black market, with an estimated value of $9.8 billion in the U.S.

The average age of children sold into the sex trade is just 13. As Americans, and as parents and grandparents, we cannot turn a blind eye to this fact any more. Human trafficking is real. It is in every state, city and suburb in America. It is imperative that we protect American children from the traffickers who prey upon the most vulnerable in our society.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act is a robust and aggressive response that does three main things.

First, the bill targets demand. Going after those who buy and sell our children will help decimate this industry. The legislation treats those who pay for sex with minors and other trafficking victims as criminals and will help prosecutors put them where they belong: behind bars.

Second, the bill focuses on restoring the victims. Children who are sold for sex are victims, not prostitutes, and it's time to treat them as such by ensuring that they have a safe place to stay, resources they need for rehabilitation and services uniquely tailored for human trafficking survivors.

Lastly, the bill provides resources to train law enforcement and others who may come into contact with human trafficking victims to better identify and respond to their needs. The bill creates a fund built from fees and fines collected from convicted traffickers.

We urge the House to bring S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, to the floor for a vote and send it to the president's desk for signature. It will be a powerful day when Washington can stand together to proclaim, ''Our children are not for sale.''

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF BRADLEY KRUPP ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Bradley Krupp of Bowling Green, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Bradley's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2019. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education, while

placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Bradley brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2019. While attending Bowling Green High School in Bowling Green, Ohio, Bradley was a member of the National Honor Society, Honor Roll, French Honor Society and received student athlete awards. In addition, he was a member of the Key Club, French club and drama club.

Throughout high school, Bradley was a member of his school's cross country team and earned his varsity letter. I am confident that Bradley will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Military Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Bradley Krupp on the offer of his appointment to the United States Military Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Bradley will excel during his career at the Military Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, on roll call nos. 216, 217, 218, 219, and 220 I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained due to travel.

Had I been present, I would have voted aye on roll call 216.

Had I been present, I would have voted nay on roll call 217.

Had I been present, I would have voted nay on roll call 218.

Had I been present, I would have voted aye on roll call 219.

Had I been present, I would have voted aye on roll call 220.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed roll call votes 208, 209, and 210. If present, I would have voted ''no'' on roll call vote 208, ''no'' on roll call vote 209, and ''no'' on roll call vote 210.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING ST. JOSEPH COUNTY CLERK PATTIE BENDER

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to retiring St. Joseph County Clerk Pattie Bender. Pattie is a staple of our Southwest Michigan community and my dear friend. I rise to thank her for 45 years of distinguished public service.

A life-long resident of Southwest Michigan, Pattie currently serves in a dual capacity as county clerk and register of deeds. She began her career with St. Joseph County in 1970 and has served as county clerk since 1991.

The office of town or county clerk is one of the oldest known offices in local government, essential to the functioning of our democracy. It is an office of trust that demands the utmost integrity and diligence. As clerk, Pattie is entrusted with the supervision of all national, state, and local elections; administers the Michigan Campaign Finance Reporting Act; and maintains all government records for the county.

Having known Pattie for many years, I can attest to the fact that no one is better suited for such a position. Throughout the years, she has faithfully served the people of St. Joseph County, fairly and competently executing her duties. Personally, I have come to rely on her extensive institutional knowledge and good judgment. There is no doubt that the citizens of St. Joseph County, having reelected her to the office of county clerk six times, share my good opinion.

In January, Pattie announced that she will retire in June of this year, planning to travel and spend time with her family. As she embarks on the next chapter of her life, I would like to congratulate her on a well-deserved retirement and thank her for her many years of public service to the citizens of St. Joseph County.

It has been an honor to work with Pattie and to count her as a true friend. She will be greatly missed in her capacity as county clerk, but I am confident she will continue to serve as a source of wisdom in Southwest Michigan for years to come.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MENDOTA HEIGHTS OFFICER SCOTT PATRICK

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women serving this nation as law enforcement officers who have given their lives in the line of duty. This week is Police Week where we reflect upon the service and sacrifice of the thousands of women and men who keep our communities safe and put their lives on the line on our behalf. For their courage, commitment and bravery, these women and men have my greatest respect.

Last year, the Twin Cities East Metro lost an officer in the line of duty when Officer Scott Patrick was gunned down in the line of duty during a traffic stop in St. Paul. Whenever an act of violence this senseless and tragic takes place, it shakes a community deeply. Officer Patrick's loss is still felt each day by his family and his fellow officers on the Mendota Heights Police force. This week we join them in mourning the loss of their loved one and friend. On Wednesday, Officer Scott's name will be added to the National Law Enforcement Officer's Memorial Wall in Washington, DC.

The work that police officers and law enforcement officials do to keep our communities safe is often thankless and dangerous. As a society, we place an enormous amount of trust in those officers and they play a critical role in shaping the world we live in. Those who serve in law enforcement have my greatest respect for the work that they do to live up to and earn that trust in their communities.

As a member of Congress, one of my jobs is to make sure police officers have the tools they need to keep their communities safe while returning home to their families safely each night. Whether this means personal safety protection, body cameras or computer systems that they need we must consider doing more for law enforcement agencies. I am proud to say that I have been a champion for more effective communication between law enforcement officers and first responders throughout my time in Congress and I look forward to continuing that partnership with the police community.

This week, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring police week by remembering those officers who have given their lives in service of their communities.

HONORING THE NOMINEES FOR KANE COUNTY CHIEFS OF POLICE ASSOCIATION'S 2014 LOUIS SPUHLER OFFICER OF THE YEAR FOR KANE COUNTY AWARD

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the nominees for the 2014 Kane County Chiefs of Police Association's Louis Spuhler Officer of the Year for Kane County Award.

The award, presented by the Batavia Moose Lodge #682 and the Kane County Chiefs of Police Association, recognizes the outstanding achievements of police officers who protect our community. The men and women who wear the badge provide our families with security while putting their own lives on the line and deserve our admiration and thanks.

I would like to congratulate the winner of the 2014 Louis Spuhler Officer of the Year for Kane County Officer Samuel G. Aguirre of the Aurora Police Department, as well as his fellow nominees: Officer David M. Bemer of the Aurora Police Department, Officer Roger Isham of the South Elgin Police Department, Deputy Raul Salinas and Chief Deputy Thomas Bumgarner of the Kane County Sheriffs Office, Sergeant Gregory Sullivan of the Montgomery Police Department, Officer Timothy Beam of the St. Charles Police Department, Officer Michael Gallagher and Officer KC Brox of the Sleepy Hollow Police Department, Detective Miguel Pantoja of the Elgin Police Department, and Sergeant Mike Frieders, Detective Matt Dean, Detective Brad Jerdee, Detective Bob Pech, Detective Sarah Sullivan, and

Officer Matt Hann of the Geneva Police Department.

Congratulations to the nominees for the 2014 Louis Spuhler Officer of the Year for Kane County Award and thank you for your continued dedication to the safety and security of our community.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF SAMANTHA MEINEN ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Samantha Meinen of Toledo, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Samantha's offer of appointment poises her to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2019. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education, while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Samantha brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2019. While attending Whitmer Senior High School in Toledo, Ohio, Samantha was a member of the National Honor Society, German club, DECA and earned awards in science, English and social studies.

Throughout high school, Samantha was a member of her school's volleyball, basketball and track teams. I am confident that Samantha will carry the lessons of her student and athletic leadership to the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Samantha Meinen on the offer of her appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Samantha will excel during her career at the Naval Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to the Nation.

SUGAR CREEK BAPTIST CHURCH 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sugar Creek Baptist Church for celebrating 40 years of prayer and worship.

This 9,600-member church is a local and global leader. The church contributes upwards of $2 million annually to local and international mission and church development programs. Over the last 12 years, Sugar Creek Baptist Church has directly supported 93 new churches. Just last year, the church led the development of the Freedom Church Alliance, an organization that works with local churches and organizations to fight human trafficking. Its members are constant volunteers in local refugee and prison communities, too. Throughout its 40 years, Sugar Creek Baptist Church has been a model of faith and a leader in our community.

Thank you to Sugar Creek Baptist Church and its members for all they do in Sugar Land and throughout the world. We are excited to see what the next 40 years hold for you.

HONORING THE DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE HONORABLE DAVID L. HUGHES

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished public service of the Honorable David L. Hughes, who retired earlier this year after 41 years as the City Clerk and Secretary to the Mayor and Common Council of Summit, New Jersey. During his record tenure, David achieved a number of significant accomplishments in service to the City of Summit.

David oversaw the transformation of the City Clerk position, bringing community services into the 21st century and instituting greater accessibility and transparency. To the benefit of residents, downtown merchants and taxpayers, public information is readily available and put to good use for City projects.

David was an integral part of the coordination of City business, reviewing all matters before the Council's consideration, securing legal and background information from stakeholders and forming advisory opinions so that elected officials could make the most informed decisions. He also managed the municipal elections—a major undertaking including the oversight of 25 election districts, numerous polling machines and poll workers and thousands of ballots cast in each election.

Due to his years of service and trusted counsel, David and his office became an encyclopedia of City history, local ordinances and best practices. I join elected officials from both parties and countless Summit residents in considering David a very thoughtful public servant.

I wish David many years of enjoyment in his retirement spent with, his wife, Maria, and his children. I thank him for his dedicated public service.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMENDATION FOR THE LIFE OF CHARLES DAUGHTRY TOWERS, JR.

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are deeply and profoundly saddened by the loss of our friend, Charles Towers, Jr. This man of prominence and bearing was the epitome of a gentleman and a scholar. We were moved by his passion, emboldened by his commitments, honored by his friendship and made all the better by his innate wisdom and his belief in the integrity of the human experience. We came to know him as a husband, father, grandfather, great grandfather, World War II veteran, Silver Star Recipient, and dedicated servant to people and causes, a humanitarian, a civic leader and businessman without comparison.

As a member of the Jacksonville community for more than ninety years, Charlie Towers, presence will be missed by many. In 1949, he began his career as an attorney, with Rogers Towers & Bailey Law Firm and continued until his retirement in 2000. He served on many community boards in positions of leadership up to and including, Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, Salvation Army, Jacksonville Tocqueville Society, long time member and devoted Deacon, Elder and Trustee of First Presbyterian Church and many other organizations.

Though our hearts ache, our tears of pain are mixed with loving memories of his smile, his touch and that gleam in his eyes telling all who knew him, that he loved you and always will. And in his remembrance, we are drawn to the words of Paul, in the book of 2nd Timothy, ''For I am now ready to be offered, the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept my faith''. May the Lord bless and keep you now and forevermore and may the memory of our dear friend, Charles Daughtry Towers, Jr., remain with us for all times.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF ANDREW WEISS ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Andrew Weiss of Findlay, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Andrew's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2019. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but

also guarantees a world-class education, while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Andrew brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2019. While attending Findlay High School in Findlay, Ohio, Andrew was a member of the National Honor Society and Honor Roll. He earned his Eagle Scout award with the Boy Scouts of America and was selected for Buckeye Boys State. In addition, he earned his private pilot's license.

Throughout high school, Andrew was a member of his school's track team where he served as team captain and earned his varsity letter. I am confident that Andrew will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Andrew Weiss on the offer of his appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Andrew will excel during his career at the Naval Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

HONORING MS. SHERRI STRAUSER

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent of mine, Ms. Sherri Strauser. She will be retiring from the Windsor C–1 School District on July 1, 2015. Ms. Strauser has contributed to the educational system for 37 years.

Ms. Strauser has worked in various capacities: 3rd Grade Teacher, Intermediate Center Assistant Principal, Intermediate Principal, and Assistant Superintendent. She has worked in the Dunklin R–V School District and is ending her career in the Windsor C–1 School District. Her current title of Assistant Superintendent has allowed her the opportunity to connect personally with students, staff, parents, and the community. This Assistant Superintendent position has given her the opportunity to direct Curriculum and Instruction, Special Services, Team Leaders, Professional Development, and serve as the Compliance Officer for the District. During her time in each position, she was committed to making a difference in the lives of students. Ms. Strauser has received the Dunklin R–V Teacher of the Year award, Dunklin National Education Association Award, and the 'Who's Who Among American Educators' award. These awards showcase her ability to make a positive impact on anyone she comes into contact with.

Over the years, Ms. Strauser has been an active member of her community, and the state, through memberships with the Rotary Club, Missouri Association of School Administrators, Missouri Association of School Business Officials, and the Missouri Association of Elementary School Principals. From her time giving back to the community, it has enabled her to nourish productive relationships and witness success for thousands of individuals.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Ms. Sherri Strauser on her retirement after 37 years of commitment to students.

HONORING THE MARTIN'S MILL LADY MUSTANGS

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor the Martin's Mill Lady Mustangs basketball team who won the Texas 2A High School Basketball Championship on March 7, 2015 at the Alamodome in San Antonio. This victory marked the third time since 2008 the Lady Mustangs captured the title.

I would like to recognize teammates Jocie Bennett, Cheyenne Brown, Calli Camacho, Hailey Celsur, Hannah Celsur, Madi Daniel, Jacee Greenlee, Hailey Hawes, Briley Moon, Hannah Munns, Sarah Munns and Alyssa Pate. I would also like to recognize Head Coach Lauran Jenkins, Assistant Coach Melissa Camacho and Managers Lydia Burns, Mollie Daniel, Hannah Manry, Abbie Orrick and Taylor Sparks.

As the congressional representative of the families, coaches, and supporters of the Lady Mustangs, it is my pleasure to recognize their outstanding season and continued success. This victory and accomplishment is an event that these young ladies will remember for the rest of their lives.

IN RECOGNITION OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY CHARLES LEWIS

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Assistant United States Attorney Charles Lewis and to honor his more than four decades of federal service.

In 1973, Charlie began his career as a law clerk to the Honorable Reynaldo Garza in Brownsville, Texas. After completing his clerkship, he joined the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Texas.

Throughout his career, Charlie distinguished himself as a tough and ethical prosecutor who passionately represented the United States in federal court.

Charlie's career included positions as Assistant Director of the Attorney General's Advocacy Institute in charge of training federal prosecutors in criminal prosecutions; Coordinator of the Presidential Drug Taskforce for the states of Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi; Coordinator of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) Houston division; Resident Legal Advisor to the U.S. Embassy in Bucharest, Romania; and Prosecutor Representative for the anti-terrorism advisory committee in Brownsville, Texas.

Charlie's dedication to the prosecution of organized crime and drug trafficking resulted in seizures of tens of millions of dollars of currency and property and the convictions of many large-scale narcotics traffickers and corrupt public officials.

Many of Charlie's cases included investigations in multiple countries across numerous federal investigative agencies, and took years to develop and prosecute. Charlie was particularly good at explaining complex cases to federal juries and applying the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act.

Charlie is particularly proud of the three years he spent in Bucharest, Romania where he helped reform the Romanian legal system and served as the U.S. representative to the Southeast European Cooperative Initiative (now known as the Southeast European Law Enforcement Center) which provides support to member states to combat transnational organized crime and corruption.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to honor Charles Lewis and his more than four decades of public service to the United States. I join my colleagues in Congress in wishing him and Mary, his wife of more than 30 years, the best.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF JEFFREY WILSON ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Jeffrey Wilson of Perrysburg, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Jeffrey's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Air Force Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2019. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education, while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Jeffrey brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2019. While attending Lake Local High School in Millbury, Ohio, Jeffrey was a member of the National Honor Society and received hockey and golf academic awards. In addition, he received his Eagle Scout award through the Boy Scouts of America.

Throughout high school, Jeffrey was a member of his school's hockey, golf and baseball teams, earning varsity letters in each. I am confident that Jeffrey will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Air Force Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jeffrey Wilson on the offer of his appointment to the United States Air Force

Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Jeffrey will excel during his career at the Air Force Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE POLICE TRAINING AND INDEPENDENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of The Police Training and Independent Review Act, which I introduced earlier today with colleague LACY CLAY of Missouri.

If enacted, the Police Training and Independent Review Act would help ensure the independent investigation and prosecution of law enforcement officers in cases involving their use of deadly force. It would also provide sensitivity training for law enforcement officers.

America received a wakeup call last year in Ferguson, Missouri. It received another in Staten Island, New York.

It received yet another in Cleveland, Ohio, and then North Charleston, South Carolina, and more recently in Baltimore.

Our nation faces sobering questions about the basic fairness of our criminal justice system. And we face sobering questions about race. These questions simply cannot be ignored.

For too many, for too long, justice has seemed too lacking.

Precisely how long, and for how many—these are numbers we ought to know, and it is shameful that we do not. The fact that police departments are not required to report data about when, where and against whom they use deadly force is absurd. Even FBI Director James Comey has said it is, ''ridiculous that [he] can't tell you how many people were shot by the police last week, last month, last year.''

Last year, and again earlier this year, I introduced the National Statistics on Deadly Force Transparency Act to address this. The legislation would give both lawmakers and the public the numbers we need to measure the problem, so we can figure out how best to address it.

However, I rise today to talk about another equally important step we can take, right now, that does not require us to wait for more data. We can remove the looming cloud of doubt that hangs over too many instances in which law enforcement officers use deadly force against unarmed individuals.

We can stop asking local prosecutors to investigate the same law enforcement officers with whom they work so closely, and whose relationships they rely upon to perform their daily responsibilities.

This is an obvious conflict of interest, and if we are serious about restoring a sense of fairness and justice, we must remove this conflict immediately.

To be sure, the vast majority of prosecutors and law enforcement officers are well meaning, dedicated public servants, and we depend upon them to keep us safe from criminals. And they have dangerous jobs, as we have seen all too frequently in recent months.

But the fact remains that some police departments don't vet their patrolmen well enough. Some allow wealthy supporters to be reserve officers where judgment is lacking and some don't provide all appropriate training. There are also some officers who go beyond the law in a callous disregard for due process.

While we have seen charges against officers in North Charleston and in Baltimore, the question remains: would they have been prosecuted if we didn't have video of the events in question?

According to a recent Washington Post investigation, there have been, ''thousands of fatal shootings at the hands of police since 2005, [and] only 54 officers have been charged. Most were cleared or acquitted in the cases that have been resolved.''

I can't stand here today and tell you whether each of these prosecutors was biased. But what I can tell you is that there is a perception of unfairness in certain kinds of cases, and that perception is poisoning the public trust.

But we can fix this problem.

The Police Training and Independent Review Act would give states a reason to do what they should already be doing: require the use of independent prosecutors when there is an obvious conflict of interest. If states refuse to use independent prosecutors for cases against law enforcement officers involving their use of deadly force, they lose federal funding, which can make up a significant portion of their budgets.

I urge my colleagues to help pass this legislation quickly, and help restore some much needed faith in our criminal justice system.

I want to thank my colleague LACY CLAY for his partnership on this bill. He is a tireless advocate on these issues, and I am honored to work with him.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SR–222

MAY 19

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, focusing on air traffic control modernization and reform.

SR–253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 562, to promote exploration for geothermal resources, S. 822, to expand geothermal production, S. 1026, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to repeal a provision prohibiting Federal agencies from procuring alternative fuels, S. 1057, to promote geothermal energy, S. 1058, to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, S. 1103, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Clark Canyon Dam, S. 1104, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam, S. 1199, to authorize Federal agencies to provide alternative fuel to Federal employees on a reimbursable basis, S. 1215, to amend the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000 to provide for the development of methane hydrate as a commercially viable source of energy, S. 1222, to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for reports relating to electric capacity resources of transmission organizations and the amendment of certain tariffs to address the procurement of electric capacity resources, S. 1224, to reconcile differing Federal approaches to condensate, S. 1226, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands to promote a greater domestic helium supply, to establish a Federal helium leasing program for public land, and to secure a helium supply for national defense and Federal researchers, S. 1236, to amend the Federal Power Act to modify certain requirements relating to trial-type hearings with respect to certain license applications before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, S. 1264, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a renewable electricity standard, S. 1270, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, S. 1271, to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations to prevent or minimize the venting and flaring of gas in oil and gas production operations in the United States, S. 1272, to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the effects of forward capacity auctions and other capacity mechanisms, S. 1276, to

amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to increase energy exploration and production on the outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico, S. 1278, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the conduct of certain lease sales in the Alaska outer Continental Shelf region, to make certain modifications to the North Slope Science Initiative, S. 1279, to provide for revenue sharing of qualified revenues from leases in the South Atlantic planning area, S. 1280, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish an annual production incentive fee with respect to Federal onshore and offshore land that is subject to a lease for production of oil or natural gas under which production is not occurring, S. 1282, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to consider the objective of improving the conversion, use, and storage of carbon dioxide produced from fossil fuels in carrying out research and development programs under that Act, S. 1283, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to repeal certain programs, to establish a coal technology program, S. 1285, to authorize the Secretary of Energy to enter into contracts to provide certain price stabilization support relating to electric generation units that use coal-based generation technology, S. 1294, to require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate in promoting the development of efficient, economical, and environmentally sustainable thermally led wood energy systems, and S. 1304, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a pilot competitive grant program for the development of a skilled energy workforce.

SD–366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife

To hold hearings to examine S. 1140, to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States''.

SD–406

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine how to safely reduce reliance on foster care group homes.

SD–215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, focusing on examining EEOC's enforcement and litigation programs.

SD–430

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Congressional Budget Office.

SD–608

2 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine proposed environmental regulation's impacts on America's small businesses.

SR–428A

2:30 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine body cameras, focusing on whether technology can increase protection for law enforcement officers and the public.

SD–226

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

2:45 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Mileydi Guilarte, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, Jennifer Ann Haverkamp, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, and Brian James Egan, of Maryland, to be Legal Adviser, both of the Department of State, Marcia Denise Occomy, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years, and Sunil Sabharwal, of California, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of two years.

SD–419

MAY 20

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight

To hold an oversight hearing to examine scientific advisory panels and processes at the Environmental Protection Agency, including S. 543, to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation.

SD–406

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on exploring institutional risk-sharing.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine 21st century ideas for the 20th century Federal civil service.

SD–342

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.

SH–216

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SR–253

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine addressing the needs of Native communities through Indian Water Rights Settlements.

SD–628

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine solutions to the hospital observation stay crisis.

SD–562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

To hold hearings to examine improvements and innovations in fishery management and data collection.

SR–253

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on the Constitution

To hold hearings to examine taking sexual assault seriously, focusing on the rape kit backlog and human rights.

SD–226

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine understanding America's long-term fiscal picture.

SD–342

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting to consider pending legislation, and the nomination of Jeffrey Michael Prieto, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

SR–328A

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, ''The Financial Regulatory Improvement Act of 2015''.

SD–538

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold hearings to examine S. 160, and H.R. 373, to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, S. 365, to improve rangeland conditions and restore grazing levels within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Utah, S. 472, to promote conservation, improve public land, and provide for sensible development in Douglas County, Nevada, S. 583, to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, S. 814, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, S. 815, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and S. 1240, to designate the Cerro del Yuta and Rio San Antonio Wilderness Areas in the State of New Mexico.

SD–366

Select Committee on Intelligence
To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

JUNE 4

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 454, to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, S. 784, to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish microlabs to improve regional engagement with national laboratories, S. 1033, to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to replace the current requirement for a biennial energy policy plan with a Quadrennial Energy Review, S. 1054, to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small-and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, S. 1068, to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system from cyber security threats, S. 1181, to expand the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program to include commercial trucks and United States flagged vessels, to return unspent funds and loan proceeds to the United States Treasury to reduce the national debt, S. 1187, to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, S. 1216, to amend the Natural Gas Act to modify a provision relating to civil penalties, S. 1218, to establish an interagency coordination committee or subcommittee with the leadership of the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, focused on the nexus between energy and water production, use, and efficiency, S. 1221, to amend the Federal Power Act to require periodic reports on electricity reliability and reliability impact statements for rules affecting the reliable operation of the bulk-power system, S. 1223, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to improve the loan guarantee program for innovative technologies, S. 1229, to require the Secretary of Energy to submit a plan to implement recommendations to improve interactions between the Department of Energy and National Laboratories, S. 1230, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program under which the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall enter into memoranda of understanding with States providing for State oversight of oil and gas productions activities, and S. 1241, to provide for the modernization, security, and resiliency of the electric grid, to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs for research, development, demonstration, and information-sharing for cybersecurity for the energy sector.
SD–366

SENATE—*Thursday, May 14, 2015*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, King of the universe, bestow upon our lawmakers understanding to know You, diligence to seek You, wisdom to find You, and a faithfulness to embrace You. Today, help them to experience the constancy of Your presence. Lord, give them a courage which shows itself by gentleness and integrity. Provide them with a wisdom which shows itself by simplicity and unity. Impart to them a power which shows itself by humility and restraint. Guide them by Your higher wisdom and fill them with Your peace.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I was glad to see our Democratic friends accept our path forward on trade yesterday. Under our plan, the Senate will avoid the poison pills that had been floated in favor of the very type of bipartisan approach we have been advocating for all along. It follows the regular order. It allows Senators to express themselves without endangering more American trade jobs for the people we represent.

So this is good news. It is good news for bipartisanship. It is good news for a new Congress that is getting back to work. And it is good news for America's middle class.

The people we represent deserve the kind of good jobs we could secure by knocking down unfair trade barriers. One estimate shows that trade agreements with Europe and the Pacific could support as many as 1.4 million additional jobs here in our country. In Kentucky, they can support more than 18,000 additional jobs.

But we can't get there without first passing the kind of legislation we will vote to open debate on this afternoon. It is the only way to enact clear standards and guidelines that our trade negotiators need to move forward, and that Congress needs to appropriately assert its authority in this area.

So yesterday's agreement is significant. I thank Chairman HATCH and his negotiating partners for the good, bipartisan cooperation that got us to where we are.

I would like to thank the President, too. No, you are not hearing things. President Obama has done his country a service by taking on his base and pushing back on some of the more ridiculous rhetoric we have heard. He was right to remind everyone that ''you don't make change through slogans'' or ''ignoring realities.'' He should be recognized for it.

The American people sent a divided government to Washington. But it doesn't mean they don't want us to work together on issues where we can agree. And on this issue, we do agree.

Today's vote brings us closer to achieving a positive outcome for the people we represent. I look forward to continued positive engagement from both the President and Members of both parties as we move forward on these bills.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is good to see forward momentum on trade. That is certainly good for the American people. But there are other issues that both parties should want to address, too, such as the broken promises of ObamaCare. It would be nice to see more bipartisan support there, and I hope we will at some point, because we all know that ObamaCare is a law filled—literally filled—with broken promises. We all keep seeing reminders of how it failed so many of the same people we were told it would help.

Back in my State in Kentucky, we are seeing how hospitals and their patients are feeling the negative effects of this partisan law. That is particularly true in the rural areas of my State. A recent report showed that ObamaCare's multibillion-dollar attack on hospitals in Kentucky is expected to result in a net loss of $1 billion over the next few years—a net loss to Kentucky hospitals of $1 billion over the next few years.

These hospitals are expected to lose more money under ObamaCare than they are expected to gain in new revenue from the Medicaid expansion. And, largely due to ObamaCare, these losses are forcing Kentucky hospitals to cut jobs, reduce or freeze wages, and, in some instances, even close altogether. We have lost at least two rural critical-access hospitals this year.

Officials report that Kentucky hospitals are suffering partly because more than three out of every four Kentuckians who signed up for ObamaCare were in fact put on Medicaid, and we know that Medicaid reimburses hospitals for less than it costs to treat patients.

So despite promises that greater access to coverage would decrease visits to the emergency room and the cost associated with those visits, the vast majority of emergency room doctors now say they have actually experienced a surge—a surge—in patients visiting the ER since ObamaCare came into effect.

In fact, a recent survey reported that thousands of ER doctors have actually seen an increase in emergency room visits since the start of last year. One physician from Lexington was quoted as saying he had seen ''a huge backlog in the ER because the volume has increased.'' He went on to say that ER volume rose by almost a fifth in the first few months of this year, which is nearly double—nearly double—what he saw last year in the same period.

There are a lot of reasons for these increases, but as one ER physician put it, ''visits are going up despite the ACA, and in a lot of cases because of it.''

Volume in the ER is driven as a result of coverage expansion, adding a lot of new people, that has largely been born by the Medicaid program. As I have said previously, though, increasing coverage doesn't guarantee access to care, and prior to Medicaid expansion, Kentucky already faced a shortage of physicians participating in Medicaid. Now, there are more than 300,000 additional enrollees—adding 300,000 new people to an already broken system. So when Americans on Medicaid get sick and can't find a doctor, who will treat the Medicaid patients? Where do they end up? Of course, in the emergency room.

Here is how one Kentucky newspaper described it last year:

That's just the opposite of what many people expected under ObamaCare, particularly because one of the goals of health reform was to reduce pressure on emergency rooms by expanding Medicaid and giving poor people better access to primary care.

Instead [what is happening], many hospitals in Kentucky and across the nation are

seeing a surge of those newly insured Medicaid patients walking right into emergency rooms.

One Kentucky doctor described it as a ''perfect storm''—a perfect storm. ''We've given people an ATM card,'' he said, ''in a town with no ATMs.''

Given ObamaCare's most famous broken promise about Americans being able to keep the health plans they liked, it is easy to see how a person who had access to good insurance and quality care before ObamaCare would find himself or herself forced onto Medicaid and into the emergency room today. A recent report found that among certain hospitals in Kentucky, as many as one in five individuals covered by Medicaid had previously had private health insurance.

So, unfortunately, it wasn't hard to see this coming. A lot of us warned about it. We warned that providing supposed health coverage, without actually giving someone access to health care, is really just a hollow promise. You could promise coverage, but it doesn't mean anything if there is nobody there to care for the people who are covered.

The same could be said of warnings regarding the impact of ObamaCare's deep Medicare cuts and the impact of that on hospitals. I wish the politicians who rammed ObamaCare through over the objections of the American people had heeded these warnings. We made all these warnings 6 years ago.

So this is just one more reminder why ObamaCare is bad for Kentucky, why it is bad for the middle class, and why it is bad for our country.

But here is the good news. The new Congress just passed a balanced budget this week with legislative tools that will allow us to begin to address ObamaCare's broken promises. I hope President Obama and our colleagues across the aisle will work with us to do so.

We owe the American people more than ObamaCare's broken promises. We owe them real health reform that lowers costs and increases choice.

I hope our friends across the aisle will work with us in a bipartisan way to help achieve that important outcome.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

FISA DATA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly—with approximately 330 votes—to end the bulk collection of Americans' phone records. Last week a Federal court, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, ruled that the Federal Government's bulk collection program is illegal.

The majority leader seems prepared to lead the Senate into reauthorizing an illegal program. He has spoken here on the floor in that regard. So how can one reauthorize something that is illegal?

This is not a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans are united in favor of reforming the National Security Agency and how they collect their data.

The House, yesterday, as I indicated, voted in favor of reform, overwhelmingly, but Republicans in the Senate want to move forward without making any changes. I don't think so.

The Republican leader is isolated in his desire for a clean extension of illegal spying programs. For example, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives, Mr. GOODLATTE, said yesterday that if the House gets an extension of FISA—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—it will go nowhere. It is dead, according to the chairman.

Republicans and Democrats have vowed to filibuster a clean extension if the Republican leader brings one to the floor. That is what is going to happen here in the Senate. I have heard extended statements by the junior Senator from Kentucky, who said that. There are others who feel the same way. Even if my friend plows forward in the face of what the bipartisan opposition is to this matter, it will take at least a week to secure the vote. And maybe that isn't even possible.

We have a chance to take bipartisan action that protects Americans' civil liberties. It would be irresponsible for us to squander this opportunity.

AMTRAK TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as I said yesterday, my heart goes out to those who suffered in the terrible accident of Amtrak's Northeast Regional Train No. 188, on Tuesday night at 9 p.m., when the accident occurred. As we now know, the train was going more than 100 miles an hour on a curve where it should have been going 50 miles an hour.

It is very tragic. Seven people died and scores are injured. There were about 250 people on the train. It is unfortunate that sometimes it takes an event such as this before policymakers learn what they need to learn. But worse still would be if policymakers fail to learn anything at all.

National Transportation Safety Board member Robert Sumwalt said there is technology available called positive train control that would have prevented this accident. That technology is in place in a few places in the Northeast corridor. This Northeast corridor, millions of people travel there, but it is not yet in place where the accident happened.

There are Members of the Republican Senate who have for years denigrated, belittled, and harmed the Amtrak system. I have watched this, and it is really unfair. They attack Amtrak every year, every appropriations process. Many on the far right regularly try to punch the Nation's train system right in the gut. They have made it a punching bag.

Yesterday, the House of Representatives approved a bill that underfunds Amtrak by another one-quarter of a billion dollars. The day after that tragic accident, they say: We are going to help Amtrak by cutting spending by another one-quarter of a billion dollars.

A nation's train system can be efficient and productive. It can be a point of national pride, but too often neglect of Amtrak has left America's train system a disappointing embarrassment. Amtrak is a vital part of our Nation's economy, and everyone should understand that. It helps—I repeat—millions and millions of people get where they need to go. It takes cars off congested highways. It takes people away from airports.

For the safety of rail passengers, for the business it helps to foster, and for the reputation of our great Nation, I hope we can learn to invest more in this important national resource. They need more, not less.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend, the Republican leader, must be in denial to come to the floor and talk about ObamaCare the way he did. He is neglecting the facts. I will only repeat a few of them.

No. 1, there are 17 million people who now have health insurance who didn't. Using his own numbers, he said: One out of every five people who went to the emergency room in Kentucky had insurance, private insurance. Four-fifths of them had no insurance. They have it now. That says it all.

Rather than cut Medicare and cut Medicaid, as in the Republican budget—they should not be doing that. The reason there are long waiting lines is because Republicans are not helping us fund Medicare and Medicaid in an appropriate fashion.

The late Senator Ted Kennedy once said: ''An essential part of our progressive vision is an America where no citizen of any age fears the cost of health care.''

We are not there yet, but since the Affordable Care Act became law, that vision has become more of a reality every day. The facts are indisputable. Health care costs are growing at a historically low rate.

The overall health of Americans is improving, and health care providers are now finding innovative ways to reduce health care spending while improving the quality of care that patients have.

Last week, the Department of Health and Human Services announced that a key pilot program created by the Affordable Care Act saved Medicare almost $400 million in 2 years. This is good news.

The Pioneer accountable care organization model was launched by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services in an effort to improve health care delivery and payment options.

An independent evaluation of this model shows an average of about $300 in savings per beneficiary every year. Rather than being a model, it should cover all patients. Right now this model is serving more than 600,000 Americans.

The idea is called accountable care. Accountable care organizations tie provider reimbursements to quality metrics and reductions in the total cost of care for patients—better care, less costs.

What is most remarkable about this program is that huge savings are being achieved without threatening the quality of care the patients receive. In fact, the quality of care is improving.

Medicare beneficiaries within the Pioneer accountable care organization model have reported more timely care and improved communication with the health care providers. They now have an ability to understand what is happening to their health care. Their questions are being answered. These patients use inpatient hospital services less and have fewer tests and have fewer procedures. That is what it is all about.

Last week's announcement shows that the Affordable Care Act is working, to the tune of $400 million.

Can you imagine the impact this pilot program will have on health care costs when it is expanded? It is true that we have more work to do to ensure quality affordable health care for every American. These reports show Senator Kennedy's vision for America's health care system is beginning to become a reality.

Mr. President, would you be kind enough to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I see no one on the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF JOE DUNN

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to honor Cascade County Deputy Sheriff Joe Dunn, a dedicated public servant who died in the line of duty on August 14, 2014.

On behalf of all Montanans, I want to thank Deputy Dunn for his service to our Nation and to the community of Great Falls, MT. Before enlisting to serve and protect his neighbors as a deputy sheriff, Joe Dunn served our Nation in the U.S. Marine Corps and deployed to the battlefields of Afghanistan.

Upon returning to Montana, Deputy Dunn married the love of his life, Robynn. They had two children, Joey and Shiloh, who were the center of his universe. Deputy Dunn's deep commitment to Jesus and his love for his family were the guiding principles in which he lived his life.

Montana's leaders have permanently honored the life and service of Deputy Dunn by naming an 8-mile stretch of Interstate 15 outside of Great Falls, MT. It is named the Joseph J. Dunn Memorial Highway.

On May 15, 2015, Peace Officers Memorial Day, Deputy Dunn's name will be enshrined forever alongside 273 other brave peace officers who were killed in the line of duty.

During his lifetime of service, Deputy Dunn always went beyond the call of duty to ensure the safety of those he served, often working the evening shift and long hours away from his family. Deputy Dunn always put others above himself, and he is the kind of leader every Montanan can be proud of.

Everyone who knew Deputy Dunn has been touched by his commitment to serve others and his passion for making his community a better place to call home. But above all, Joe Dunn was a family man. Regardless of the length of his shift or the difficulty of his day, his top priority was that of being a father.

Today, as a body, we offer our deepest thoughts and prayers to his family, Robynn, Joey, and Shiloh. The State of Montana and this country are endlessly grateful for his service.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

IRS BUREAUCRACY REDUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1295 and H.R. 644 en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1295) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code.

A bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1223 AND 1224

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Hatch amendments, amendment No. 1223 to H.R. 1295 and amendment No. 1224 to H.R. 644, are considered and agreed to.

(The amendment (No. 1223) in the nature of a substitute is printed in the RECORD of May 13, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

(The amendment (No. 1224) in the nature of a substitute is printed in the RECORD of May 13, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today, at this moment, we begin the debate on one of the most important bills to come in front of the Senate this year, to guarantee that Americans can find a more level playing field as we compete in the world economy to show that Americans should not be patsies for other countries that are cheating and altering records and information they submit to trade authorities.

This is an opportunity to close an 85-year-old loophole that has allowed us to import products produced by slave labor and child labor and to fix our currency system so countries and their companies, especially in East Asia and South Asia—mostly East Asia—cannot continue to cheat and sell into our country with a bonus and penalize us when we try to sell our products to their countries.

This body delivered one strong message this week which was unprecedented. I can't think of the last time the Senate spoke with such an emphatic voice on a trade issue. The simple message: We cannot have trade promotion without trade enforcement.

We should not be passing new agreements while doing nothing, which the Senate tried to do on Tuesday, but the Senate stood up and said no. We should not be passing new agreements while doing nothing to enforce existing laws and support American companies dealing with unfair competition.

We need to stand up particularly for our small businesses, which are always hurt to a much greater degree than large businesses. When a large company in Cleveland, Toledo or Lima shuts down production and moves overseas to Xi'an, Beijing or Wuhan, China, so they can get a tax break from our government—amazingly enough, this body will not close that tax loophole—and sell products back to our country, that company's bottom line may be a bit better, but the supply chain for those large companies—the companies in our communities in Lima, Toledo, Mansfield, and Wooster—that sell to those big companies have lost their biggest customers in far too many cases. Those businesses go out of business, those workers get laid off, those plants close, and we know what happens. That is why we especially need to stand up for those small businesses that play by the rules and are drowning from a set of imports from countries that manipulate their currency and practice illegal dumping. Dumping is when companies subsidize water, capital, land, labor costs or other inputs, such as energy, and sell under the real cost of production into the United States—that kind of illegal dumping.

It is one thing to talk about statistics, but I want to stop and think about the costs of imports to our companies, communities, and families.

In the State of Pennsylvania, as the Presiding Officer knows, especially between Pittsburgh and Philly or Western Pennsylvania, the area I am more familiar with because I represent the adjoining State, we see time after time companies in small towns—when a company shuts down in a place like Jackson, OH, or Chillicothe, OH, so often because of the size of the town, both the husband and wife each lose their jobs because they both work at that company, their entire family income is wiped out, and they are likely to lose their home to foreclosure. We know all of those problems that happen because we don't enforce our trade rules. That is why I want us to stop and think about the real costs to families, communities, and companies.

In Ohio, we have seen how dumping by Korean companies has hurt our steel industry. Neither President Bush nor President Obama has stepped up on trade the way each had promised in their campaigns, and neither has stepped up the way that they should to preserve our workers, our businesses, and our livelihoods. We both promised, on Korea, thousands—that there would be tens of thousands of new jobs, billions in increased exports for our companies. Yet the reality of the Korea trade agreement was absolutely the opposite of that. We had major job loss and a major loss in the import-export ratio because of that South Korea trade agreement they pushed on the U.S. Congress, and the people here too willingly passed.

Natural gas production has increased demand. I will explain Korea for a moment. Natural gas production has increased demand for the world-class tubular steel made in plants such as U.S. Steel in Lorain, Youngstown, and Trumbull County. Tubular steel is the steel piping that is particularly strong and durable. It is subjected to great pressure and great heat as they drill for natural gas—in so-called fracking—or they drill for oil.

Mr. President, 8,000 workers in 22 States make these Oil Country Tubular Goods. Each one of those jobs supports another seven positions in the supply chain. We know when we talk about manufacturing, it is never just the manufacturing jobs, as important as they are, it is the jobs in the entire supply that go into the assembly of the airplane or the automobile or the steel production of Oil Country Tubular Goods. These producers increasingly lose business to foreign competitors that are not playing by the rules. Imports for OCTG, Oil Country Tubular Goods, have doubled since 2008. By some measures, imports account for somewhat more than 50 percent of the pipes being used by companies drilling for oil and gas in the United States.

Korea has one of the world's largest steel industries, but get this, not one of these pipes that Korea now dumps in the United States—illegally subsidized—is ever used in Korea for drilling because Korea has no domestic oil or gas production. In other words, Korea has created this industry only for exports and has been successful because they are not playing fair. So their producers are exporting large volumes to the United States, the most open and attractive market in the world, at below-market prices. That is clear evidence that our workers and manufacturers are being cheated, and it should be unacceptable to the Members of this body. It hurts our workers, our communities, and our country. It is time to stop it.

I toured Lorain's best U.S. Steel plant in 2013 and saw the No. 6 quench and temper finishing line, which was part of a $100 million expansion project.

The naysayers who talk about our country, workers, and businesses say we cannot compete because we are not up-to-date or our workers are not producing—all the whining from these naysayers who support these trade policies is insulting to our workers, insulting to our communities, and insulting to our small businesses. They say we are not modern enough.

Well, look at the investment. I have seen the $100 million investment in Lorain, for instance, and what that means. The first time in the history of steel production in this world, ArcelorMittal workers created about 1 ton about 5 years ago. When they passed this threshold, 1 person-hour created 1 ton of steel. They are the most productive steelworkers in the world, working in the most productive steel company in the world.

The expansion project with Lorain's U.S. Steel plant was made possible, in part, because we were able to crack down on Chinese steel pipe imports that flooded the market with illegal and cheap products. They made this investment because we won that trade case. Then, along came Korea to again try to inflict the same damage on our producers and our workers. It is clear that once again we need to ensure that other Nations don't unfairly dump steel into the U.S. market.

Last year, I visited the same plant and joined in with workers, managers, and union leaders to send one message: It is time for America to stand up to these lawbreakers; pure and simple, strip it all away—these countries are lawbreakers.

Here is the bad news: In January, U.S. Steel—in part because of Korea's dumping—announced 614 temporary layoffs at the plant in Lorain on Lake Erie. Those layoffs began in March.

I spoke on the floor before about one of the U.S. steelworkers I met, Ryan, who has been out of work for weeks. He has four kids at home and doesn't know when or if he will be back at work. Will his home be foreclosed down the road if he can't go back to work? He has played by the rules. He has been living a responsible life, by taking care of his kids, paying his mortgage, engaged in the union and community as a good, strong, productive worker. There are hundreds more like Ryan in Lorain and around Ohio.

In March, Republic Steel in Lorain announced 200 temporary layoffs. I say ''temporary'' because the company is hopeful that our government will enforce trade rules and that the dumping of steel will abate a bit.

TMK is one of the largest producers of oil country tubular goods in the world, with a facility in Brookfield, OH, north of Youngstown. Since 2008, the company has invested $2 billion in their U.S. operations. They are keeping up on technology and modernizing their plant with very productive workers. But how do they compete with Korea or China or other nations that are cheating?

Other companies make similar investments to stay on the cutting edge, but instead of expanding production to keep up with increasing demand, these companies operate under tighter and tighter margins and lay off workers. Last week, TMK announced plans to

reduce operating hours at three of its facilities and completely idled another one.

I visited Byer Steel in Cincinnati. I spoke with Mr. Byer just yesterday when I met with some steel company executives, many of them from small businesses like his, where I first announced the Level the Playing Field Act to his company in Cincinnati.

American companies—Byer, TMK, U.S. Steel, Republic Steel, so many others—know firsthand that they are not in a fair fight. These manufacturers across Ohio and all over our country suffer enough from unfair trade practices distorting the market. It is their workers who suffer even more. Think about what even a temporary layoff can do to a family. They are facing mounting bills, facing mounting uncertainty. They may have to start to turn to credit cards and payday lenders to get by, and then the downward spiral begins.

I don't think too many in this body who are dressed like this and who have good-paying jobs and titles and far too often an adoring staff end up—we don't think much about this, but think about the laid-off worker who has for 7 years—she and her husband have lived in Lorain, where I used to live, which is an industrial city west of Cleveland—they have lived in Lorain and paid their mortgage. They are involved in their kids' activities in soccer and school and go to the programs at school. They are living lives the way we hope they would. But then she loses her good-paying, 18-dollar-an-hour job. She has a mortgage she meets every month. She has bills she pays every month. Then she loses her job. She faces the uncertainty of what happens next, and she faces a sharply declined income. At some point, her kids understand their mom lost her job and their dad's hours have been cut back. Then they face the question—and this is what we don't think much about in this body, people who dress like us and make good incomes and have good benefits and have a staff who helps them—then she has to sit down with her kids and say: We may lose our home because we can't keep up with these bills. It is not because they speculated, not because they stole, not because they are morally inadequate in some ways; simply because they lost their job.

My State—and the Presiding Officer's State is not too far behind this, I don't think—my State for 14 years in a row had more foreclosures than the year before. That is not because Ohioans are irresponsible; it is because Ohioans have lost so many of these manufacturing jobs. They were paying their bills and meeting their obligations and raising their kids, and then all of a sudden they couldn't.

So they have to face their 12-year-old daughter and say: Honey, we are going to have to move. We can't afford to keep this house anymore. I don't know where we are going to move. I don't know what school you are going to go to. I am sorry.

I don't think people around this place think very much about the human face of these kinds of decisions. That is why this is so important.

We can do something about this. When jobs are lost due to cheap, flooded, illegal imports and at the same time we aren't increasing our exports, we need to do all we can to stop this practice and protect our workers.

The other side will say we are increasing our exports. We are a bit, but the imports are much higher in almost every one of these cases. That is why we need to pass this Customs bill that incorporates the Level the Playing Field Act to crack down on foreign companies that are cheating. We welcome competition. We are a competitive country. We succeed in competing among ourselves and around the world. But it has to be fair; it has to be a level playing field. That is why the Level the Playing Field Act, title V of this Customs bill, is so very important.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum calls be equally divided between the parties.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Mr. President.

PATRIOT ACT

Today, I rise to express my longstanding concerns about the PATRIOT Act and in particular section 215, which is set to expire on June 1. A major use of this section—the bulk collection of Americans' phone records—has just been ruled illegal by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. If we didn't already have enough concern about reauthorizing section 215, this decision should raise alarm bells. Yet, the majority leader is asking us to act quickly to reauthorize this law unchanged for another 5 years.

Without significant reforms to the law, I cannot support an extension of any length of time, and I urge my colleagues to listen to the court and listen to the numerous oversight groups from within the administration and the millions of citizens who are saying that Congress needs to rethink whether this program is violating our rights in the name of keeping us safe.

Ben Franklin was very fond of saying, ''Those who give up liberty in the name of security deserve neither.'' That is where we are today. Congress passed the PATRIOT Act over a decade ago after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Our Nation was devastated. Our security was at stake. But this legislation was hasty, it was far-reaching, and it undermined the constitutional right to privacy of law-abiding citizens. It still does.

I have made my opposition clear in the years since 2001. The major advocates of this law—primarily former President Bush and his key national security officials—used a potent combination of fear and patriotism to drive this bill through. I was one of only 66 Members to vote against the PATRIOT Act in the House of Representatives. I also voted against the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act in 2006 and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008.

In 2011, I opposed once again the extension of three controversial provisions of the PATRIOT Act: roving wiretaps, government access to ''any tangible items,'' such as library and business records, and the surveillance of targets that are not connected to any identified terrorist group.

Back in 2001, I said on the House floor that I was unable to support this bill because it does not strike the right balance between protecting our liberties and providing for the security of our citizens. I went on to say: The saving grace here is that the sunset provision forces us to come back and to look at these issues again when heads are cooler and when we are not in the heat of battle.

That is exactly what we should do. To govern in a post-9/11 world, we have to strike the right balance, to fight terrorism without trampling our Constitution. We can do both. The Bill of Rights was established immediately following a war. Our Founders knew the tension between freedom and security. Our Nation was founded on the right of individual liberty, in stark contrast to the long tradition of total sovereign authority of most other governments.

I strongly believe we should not force through a reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act without a hard look at the long-term ramifications of the law. We must look at how the law is being used for things such as the collection of all Americans' phone records. We must consider whether that use is necessary to keep us safe and whether it is in line with the Constitutional rights we are sworn to uphold.

I urge our colleagues not to be swayed by the false argument that this provision must be reauthorized urgently, that we will be vulnerable to attack if we let it expire—another false argument.

Here is the reality. This provision is being used to sweep up the phone calls of all Americans across this country. Yet there is zero conclusive evidence that it has kept us safe from attack.

What we do have, however, is ample evidence that the PATRIOT Act, section 215, has been used to violate the privacy of everyday Americans. I believe it has violated the Constitution. I certainly agree with the Federal court of appeals which last week ruled that the bulk phone record collection goes far beyond what Congress intended when the law was passed.

We have a decade of hindsight. Let's be honest in this debate and let's be thorough. The entire law bears careful scrutiny. Senators LEE and LEAHY have introduced the USA FREEDOM Act to reform the law while reauthorizing the expiring provisions. I commend their efforts, but I think we can go even further.

The House also overwhelmingly passed its version of the USA FREEDOM Act just yesterday. It deserves Senate consideration. Congress has a duty for robust oversight, to ensure real constitutional privacy rights are upheld. I pushed for this from when I was in the House. I advocated then for the creation of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, also called PCLOB.

In June 2013, after details about NSA's bulk collection program were made public, I led a bipartisan call for the PCLOB to conduct an independent review. Their review assessed the impact of NSA's spying program on Americans' constitutional rights and civil liberties. The Board concluded what many Americans had feared: One, that the spying program is an unconstitutional intrusion on their privacy right, and, two, that it has almost no impact on safety.

The Board's oversight role is crucial. Its independent evaluation of section 215 demonstrates why. It has an important job, and it requires more support so it can do its job. That is why yesterday Senator WYDEN and I reintroduced the Strengthening Privacy, Oversight, and Transparency Act, or SPOT Act. Our bill, with bipartisan cosponsors in the House, would strengthen the Board. This is key to real oversight, and it should be included as part of any reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act.

The SPOT Act extends the Board's authority to play a watchdog role over surveillance conducted for purposes beyond counterterrorism. It also allows the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to issue subpoenas without having to wait for the Justice Department to issue them. It makes the Board member's positions full-time.

Finally, it makes the Board an authorized recipient for whistleblower complaints for employees in the intelligence community, so they can take concerns to an independent organization, one that understands the intelligence community. I know we must protect the Nation from future attacks. But there must also be balance. We cannot give up our constitutional protections in the name of security. To do so does not protect our Constitution nor does it increase our security.

We need to have a serious debate about these issues and allow Senators to offer amendments. This is important to the American people, to our security, and to our liberties. Congress cannot just leave town and leave this work undone.

I voted against the PATRIOT Act and the FISA Act amendments, because they unduly infringed on the guaranteed rights of our citizens. I believe that time has shown that to be true, and the time has come to correct it. We all value the work of our intelligence community. Their efforts are vital to our Nation's security. But I believe these amendments are crucial.

We can protect our citizens and their constitutional rights. We acted in haste before. It was a mistake then. It would be a mistake now to approve a straight reauthorization of that law. We need to take the time this time to get it right.

I see Senator WYDEN is on the floor. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today the Senate is formally kicking off the trade debate here in the Senate. What I intend to do, starting today and in the days ahead, is to come back to what I think needs to be the central statement of this discussion; that is, the NAFTA playbook. The playbook for trade in the 1990s is gone. It is a new day in trade policy.

So I have summarized why the trade promotion act is not the trade policy of the 1990s and is not the North American Free Trade Agreement. What we are going to do today is essentially start with the question of how vigorous trade enforcement ought to be at the forefront of America's trade policy in 2015 and beyond, and how our new approach on enforcement is different than the policy of the 1990s.

The reality is, we can pass trade agreements full of lofty goals and principles. You can amass all of the enforcement ideas you might want, but it does not do any good if you do not have real enforcement tools and you make sure that they are not locked in a shed.

In my view, that has been happening for way, way too long. The status quo on trade enforcement simply no longer does the job. As I have listened for many months to Senators on both sides of the aisle, I believe there is widespread recognition that our approach to trade, particularly trade enforcement, has to change, because without that change, we are not going to have the best possible path to creating more good-paying jobs for our people in a modern and globally competitive economy.

The bottom line is that those trade policies in the 1990s did very little—really nothing—to ensure strong enforcement of our trade laws to protect the American worker from the misdeeds of trade cheats. This bill is designed to take on the universe of aggressive tactics that our competitors have used. It upgrades trade enforcement laws to meet today's challenges.

What we have seen in recent years is that there are some overseas who play cat-and-mouse games with our Customs agents, using shell companies, fraudulent records, and sophisticated schemes. Then they bully—bully—American businesses into relocating factories and jobs or surrendering valuable intellectual property. Too often our companies are spied on, and trade enforcers may, in effect, be victimized by those who steal secrets and dodge accountability.

Our competitors often mask their activities by obscuring paper trails and perpetrating outright fraud. Now, our challenge—and I know my colleague the Presiding Officer has seen this as a member of the Finance Committee—is to get out in front of these schemes that I have just described. The enforcement legislation before the Senate is about guaranteeing that the United States has a queen on the chess board, no matter what competitive tactic it faces.

That starts with a proposal I first offered years ago called the ENFORCE Act. Now, the North American Free Trade Agreement did nothing to stop foreign companies that cheat and evade duties by concealing their identities and shipping their products on untraceable routes.

That is the way it used to be. That is why this legislation is not the North American Free Trade Agreement. The ENFORCE Act is going to give our Customs agents more tools aimed at cracking down on the behavior I have just outlined. Another major upgrade, something else that did not exist during those NAFTA days, is what I call an unfair trade alert. The new alert system would set off the warning bells long before the damage is done, when American jobs and exports come under threat.

One of the big fears we hear today is that our enforcers are incapable of stopping the trade cheats before it is too late. By the time somebody in Washington catches on to the newest unfair threat to undercut an American business, the plant has been shuttered, the factory lights are out, and the workers' lives have been turned upside down. In a lot of cases, if you are talking about the small towns that dot the landscape of Oregon and elsewhere, that abandoned facility might have been the beating heart of an entire community.

The slow pace of action in Washington, DC, should never be the reason Americans lose their jobs. The unfair trade alert—that was not part of the

1990s; that was not part of NAFTA. It is going to be part of our current policy today, helping our companies, helping our workers get there before it is too late.

Next, the Congress is going to lay down clear priorities for our trade enforcers, priorities that are centered on jobs and economic growth. There is going to be more accountability and follow-through baked into our enforcement system. In years past, trade debate in the Congress used to come down to a simple transaction of trade promotion authority for trade adjustment assistance.

What I said in developing this package of bills and what more than a dozen protrade Democrats said on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week was that the Senate needed to aim higher. The status quo was not good enough. In particular, it was not good enough in terms of enforcing the laws that are on the books. My guess is that in Pennsylvania and everywhere else—because I certainly hear it in Oregon—people say—particularly those of us who are protrade and want to tap these global markets: I hear you are talking about new trade agreements. How about enforcing the laws that are on the books?

What I started this morning—and I will be back again and again between now and the end of this debate—is to talk about why this is a very different approach than the approach taken in the 1990s. Tough, robust, effective enforcement of our trade laws is right at the core of a new and modern trade policy. It is a major part of what I call trade done right. It is how you guarantee that trade gives everybody in America a chance to get ahead.

Those are propositions, in my view, that deserve strong, bipartisan support in the Senate, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this trade enforcement law package.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic side have 20 minutes of the debate time remaining prior to noon.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to be able to equally divide the time spent in quorum calls.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FREEDOM FOR AUSTIN TICE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to spend a few minutes this morning talking about a young man who can be described in many ways and one who has earned many accolades: decorated Marine Corps veteran, award-winning journalist, Houston native, and seventh-generation Texan. But most importantly, this young man, Austin Tice, is better known as a friend, brother, and son to loving and caring parents.

Almost 3 years ago, Austin decided to pause his law school studies to spend the summer in Syria as a freelance journalist. He was frustrated by the lack of reporting on Syria's civil war, a war that has claimed the lives of more than 300,000 people by some estimates—and that is just within the borders of Syria—and has displaced millions more who are living in refugee camps both in Syria and in surrounding countries. This huge refugee crisis affects many neighboring countries, such as Jordan, Turkey, and Lebanon, and has tremendous potential to destabilize the entire region.

As a strong believer in freedom of the press, Austin wanted to let his fellow countrymen know what was going on in that part of the world. As a former Eagle Scout and Marine Corps captain, Austin's typical can-do attitude led him to decide that he should go to Syria himself and report on the civil war, and that is exactly what he did. Well, as with most things he tried, Austin proved to be very successful. While he was reporting from Syria, his work was published in the Washington Post, McClatchy news, and other outlets.

In August 2012, just days before he was planning to leave Syria, he was kidnapped, and no one has heard from him since. We still don't know for sure who his captors are. Sadly, we know very little. One thing we do know is that his parents, Marc and Debra Tice, and his entire family have worked tirelessly to locate him and to bring him home safely.

This week marks the 1,000th day of Austin's captivity. I really can't begin to imagine the toll this ordeal has taken on Austin's family, but I have to say I so greatly admire the courage and conviction of his parents, who said earlier this week in a statement:

> We have desperately missed Austin for over 1,440,000 minutes—each new minute fuels our resolve to find him and bring him safely home.

While we often mark the number of days someone has been missing, it is important to remember that to the family and friends of someone who has been kidnapped, even the minutes that pass are almost unbearable. Austin's family is not just counting the days he has been gone and all the milestones he has inevitably missed, they are counting the minutes too.

Austin Tice has a family who is waiting for him, missing him, and laboring to find any piece of information that will lead to information about his whereabouts, while longing for his freedom. I join the Tice family in encouraging the Federal Government to do everything we can to possibly secure Austin's safe return home.

I also say once again to his family: We haven't given up. We will continue to stand by you, and we will never give up until we find your son and bring him safely home.

This week, we pass another milestone, this time of 1,000 days that Austin has been separated from his family. I join the Tice family in their hope that someday soon we will be able to add another milestone to this story, one that marks the day of his safe return to so many who love and miss him.

Today, our thoughts and prayers are with the Tice family, and I stand ready and I daresay all of us stand ready to do whatever we can to encourage and facilitate the return of this Texan, veteran, brother, and son.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on two pieces of important trade legislation. Both of these bills have been in the works for some time. They were among the four trade bills we reported out of the Senate Committee on Finance last month, and as a principal coauthor of both bills, I am very glad we found a way to get them to this point.

The first bill we will be voting on is the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015. This bill will reauthorize and improve three of our trade preference programs: the generalized system of preferences, or GSP; the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or AGOA; and tariff preferences for Haiti. I want to take a few minutes to talk about each of these programs individually, starting with the GSP.

The GSP promotes trade with developing nations by providing for nonreciprocal duty-free tariff treatment of certain products originating in those countries. The program helps beneficiary countries advance their economic development and encourages them to move toward more open economies and eliminate trade barriers to U.S. exports.

The GSP does more than provide assistance in the developing world; it also assists hundreds of businesses here in the United States. Across our country, manufacturers and importers benefit by receiving inputs and raw materials at a lower cost. Approximately

three-quarters of U.S. imports under GSP are raw materials—parts and components—or machinery and equipment used by U.S. companies to manufacture goods here at home.

Unfortunately, because the program expired in 2013, many U.S. businesses have had to deal with high tariffs on these imports for the last 2 years. As an example, last year alone, without the GSP program in place, American companies paid over $600 million in tariffs. Businesses in every State have been affected by the expiration of GSP and have a vested interest in the renewal of the program. There are businesses in my own home State of Utah and around the country that have been left with difficult decisions about downsizing, hiring freezes, and employee layoffs in the absence of GSP. Today, with the passage of this bill, we will take a long-overdue step toward solving these problems.

Also included in the preferences bill are provisions for the long-term renewal of the AGOA Program, which encourages African countries to further develop their economies by lowering U.S. tariffs on their exports. Since AGOA was enacted in the year 2000, trade with beneficiary countries has more than tripled, with U.S. direct investment growing more than sixfold in that time.

This program has helped create more than a million jobs in Sub-Saharan Africa. I worked with my colleagues on the Committee on Finance to craft reauthorization language that will improve on AGOA's past success, to remove obstacles to trade in Sub-Saharan Africa and allow both that region and our job creators here at home to benefit from expanded market access.

I share many of my colleagues' belief that benefits under AGOA should go to countries making good-faith progress toward meeting the program's eligibility criteria. For example, I am very concerned that officers in the Republic of South Africa recently indicated they will attempt to renegotiate commitments made under the General Agreement on Trade in Services to require foreign-owned companies to relinquish 51 percent ownership and control to South Africans.

South Africa also developed a draft policy that proposed changes to intellectual property rights laws which contained significant shortcomings, including inadequate protections for patents, trademarks, and copyrights. These are three areas I take a tremendous interest in, among so many other things around here. I hope very much that as they redraft this policy, it will include recognition of how important protection of intellectual property is to supporting economic growth.

But it is not just South Africa. For example, I understand other beneficiaries under the program continue to impose barriers and limitations to cross-border data flow or otherwise limit digital trade. Because of these concerns, we thought it was important to create a mechanism under the AGOA Program which would allow for benefits to be scaled back if a country is found to not be making good-faith progress on these and other issues. That new tool is included in the bill, and we expect the administration to use this tool aggressively, particularly in the case of South Africa.

The legislation also includes new consultation and notification requirements, keeping Congress informed of beneficiaries' progress.

There are new mechanisms for stakeholders to petition the administration to raise awareness about potential eligibility violations. The bill will require these petitions to be taken into account when determinations are made regarding a beneficiary's status and in regular reporting.

I know the AGOA Program has a lot of support here in Congress among Members of both parties. I think we were able to craft a bill that not only provides for the long-term extension of the program the administration was seeking but also responds to some very serious bilateral trade challenges we are facing today. With these changes, we have created a more flexible program we believe will spur greater development and economic integration and opportunity in the region, while better serving the needs of our job creators here at home. I believe it deserves strong support.

Finally, the preferences bill would also extend preferential access to the U.S. market for Haiti. Haiti is one of the poorest economies in the Western Hemisphere. The Haiti preference program supports well-paying, stable jobs in a country saddled with poverty and unemployment. I hope this extension will encourage continued economic development and support democracy in Haiti.

This is a strong preferences bill. I expect a strong vote in favor of passing it later today.

Next, the Senate will vote on the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, which includes important provisions to reauthorize and modernize the operations of Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, and significantly improve intellectual property rights protection in the United States and around the world.

The Customs bill will facilitate the efficient movement of merchandise destined for the United States by formalizing in statute programs such as the Centers of Excellence and Expertise. It will also ensure that U.S. customs and trade laws are uniformly implemented nationwide and help ensure that the private sector and CBP work together.

With this bill, we will also ensure that the automated commercial environment and the international data system are completed so that trade documentation can finally be submitted electrically and importers will no longer be required to submit the same information to numerous government agencies.

In addition, the bill will modernize the drawback process by moving from a labor-intensive paper-based system to an electronic claims process that will significantly free up resources in the private and the public sector, and it will increase the de minimis level from $200 to $800, reducing needless burdens on small businesses importing into the United States.

Additionally, the bill strengthens our trade remedy laws and our ability to respond to imports that pose a threat to the health or safety of U.S. consumers.

When drafting this customs legislation, I was particularly interested in beefing up our enforcement of intellectual property rights. The bill includes the strongest possible provisions with regard to intellectual property rights and intellectual property rights enforcement. For example, our bill will establish in law the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center to coordinate Federal efforts to prevent intellectual property violations. It will also significantly expand CBP's tools and authorities to protect intellectual property rights at the border by requiring CBP to share information about suspected infringing merchandise with rights holders.

Our bill will provide CBP with explicit authority to seize and forfeit devices that violate the Digital Millennium Copyright Act—an act I put through a number of years ago—and require CBP to share information with rights holders who are injured by these unlawful devices.

The bill contains provisions to establish a process for CBP to enforce copyrights while registration with the copyright office is pending and to significantly improve CBP's reporting requirements to hold the Agency more accountable for its enforcement efforts with regard to intellectual property.

The bill will strengthen CBP's targeting of goods that violate intellectual property rights, improve CBP's cooperation with the private sector and with foreign customs authorities on enforcement, and require an educational campaign at the border. I am particularly fond of that last part. At my insistence, the bill includes provisions that will require all versions of the Customs Declaration Form that everyone fills out when they enter the United States to contain a warning that importation of goods that infringe on intellectual property rights may violate criminal and/or civil law and may pose serious risks to health and safety. I am not sure most Americans appreciate the danger that counterfeit

products can pose, as they often are not built to the same standard of the protected product. So I hope making people more aware of these dangers will help us make sure we are doing all we can to keep Americans safe.

In addition to enhancing protection at our borders, our Customs bill will provide USTR with additional tools to improve the protection of intellectual property rights by our trading partners overseas in order to stop infringing goods at the source. For example, the bill will establish a chief innovation and intellectual property negotiator, with the rank of ambassador, to ensure that intellectual property rights protection is at the forefront of our trade negotiation and enforcement efforts and to enhance USTR's accountability to Congress on these issues. On top of that, the bill will give USTR more tools to increase enforcement for trade secrets and to ensure that countries that consistently fail to protect intellectual property meet specified benchmarks for improvement.

I am a big fan of this bill. It includes a number of my top trade enforcement priorities, and I am very glad we will get a chance to vote on it today. Of course, it is not perfect. Some of the amendments that were added in committee leave me with some reservations. Most notably, the bill now contains provisions that purport to deal with currency manipulation that are, in my view, very problematic. One provision sets up an avenue for a countervailing duty investigation or review to determine whether some measure of a currency manipulation is effectively a subsidy, either ''directly or indirectly'' to a country's exports. If the government finds that the manipulation is, once again, either ''directly or indirectly,'' an export subsidy, sanctions can follow. This provision is problematic for a number of reasons.

First of all, it is likely not compliant with our existing international trade commitments. It would effectively require the imposition of trade sanctions that, under the language of the legislation, could be based on presumptions without support. And it will almost certainly invite retaliatory trade sanctions from our trading partners, who will argue, and in fact have already argued, that actions taken by the Federal Reserve Board constitute currency manipulation.

While the authors of the currency manipulation provision in the Customs bill may believe that there is a clear delineation between monetary policies used primarily for domestic economic stabilization and policies used to gain a trade advantage, there is not.

When Japan engages in quantitative easing to boost its economy and inflation expectations, sometimes at the very urging of U.S. officials, is that manipulation?

When the Federal Reserve engages in quantitative easing, with part of the expected benefit being downward exchange rate pressure and boosted exports, is that manipulation, or just domestic stabilization?

Is Germany's persistent trade surplus somehow partially caused by ongoing quantitative easing activities at the European Central Bank?

And, with respect to detection, despite the intent of the authors of this provision, accuracy is evidently not a concern.

I am sure that everyone—or at least those who support this provision—has looked at the recent exchange rate assessments for 2013 from the International Monetary Fund External Sector Report.

For Japan, one IMF method suggested 15-percent yen overvaluation, while another method suggested 15-percent undervaluation. Yet under the currency manipulation provision in this bill, IMF models and methods are what we are supposed to use to set trade sanctions.

For South Korea, the two IMF methodologies suggested undervaluation between around 7 percent and 20 percent. So when we want to set a punitive countervailing duty, what are our authorities supposed to do? Should they assume that South Korea benefited from currency undervaluation of 7 percent or 20 percent or some random number in between? Who knows.

This provision, unfortunately, simply won't work, since it assumes the existence of accurate knowledge and abilities to determine some fundamental equilibrium exchange rates that the IMF and the economics profession simply do not have.

Under the questionable provision of the bill that allows for investigation of currency undervaluation and potential ensuing trade actions, I believe the authors of the provision were overly heroic and mistaken in their belief about the precision of currency valuation methodology. The provision would appeal to models and methodologies, as described in IMF documents.

The problem is that even the IMF does not use those models and methodologies to make definitive judgments about appropriate currency values, which are inherently some of the most difficult things for economic models to identify. It would not be difficult for our trading partners to use precisely the same models and methodologies to make countervailing cases against Federal Reserve monetary policy, resulting in retaliatory trade sanctions and perhaps defensive currency interventions.

This is a clear road to trade wars and currency wars replete with competitive devaluations. Such a road is paved by the offending provision in the Customs bill, which basically gives our trading partners a template for their own accusations about currency manipulation and ensuing trade sanctions. This is problematic.

And while Senators in this Chamber would like to simply decree that our monetary policies are just domestic economic stabilization, while foreign monetary policies that may look similar are manipulation, such self-evaluations will not be acceptable in international trade and agreements.

I understand the desire among many of my colleagues to address currency manipulation, and I want to work with them on this issue. But I am convinced that the currency manipulation provision in the Customs bill simply will not work, and, when tried, it will simply give ammunition to our trading partners to consider engagement in trade wars, currency wars, competitive devaluations, and beggar-thy-neighbor monetary policies. This isn't what we should be shooting for with our Nation's trade policy.

In addition to the currency language, there was another provision added during the markup that would require employers to report occupational classification data to State agencies when filing their quarterly wage reports. This is an entirely new burden that would be placed on employers throughout the country, added to all the other reporting burdens they already face, and would require brand new systems for reporting and collecting information. And in the end, it is not readily apparent just how valuable this new collected information will be.

According to CBO, this new requirement would cost employers throughout the country more than $200 million between 2016 and 2020. Now, that may not seem like much compared to the numbers that get thrown around here in the Senate. But when we are talking about small businesses who struggle from month to month to cover their payrolls, it is a burden that, at least to me, doesn't appear to be necessary.

So once again, I am concerned about this provision and the impact it might have. However, despite the reservations I have about the flawed currency manipulation concepts and language and the unfunded mandate on employers, I believe it is important that we vote to move the Customs bill forward. Overall, this is a very good bill. A lot of work has gone into it, and I know that it reflects the priorities of a number of our colleagues and Members here in the Senate, including myself. That being the case, I plan to vote in favor of passing this legislation later on today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Once again, I am very glad to see that we are making progress on moving these bills through the Senate. I wish to thank all of my colleagues—particularly those on the Finance Committee—who worked so hard on these bills to get them to this point.

These are important votes we are going to take today. I expect that both of these bills will receive broad bipartisan support, and I hope they will.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE AMTRAK TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I address the matter at hand, I want to say that our hearts go out to the families of the men and women who lost their lives as a result of the Amtrak derailment last Tuesday. There are many still fighting injuries, and our thoughts and prayers are with them and their loved ones.

This was a commuter train. I have ridden it personally hundreds of times, and it is one my colleagues have ridden.

It was a train full of people on their way home—to their families, to their loved ones, to the things they like to do. So our thoughts go out to all of them.

It will be our job as lawmakers to analyze why this happened, how we could have prevented it, and how we can best move forward to ensure such a tragedy is not repeated. Some of this is already underway. But the more pressing task in this moment of tragedy is for us to show solidarity with the victims and their families, and recognize their contributions—however large or small—to our national story.

New York lost a few native sons and daughters:

Abid Gilani, a senior vice president of Wells Fargo and a father of two.

Rachel Jacobs, an industry leader in her field, was heading home to her husband and 2-year-old son as CEO of a new job at an educational software company.

Jim Gaines, a software architect for the Associated Press, a beloved member of the staff, who was heading home to Plainsboro, NJ, to see his wife, 16-year-old son, and 11-year-old daughter.

We lost Dr. Derrick Griffith, a dean of student affairs at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn, just a stone's throw away from where I live. He spent his entire adult life working to improve urban education.

And we lost a young man named Justin Zemser, who lived in Rockaway, in my old congressional district, and was studying at the U.S. Naval Academy. He was a tremendous young man—and I know that because I nominated him to the Naval Academy.

He was a valedictorian, an earnest big brother and mentor to two children with autism, as well as being captain of the varsity football team. His family mourns his loss and so does America. He would have done so much for our country.

Today, let us remember them. Tomorrow, let us work together so that their loss is not in vain.

Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Customs bill before this body, particularly because of the strong language it contains on the crackdown on currency manipulation.

I have spoken many times on this subject in the Finance Committee and here on the floor because I am passionate about finally passing enforceable mechanisms for dealing with this malicious trade tactic. Why? Because I am deeply concerned by the plight of the middle class in today's economy, where globalization and free-trade agreements have accelerated a downward pressure on middle-class wages and forced entire industries to relocate to low-wage countries.

And I believe currency manipulation is one of the most significant emerging trade challenges this country faces, because it directly impacts wages and it directly impacts jobs.

As this Congress is soon to reengage on a fast-track for a massive free-trade agreement, now is the time to think deeply and comprehensively about our country's trade policy and how it impacts the broad middle of our economy.

To me and many of my colleagues, it does not make sense to move forward on the one hand with a blank check for free trade without passing strong worker protections on a parallel track. The global economy is a rough sea. We should not pass a trade package that forces the American worker to navigate those waters with a leaky boat and a deflated lifejacket.

So to me and to many of my colleagues, this Customs bill and the currency manipulation issue is unquestionably germane to the larger debate on trade. If the goal of TPP is to lure countries away from China, it makes perfect sense that, as part of the overall effort with TPP, we also go after Chinese currency manipulation, as well.

But beyond the question of relevance to this debate—which I believe is dispatched easily—this bill is substantively good trade policy. It contains several smart, balanced, effective measures to create a level playing field with our international trading partners.

First and foremost, currency manipulation is finally attacked head-on. Companies have asked me about this. CEOs of major companies have said to me: We cannot compete if we have one hand tied behind our back, which currency manipulation does.

Mr. President, may I ask my colleague a question, the ranking member?

How much time do you wish?

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague. I will be very brief.

Mr. SCHUMER. How much time is left for the minority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Seven?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would you please notify me when I have taken 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Big companies have been hurt. Small companies have been hurt. We have lost millions of jobs because of currency manipulation, which makes the exports from China and other countries about 33 percent cheaper and imports from America to China 33 percent more expensive.

I would say this: China seems to feel they can get away with any kind of trade misdeed, whether it is stealing intellectual property by cyber security or any other means, whether it is keeping out the best of American products, which they do until they can learn how to make them themselves in their protected market and then fight us everywhere else.

This currency bill will finally be the first real shot across the bow to China that you cannot keep getting away from it. Their unfair trade practices hurt us in low-wage industries that were very important—shoes, clothing, toys, furniture. Those industries have already suffered. But if we do nothing, it will be the cream of American industry where our innovation and hard work is lost to China through unfair means, currency and other, whether it is tech or pharmaceuticals. Talk to the CEOs of these companies, and they will tell you China does not play fair. Talk to them, and they will tell you that the Chinese shrug their shoulders at what we have done up until now. We must do something—if not in the TPA bill, alongside it—that shows China once and for all they cannot get away with it. I fear that if we do not, in 10 years we will be saying the same thing about the industries that we say today. The customs measure, currency measure is bipartisan. The currency measure passed our committee with an overwhelming bipartisan vote, 18 to 8, and was supported by our ranking member, which I most appreciate. It passed the Senate in 2011 with 63 votes. It passed the House of Representatives with 348 votes. And a year and a half ago, in 2013, 60 Senators sent a letter to the President imploring the inclusion of enforceable currency provisions.

In conclusion, we have to think about the big picture when it comes to trade policy. If we move the ledger on one side, opening up our markets in foreign markets, we better make sure we adequately move the ledger on the other side to protect our workers, curb unfair deceptive practices, and give our small businesses the ability to compete in a global economy.

The fate of middle-class wages, middle-class jobs, and the very economy of this country hang in the balance. I

urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the floor, I wish to also note that Senator SCHUMER has provided leadership on another very important enforcement issue. He introduced the committee to something a number of years ago known as honey laundering. What this involved was, in effect, we set up a sting operation. In particular, with respect to Senator SCHUMER's constituents and his interest in tough enforcement of the trade laws, the Chinese, as my colleagues will recall, were found guilty of unfair trading practices. In effect, they would just ship honey through other countries, such as Indonesia.

I want my colleague to know I am going to continue to work with him on a variety of issues.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator. If I might, I thank the Senator for the great job he has done under very difficult circumstances. I think everyone on both sides of the aisle appreciates Senator WYDEN's intelligence, his bipartisanship, and his steadfastness.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Senator.

I am going to wrap up as we move to this first vote in a few minutes and come back to what this debate is all about. We are starting, of course, with the issue of trade enforcement, but the big challenge is to show this country that we are putting in place a modern trade policy, a trade policy that sets aside once and for all the NAFTA playbook of the 1990s. This overall package will usher in a new and modern American trade policy. It must start with a tough, robust, effective trade enforcement package, many of the details of which I have outlined here this morning.

It is time also—and this will be part of our early work—to upgrade and renew our trade preference programs. The businesses and workers who rely on these programs are waiting for this Congress to act.

The first of these proposals enhances and extends the African Growth and Opportunity Act, referred to as AGOA. This has been the core of a close economic partnership between our country and a host of African nations for more than a decade. The proposal before the Senate will update that partnership in a way that is positive for all involved.

Back in the 1990s—once again returning to this theme, the NAFTA era—the United States had no meaningful trade policies to help African nations facing profound economic hardship climb back from the brink. This renewal of the AGOA law takes the program to the next level. AGOA will be simpler for businesses to use. There will be less redtape to worry about. African countries will be encouraged to zero in on strategies that can make the program more effective. It will be easier for the United States to crack down on the bad actors and verify that countries stay strictly in line with the criteria for eligibility. Most importantly, the proposal gives all concerned—workers, businesses, countries, and investors—a decade of certainty.

I am a real fan of this program. I believe it works for our country, for Sub-Saharan Africa, and it ought to be a cornerstone of our economic policy in the region.

The second part of this package of programs renews the program known as the generalized system of preferences. This is an economic win-win because it is a shot in the arm for developing countries, and it is a major boost for American manufacturers, including hundreds of them in my home State. One of those businesses in Oregon is Stackhouse Athletic in Salem, which will not only be able to create new jobs, they will be able to offer health benefits to their workers.

The extension of GSP will save American businesses an estimated $2 million a day by reducing tariffs. The GSP program expired nearly 2 years ago. As a result, businesses in my home State of Oregon paid an extra $4.9 million in tariffs. Renewing GSP would correct that issue and support as many as 80,000 jobs with manufacturers, ports, farmers, and retail stores. That program would be extended by this legislation through 2017.

Finally, the Senate has an opportunity with this legislation to reaffirm our economic commitment to Haiti, one of our closest and most disadvantaged neighbors in the world. In my view, Senator NELSON of Florida has done very important work in this area. He has been our leader on this issue, and there is bipartisan understanding that now is the right time to extend the Haiti trade preferences to line them up with AGOA. These Haiti preferences also did not exist in the NAFTA era. Together, they support as many as 30,000 jobs in that country, and they help to drive investment and lift Haiti's economy in the long term.

I am confident the Senate will come together to extend this package of preference programs because they make economic sense for America, and they strengthen our ties with the developing countries around the world.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation with our first vote.

I will close by saying that today we begin to turn the corner on a fresh, modern trade policy for the times, a policy very different from the trade policy of the 1990s, the NAFTA era. Let's begin this effort—begin this effort—for a new 21st-century trade policy by passing the legislation we will be considering shortly, both parts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will now read the bills, as amended, for the third time.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bills to be read a third time.

The bills were read the third time.

VOTE ON H.R. 1295

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 1295, pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Ayotte	Franken	Paul
Baldwin	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blumenthal	Grassley	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Reid
Booker	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boxer	Heller	Rounds
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sanders
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Scott
Casey	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Tester
Corker	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McCaskill	Udall
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Fischer	Murray	

NAYS—1

Lankford

NOT VOTING—2

Cassidy Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved,

the bill, H.R. 1295, as amended, is passed.

Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

VOTE ON H.R. 644

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 644, pass?

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Hirono	Risch
Boxer	Hoeven	Roberts
Brown	Isakson	Rounds
Burr	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Capito	Kirk	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Scott
Carper	Lankford	Sessions
Casey	Leahy	Shaheen
Cochran	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Vitter
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Enzi	Mikulski	Warren
Ernst	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—20

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Coats	Gardner	Rubio
Corker	Heller	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Cassidy	Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, H.R. 644, as amended, is passed.

Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER CLOTURE VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote on which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 is agreed to.

Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, soon the Senate will vote once again on whether to begin debate on legislation that will help shape the future of America's trade policy, and, in addition, our role in the global economy. Needless to say, I was very disappointed when many of my Democratic colleagues voted to block debate on these important issues earlier this week. I am hoping for a much different result this afternoon.

This vote will set the stage for an important debate, quite likely the most significant debate that we will have in this Chamber all year. This debate will determine whether our Nation is willing and able to accept the challenges of the world economy or whether we continue in retreat and yield to the siren song of isolationism and protectionism.

It will determine whether we, as a nation, are able and willing to take the lead in setting the rules for the world economy or whether we will sit on the sidelines and let other countries create the rules that will govern trade in their regions for the foreseeable future. It should be pretty clear where I stand in this debate.

I support free trade and open markets for U.S. exporters and job creators. I support new opportunities for American farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, service providers, and the workers that they all employ. I support expanding American influence in the most vibrant and strategic regions in the world. The best way for Congress to help our country achieve these goals is to renew trade promotion authority, or TPA, as soon as possible.

That is what we will be debating, if this vote goes the way I hope it will. TPA is the most effective tool in the Congress's trade arsenal. TPA ensures that Congress sets the objectives for our trade negotiators and that those negotiators will be able to reach the best deals possible. Without TPA we have no way of holding the administration accountable in trade negotiations and no way of making sure our country can get a good deal.

Getting TPA renewed is currently President Obama's top legislative priority. He is right and we should support our President on this issue.

As chairman of the Senate committee with jurisdiction over trade, it is a very high priority for me, as well. The TPA bill that will be brought before the Senate represents a bipartisan, bicameral effort to advance our Nation's trade interests.

The legislation we will be debating will also include provisions to reauthorize trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, which I know is a high priority for many of my colleagues. It has taken a long time, a lot of work, and no small amount of compromise to get us to this point. People from both parties have put in enormous efforts just to get a chance to have this debate here on the Senate floor.

I want to thank my colleagues for their work thus far in this effort, but also to remind them that we are not there yet. Now, I am well aware that not all of my colleagues share my views on trade. I expect that they will make those views abundantly clear in the coming days, as they should. But to do that, we need to begin that debate. I am looking forward to it. The American people deserve a spirited debate on these issues.

Of course, they deserve an opportunity to see this Chamber function like the great deliberative body that it once was and under the current leadership is becoming again. Put simply, the obstruction has gone on long enough. It is time to get down to the serious business of legislating. I hope we can begin or continue that process today by voting in favor of the motion to proceed. I encourage all of my colleagues to do that so that we can get on this bill, debate it, have a full-fledged debate, and let the chips fall where they may.

If we do, I think we will all feel a lot better about what goes on around this place.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me respectfully disagree with my friend from Utah. Let me urge all Members to vote against what I believe to be a disastrous trade agreement, a trade agreement based on other trade agreements, which, in fact, have cost us millions of decent-paying jobs and have led to a race to the bottom.

Let me just briefly give four reasons—and there are many more. But let me just focus on four objective reasons why we should defeat this fast-track legislation and why we need to develop a whole new approach to trade that benefits American workers rather than just the CEOs of large multinational corporations.

Reason No. 1, this unfettered free-trade agreement with Vietnam, Malaysia, and 10 other countries follows in the footsteps of disastrous trade agreements such as NAFTA, CAFTA, Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, and the South Korea Free Trade Agreement.

Any objective look at these trade agreements will tell us that they have cost us millions of decent-paying jobs and have led us to a race to the bottom, where American workers are forced to compete against workers in low-wage countries who are making pennies an hour.

Over and over again, supporters of these types of trade agreements have told us about how many jobs they would create, how beneficial it would be for the middle class and working class of this country. But over and over again, virtually everything they told us turned out to be wrong, and they are wrong again in terms of the TPP.

In 1993, President Bill Clinton promised that NAFTA would create 1 million American jobs in 5 years. Instead, NAFTA has led to the loss of almost 700,000 jobs. In 1999, we were promised that Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China would open the Chinese economy to American-made goods and services. Instead, as everybody who goes shopping knows—when you buy product after product made in China—that trade agreement has cost us some 2.7 million American jobs. I remember hearing all the accolades about free trade with China. They all turned out to be wrong.

In 2011, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce told us that the South Korea Free Trade Agreement would create some 280,000 jobs. Well, wrong again—instead, that agreement has led to the loss of some 75,000 jobs.

The reason for all of this is very simple. Why would an American corporation invest in this country, pay American workers 15, 18, 20 bucks an hour, provide health care, have to obey environmental regulations, and deal with trade unions, when they can go abroad, pay people pennies an hour, and not have to worry about the environment. That is, of course, what has happened.

These trade agreements have failed. TPP is based on these principles. It will be another failure. We should reject it for that reason.

Second point, in politics it is always interesting and important to know whose side different groups are on. You can learn a lot by who is supporting an agreement and by who is opposing the agreement.

Well, let's talk about who is supporting the TPP. It turns out that virtually every major multinational corporation, including many that have shut down plants in the United States and moved abroad—all of these multinationals think the TPP is a great idea. I am sure I can understand why it will be a great program for them. It will only accelerate their ability to shut down plants in America and move to low-wage countries abroad.

There is another group that is actively pushing for us to vote for the TPP. That is the pharmaceutical industry. As I think every American knows, the drug companies in this country charge our people here the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, but they love this legislation. They just love it because they think as a result of this legislation, they will be able to charge people all over the world, including in very poor countries, higher prices for their products.

Wall Street—surprise of all surprises—Wall Street loves this agreement. As we all remember, not so many years ago, the greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior of Wall Street caused the most significant economic recession since the Great Depression. But Wall Street loves this legislation because it will make it easier for them to sell esoteric, complicated financial products all over the world.

So those are some of the groups that think this legislation is wonderful, that we should vote for it.

Which are the groups and the organizations that oppose this legislation? Well, it turns out that every trade union in this country, unions representing over 20 million American workers, unions that are fighting every single day to get workers higher wages, better pay, better health care, are in strong opposition to this legislation.

This is what the trade union movement has to say about TPP:

> Fast Track trade deals mean fewer jobs, lower wages, and a declining middle class. Fast Track has been used since the Nixon Administration to advance deals, like NAFTA, that are sold to the American people as job creation measures. But these deals, written largely by and for the world's largest corporations, don't create jobs; their main purpose isn't even related to trade, it's to enshrine rules that make it easier for firms to invest offshore and increase corporate influence over the global economy.

That is what the trade union movement in this country believes about this agreement. But it is not only the trade union movement that has opposed the TPP. Virtually every major environmental and scientific group in this country, groups such as the League of Conservation Voters, the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Union of Concerned Scientists, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, and 350.org oppose this legislation. This is what the environmental organizations have written about this bill:

> As leading U.S. environmental and science organizations, we write to express our strong opposition to ''fast track'' trade promotion authority and to urge you to oppose any legislation that would limit the ability of Congress to ensure that trade pacts deliver benefits for communities, workers, public health, and the environment.

So we have trade union organizations representing some 20 million American workers that say we should not go forward with this agreement. We have organizations representing millions of people in the environmental community that say we should not go forward with this legislation.

Then we have religious groups, such as the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the United Methodist Church, and the Sisters of Mercy, that also are opposing this legislation. This is what they have written:

> As people of faith, we call on all nations and government to uphold the dignity of all people. Yet modern trade agreements have harmed people, especially the most vulnerable in the United States and globally. . . . Trade, like the rest of the economy, must be a means of lifting people out of poverty and ensure a country's ability to protect the health, safety and wellbeing of their citizens and the planet. In recognition of your sacred task of stewardship over people and policies, we ask you to oppose fast track trade promotion authority for any trade agreement currently being negotiated.

So, on the one hand, you have all of the big-money organizations. You have every major multinational corporation in America. You have Wall Street, and you have the pharmaceutical industry. They say: Vote for this legislation.

On the other side, you have unions representing millions of Americans. You have environmental organizations representing millions more Americans, and you have religious organizations who say: Wait a second. This fast-track trade agreement may not be a good idea. Vote no.

So on the one hand, you have groups whose motivation is greed and profit, and on the other hand, you have organizations trying to protect working people, trying to protect the environment, trying to uphold basic religious values about human dignity saying no. Well, which side should we be on? I say we stand with those who are concerned about workers' rights, the environment, and moral values.

Let me give you another reason why we should oppose this trade agreement—and this is a provision that has gotten far too little attention—and that is the investor-state dispute settlement. That sounds like a highly technical term. What in God's Name does that mean? But let me try to explain what it does mean. What it does mean in English is that it would allow large multinational corporations to sue national, State, and local governments—not only in the United States but all over the world—if those governments pass legislation that hurts their expected future profits.

This, to me, is exactly about what this whole agreement stands for. It is not for raising wages or creating jobs. It is to protect corporate profits. And, unbelievably, what this legislation is prepared to do is to undermine basic democracy in terms of what local communities around the world, States in the United States, and national governments do—whether it is the United States or any other government—if that undermines future profits of large multinational corporations. That is really extraordinary.

I thought that our job, as Members of the Senate, and the job of people in Australia who represent their government and people democratically elected all over the world—I had the idea that maybe their function was to represent, as best they could, the needs of

the people who voted for them. I guess that is a radical and crazy idea.

What this bill says is that if legislation is passed by people who are democratically elected, those decisions—that legislation—can be brought to an independent tribunal, and those countries could have to pay huge fines if the legislation, which might protect health care or might protect the environment, undermines future profits of multinational corporations.

What an attack—not only on health and the environment—but it is an attack on the fundamental tenets of democracy. Our job is not to worry about future corporate profits. Our job is to worry about the needs of the American people. That is what elected governments all over the world are supposed to do.

Let me give you some examples—because we have not talked about this—of what is already going on around the world based on similar language to what will be in the TPP if we vote for it—similar language.

This is maybe the most outrageous example that I can give you, but there are many others. Philip Morris, one of the large tobacco companies in the world, is suing both Australia and Uruguay over labeling requirements for cigarettes.

Uruguay is this little country, and what they have done is they have been very aggressive in trying to protect their children and their people from the very harmful impacts of smoking.

Now, you know what. I happen to think that is a good thing. I think in America and all over the world we should do everything that we can to make sure that our kids are not hooked on nicotine and do not have to suffer heart disease, cancer, emphysema, and all of the other diseases related to smoking. I think our government should be very vigorous. We have done some things in our country. I think we should do more.

Uruguay, a little tiny country whose President turns out to be an oncologist, a guy who is worried about cancer, was trying to do everything it could to try to keep the kids in Uruguay from getting hooked on cigarettes. And what happened to Uruguay? Well, they were taken to this independent tribunal, composing, as I understand it, of three corporate lawyers, because Philip Morris said: Hey, Uruguay, you are impacting our future profits. We want to get kids hooked onto nicotine. We want to sell our products to kids and to the people of Uruguay. By fighting us, passing legislation, and doing things that will make it harder for kids to smoke, you are ruining our profits.

This case is now resting in an independent tribunal. How insane is that—that a country trying to protect its kids from getting cancer is being sued by Philip Morris because it might cost them profits? So this is not only a health issue—in this case of cancer prevention—but this is an issue of basic democracy.

Do the people of Uruguay, do the people of Australia, do the people of any country have a right to be very vigorous in protecting the health of their kids and their citizens without worrying about being sued by a cigarette manufacturer that is trying to poison these kids with deadly products.

So this is not only a health issue, it is a basic democratic issue, and if Philip Morris wins this case, it will be sending a message to every government in the world that they can't be aggressive in doing things to protect their kids from cigarettes.

That is one example. Let me give another equally outrageous example. Under this investor-state provision, a French waste management firm—Veolia—is suing for $110 million under the France-Egypt bilateral investment treaty over changes to Egypt's labor laws, including an increase in the minimum wage.

Now, let me be honest. I know nothing about Egypt's minimum wage, but I do think Egypt and every other country on Earth has a right to raise its minimum wage, if they think it makes sense, without worrying about being sued by some company that will have to pay higher wages. How crazy is that? So, again, not being terribly knowledgeable about domestic policies in Egypt, the idea that they are being sued for the crime of raising their minimum wage is, to me, beyond comprehension.

Again, this is just an example of what is happening now and what will only happen in an accelerated manner if we pass this agreement, but let me give one last example.

A Swedish energy company called Vattenfall launched a $5 billion lawsuit over Germany's decision to phase out nuclear power. This initiative was implemented in response to the Fukushima disaster. Germany, last I knew, was an independent country, with an elected government, and they made a decision to phase out nuclear energy. Some people think it is a good idea, some think it is a bad idea, but last I heard that should be a decision of the German Government and the people who elected that government. The elected officials of Germany are not dummies. I presume they do what their people want them to do or they pay the political consequence.

But that was the decision of the elected officials of Germany. They said: Let's phase out nuclear power. Yet now they are being sued by a Swedish energy company, Vattenfall, for some $5 billion because they made that decision.

Now, that is just what is going on right now. Think about what that means into the future. It means any government around the world or in this trade agreement, it means any State in the United States—if my State of Vermont, which is sensitive to the environment, decides to go forward on an environmental piece of legislation, some large corporation can go to an independent tribunal and say: Look, we are going to sue Vermont for $1 billion because we wanted to do business there and their environmental regulations are impacting our ability to make a profit. That undermines what the State of Vermont or the State of Georgia or any other State chooses to do.

To me, it is just beyond comprehension that anybody would vote for that type of legislation. We can disagree with what they do in Egypt or disagree with what they do in Uruguay, we can disagree with what we do here, but to say an independent tribunal can provide billions of dollars in damages to a corporation because of a democratically made decision in the United States or any other country around the world is, to me, just incomprehensible.

The last point I would want to make deals with a health issue. Clearly, one of the health crises we face not only in America but around the world is the high cost of prescription drugs. In our country, if my memory is correct, some 25 percent of Americans who receive prescriptions from doctors are unable to afford to fill those prescriptions—someone goes to the doctor who diagnoses that individual and writes out a script, and the person says thank you very much but doesn't have the money to fill that script. It is bad in this country, but obviously it is much worse in very, very poor countries around the world.

What this agreement will do, among other things, if it is passed, is allow pharmaceutical companies to fight back against their brand-name products being converted into generics at much lower prices, so poor countries all over the world would have to struggle to come up with very high prices for medicine for people who don't have a whole lot of money.

In fact, that is why Doctors Without Borders has said—and Doctors Without Borders, as you may know, is a heroic group of doctors who, whenever there is a health care crisis around the world—whether it is Ebola in Africa or whatever—travel to those places and put their lives on the line. Some have died to provide medical treatment in the most difficult of circumstances to the poorest people around the world. They are really a heroic group of people. But Doctors Without Borders has said: ''The TPP agreement is on track to become the most harmful trade pact ever for access to medicines in developing countries.''

So to my mind, the vote we are going to have in a short time is really a no-brainer. Are we dumb enough to continue down the road of failed trade

policies? I would hope not. Do we think it is a good idea to be siding with corporate America, which has already used previous trade agreements to outsource millions of our jobs and thinks this agreement is just wonderful? Are we going to stand with Wall Street, whose greed has no limits? Are we going to stand with the pharmaceutical industry, which wants to sell drugs to people all over the world at a higher price or do we stand with unions, environmental groups, religious groups? Do we get involved in a trade agreement which allows corporations to undermine the democratic rights of countries that stand up for their environment, stand up for the health and well-being of their kids? Do we make it harder for poor people around the world to get the medicines they need?

This is a no-brainer. I would hope Members of the Senate send a resounding note to the corporate world that says you can't have it all; that we are going to pass trade agreements which protect working families, which protect the middle class, and which protect struggling people all over the world and we are going to vote no on fast-track and no on the TPP.

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the negotiating process has finally worked. Indeed, the spirit of four bills that passed the Finance Committee last week on this issue of trade—the spirit of that overwhelming bipartisan vote in the Finance Committee has now been carried out on the floor of the Senate and, in fact, is being carried out and will be so as we invoke the motion for cloture to go to the bill in the next vote that will occur in 30 minutes.

Certainly, trade preferences with regard to African countries, plus the trade preferences with regard to the poorest nation in the Western Hemisphere, Haiti, were not controversial at all. We passed that.

Certainly, the intent was that the safeguards we put in with regard to considering trade legislation put them on a Customs bill. That was intended to go along with the trade legislation, and now that has passed. Remember, all of this was bollixed up 2 or 3 days ago and we weren't going anywhere, but cooler minds prevailed and brought everybody together.

Now we go to the main event.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the minority has expired.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. NELSON. I am very grateful to my colleague from Alabama for allowing me to do that.

Mr. President, the main event is the combined two bills of trade adjustment assistance, which is, if there is a disruption in a local economy or in a particular trade as a result of new international trade arrangements, there will be extra training for those workers to be trained into another job so they have a livelihood—that is common sense. That is combined with the other main event, which is a procedure to fast-track, ultimately, the two trade bills that are being negotiated by the United States, one in the Pacific area, the other one with Europe.

Fast-track means that when those trade bills come to the Congress for approval or disapproval, it will be done with an up-or-down vote. In other words, they can't be pecked to death with hundreds of amendments. That is why it is called fast-track. We are getting to the point where we are going to pass this as we get into the consideration of this legislation and amendments that will be coming to it.

At the end of the day, this Senator is quite confident we will be able to pass the fast-track, and it will have this Senator's support. Why? Simply because this Senator believes these trade agreements are in the interest of the United States.

I would conclude by saying that if we take, for example, the potential Pacific agreement, our military commanders have told us that, in fact, it is one of the best things we could do to get this trade agreement so China can't get in the economic door before the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be notified after 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so notify the Senator.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I think that as we consider these trade agreements, it is appropriate that we recognize the importance of free trade, how it helps the world and helps the economy, and it is something I certainly support and have supported on a number of occasions in the past, including the last big trade bill, the Korean trade bill. I generally support—I actually do support the idea of comparative advantage, the gist of which is that if a nation can produce a product and sell it cheaper in another country, people over time will benefit from allowing that country's product to enter the country and being able to buy it at a lower price. That is comparative advantage, and I think it is sound in principle and generally sound in practice.

But the American workers are not doing well now. Wages have not increased since 2000—15 years. We have been down $3,000 in median family income since 2009 and still down $3,000. We have the lowest percentage of Americans in working years actually working today since the 1970s. So this is not a healthy environment for Americans. The market has done pretty well. Revenues and profits are holding pretty well, but the average American working person is not doing so well.

So what has happened? Is there a problem with currency manipulation, state-owned enterprises, subsidized foreign industries, people who dump products here below market cost or right at market cost being subsidized and supported by foreign countries? Do those alter the situation? Do they make it impossible for American businesses to compete, and if they go out of business, will our government bail them out in any way? We had one bailout after the financial collapse, but businesses are closing every day and they are not being bailed out today. We have seen substantial reductions in manufacturing around the country.

The Wall Street Journal just this week published an article, ''The Case of the Vanishing Worker.'' That was in Monday's Wall Street Journal. It talked about the city of Decatur, IL, and detailed how their unemployment rate had gotten as high as 14 percent and it had dropped to almost half of that. It dropped down to almost half of that, so that looked pretty good, but when they looked at the numbers, they weren't so good.

What did they find? Even though the unemployment rate had fallen to almost half, how many people were actually working? Well, the answer was 8 percent fewer. So how can the unemployment rate fall and the number of people actually working fall at the same time? The answer is, as the article said, that people are moving away; they are dropping out of the workforce entirely; they are taking early retirement. That is what is happening too often in America.

So I think it is important for us to ask, how are these trade agreements benefiting the nation? How are they impacting American people? Let's ask some questions about it.

I asked the President questions on that. I sent him a letter, and I asked him a series of questions relating to wages. Will this trade agreement improve job prospects? Will it improve or make worse our trade deficits? Well, he hasn't answered those questions.

So I ask my colleagues: Has anybody demanded the Commerce Department, the Treasury Department, the administration to produce data to show that if

we enter into another agreement involving 40 percent of the world's economy, involving some of our most capable and rigorous and toughest mercantilist competitors, what will it do to the American workers' prospects? Is that a fair question to ask? We haven't seen any discussion of it, so far as I can tell. And let me tell you what the reason is.

Well, first, I will say this: I believe unfair trade competition is real. We talk to people out there every day, and they tell us about it. Dan DiMicco, former CEO of Nucor Steel, has one of his plants in Alabama. They have plants all over the country. He said that these trade agreements are in effect unilateral American trade disarmament and they enable foreign mercantilism. In other words, what he is saying is that we have acquiesced to the mercantilist nationalism emphasis of our trading partners. And why is that? Well, I figured it out. It has taken me a while to understand exactly what the theory is behind these trade agreements, and I don't believe I am in error when I discuss this.

Ross Kaminsky, writing in the American Spectator—a fine magazine—wrote a fine piece arguing for this TPA and the trade agreement. He was overwhelmingly saying it must be passed virtually regardless of what is in it.

I have to say his position is consistent with the position of the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal and many other economists, and we have to understand what it is. And I am losing confidence in this position. I am not sure it is a good position. As a matter of fact, I don't think it is. Maybe I am wrong, but I don't think it is.

This is what he says on trade:

> It bears repeating—and repeating and repeating and repeating—that the benefit to American consumers of free trade is so large that it must trump any parochial interest of a particular industry or labor union or politician.
>
> Because they lower the prices of imports, and even understanding that there will be a few losers, free trade agreements are almost always worth supporting regardless of what is offered to American exporters by the foreign trade partner.

Let me repeat that. He said they are almost always worthy of being entered into regardless of what is offered to the American exporters by the foreign trade partner.

I remember, as a skilled businessman, when I first came to the Senate, and Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, was before me. I was kind of nervous about it—a big maestro of the economy.

I asked him a simple question: Mr. Greenspan, what if a country wants to trade with us, wants to sell products to us but will buy zero products from us? They just want to sell to us but will buy nothing in return. Should we enter into a trade agreement with them?

What do you think he answered? I used to ask people in townhalls about this on occasion, and they would say he said no. But, but he said yes.

I am telling you, this is the movement—the mentality of the current trade agreement supporters, at least in the intellectual, corporate world and the newspaper world and many within universities, certainly not all.

So is this a valid position? Are we subjecting our American people unfairly to competition that could cost jobs and so forth?

Well, I am losing confidence in those views. That is all I am saying, colleagues. And I think it is time for us to analyze what it means.

I would say that the steel industry of the United States is not a little bitty matter. Right now, U.S. Steel closed a big plant I think in Indiana or Ohio. They just laid off a thousand or so workers in Alabama. SSAB Steel in Alabama says they are facing ferocious dumping, it is threatening their market share and their ability to make the most modern plant in the world competitive, and they don't think it is fair.

How long do you have to sustain this to have dealt substantial damage to the American steel industry? Don't we need a steel industry? Where would steelworkers get jobs? They say: Well, they can take service jobs. Well, maybe so. Maybe they can work at the plumbing company. Maybe they can work at a hospital. Maybe they can work in a nursing home. Maybe there is other work that can be found. But at some point, do we not need a manufacturing capability that provides a lot more than a service job—manufacturing capabilities, for example, that provide demand for products, demand for supplies, demand for workers who supply those plants and have ripple effects much larger than a person just repairing faucets. I think we have to ask that question in a very serious way.

I said earlier I voted for the Korean trade pact. I did not have a lot of trouble voting for that at the time. I thought it was going to be fine. Maybe it is OK. Maybe the pact is going to be, sometime in the future, positive for the United States.

The Koreans, like the Japanese, are good trading people. They are allies around the world on security agreements. I am not putting the Koreans down. The Koreans are tough trade negotiators. They have a mercantilist philosophy.

What happened before that agreement was passed? President Obama promised that the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement would increase U.S. goods exports to Korea by $10 billion to $11 billion. However, since the deal was ratified in 2012, I believe it was, our exports rose only $0.8 billion—less than $1 billion, not $10 billion. Does that make any difference?

We just bring in from abroad and our trading partners don't allow exports abroad? What about the Korean imports to the United States? They rose more than $12 billion, widening our trade gap, almost doubling our trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 12 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe I had up to 15 to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is still time until 2. We are just notifying you of the 12 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I see my colleague from Louisiana. If he is ready to speak, I will wrap up.

Mr. VITTER. I do not desire to speak.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will wrap up, Mr. President.

What about the Census Department's report on the U.S. trade deficit of South Korea? They found it has almost doubled since the passage of the agreement. In 2011, the United States had a $13.2 billion trade deficit with South Korea—not a healthy relationship there—but in 2014, it was $25 billion.

Furthermore, the deficit is currently 66 percent higher so far this year than it was at the same point last year. March was the largest trade deficit we have had in a very long time. The first quarter, we had a huge deficit. I believe the March trade deficit was the largest worldwide that we have had in over 6 years. It was almost the highest ever.

I am going to support moving forward to discuss this trade bill. There will be some amendments that I would seek to offer. If that is the will of the Congress, those will pass; if not, they will not pass. But fundamentally I do believe it is time for the American people to expect their political leaders to give them some real analysis about what the results of these trade agreements are going to be. Will it help raise wages? Will it create increasing job prospects? Would it increase or reduce our trade deficit? Trade deficits represent a drain and a negative pull on the American economy. Some say they do not make much difference, but they do. It does impact adversely GDP. With regard to those questions, I think we need some answers. I will be asking those as we go forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to share a few more thoughts with my colleagues.

In 2014, net exports—net exports subtracted 1.5 percent from fourth-quarter GDP. That is a lot. GDP growth in the fourth quarter was subtracted by—excuse me, 1.15 percent. That is more than $500 billion. That is enough to fund a highway reauthorization program for a long time.

The problem is that in the short run, Americans tend to be losing jobs as a result of trade agreements; whereas, long-term unemployed people have a difficult time finding work. I would say

I believe in trade, but it is not a religion with me. I believe it is a religion when somebody says that you should enter into a trade agreement with anybody, opening your markets totally without demanding anything in return for that.

I have to tell you, as I just read from others—it is clearly the policy of the Wall Street Journal—that is good policy, that you should enter into a trade agreement whether or not your partner will allow you to sell anything at all to them. I say good negotiations in a contract are, which a trade negotiation is, if we open our markets, our competitors ought to open theirs sufficiently. Too often we have the problems that arise from nontariff barriers that are impacting the ability of American businesses to sell products in their country. So even if they reduce their tariff, their ability to sell products is blocked by other nontariff matters, all of which I think we can discuss in the weeks to come.

Let's be sure we understand where this trade agreement is taking us, what the philosophy and approach behind it is, and let's be sure it serves the interests of the American people first.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the vote now, 5 minutes earlier than we planned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider the vote on which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Joni Ernst, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, Thad Cochran, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, John McCain, James Lankford, Patrick J. Toomey, Roy Blunt, Ron Johnson, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, David Vitter, Ben Sasse.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Leg.]

YEAS—65

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

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	King	Reid
Boxer	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown	Leahy	Schatz
Cardin	Manchin	Schumer
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Donnelly	Menendez	Tester
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—2

Cassidy	Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 65, the nays are 33.

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

The Senator from New Hampshire.

DON'T TAX OUR FALLEN PUBLIC SAFETY HEROES ACT

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 606, the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act, which was received from the House.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 606) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

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

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 606) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I am very honored to be here today with my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN. We worked together on this important bill that has just passed the Senate and had previously passed the House of Representatives.

This week is National Police Week. We were honored to receive law enforcement officers representing more than 20 agencies in New Hampshire, including the Brentwood police chief and many members of his department. They are here joining thousands of officers and families of law enforcement to remember and honor those who have given the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty to keep the rest of us safe.

Last night during a candlelight vigil, 273 fallen officers from across the Nation whose names were added this week to the national memorial were honored, including Officer Stephen Arkell from New Hampshire, from the Brentwood Police Department, who lost his life in the line of duty a year ago Tuesday. Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with Officer Arkell's family and with the Brentwood Police Department.

Unfortunately, more than a year after his death, his family is still waiting for their survivor benefits. We are here today to discuss the bill that was just passed by the Senate—H.R. 606, the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act—which Senator SHAHEEN and I worked on together.

Recently, Senator SHAHEEN and I had the opportunity to sit down and have a roundtable with many law enforcement officers, fire chiefs and firefighters from our State. We heard many of the challenges that the families of those law enforcement officers and firefighters who lost their lives in the line of duty face to get the survivor benefits that they should receive.

One of those challenges is the fact that while survivor benefits for the families of our fallen firefighters and law enforcement officers are tax free,

unfortunately, ambiguity in the tax has forced families to apply for private letter rulings from the IRS to have that clarified. Our bill will ensure that they no longer have to go through this bureaucratic step when it comes to their survivors' benefits.

It ensures that the benefits their survivors receive for the sacrifice they have made are not taxed under the Internal Revenue Code. These benefits are intended to help those families and make sure that when they go through this incredibly tragic loss, they are able to continue with their lives.

I thank Congressman ERIK PAULSEN from Minnesota for working with us to get this bill passed through the House of Representatives.

I also thank Senators TOOMEY and CARDIN for their work in the Senate Finance Committee to pass this legislation and Senate Finance Committee Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN for their work to help get this important legislation passed.

I most of all thank my colleague Senator SHAHEEN because this issue is so important to law enforcement officers and firefighters in New Hampshire. Our public safety officers who go out every single day on our behalf—every hour, every holiday, every weekend—to make sure we are safe. When, unfortunately, we lose one of them in the line of duty, as we experienced in New Hampshire too recently, we want to make sure those families are taken care of. That is what this bill does—it makes sure that those families do not have to wait to receive benefits they should receive and that they do not have to go through a rigamarole with the IRS to make sure these benefits are not taxed.

I also want to mention that, in New Hampshire, not only did we unfortunately lose Patrolman Stephen Arkell a year ago, but in 2012 we also lost Greenland Chief of Police Mike Maloney, who was about to retire. Both of those families have been down here for National Police Week. Our prayers continue to be with their families and the families of every single law enforcement officer and firefighter who makes sure we are safe every single day.

I am so glad this legislation passed during National Police Week. We are going to continue to work together to make sure that the families of public safety officers that lose their lives in the line of duty do not have to go through any bureaucratic red tape to get their survivor benefits.

I want to thank Senator SHAHEEN for her work on this issue.

I yield to Senator SHAHEEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am very pleased to be here to join my colleague Senator AYOTTE in applauding the passage in both the House and the Senate—today in the Senate—of H.R. 606, the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act.

As Senator AYOTTE said so eloquently, this is legislation we have worked on for over a year. It was first introduced in the last Congress. Now, it is finally on its way to the President's desk to become law, and it couldn't be happening at a more important time.

This is National Police Week, but maybe more important for New Hampshire, this week we celebrate the memory of Officer Stephen Arkell of Brentwood. He was killed in the line of duty just a year ago this week. Last night, Officer Arkell's name was added to the Roll of Honor of police officers killed in the line of duty at the National Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington, DC.

Officer Arkell was not only a terrific police officer, he was a very good and decent man. As I read in one newspaper, he was the kind of police officer who would rather write a warning than a ticket, and he aimed to end fights with words instead of handcuffs.

Well, it has been a full year since we lost Officer Arkell. We don't forget, and we will never forget his example of courageous public service. Day in and day out, our public safety officers, our police, our firefighters, and their families make enormous sacrifices.

Now, family members fully understand the dangers of their spouses' jobs. They live with that constant worry. But when the worst happens in the line of duty to a loved one, the last thing a surviving family should have to worry about is navigating the Federal Tax Code. For too long, families of police officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty have had to wrangle with the IRS to exempt death benefits from taxation. They have had to hire lawyers and wait years for a ruling from the IRS and, in the meantime, their urgently needed benefits are held up.

This is just unacceptable, and today it ends. Thankfully, the House and Senate have passed a bill to exempt these death benefits from taxation, ending any ambiguity that may have existed. So this is legislation that should not just help the Arkell family, but it should help families across this country.

I applaud the work of my colleague Senator AYOTTE on this bill, all of our colleagues in the Senate who have helped to make this happen and also those in the House who understood the need to help support our fallen public safety heroes. When the President signs this bill into law, this problem will finally be cleared up once and for all.

Again, I thank my colleague Senator AYOTTE for all of her work on this issue. I am delighted it is finally done and look forward to making sure it gets implemented in a way that continues to support the surviving families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before I speak on the trade legislation—and the distinguished chairman of the committee is on the floor as well—I wish to note that the Finance Committee, under the leadership of Chairman HATCH, has already passed a version of this important legislation.

Now we have taken up the House bill—our companion legislation. I congratulate both of my colleagues. Senator SHAHEEN has talked to me about this a number of times. I know Senator AYOTTE is very interested in it as well. I congratulate both of them.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, if I could make my remarks about trade, Chairman HATCH has graciously allowed me to make a few comments at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, with the votes that have been cast today in the Senate, the Senate has begun to develop a powerful and bipartisan message that the trade policy of the 1990s will be unacceptable in 2015.

The Customs and Enforcement package passed this morning goes a long way toward breaking new ground. We will be talking about the final two elements of the overall trade package, trade promotion authority, and trade adjustment assistance. But until we are done with this debate, I will be referring to the chart next to me because what we will be outlining are all of the specific areas that demonstrate that this legislation is going to finally put the 1990s and NAFTA in the rearview mirror and fix many of its flaws.

For example, in the NAFTA era, American priorities, like rights for working families and environmental protection, were an afterthought, and they were stuck in unenforceable side agreements. With this legislation, they will be bedrock elements of future trade agreements. Back in those NAFTA days, the United States pretty much just asked our trading partners to enforce their own labor and environmental laws, and then we sort of hoped for the best.

The trade promotion act says that if a trading partner's laws fall short, they are going to be required to pass new laws to fix the problem, and for the first time, these labor and environmental protections will be fully enforceable, enforceable because they are backed by the threat of trade sanctions.

So the NAFTA-era policies, colleagues, had no teeth. In effect, this legislation raises the global bar on labor rights and environmental protection.

We are going to hear a lot about how somehow this is just more of the same, and it is going to promote a race to the bottom. What we intend to spell out in the days ahead is how this creates new momentum to push our standards up, rather than promote a race to the bottom.

For the first time, I wish to note—with the support of our colleagues, the outstanding work done by our colleague from Maryland, BEN CARDIN—now human rights will be a negotiating objective for our future trade agreements.

Back in the NAFTA era, the United States fought for intellectual property protection for drugmakers, but nobody was trying to do much of anything to look for people stuck in hardship around the world who needed access to affordable medicine. That also will change with this legislation.

The old NAFTA playbook was written in a time when cell phones were about as big as bricks and Internet commerce was still a dream. Today, it is right at the heart of our economy.

So our new approach to trade is going to help cement American leadership in the digital economy. Even now, in 2015, you have repressive governments in China, Russia, and elsewhere building digital walls that block the free flow of information and commerce online. If that trend continues, it would chop the Internet up into small, country-sized pieces. In my view, the Internet is the shipping lane of the 21st century, and products sent around the world in bits and bytes are just as important as products packaged into shipping containers and sent across the oceans. I strongly believe this is the best chance to fix what NAFTA got wrong and introduce a new day in American trade policy.

The only way for our country to defend an open Internet, promote access to affordable medicine, protect our values on labor standards, environmental protections, and human rights is to fight for them as part of our trade negotiations. Certainly nobody else is going to pick up the American banner and fight for those kinds of progressive American values in the way we can. In fact, it is my view that if our country fails to lead the way, it will be China that steps in to write rules, rules that very likely could hurt American workers and our exporters. So we have to engage with modern, progressive trade policies and with a higher bar for trade agreements.

I recognize there are skeptics with doubts about trade deals and the process of moving them through Congress. I think we can still take steps to try to reach out to those who have been critical about past trade policy, find common ground, and lock those new policies into the future way in which we make a trade law.

I have indicated for many months that I think those who are skeptical about our trade policies have a valid point when they talk about the excessive secrecy that has so often accompanied much of the trade discussion. My view has been, if you believe strongly in the benefits of trade—and particularly those high-skilled, high-wage export jobs, and you want more of them—why in the world would you want to have all of this secrecy that just makes Americans so aware of the fact that something isn't coming to light? They are wondering whether there is a reason something has been hidden.

Now, it has been too common that Oregonians and other Americans have no way of knowing what is on the table in trade talks or how they would be affected. That was a problem with NAFTA, and it has been a problem that has continued over the years.

There is no question about the need for protecting some of the details in our trade negotiations. I often say at a townhall meeting that nobody is talking about giving out the secret sauce in some particular product. But today Americans have reasonable expectations to be able to fire up their computer, click open their browser, and learn about the public policies that affect them and their families.

It is time to close the book on those days when Americans were kept in the dark on trade. The reality is, under the old playbook, that NAFTA playbook, the President could be handed an agreement for signature and put pen to paper right away.

So nothing illustrates better than the changes that Chairman HATCH, I, and Chairman RYAN have worked on to put in place a fresh set of policies to ensure that the American people are no longer in the dark with respect to trade.

Under this legislation, the President, by law, will have to make the full text of trade deals public for 60 days before a President can sign them. When you factor in the Congress, agreements would be public for as many as 100 days before they are voted on and often more.

So what that means is, if you live in West Virginia, Utah, Oregon or Alaska, you will be able to come to one of our community meetings and have in your hands the trade agreement, starting with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, for more than 3 months before your Senator or your Member of the House has cast a vote on them. For more than 3 months, the American people will have the actual text, starting with the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement. I think that is a long overdue change. I will say, that is a very dramatic change. That is part of the reason why I note that this TPA is certainly not one that resembles the NAFTA era on transparency.

Finally, on the transparency front, long before the deals are finalized, our trade officials would be required to give detailed and public updates on what is at stake in the negotiations. Every Member of Congress will have access to the full text, from beginning to end, and the doors will be open for Members to attend negotiating sessions and briefings.

Perhaps the most important new tool in this legislation is a new procedure for hitting the brakes on bad trade deals before they reach the Senate or House floor. If a trade deal doesn't meet the high bar the Congress sets under this progressive, modern approach, it will be a whole lot easier to shut it down. It is my view that protecting that ability makes the process more democratic, and all of those upgrades will close the door on the 1990s and NAFTA once and for all.

The second matter at hand now is the support system for American workers known as trade adjustment assistance, and paired with that program is the health coverage tax credit.

When times are tough for workers and industries affected by trade, the health coverage credit guarantees that those persons and their families will still be able to see their doctors. And trade adjustment assistance is there to help with job training and financial support. It is a lifeline for more than 100,000 Americans today, including 3,000 in Oregon, and it helps to guarantee that those workers and their families have a springboard to a new set of opportunities where they can have for themselves and their families a new opportunity for good-paying jobs and a chance to get ahead.

The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program has spent the last few years working at reduced capacity. That would change with this legislation. Trade adjustment assistance would be back at full strength in the year 2021 with a level of funding the administration says will cover everybody who qualifies. Once again the program would bring service workers into the mix because it is not just manufacturing employees who face competition from abroad. Trade adjustment assistance takes into account competition that comes from anywhere, including China and India, instead of just a select list of countries.

I want to be clear that the Senate is not voting today to give the green light to the Trans-Pacific Partnership or any other trade agreement. As I see it, this is legislation which raises the bar for trade deals and challenges our negotiators to meet it. It will go further than ever before in stripping the secrecy out of trade policy and will provide new accountability by protecting our ability to slam the brakes

on trade deals that don't work for our hard-working middle class.

When you put these vast improvements together with a next-level enforcement system, it is my view that you have a long-overdue progressive, modern approach that sets aside the NAFTA playbook. This is a plan which will help get trade done right so that it works better for all Americans, whether they are a service professional, a business owner, or a worker who punches the time clock at the end of the day.

I will close with just a short statement about why this is especially timely right now. All the evidence suggests that in 2025 there are going to be 1 billion middle-class workers in the developing world. These are going to be workers with money to spend. They are going to buy computers and helicopters and bicycles, their companies will buy planes, and the list goes on and on. It is my hope and I think the hope of every Member of the Senate that we have a trade policy that ensures our workers can have the opportunity to export what we make here and what we grow here—the products of the United States—to this 1-billion-person middle-class market.

Let's take this opportunity—a bipartisan opportunity—to have a fresh new trade policy that increases the prospect of having American workers, who are the best and most competitive workers on the planet, sell the goods and services they make and deliver them to that enormous market that wants to buy American, wants to buy Oregon. It just seems to me to be obvious that we should take the opportunity to tap the potential of that market.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, while my colleague from Oregon is still on the floor, I want to thank him for his leadership through these discussions over these past several days on the floor and longer prior to that. He has been a leader in trying to thread the needle, and it has been a little bit harder, but I appreciate the fact that we are here today and hopefully moving forward to that agreement that will allow us as a nation to be the best we can and to engage in a level of trade that is fair, free, and really of great benefit to us as a nation. I thank him for that.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Madam President, I too want to speak about the trade promotion authority and some of the issues associated with it, but I first want to speak briefly and acknowledge the comments made by my colleagues from New Hampshire when they spoke about National Police Week and honoring those brave men and women who serve us day in and day out, those who go where many of us would choose not to, whose families worry about them, and those who have fallen in the line of their service.

This is National Police Week in the Nation's Capital and across America. Each year during National Police Week I honor the men and women of law enforcement who have given their lives in the line of duty. In previous Police Week speeches I have taken note of the sad coincidence that a spate of line-of-duty casualties seems to happen in the days and weeks leading up to National Police Week.

This year, unfortunately, is no exception. Last weekend the Nation was shocked by the shooting of two members of the Hattiesburg, MS Police Department. A week ago two communities lost law enforcement officers bearing the last name of Moore—Detective Brian Moore of the New York Police Department and Sergeant Greg Moore of Coeur d'Alene, ID. They are among 45 law enforcement heroes who have died in the line of duty this year alone. I extend my condolences to their families and to their communities on these tragic losses. And I extend my support to my colleagues from the States of Idaho, Mississippi and New York who share in the grief of their communities. In the U.S. Senate we take the loss of a first responder personally for we regard these public servants as members of our own extended families.

During National Police Week we honor and remember the 117 law enforcement officers lost in 2014. Their names were read at a candlelight vigil on Judiciary Square Wednesday evening and their memories will be honored at the Peace Officers Memorial Service on the Capitol grounds on Friday. This week the families and colleagues of these 117 officers are gathered in Alexandria at the Police Survivors Seminar sponsored by Concerns of Police Survivors, where they will gain comfort from a community of survivors who have walked in their steps. This week's events are very important steps in the lengthy journey our families face to heal their losses. But it is a vital step.

I have attended the Police Survivors Seminar and cannot say enough good things about Concerns of Police Survivors and Suzie Sawyer, its founding executive director, who set the standard for caring and healing. Although Suzie claims to have retired, when we face a law enforcement tragedy in the State of Alaska I am comforted by the fact that her phone number is still in my speed dial. Sadly I had an opportunity to use it in 2014.

Last evening I attended the candlelight vigil as I have in past years to honor fallen officers from the State of Alaska. Joined on the dais by the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of Homeland Security I was honored to read the names of two Alaska State Troopers who gave their lives while protecting the Native Village of Tanana in 2014. Trooper Sergeant P. Scott Johnson and Trooper Gabriel Lenox Rich at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

I have spoken before about the unique dangers that are presented when law enforcement officers perform their duties in Alaska Native villages. No roads connected most of these villages to the nearest trooper post which can be hundreds of miles away, accessible only by air or boat and only then when the weather cooperates. And that was the case when Sergeant Johnson and Trooper Rich were ambushed in the village as they sought to apprehend an individual who was driving while intoxicated in the village and brandished a weapon at the unarmed village public safety officer.

There is no consoling those who remember the lives and passions of Scott and Gabe. But it matters that their life stories were not forgotten. Fallen law enforcement officers are heroes for the way they live their lives. And at last night's observance the stories of Scott and Gabe were an integral part of the event. Attorney General Loretta Lynch spoke to their heroism as did the event organizers. For the first time I can remember you could see the distinctive tunics worn by our Alaska State Troopers among the crowd of 10,000, and as the event ended my staff encountered two members of the Fairbanks Police Department in uniform on the streets of downtown Washington. They traveled at their own expense to pay their respects to two individuals from Interior Alaska who were widely respected by area wide law enforcement. Sergeant Johnson was well known as a ''cop's cop''. He was well known as both a drug expert and a tactical expert.

The Fairbanks officers mentioned that Scott was gracious with his time and his expertise—providing training to the Fairbanks Police Department that otherwise would have cost tens of thousands of dollars. Gabe Rich was a young guy and mentored by the finest of Alaska's finest—Sergeant Johnson—and he demonstrated great potential. Both lived their lives as model Alaska State Troopers.

Service as an Alaska State Trooper is regarded as a huge deal in our State. I am reminded that there are 700,000 law enforcement officers across the country but only 400 have what it takes to be Alaska State Troopers. Guardians of the last frontier.

In May I came to the floor to discuss the lives of Scott and Gabe and the families they left behind. Today I would like to pay homage to the organization they were a valuable part of and devoted their lives to. And I pay homage to the creed they willfully and

enthusiastically chose to live their lives by.

I ask unanimous consent that the Creed of the Alaska State Trooper be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CREED OF AN ALASKA STATE TROOPER

From the beginning, society has needed a special few willing to face evil and run toward harm for the sake of others. I am one of those few. I am an Alaska State Trooper. My environment is harsh, vast and unforgiving. I thrive in it. My state is beautiful, majestic and the last of its kind. I will protect it. My integrity is absolute. My loyalty is to what is ethical, right and true. My courage will not falter. Fear does not control me. I am the master of my actions and emotions, regardless of circumstance. When action is needed, I will act. If I fall, I will get back up. If I fail, I will try again. I will either find a way or make one I will never give up. I will be physically superior, mentally tougher and more tenacious than those determined to bring harm to others. I will enhance my knowledge and proficiency every day. My training will never cease. I am a quiet professional. I do not seek recognition for my actions. I accept and will overcome the mental and physical hazards of my profession. I will do what is necessary to place the needs of others before my own. Because I endure this, others won't have to. Titles will not define me. No man will determine my worth. I will live my life according to the creed I have written on my heart, regardless of my position, rank or title. I will stand on the shoulders of those who have gone before me. I am honor bound to maintain the proud traditions of Alaska's finest. The fallen are honored by my actions and I commit myself daily to the mighty cause of preserving this honor. I am an Alaska State Trooper.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I will close with these words which appear at the gates to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. The words of President George H.W. Bush: ''Carved on these walls is the story of America, of a continuing quest to preserve both democracy and decency, and to protect a national treasure that we call the American dream.'' Last evening the names of Patrick Scott Johnson and Gabriel Lenox Rich were carved into those walls. A reminder, once again, that in valor there is hope.

Madam President, returning to the issue of trade in my State of Alaska, we are here to debate trade promotion authority. We have had an opportunity to proceed to this measure. I was pleased to be able to vote to advance it earlier this week and again today, and I will continue to support free trade.

In my State, which is separated from the contiguous 48 States, our trade is based primarily with those to the west in Asia. Most of our trade does not go to the lower 48 States. So when we think about our trading partners, for Alaskans, it is international trade. International trade in our State supports about 1 in 5 jobs—over 90,000 Alaskan jobs. Of those who are exporters, about 70 percent are small- and medium-sized companies. These are men and women who are engaged in a very sophisticated level of trade overseas, but many of them are relatively small. We are very vigorous in our trade with Japan, South Korea, and China, but we also have good relationships, of course, with our friends in Europe and elsewhere around the globe.

In 2013, the countries that are negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership—the TPP—and the TTIP agreements comprised about 54 percent of Alaska's exported goods. This is a significant part of what we look to for our exports. As we look to the TPP and the benefits that it will accrue, I think our State is looking to clearly strengthen these relationships as well as open new markets for Alaska's exports.

About 34,000 Alaska jobs are supported by trade with TPP countries. Thirty-six percent of Alaska's goods are exported to TPP countries, and more than 50 TPP companies have investments within the State of Alaska.

One of our longest and more established trading partners—Japan—is obviously not a current U.S. FTA partner, but the TPP negotiations will provide an avenue for removing some of the trade barriers we see with Japan and will allow us additional economic opportunities within the State of Alaska, specifically as it relates to our fish, our fisheries, and our frozen fish. Current tariff rates to export frozen fish and prepared crabs to Japan are about 10 percent, so a free-trade agreement will lower these tariffs and increase access to Japan's seafood market. This is something we care a great deal about, and it has been a very longstanding partnership and relationship.

Today, I want to move from some of the issues relating to my State and what opportunities there will be for us with the prospect of trade promotion authority moving forward and I want to draw attention to a related issue. This is an issue that is outdated when it comes to exports and, very specifically, a ban on exports. What I am referring to is the current ban, the prohibition on crude oil exports. This absolutely runs counter to the principle of free trade as well as the notion that we should stand ready to help our allies, to help our friends for the sake of global security.

We talk a lot about national security. We talk a lot about what more we can do to provide for national security and the geopolitics and how we can be of help to our friends and allies. Well, one way we can demonstrate our willingness to help is by lifting this decades-old ban, this prohibition on our crude oil and allow for exports.

I want to share with my colleagues five quick facts they may or may not know about our Nation's history of oil exports, because while we have this ban in place—and it has been in place since the mid-1970s—there is a history that I think is important.

The first fact goes back to World War II. The United States exported tens of millions of barrels of crude oil to our allies in World War II, and I am talking about Canada, the United Kingdom, India, and Australia. We were engaged in a very robust level of exports to our friends during World War II.

Second fact: When Egypt seized control of the Suez Canal, President Eisenhower moved quickly, and he ordered American oil to relieve what was called Europe's oil famine. That was pretty immediate, that was pretty direct, and it was targeted to help our allies and friends at that time.

Third fact: When Rhodesia cut off the flow of oil to Zambia in 1965, America stood with Britain to provide assistance. We delivered petroleum products in the Zambian airlift. So we were there in 1965 when Zambia needed that assistance.

Then, in the 1970s, facing a threat from multiple regimes, Israel secured an agreement from the United States to supply it with oil in the event of a national emergency. So this agreement was made back in 1975. This was under the administration of President Ford, and that agreement was that the United States would stand with our friend and ally and provide oil in the event that their sources were threatened, that Israel was threatened.

That agreement stood through President Ford's administration, President Carter's, President Bill Clinton's, President George Bush's, and with President Obama's administration. So it is an agreement that has endured—that we will stand by our friend Israel in providing it with a source of oil in the event of a national emergency. This is something where we just got the administration to sign off on this just literally a month or so ago, to reaffirm that agreement.

Then, the fifth fact here is that former Ambassador Carlos Pascual and others have testified before our energy committee that the sanctions against Iran—which brought Iran to the table—worked. They worked because of rising U.S. oil production. He went further to say that we were hamstrung by our inability to export it.

We have heard this consistently in the energy committee. We heard this discussed on the floor of the Senate the past couple of weeks when we were talking about the Iran deal. Today, we are in a position where our friends, our trading partners, and our allies are again asking for our assistance. We have the resource.

Some would say we are awash in oil right now. The production we have seen has been nothing short of phenomenal. But we are tied. We are limited in our ability to move it beyond our shores. Our allies are looking at us, and they are in the grips of tension.

Look at our friends and allies in Poland. Poland is 96-percent dependent on

Russia for their oil. Don't we think that Poland would rather receive their oil from their friend the United States? Poland has been there with us when it comes to national missile defense. With just about every engagement we have had, Poland has been there for us. Wouldn't it be nice for us to be there for our friend Poland?

Just a couple weeks ago, we had the Prime Minister of Japan here, Mr. Abe. Iran is still supplying oil to Japan, despite those sanctions. Japan needs a source of oil. Don't we think that Japan would much rather receive oil from the United States—more crude from the United States?

I think we recognize the world has changed out there. There are new alliances, there are new threats, there are new hopes, and there are new fears. It remains my hope that, while the world may change, our role as a global leader has not eroded. And one way—one clear, sure way—we can ensure that it hasn't eroded is to help our friends and to use our resource as a national strategic asset to help our friends and allies.

The whole idea that oil exports are still prohibited is just mind-boggling. I have been working on this now for over a year. We have been encouraging different reports so people really understand this issue and wrap their minds around it, because to change a policy that has been in place for decades takes understanding and education. I am willing to give that time, but I also appreciate that the policy that is in place right now just doesn't make sense.

The Commerce Department retains a list of commodities that are defined in short simply, and they call this the Short Supply Controls. Historically, these controls were generally not blanket prohibitions. They were on things such as aluminum, copper, iron, steel scrap, nickel, selenium, and the polio vaccine.

But it is interesting—we look at that Short Supply Controls list right now, and there are three items on that list. The first, obviously, is crude oil; the second is western red cedar; and the third is horses for export by sea intended for slaughter.

Now, there is a small caveat, because there is a prohibition of exports of petroleum products that would come from the Naval Petroleum Reserve, but it is very small. So really what we are talking about and the three items that are on this Short Supply Controls list—in other words, prohibited—are oil, cedar, and horses. Go figure.

Now, we do have embargoes on North Korea, for example, and we control the export of other things such as sensitive technology. But crude oil's presence on the Short Supply Controls, I think, is particularly conspicuous, since we export our petroleum products—our refined products—at record levels. I think it is important for people to make that distinction because sometimes there is a little bit of confusion.

We export our refined products at record levels. What we don't export is the crude. Some people say: Well, I am afraid that if we lift the oil export ban and we allow for crude export, the price of oil or the price at the pump is going to go up, and I am worried about that. I think we would all be worried about that. We don't want to see the price of gasoline at the pump go up. The fact remains that what we put in our vehicle, what we pump at the filling station is a refined product that we already export. So we don't see that price spike; we don't see that increase. What we don't refine is the crude product.

We have engaged in study after study after study. There have been about eight different, very reputable studies out there, and each and every one of them has come to the same conclusion—that allowing for the lifting of the export ban will not increase the price of gas to the consumer. I think it is important to reaffirm that.

I urge my colleagues who are ready to vote for trade promotion authority to consider joining my effort. My colleague Senator HEITKAMP from North Dakota is working with me on the other side to lift this ban, to extend the principle of free trade to crude oil exports.

We export natural gas. We export diesel, jet fuel, gasoline, natural gasoline, propane, coal—so many other petroleum products.

I should end by reminding people that the ban that we have in place does allow for certain limited amounts of export. Today, we export to Canada about 4,000 barrels a day. I think that is about average right now. With Alaska, there is an exception that allowed for export of Alaska crude back in the mid 1990s. I just asked for confirmation on what we have been exporting. Last year, in September of 2014, we exported about 800,000 barrels to South Korea, and I am told that just this month, in May, there were 975,000 barrels that went over to South Korea.

So we in Alaska are trying to do our little bit to help. We need to get our oil pipeline filled up so that we can do more to export more to those who are our friends, partners, and allies. But this is something for which, again, the time is now. The subject is ripe as we are talking about allowing for greater opportunities for export. But when we look to those policies that hold us back—hold us back from good jobs, from producing our resources to our benefit and our economy's benefit and to the benefit of our friends and allies—it is time that we lift the ban on crude oil. Doing so will create jobs, strengthen our security, lower our trade deficit, and, again, as study after study has shown, not raise our gasoline prices.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the time on the floor this afternoon, and look forward to working with my colleagues on these issues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I thank the Presiding Officer for letting me talk about the trade agenda this afternoon. And I appreciate the words of my colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, regarding the liquefied natural gas exports and oil exports.

This is a discussion about how we ensure that we are accessing the 95 percent of consumers who live outside of our borders. For the workers and farmers I represent in Ohio, that is really important. This is how we are going to be able to get this economy back on track. In part, it is to provide more markets—more customers.

Already in my State of Ohio, we depend heavily on exports. One out of every three acres that is planted in Ohio—we are one of the top farm States in the country. We are proud of that. It is the No. 1 industry. One out of every three acres that is planted is exported. Of our soybean crop, which is typically our biggest crop in Ohio, 60 percent gets exported. So for farmers, in order to keep their prices up, these foreign markets are absolutely critical.

But it is also really important for our manufacturing sector in Ohio. About 25 percent of our manufacturing jobs are export jobs. And, frankly, what has happened over the last 7 years, while America has not been in the business of opening up these markets, is that they are beginning to lose their market share.

So it is good for us to expand exports. We have to do that because that creates not only more jobs in my State and in our country, but it also creates better jobs. These are higher-paying jobs with better benefits.

Those 95 percent of consumers outside of the United States border deserve to get some products stamped ''Made in America'' because they are great products. They are great agricultural products, great manufacturing products, great services. We should be aggressively expanding our exports.

But while we do that, we have to be sure it is fair, too. We have to be sure that these other countries are not sending us imports that are traded at below their cost—that is called dumping—that they aren't illegally subsidizing their exports, which happens. That is when you put duties in place to make sure they are not doing things to make the playing field unlevel, and so that our workers who are doing all the right things—playing by the rules, becoming more competitive, and making concessions to be competitive—are not left holding the bag and don't get the short end of the stick. Instead, they get the ability to compete on a level

playing field. If they can do that, they will be just fine. We will be able to expand exports, and therefore, create these better-paying jobs we talked about.

That is what this debate should be all about. It is about a balance. It is about expanding exports, at the same time making sure that the rules of the road work for all of us, including our workers and our farmers, our service providers in my State of Ohio and all around our great country.

I am delighted to see that we are moving forward with this debate because it is an honest debate we have to have.

And for those who just say that we can expand exports but we can't do anything about this unfair trade, I think that is not the right balance. For those who say we shouldn't be doing these exports because somehow that doesn't help our workers because there is so much unfair trade out there, that doesn't work, either. There is a balance in between here.

One of the issues I have spent a lot of time working on over the years and looking at is this trade distortion called currency manipulation. Look, I understand it is a complicated area, and some people think we just shouldn't touch it or maybe it is something that only the Department of Treasury can deal with because it is currency. It is not technically products and goods. But I would say that there is not a Member in this body who doesn't believe that when another country manipulates its currency to expand its exports, that that affects trade. It is just obvious.

If you are trying in a deliberate way to lower the cost of your exports by lowering the value of your currency vis-á-vis another country, such as us, that is going to help you in trade.

I had the fasteners in here this week. These are the people who make nuts and bolts and screws, and they are big in Ohio. We are happy to have a good fastener industry in Ohio. But they will tell you that their margins are pretty tight.

Chairman Volcker, who was the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, made an interesting statement. He said that, in 1 week, through currency manipulation, we can do away with all the benefits of years of trade negotiations. Sadly, I think that is true.

So while we are promoting exports, we should also make it clear that we do not believe we should distort trade. And for our Republican colleagues, those of us who believe in markets, we should be against distortions—and this is a market distortion. We should speak up about it and not be shy about it and not suggest that somehow, because it is something that traditionally has been handled by the Treasury Department and by the International Monetary Fund and as a currency issue, it doesn't affect trade. It does affect trade.

Now, if they were making great progress on it at the International Monetary Fund, I might feel differently about it. But why not include it as a trade negotiating objective? I think it makes all the sense in the world. We are going to have an amendment to do just that, and it will be on the floor next week as we take up the trade promotion authority.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at it, objectively. It is very targeted. It does not deal with a country being able to adjust its monetary policy. It explicitly says it does not relate to monetary policy, macroeconomic policy. It has to do with deliberate intervention in currency markets to have this benefit in exports we talked about, again, to distort the free market in order for other countries to be able to sell their products to us at a lower value than they should be and in turn, for our exports to them to be at a higher value, which makes it harder for us to keep jobs here in America.

People say this is all about the auto industry. Yes, the autoworkers care about it, and they should—so do the auto companies, so do the fastener companies, so do the steel companies, so does anybody or any group in Ohio that is concerned about ensuring that they get a level playing field for their exports, because currency manipulation does not help anybody. People say: Well, why are you doing this now, because these countries, such as Japan, are not currently manipulating their currency? I agree. Since probably the end of 2011, 2012, Japan stopped manipulation of their currency. They would not fall under these criteria we played out. But they have done it over 300 times in the past.

All we are saying is this: Is it not right that when we are negotiating an agreement, we put in place some kind of discipline to say we do not want you to do this in the future because it is not fair for you and for us? Trade ought to be about balance—not just a balance of expanding exports but also having enforcement measures in place to level that playing field I talked about, and balance in the sense that we sell something to you, we get some money from doing that, and we use that money to buy something from the other place. So you have a balance in terms of trade. You do not have these huge surpluses you see in countries such as China, for instance, where they have manipulated their currency.

I hope this issue will be one that we can address in an objective manner. Take the politics out of it. Let's decide what is best for the workers and farmers we represent and for the overall health of our economy. If we are going to get back into the business of trade—which I think we should—I think we should be expanding trade by doing good agreements that knock down the barriers to us so that it is fair. If we do that, let's be sure that we can build a consensus for that among the American people, who get it. They understand that we need to have exports. But they also understand that we need to have more fairness.

There are other issues as well that we are going to address in the Senate in the trade promotion authority vote next week. I hope some of them will be issues that we actually voted on today in the Customs bill. Some of you followed this closely, but in the Customs bill there were a number of enforcement measures, not just on currency but also on this issue of how do you show when you are injured, as an American company, if there is unfair trade. If another country sells something over here below its cost—meaning they dumped it here—or if they subsidized something illegally, how do you show as an American company that you have been injured by it in order to get the relief that you and the workers you represent deserve?

Right now, it is very difficult sometimes to show injury, to the point that some companies tell me: ROB, by the time we were able to go through this process and show that we were injured, it was too late. We had lost too much market share. We were not able to get back on our feet.

There is a very simple provision. It is a Brown-Portman amendment that was included in the Customs bill. We voted on it today. I would urge my colleagues to help us get that provision into the TPA bill as well because we know that the Customs bill may or may not make it through the process. We believe that the trade promotion authority bill is much more likely to make it through the process and to the President's desk for signature.

I hope we have that provision in there. I asked my own leadership to include it in the substitute that was filed apparently today. I do not know if it is in there. I am told it is probably not. I am sorry to hear that because it was one that we seem to have a bipartisan consensus on in committee. I thank Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN because they included it in the committee markup on the Customs bill. We did not have a vote as an amendment because they included it in the markup because they thought it was good policy.

Yet, somehow in the substitute, I understand it may not be in there. I hope it is. But if it is not, we intend to offer an amendment to have it included. I hope my colleagues will support that, because, again, if you are talking about trade in a State such as Ohio where we have a lot of manufacturing, you have to be sure to be able to look workers in the eye and say: This is going to be fair for you. Get in this business of trade

because we want to access the 95 percent of consumers outside of our borders, but we are going to help you. If somebody unfairly competes with you by dumping their product or illegally subsidizing their product, you know what, we will be there for you. We are going to be able to level that playing field by adding tariffs to their products because it is illegal what they are doing.

I have been active on this issue back home, not just on the material injury standard, which is what this is about when you get injured in trade, but also on this issue of being sure that we are opening up more markets for all of our Ohio products.

Ohio manufacturers right now in rebar, hot-rolled steel, tires, and uncoated paper are all involved in trade cases such as this—all of them. They all want to know that this is going to be fair.

Wheatland Tube is one of the Nation's largest producers of steel pipe and tube products. They have four facilities in Ohio: one in Warren, one in Niles, one in Cambridge, and one in Brookfield. They make products ranging from steel products for the energy industry, pipe for hydraulic tracking, and so on—construction industry. They have been particularly impacted by a number of these trade enforcement cases, including several crucial cases we won last year on pipe and tube from China. We have had some nice victories for them. In fact, given the import concerns they have, I understand the plant in Warren, OH, which has 178 workers, probably would not be in existence today if we had not won these trade enforcement measures. Here is a plant with 178 people in Warren, OH, who would not have a job today if not for our standing up for them and saying we are going to help you when there is an unfair import coming into this country.

The workers there understand this issue. They get it because they know it has a direct impact on their jobs. Let me read an email I received this week from Mike Mack. Mike is a maintenance foreman at Wheatland Tube in Warren, OH. This is what he said:

As an individual employed in manufacturing, I understand better than most that trade is a key component for economic growth. However, it's important for U.S. manufacturers (i.e. steel pipe and tube producers) to have the tools to challenge unfair trade. . . . I support the adoption of enforcement provisions . . . that will close loop holes in the trade laws to ensure that companies can access these laws to challenge trade distorting practices.

I continue with his quote.

I also support language in the TPA that prevents currency manipulation and the ''dumping'' of foreign products in the U.S.

It's essential that provisions to close loop holes in trade laws are included in a final trade bill. After all, there's a huge difference between FAIR trade and FREE trade.

He says his company ''relies on these laws, and has utilized them in recent years to challenge trade distorting practices that have injured our industry and our employees.''

He says:

Without laws to regulate unfair trade, I know my job—and the jobs of thousands of other manufacturing workers—is at risk.

I think that email says it well. He did not say he is against trade. He did not say he is against exports. In fact, he said that ''trade is a key component for economic growth.'' He supports it. He just wants to know there is going to be a balance.

If there is a balance, Mike will stand up and support trade. But if there is not, he, understandably, is worried about his job and the jobs of his colleagues at that company and the companies all over my State.

I really hope that as we promote trade—and we should—we do so in a more balanced way. If we do that, I think we are going to build a broader consensus for doing exactly what we should be doing—reengaging in the world, expanding markets, and knocking down barriers to trade—tariff barriers and nontariff barriers alike.

As some of you know, I was the U.S. Trade Representative for a while. I had that great honor to be able to travel all around the world representing our great country. Other countries are looking to us to be able to knock down these barriers to trade because they are unfair, because they know that it helps the economies in their countries develop.

Developing countries know in their hearts that higher tariffs and nontariff barriers between countries make it harder to grow a middle class, to be able to bring people out of poverty, and they depend on us for that. They also depend on us to ensure that the rules of the road are fair. It affects us. It affects this plant in Warner, OH, and it also affects them.

They suffer from currency manipulation, too. They suffer from unfairly traded imports, too. Frankly, they are not always strong enough or big enough countries to be able to stand up to it. America's role in the world is truly exceptional. It is truly essential that we are out there. It is true on a whole broad range of issues—from human rights, to fighting terrorism, to keeping open the Strait of Hormuz, the South China Sea, and so on.

It is also important on trade. This is an opportunity for us to stand up here in this Chamber and say we are going to get back into the business of expanding trade. We are going to do it in a balanced way.

Finally, let me mention a specific issue that is part of the trade legislation coming to the floor. This is about something beyond exporting American products. It is about exporting American values and the rule of law. As I said, countries are looking for us, in part, to let people know what the rules of the road ought to be. One of those rules of the road ought to be that we believe that human trafficking ought to be stopped, whether it is in our country or on other shores.

Addressing human trafficking has been a really bipartisan issue here in this body. I serve as cochair of the Senate Caucus to End Human Trafficking. I started it a few years ago with Senator BLUMENTHAL. Since we founded the caucus in 2012, we have made real progress, passing a number of bills to end trafficking in Government contracting, for instance, reauthorizing the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. A few weeks ago we passed a big bill called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. We passed it 99 to 0. Three bills that I had proposed were part of that package. It is good legislation.

As a member of the Finance Committee, I was happy to support a bipartisan amendment to the trade promotion authority that was offered by Senator MENENDEZ. It puts additional teeth into our trafficking enforcement so that countries that are dealing with us in a trade agreement know that we are serious, if year after year they turn a blind eye to the horrible reality of human trafficking in their labor markets and in their countries.

The question before us is this: Do we keep that in this legislation or not? I think we should not water down trafficking protections that have already been adopted by a bipartisan majority of the Finance Committee by a vote of 16–10. I think we should take into account the horrendous human trafficking record of some of the world's worst offenders.

If we do—if we do that—we are going to be able to help stop human trafficking globally. If we do not do that, if we water it down, I fear we are giving some of these countries an easy way out, promoting trafficking by letting countries get around the rules.

Every year, the State Department issues the ''Trafficking in Persons Report,'' or TIP—''Trafficking in Persons Report.'' The report ranks countries. They have different tiers. Tier 1 means the country is responsive and proactive to combating human trafficking. Tier 3 means the country has failed to take steps to prevent trafficking, and the laws and policies of the country actually promote a market that encourages human trafficking, so that is the State Department.

I understand this report—the TIP Report—will be released in June. It has already been substantially drafted. I understand that one of the TPP countries may fall in category 3, tier 3. This government continues to detain trafficking victims for periods of time, treating them as criminals for months or years, we are told. This country does

not support the NGOs, the nongovernmental groups in the region that provide counseling or rehabilitation for victims. This is from the State Department.

The most egregious trend highlighted by the State Department is that this government is now identifying fewer victims and conducting fewer investigations than in recent years.

Should we be concerned about that? Yes, we should. I think there is nothing wrong with us including that, to provide that incentive and to provide that leverage in this TPA bill that we are going to vote on early next week.

The trafficking in persons office is independent. They are not swayed by political considerations. That is my sense of it. It is a good office. I will have enormous respect for their TIP analysis. I will be disappointed if that language is not included in the trade agreement.

Again, the Finance Committee—with the support of five Republicans, including me—passed this amendment, and I think Senator MENENDEZ's attention to this issue is appropriate. I hope it will stand up, as we did with the 99-to-0 vote with regard to the broader legislation.

I thank the Presiding Officer for giving me the ability to talk about these issues today. I think it is incredibly important that we move forward with expanding trade. I think trade promotion authority is needed to do that. But as we do it, let's be sure that we are able to look those workers and those farmers in the eye back home and say: You know what. This is going to work for you, too. It is going to work for all of us. This is going to work because we are giving you access to markets you would not otherwise have. That creates more and better-paying jobs. But we are also going to be sure that it is a more level playing field, that you are able to compete effectively and win because the rules won't be rigged against you. The rules are going to be fair for everybody.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I appreciate the excellent remarks that were made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio and other Senators on the floor this day. There is no question that the Senator from Ohio is a very strong leader when it comes to international trade, having served as the Nation's Trade Representative and having served very well.

Not only was he a great Trade Representative, but he is a great Senator. I have a very high regard for him. I understand why he—just as I am—is working to push this bill through Congress.

We have enough Democrats who are pro-free trade and understand what this bill will do for them, and I think we have enough Republicans. Let's just hope that we can put this through.

Having said all of that, I wish to praise the President. I have had many differences with the President over the years. We have always been cordial. There is no question that I care for him, and I hope he cares for me. But the fact is that on this issue, our President happens to be right, and that is why I was pretty upset the other day when cloture was not invoked. I am glad we were able to work together to overcome that logjam and have the bill on the floor now, and hopefully we will overcome any desire to filibuster this bill in any way, shape, or form.

There have been many heroic Democrats who have worked on this bill, and I want to pay homage to all of them, from Senator WYDEN right on through. They all deserve a lot of credit. There are not enough, but nevertheless a good number, and those folks deserve a lot of credit for standing up for this bill the way they have.

Think about it. The Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, said that 95 to 96 percent of all of the world's consumers live outside of the United States of America. That ought to tell anybody—even an idiot—that this bill is important and that international trade is important. We have all kinds of small and large businesses that are doing trade overseas but are severely limited because of the lack of a free-trade agreements with a wide variety of countries.

The advantage of this particular agreement—and people are starting to realize that it is a very advantageous agreement—is that this will provide great trade relations.

This bill will provide a means whereby 11 countries in the Asian-Pacific—through the Trans-Pacific Partnership—will have great trading rights with us, and us with them.

Additionally, should this bill pass, there are 28 nations in Europe that are party to the TTIP negotiations, and this will be one of the most important things we can do to keep trade alive and interchange with these countries in ways that will benefit not only them but us.

The fact is that we know that trade generally helps us to have better jobs in this country, and the proven fact is that when we negotiate free trade agreements, wages go up. So it is good for our workers, it is good for our consumers because we will be able to purchase products at better prices than we have in the past, and it is good for our country because we will lead the world in trade. Although we are far away from that right now because there are 400 trade agreements in the world and we are only signed on to 20 of them. It shows how lacking we are in negotiating the free-trade agreements that we really ought to.

This bill will push us forward, and it will enable us to create free trade agreements with countries that compose 40 to 60 percent of worldwide trade. That should say to anybody that this is a good thing to do. It creates jobs, it creates opportunities, and it also creates better relationships between our Nation and the almost 40 nations currently in negotiations with us under TPP and TTIP.

Having said that, there are those who do not like this bill. The labor unions, in particular, don't like this bill. I think some of the union members do, because it means a level international playing field for their jobs, higher pay, more opportunity, their States can get well and strong, that their agriculture is going to improve, their industry is going to improve, and their manufacturers are going to improve. I could go on and on. It creates more jobs, more opportunities, and higher paying jobs.

It is pretty hard for anybody to really cite any reason why they should vote against this agreement. A lot of people have misconstrued—some of the most brilliant people in the Senate—that it as though this is the final trade agreement, that is TPP, with 11 nations.

This is TPP. This is the procedural agreement that makes it possible for those nations to sign treaties with us knowing that when the TPP or the TTIP agreements are brought to the Senate and the House, we will simply have a right to a vote those agreements up or down.

After having a complete look at them, there will be lots of transparency. People have been raising the issue that this is not transparent. Well, this is not the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement; this is the mechanism through which we can arrive at a Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. This bill provides more transparency than any other TPA agreement in the past.

This opens up the world for trade and says to the other countries that we are willing to comply with certain rules and regulations if they will. And in the process, we know that we are not going to be able to conclude most of these individual trade agreements with individual nations unless we have trade promotion authority in law because these countries don't want to enter into a very difficult, intensively complex set of negotiations if their only hope is that the negotiations in the trade agreement that they signed would be brought back to the two Houses of Congress that could do whatever they want to with it and open it up to any kinds of amendments. They are not going to sign on to these trade agreements.

We have had some representatives of some of these 11 countries in the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations saying that unless we pass trade promotion authority, they will not sign on to any agreement, and I can hardly

blame them because you never know what Congress is going to do once these agreements come back.

We do have a right to know what they are. We do have a right to look at them thoroughly. We do have a right to debate them on the floor. We do have a right to vote up or down for or against these treaties, and that is a right this particular bill enshrines. That is an important right. On the other hand, we need to have TPA in order to attract other countries to negotiate and conclude agreements with our country, which is what this agreement is all about.

So those who are saying ''Well, this is not transparent'' or ''We don't know what is in the TPP'' and so forth, of course they don't. It is not concluded yet. But this gives us the right to know, this gives us the right to debate, this gives us the right to vote, and this gives us the right to be part of that system.

The administration has made it very clear that they will work in a way that every Senator in the Senate and every Member of the House of Representatives will have a right, if they want to, to participate in the process under certain terms that are really outlined by this particular bill.

What we are talking about here today is future trillions of dollars in trade—not just billions, trillions. We are talking about the United States being a leader of the free world. We are talking about leading other nations to come and work with us for freedom in this world.

Think about it. If we get those mainly Asian-Pacific countries in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement to agree to this agreement and agree to work with us on trade that will send a message to everybody in that area that they better work with the United States as well. It sends a message to every country in the world, really, that if they are willing to work in a fair way with the United States of America then we are willing to work with them.

If we don't pass this legislation, can you imagine what it will do to our relationships with many of these countries that are absolutely critical to our foreign influence? I would say all 11 of the Asian-Pacific and 28 of the European countries are. These are important countries to us. Just the massive percentage of trade in the world that is done by these almost 40 countries says to anybody—any thinking person—you would be crazy not to enter into agreements that outline how we can do things, do them right, protect intellectual property, and do a lot of other things that good trading relationships can grow from.

This will enable us to at least work with the United States Trade Representative, the Ambassador Michael Froman, and conclude these agreements so that everybody in our country will benefit from them. It just makes sense.

Not only that, can you imagine, if we fail to pass TPA—trade promotion authority—the message it will send to almost 40 countries, including ours? Can you imagine what message that would be? Not only that, but it would interfere with foreign policy objectives for our country in many years to come in drastically bad ways.

So the frightened people who don't like this approach, of giving the administration the tools it needs to be able to properly negotiate free-trade agreements with other countries need to understand that this is the best tool Congress has to give the American people the level playing field and competitive edge they have worked so hard for. It also lets other countries know they are going to have to comply with important and relevant terms—and it says to the people in all of those countries that the United States is a dependable partner to deal with.

This is an important debate, and that is why it has come so far. I wish to personally applaud the heroic Democrats who are willing to stand up for this, as well as Republicans. We can always find something wrong with every piece of legislation that comes through this place. I don't know of many that have been perfect, although I am sure there have been a few. Nothing seems to be perfect, but what we try to do here is do the absolute best we can to get as close to perfection as we can. Yes, this is not a perfect bill, but, by gosh, it takes us a long way toward resolving all kinds of disputes and relationships throughout the world.

This is an important bill, and we will begin the real work by holding votes on the bill on Monday. Hopefully, our colleagues will pay attention to what is in this bill and what it really means; that it is not the Trans-Pacific Partnership but that it is a means by which Congress has a say in the Trans-Pacific Partnership and TTIP, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, and it gives us some authority over these matters. Plus, it helps us to comply, cooperate with, and work with the President of the United States and the people he has designated to negotiate these agreements. It is just the right thing to do.

I have to say this would be a crown for the Obama administration should we pass this through. It would be a crown to every Senator and every House Member who votes for it. It is going to be a crown that a lot of people will be able to wear for years to come—at least 6 years—and it will be helpful to future administrations as well.

So I hope our colleagues will help us to pass this bill. I hope they will help us to keep amendments that shouldn't be on and that really aren't helpful off this bill. I hope they will help us to keep the poison pills that sometimes come up around here off, so this bill can pass through and become law. Then, it will enable whatever administration it is—this administration for the next year and a half, approximately—to be able to complete some of these agreements with other countries that are important to our well-being as well as their well-being, that may be as important to our relationship with them as it is to their relationships with us, and to our region as well as their region. To have the United States of America working with them and have them working with us sends a message to a lot of enemies around this world that we are making headway. We are doing things the way they ought to be done, that the United States is a good trading partner, and that as tough as it sometimes is to get these types of landmark pieces of legislation through both Houses of Congress, this one is worthwhile to put through.

I hope we will conclude this in a way that will help the administration do a really good job and will help us to move forward as a nation and will help our economy and help their economies and create greater foreign policy presence for our great country around the world, especially for the countries involved in these agreements.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, this is a very important debate. I was here earlier this week and I look forward to more debate next week. I look forward to a vote on the Portman-Stabenow amendment addressing currency manipulation.

At this point in time, I wish to speak as in morning business, and I ask unanimous consent to do so.

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

REMEMBERING RACHEL JACOBS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today on the floor of the U.S. Senate in memory of a young woman whose life was extraordinary and meaningful and whose passing has left so many of us so profoundly sad.

On Tuesday night, Rachel Jacobs left work and boarded a train to go home to her husband Todd and her 2-year-old son Jacob. Rachel's life, so filled with passion and purpose, was lost that night, along with at least seven others, when her train—and we all know now about the train—derailed just outside of Philadelphia.

Rachel touched so many lives all across the country. Today, all of those hearts are broken. The loss is so profound. Her family has lost a wonderful wife and mother and daughter and sister, and all of us have lost someone who had accomplished so much already in her young life and would have done so much more to make the world a better place if only she had been given the time.

I want my colleagues in the Senate to know Rachel. I want them to know the life she lived. She grew up in the Detroit area, where she was a smart, engaged young woman who was active in her community and always looked for ways to make a difference. She was an exceptionally talented and bright young woman. She went to college at Swarthmore and then to Columbia for her MBA.

Two months ago, she became the CEO of ApprenNet, an online workforce training startup. She had a vision to use technology to help people get the right skills to be successful in the fastest growing sectors of our economy, such as health care.

She was also the cofounder and chair of Detroit Nation, which brought together native Detroiters around the country to stay engaged and connected to their hometown in an effort to create jobs and economic growth.

Rachel did so much for others—something I know she learned from her parents, Gilda and John Jacobs. Gilda is a dear friend of mine and someone who has devoted her own life to public service. I cannot imagine the sadness of her family today. It is small comfort that Rachel's dedication to her family and community is a testament to the wonderful person she was. She was an inspiration to so many and that inspiration will endure.

Rachel's life was not the only one lost on Tuesday night. A Navy midshipman from New York, a college dean, an award-winning Associated Press technology staffer, and five other Americans with families and friends and with so much going for them, and we are finding more who have lost their lives—so many lives cut short in their prime, so many people who were doing so much good in the world.

There are many questions as the investigation into this crash gets underway. Federal authorities are doing their work right now, and the families of those killed or injured deserve answers.

So I was truly stunned yesterday when the House of Representatives voted in committee to slash funding for our infrastructure, including Amtrak. I could not believe that happened. There is something deeply wrong when an unthinkable tragedy such as this occurs—that should serve as a wakeup call to all of us to work together—and not even 24 hours later, Republican Members of Congress act as if nothing had happened.

Our roads and bridges and railroads carry people. They carry young mothers such as Rachel who want to get home to hold their babies. They carry young men such as Justin Zemser, the 20-year-old midshipman at the Naval Academy—a patriot whose contributions to his country could have been incredible. I know, from speaking to Senator SCHUMER who nominated him, he was an incredible young man.

We have a responsibility to the people of this country, to the people who sent us here to represent them, to make sure our infrastructure is secure. Yet we see on the horizon the very real possibility that our highway trust fund will soon be empty. We see the events of yesterday, with a vote in the House Appropriations Committee to slash funding for trains and roads and bridges. It is personally very alarming to me.

As we engage in these discussions over the next few weeks about how to fund transportation in this country, I hope my colleagues will not forget the people who use our transportation system—people like Rachel Jacobs.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

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

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

NIH-SUPPORTED RESEARCH AND ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the idea that biomedical research must be a national priority.

The Presiding Officer and myself, as members of the Appropriations Committee, are in the process of crafting our appropriations bills for fiscal year 2016, and we face a tremendous task in trying to balance effective, efficient government operations with the necessity of righting our Nation's fiscal course during very difficult and challenging times. Therefore, what I take from that—the circumstance we are in—is it is extremely important that we prioritize initiatives that are effective in their service to the American people and demonstrate a significant and sufficient return on investment. Congress should set spending priorities and focus our resources on initiatives with proven outcomes. No initiative meets these criteria better than biomedical research supported by the National Institutes of Health.

NIH-supported research has raised life expectancy, improved the quality of life, lowered overall health care costs, and is an economic engine that strengthens American global competitiveness.

The benefits of NIH are widely acknowledged on a bipartisan basis. During the recent negotiations on the fiscal year 2016 budget agreement, 34 of my Senate colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, cosponsored an amendment I offered affirming NIH biomedical research as a national priority. I was pleased this amendment was included in the final budget agreement passed by Congress.

Furthermore, the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, and the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, have recently agreed to form a Senate NIH—National Institutes of Health—Caucus. I am happy to be a founding member of this caucus, which will offer an opportunity for Senators to visit about the importance of NIH and to seek bipartisan strategies to provide steady, predictable growth for biomedical research.

If the United States is to continue its leadership in providing medical breakthroughs to develop cures and treat diseases, we must be committed to supporting this research.

If researchers cannot rely on consistent support from Congress, we will jeopardize our current programs, we will reduce our progress, stunt our Nation's competitiveness, and lose a generation of young researchers to other careers or other countries.

New scientific findings help us confront the staggering challenges of disease and illness. One such challenge I wish to focus on in my remarks is Alzheimer's. It is a devastating and irreversible brain disease that slowly destroys an individual's cognitive functioning, including memory and thought. Today, more than 5.3 million Americans are living with this terrible disease. Every minute, someone in our country develops Alzheimer's. It is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, and it is the only cause of death among the top 10 in the United States that cannot be prevented, cured or even slowed.

Within these grim statistics are immeasurable suffering and stress this disease places on individuals, on their families, on their friends. This reality hits home in the stories I hear from Kansans.

The Alzheimer's Association's Heart of America Chapter in Prairie Village, KS, tells me about Ricky from Topeka:

Ricky has early onset Alzheimer's disease. He is 60 years old. Due to Alzheimer's disease, Ricky had to retire from a good-paying job because he no longer was able to do the work. He and his family expected him to work at least another 5 years or more, and they had plans that were interrupted that caused them to have to adjust from a two-income family to a single-income family.

Ricky is frustrated at times and tries to maintain a positive attitude with his family and his peers. He and all members of his early stage support group are very scared about their future and they are desperate for a cure. They are worried about the burden they might place upon their families.

Ricky and so many of his peers are continually looking for ways to slow down the progression of this disease. This includes testing himself daily with the use of an iPad, trying new foods, and joining in a research study at the University of Kansas Medical Center. Fortunately, Ricky is still able to ride his Harley Davidson, but he

knows the day is coming when the thing he enjoys so much will not be able to occur again.

I am also aware of Katrina from Shawnee, KS. She is an Alzheimer's Association ambassador and she shared her story:

As personal and health care advocates, my brother and I used more than 7 weeks of personal vacation time—some unpaid—during our mother's final year of care. During the year, she was transitioned through 10 different care facilities, we worked with more than two dozen health care professionals at these locations and some were not [even] notified of her basic needs such as her iodine allergy or insurance—information she was unable to share during her moves. This would be a significant life change for anyone—but especially for our mother, a 67 year old, physically strong woman but cognitively impaired due to early onset dementia diagnosed at [age] 59.

Katrina said they reflect upon her passing, which is now 3 months ago, and the emotional and financial toll of the last 27 months couldn't be quantified—long-term savings and time off from work for vacations were limited, and the time spent at work was interrupted with calls, doctors appointments, and meetings to communicate with care providers ''regarding our mother's ongoing care needs, including behavioral challenges.''

My brother and I are 40 and 37—we have children ages 4 to 15—we worked full time [during this period of time] while doing everything we could to advocate for our mother's care. We are fortunate to have devoted spouses, family, and friends and understanding employers that worked through these difficult times with us.

All of us in the Senate, every American knows someone who has been affected, someone whose family member has been affected by the terrible disease Alzheimer's. It is a tremendous personal tragedy, this disease, but it is also a very expensive disease, and we have a lot to gain both in the care for people and the quality of their lives that we want to maintain.

We also have the opportunity to invest in Alzheimer's research that will reduce the cost of Alzheimer's to us as taxpayers, to health care, to those of us who pay insurance premiums. This is a way we also can save money because, on average, per-person Medicare spending for individuals with Alzheimer's and other dementias is three times higher than Medicare spending across the board for all other seniors. So for Alzheimer's patients, Medicare has per-person expenditures three times the amount of other seniors on Medicare.

This year, the direct cost to America for caring for those with Alzheimer's is estimated at $226 billion—$226 billion. Half of these annual costs—more than $100 billion—will be borne by Medicare. These numbers mean that nearly one in five Medicare dollars is spent on individuals with Alzheimer's disease and other dementias.

In 2050, which isn't that far away, this amount will be one in every three Medicare dollars will be spent on Alzheimer's and dementia diseases. Unless something is done, in 2050, Alzheimer's will cost our country over $1 trillion in 2015 dollars. Taking into account inflation, it will be $1 trillion, and costs to Medicare will increase more than 400 percent to nearly $590 billion.

We must commit to a national strategy for speeding the development of effective interventions for Alzheimer's disease. As the baby boomer generation ages, Alzheimer's has unfortunately become a disease to define a generation, but it doesn't have to be an inevitable part of the aging process. America can tackle Alzheimer's by prioritization of our biomedical research capabilities.

In a recent New York Times editorial, former Speaker Newt Gingrich praised the considerable benefits of NIH and specifically a research breakthrough relating to Alzheimer's. He noted that a breakthrough that could delay the onset of the disease by just 5 years, slow the onset by 5 years, would reduce the number of Americans with Alzheimer's in 2050 by 42 percent and cut costs by a third.

These encouraging statistics—the idea that we can have hope and that there is a better day—these encouraging statistics would also represent increased health and quality of life for both patients and their loved ones. Current research advances give us that reason for hope. Dr. Francis Collins, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, recently stated, ''Alzheimer's research is entering a new era in which creative approaches for detecting, measuring and analyzing a wide range of biomedical data sets are leading to new insights about the causes and course of the disease.''

Dr. Collins calls on our Nation's medical researchers to work smarter, faster, and more collaboratively to determine the best path for progress in Alzheimer's disease research. As an example, NIH is implementing a new initiative called the Accelerating Medicines Partnership, working together with pharmaceutical companies to develop the next generation of drug targets for Alzheimer's disease, as well as rheumatoid arthritis, type 2 diabetes, and lupus.

NIH is also leading the Brain Research through Advancing Intuitive Neurotechnologies Initiative, or BRAIN Initiative, which is a multiagency effort to revolutionize our understanding of the human brain. The objective of the BRAIN Initiative is to enable the development and use of innovative technologies to produce a clear understanding of how individual cells and neurocircuits interact. By better understanding how the brain works, technologies developed under this initiative could help reveal the underlying cause of a wide array of brain disorders. Understanding these causes will provide new avenues to treat, cure, and prevent neurological and psychiatric conditions such as Alzheimer's disease, traumatic brain injury, autism, schizophrenia, and epilepsy.

Groundbreaking research is taking place, and Congress must do its part to prioritize the important work supported by the NIH. As a member of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that is responsible for the funding of NIH, I am committed to working with my colleagues to see that prioritization of NIH occurs and that within NIH there is strong support for Alzheimer's research.

In 2011, Congress passed the National Alzheimer's Plan that specifically lays out a series of scientific milestones that researchers think need to be met in order to make meaningful impact on the trajectory of Alzheimer's by 2025—what is the plan to get us where we need to be by that point in time?

Over the last two years, Congress has provided NIH with approximately $125 million in increased funding to support good science that addresses Alzheimer's disease and other dementias. Additionally, we have worked to include language in the fiscal year 2015 omnibus that requires NIH to submit a yearly budget request for Alzheimer's research based on what is required to fund the necessary science. This particular effort is to make certain we have a specific, accountable research plan to ensure that our resources are effectively targeted to meet these milestones the scientific community has established.

Alzheimer's disease is a defining challenge for our generation. The health and financial future of our Nation are at stake, and the United States simply must not continue to ignore such a threat. This is a moral and financial issue. It is one that should be easy for us to come together on. If you are the person or the Senator who cares the most about people, who cares in compassionate ways, you should be for medical research. If you are the Senator who cares about the fiscal condition of our country and getting our financial house in order, you should be for biomedical research.

This commitment by all of us will significantly lower costs and improve health care outcomes for people living with the disease today and those who may encounter it in the future. Together, we can. This is what we are all here for. Together, we can make a difference, and we can do that by making a sustained commitment to Alzheimer's research that will benefit our Nation and bring hope and healing to Americans today and tomorrow.

The challenge is ours, and the moment to act on this disease is today. It is important for our moms, our dads, our grandparents, our family members, our friends. For the fiscal health of our Nation, the time to act is now.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, I rise to continue an effort to honor the 198 North Dakotans—soldiers, sailors, and airmen—who gave their lives while serving in Vietnam.

Together with the Bismarck High School history and English classes, we are reaching out to families and friends of these fallen servicemembers and sharing a bit about each one on the floor of the Senate.

Today, I begin by talking about a large family, the Gietzens, who lost one of their own in Vietnam but continue to serve our country and our State. Bill and Mary raised 15 children on a farm outside Glen Ullin. It was on their farm that their children learned the importance of hard work, dedication, and bravery.

After serving in the Army in World War II, Bill married his sweetheart Mary, and they had 15 children.

GENE GIETZEN

Gene Gietzen served in Vietnam in the Marine Corps' Alpha Company, lst Battalion, 7th Marines. Gene was born March 19, 1950. On May 21, 1969, he died as a result of wounds received on a company operation. He was 19 years old.

Gene's twin brother Glenn and older brother, Russell, were also stationed in Vietnam for a time while Gene was there. Once, when Russell and Glenn's battalion passed through Gene's camp, they had an opportunity to spend a night together. That night, the young men learned of the birth of their youngest brother Fred.

While the brothers said goodbye, Gene told them he would never get to see baby Fred. Glenn and Russell told him they would see him soon and that he needed to stop being so pessimistic. A few weeks later, they learned of Gene's death. Glenn escorted his twin brother's body home.

Russell, the oldest child, served three tours of duty in Vietnam with the Army as an interpreter and participated in several covert missions. Russell has two sons who served our State and country in the North Dakota National Guard.

Glenn also served in the Army in Vietnam. Glenn started the Injured Military Wildlife Project of North Dakota, which gives wounded veterans nationwide opportunities to hunt and fish in North Dakota.

Mark, their other brother, joined the Marine Corps and served all around the world on embassy duty.

Greg served with U.S. Special Forces for 37 years. Jim joined the Army and was stationed in Germany for 2 years.

Aaron served 22 years with Army Special Operations as a combat medic. He now trains a new generation of Army medics at the U.S. Army Special Operations Command in Fort Bragg, NC.

The rest of the Gietzen children have served as nurses, missionaries or have kept up the tradition of family farming.

North Dakota is proud to be home to this inspiring family.

Now, I will talk about more North Dakotans who, like Gene Gietzen, gave the ultimate sacrifice while serving their country during Vietnam.

GERALD ''JERRY'' DECKER

Gerald ''Jerry'' Decker was from Sentinel Butte and was born June 17, 1948. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Jerry died on April 10, 1969. He was 20 years old.

Jerry was one of seven children and the youngest of three boys. Jerry and his brother, Ron, were both stationed overseas at the same time, Ron running supplies from Thailand and Jerry as a cook in Vietnam.

Jerry chose to enlist so he could serve his country and return to the family farm and ranch as soon as possible. Jerry intended to eventually take over the farm. His sister, Rose, recalls how much Jerry loved farming, loved the animals, and loved training his dogs to hunt.

After his death, Jerry's brother, Ron, escorted his body home. The day after Jerry's funeral, their brother, Tom, had to appear before the draft board, but he was excused from service.

Rose remembers Jerry as the kind of guy everyone loved, even though he had a very dry sense of humor. She says that during Jerry's funeral, their church was overflowing with people mourning Jerry's death.

NORMAN EMINETH

Norman Emineth was from Baldwin and was born June 13, 1949. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Norman was 20 years old when he died on May 22, 1970.

Norman and his four siblings grew up on a farm outside of Baldwin. He spent his childhood working on the farm, picking rock, and milking cows. In his free time, Norman enjoyed hunting, fishing, and spending time with their neighbors.

In 1961, the singer Sue Thompson recorded a song called ''Norman.'' His friends poked fun at Norman, but despite the teasing, Norman loved the song. He bought the record and listened to the song over and over until he had memorized all of the lyrics. To this day, his sister, Elaine, can still hear the song in her head.

Elaine cherishes the time she spent with Norman when he was home on leave from Vietnam. She said that during this time, she felt like the kids had finally become adult friends instead of bickering children. The siblings all wished they could have spent time in their adult years with their brother, Norman.

LAWRENCE ESSER, JR.

Lawrence Esser, Jr., was from Minot. He was born February 21, 1948. He served in the Army's Ninth Infantry Division. He was 21 years old when he died on March 12, 1969.

Lawrence was the fourth of eight children, and his family and friends called him Junior.

His sister, Darlene, has fond memories of playing together outside making mud pies. She says that from the time Lawrence was a child, he loved to build things and work with his hands. He attended a trade school and worked for his brother-in-law in a construction firm.

Lawrence's family remembers him as a humble and quiet person. His mother, who died when she was 98 years old, still had a hard time speaking about Lawrence until her own death.

JOSEPH ''JOE'' FISCHER

Joseph ''Joe'' Fischer was from Zeeland and was born September 11, 1948. He served in the Army on the USS King as a boiler technician. Joe died on May 23, 1969. He was 20 years old.

When Joe was very young, his mother passed away. During middle school, he began living with Ben and Laura Jund of Zeeland. Joe and the Junds, his foster family, grew very close.

Joe's high school friend, Anne Welder, remembers that Joe was kind of a class clown and participated in baseball, basketball, football, drama, and pep club. Anne and Joe's foster family believe that everyone who knew Joe loved being around him.

After his high school graduation, Joe enlisted in the Navy. He enjoyed his Navy service very much.

The day after Joe's foster family learned that Joe had died, they received a note in the mail sent to them, stating: ''I just thought I would let you know that I am still alive.''

WENDELL KELLER

Wendell Keller was from Fargo and was born May 19, 1934. He served in the Air Force 433rd Tactical Fighter Squadron. Wendell was 34 years old when he went missing in action on March 1, 1969.

Wendell's parents were Raymond and Leona Keller, and his siblings are Virginia Post, Ray Keller, and David Keller. In addition to his siblings, Wendell is survived by his wife Jacqueline, son Gregory and his wife Patty, stepson Andy, and son Michael and his wife Janie and their daughter Lydia.

While at North Dakota State University, Wendell majored in electrical engineering and graduated with an Air Force ROTC commission.

Wendell was an accomplished pilot. In 1959, he was selected to fly over the first U.S. Air Force Academy graduation ceremony. In 1968, Wendell volunteered for an assignment in Southeast Asia rather than accepting the recommendation to become a Thunderbird pilot.

On March 1, 1969, Wendell, an Air Force major at the time, was the flight commander of a night strike over Laos. It was his 80th mission, and he made multiple passes before his plane was struck by anti-aircraft fire and crashed in the rugged terrain. Search-and-rescue efforts to locate him were unsuccessful. He was declared missing in action and was promoted to lieutenant colonel.

Fifteen years later, the crash site was discovered, and after several ground searches and excavations, in 2012, his remains were identified and he was buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

The Air Force issued Lieutenant Colonel Keller medals to honor his extraordinary service, including the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with Four Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Purple Heart.

STANLEY OTTMAR

Stanley Ottmar was from Mott and was born October 26, 1949. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Stan died April 10, 1969. He was 19 years old.

His family called him Stan, and he was the third of seven children. His sister, Mavis Jarnagin, or Mavis Ottmar, was my college roommate when we were at UND and remains a good friend of mine today.

Their father served in World War II in the Army. After high school graduation, Stan followed in his father's footsteps and enlisted in the Army, where he joined a parachute training program.

Stan was a friendly and social person who had a love and talent for music. His sister, Sharon, has fond memories of Stan at home standing in front of the mirror watching himself play guitar and sing. The family cherishes the recordings they have of him singing and playing the guitar.

Stan died with just 2 weeks left in his tour, and he was already making plans at the time to buy a new car.

JOHN RENNER

John Renner was from Mandan and he was born June 24, 1949. He served in the Marine Corps' Hotel Company, 2nd Battalion, 26th Marines. He was 20 years old when he died July 28, 1969.

John was one of three kids. His sister Mary lives in Mandan, and his brother Tim lives in Arizona.

Mary remembers John as a happy, nice person who was always smiling. He was never unkind to a soul.

John was killed just 2 months after beginning his tour of duty in Vietnam.

After John died, his brother Tim joined the Marine Corps. Tim was not sent to Vietnam but felt he owed it to his brother to join the military.

John's fellow soldiers remember him as a brave and good friend. He is deeply missed by all who knew him.

VIRGIL GREANY

Virgil Greany was from Rugby and he was born November 26, 1930. He served as a major in the Army. He was 33 years old when he died September 25, 1964.

Virgil served our country for over 12 years prior to his death, including service in Korea and Ethiopia before he volunteered to go to Vietnam as an adviser. Virgil had made the military a career, but he had a passion for mathematics. Virgil's dream was to become a math teacher after he retired from the Army.

The day Virgil died, a Vietnamese soldier threw four grenades into his vehicle. The third grenade exploded inside of the truck, killing Virgil.

Virgil left behind his young wife, stepchildren, and a daughter.

ROBERT ''BOB'' SIME

Robert ''Bob'' Sime grew up in Velva and Tolna and was born on December 10, 1939. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division, in what was called the ''Garry Owen'' regiment. Bob was 27 years old when he died on October 23, 1967.

His siblings are John, Richard, and Marilyn. His parents both worked in education.

Bob grew up in Velva. His senior year of high school the Sime family moved from Velva to Tolna, where his father became the superintendent of schools. Bob was tall and was talked into joining the basketball team at Tolna, where he played just for the fun of it.

Bob's cousin, Jean, remembers that Bob liked 1950s rock-and-roll music and that he always combed his hair like Elvis Presley. After graduating from Tolna High School, Bob enlisted in the Army.

In the Army, Bob met Lieutenant Bob Trimble, who became his company's executive officer. The two men had confidence in each other on missions and also enjoyed spending their free time together. Lieutenant Trimble remembers Bob's great sense of humor, even when times were tough. He was with Bob when Bob was killed and says that day will always haunt him.

THOMAS ''TOM'' SPITZER

Thomas ''Tom'' Spitzer grew up on a farm south of Wilton and was born June 17, 1941. He served as a Navy pilot on the USS *Oriskany*. Tom was 25 years old when he died on October 26, 1966.

Tom is survived by his siblings, wife, and his son Tom, who was born the month after his father was killed.

In high school, Tom and a friend began flying. He then attended North Dakota State University, where he participated in ROTC and received a degree in business administration.

During his Navy training, Tom was designated a Top Gun graduate. His brother Jeff says it was the proudest moment of Tom's life.

The Navy intended for Tom to stay in the United States to train other pilots, but Tom volunteered to go to Vietnam to serve his country. As a Navy pilot in Vietnam, Tom flew over 100 missions. One of those missions involved him flying over his wing commander, who had been shot down, to draw fire away while they waited for help to arrive. The Navy awarded Tom with distinguished medals in recognition of his heroism.

DONALD ''DONNY'' VOLLMER

Donald ''Donny'' Vollmer was from Bismark. He was born August 2, 1950. He served in the Army's 1st Aviation Brigade. Donny died on November 2, 1969. He was 19 years old.

Donny had three brothers and one sister. He enjoyed hunting and fishing in his free time. Donny decided to join the Army because his older brother Jim was enlisting and he wanted to go too. At the time, Donny was 17 years old, so his parents had to give permission, and Donny had to finish his GED while at basic training.

Donny and Jim served in the same unit, and Donny was a helicopter crew chief. A few weeks before Donny was killed, he and Jim came home on emergency leave because their mother had a heart attack. Donny spent his time at home telling his friends how much he loved serving his country. Jim's tour was almost over, so he was allowed to stay home, but Donny returned to Vietnam alone.

Jim believes that if Donny had not been killed in the war, he would have made the Army his career.

ROBERT BROTHEN

Robert Brothen was from Mohall and was born February 14, 1947. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. Robert died on February 27, 1969. He had just turned 22 years old.

His two sisters were Beverly and Audrey, and his brother's name was Bernard. Even though he was Robert's younger brother, Bernard joined the Army during the war just to help protect Robert.

At one point during their service, Robert and Bernard were both hospitalized in Washington State, being treated for foot rot, but didn't learn they were in the same place until the day after they left.

Robert's father Alvin died of cancer the same year Robert died. Their sister Beverly is the last living member of the family. Their mother Pearl passed away in 2004 but witnessed the deaths of three of her children and two husbands during her lifetime.

These are the stories of just a few North Dakotans and actually just a few of those brave soldiers killed in action in Vietnam. As we continue to participate in the commemoration of the

Vietnam war, I believe it is critically important that we continue to honor and appreciate their sacrifice and to help educate the younger generation, like the Bismark High School students who are helping me with this project, on the importance of sacrifice and commitment to our country.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time be considered expired and the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 be agreed to, and that Senator HATCH be recognized to offer substitute amendment No. 1221 and a first-degree amendment to strike title 2 of the amendment. I further ask that the following amendments be the only other amendments in order during today's session of the Senate: Brown No. 1242 and Lankford No. 1237.

I further ask that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 1314 on Monday, May 18, the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided between the managers or their designees, and that at 5:30, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Brown and Lankford amendments in that order, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes, and a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, reserving the right to object, first of all, I haven't had the opportunity to express my appreciation for the hard, hard work of the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance. The senior Senator from Oregon has gone through a lot the past 2 weeks trying to help us get to the point where we are today, so I admire the work they have done and look forward to the fair amendment process we are going to have next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the motion to proceed is agreed to.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 1221

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1221.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] proposes an amendment numbered 1221.

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

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of May 12, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1243 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1243.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for Mr. FLAKE, proposes an amendment numbered 1243 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program)

Strike title II.

AMENDMENT NO. 1237 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I call up the Lankford amendment No. 1237.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for Mr. LANKFORD, proposes an amendment numbered 1237 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish consideration of the conditions relating to religious freedom of parties to trade negotiations as an overall negotiating objective of the United States)

At the end of section 2(a), add the following:

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 1242 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I call up Brown amendment No. 1242.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 1242 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding for the trade adjustment assistance program to the level established by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011)

On page 118, strike lines 19 through 23, and insert the following:

(b) TRAINING FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''shall not exceed'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $575,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021.''.

(2) OFFSET.—

(A) CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.—Subparagraph (B) of Section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income;'', and

(ii) by inserting ''(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)'' in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after ''In determining the amount omitted from gross income'', and

(iii) by inserting ''AMOUNT OMITTED FROM'' after ''DETERMINATION OF'' in the heading thereof.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subparagraph (A) shall apply to—

(i) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, if the chairman of the Committee on Finance and Senator WYDEN will indulge me, I would like 2 or 3 minutes to explain the amendment and the importance of it.

One of the most important reasons for the vote on Tuesday, I believe, is that a significant number of Members of this body and I think the public—those who support fast-track and those who oppose it—all believe that enforcement is important and assisting workers is important. So it would be a tragedy to send TPA to the desk of the

President for him to sign, leading the way to at least two other trade agreements—the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the United States-European Union agreement, the so-called TTIP trade agreement—without enforcement and without assistance for workers.

We make decisions in this body, those who support this fast-track and the trade agreements, and we know—even the most enthusiastic supporters and cheerleaders for free trade acknowledge there are winners and losers when it comes to trade agreements. Some people, because of dislocation due to these trade agreements, dislocation in the economy, lose their jobs in places such as Wheeling, WV, and Bellaire, OH, right across the Ohio River. So it is important that we take care of those workers who lose their jobs because of our actions. That is why the TAA—trade adjustment assistance—provides help for workers to get new training and find new jobs when they are laid off from the chemical or steel industry along the Ohio River or elsewhere. The opportunity to be retrained is so important.

I meet people frequently who were laid off because of NAFTA or because of CAFTA and now they are back in school. A man the other day I met is becoming a nurse, a woman might become a physical therapist, a man might be trained in information technology or some other kind of work after they have lost their job. So that is the importance of trade adjustment assistance.

The President's budget called for a significantly higher number of dollars for trade adjustment assistance than the bill coming out of the Finance Committee. That is why I am offering my amendment, to get those dollars commensurate with the need, because every President in both parties—President Bush I on NAFTA, President Clinton on NAFTA and PNTR, President Bush on fast-track and CAFTA, President Obama on South Korea Free Trade Agreement and now on TPP—make big promises about trade numbers and increased jobs, big promises about higher wages. Unfortunately, those big promises end up with bad results.

We know it from South Korea most recently; we have seen it throughout the last 20 years of trade. That is why the number of dollars authorized and appropriated for the trade adjustment assistance needs to be increased, so it will take care of those people who lose their jobs because of the Trans-Pacific Partnership and because of TTIP, which this Congress could very well agree to in the next year or so.

So I ask for support of Brown amendment No. 1242. My understanding is that vote will come on Monday night. I appreciate the support of all the Members of this body.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, this week we welcome thousands of law enforcement officers for National Police Week 2015. It is a time to pay tribute to all the men and women who serve in Federal, State, and local law enforcement all across America. It is a good time for those of us who benefit from the shield of protection they provide—and actually, that is all of us—to express our gratitude.

Police officers are here to rededicate themselves to the pursuit of justice and to honor fallen officers. We are proud to have them all here in Washington.

I want to recognize especially the many men and women who protect and serve as peace officers in Kentucky. Today, I had the pleasure of meeting with some of Kentucky's finest. I want to thank them personally for courageously risking their lives in the service of people across the Commonwealth.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF ERNEST T. FRANKLIN

Sadly, the occasion of National Police Week is also the time when we pay tribute to the brave and honorable peace officers who have fallen in the line of duty over the last year. So I want to remember and say a few words about Kentucky's own Deputy Sheriff Ernest T. Franklin, of the Barren County Sheriff's Office, who died on April 2, 2014.

Deputy Sheriff Franklin was killed in an automobile crash on Kentucky Route 90, just west of Glasgow. He was 58 years old and had served with the sheriff's office for 7 years.

Friends and coworkers recall him as a friendly man who always had a kind word for everyone. He worshipped at Hopewell Baptist Church, volunteered at the local community center and soup kitchen, and was, by all accounts, an excellent chef.

Deputy Sheriff Franklin put his life on the line every day to protect his fellow Kentuckians. I want to extend my deepest condolences to his family and to all of those who knew and loved him.

As Deputy Sheriff Ernest T. Franklin is mourned in Barren County, in Frankfort, the Kentucky State Police have created their own unique way to memorialize their fallen fellow officers. This week they unveiled a new statue called The Trooper, a figure of a Kentucky State Trooper cast in bronze and 10 feet tall, at the Kentucky State Police Academy.

The statue is a tribute to members of the Kentucky State Police who have given their lives in the line of duty. That is 27 troopers and officers. It is quite an inspirational sight—a lone figure in uniform striding forward, ready to defend the property, dignity, and lives of his fellow Kentuckians.

I know my colleagues in the Senate join me in holding the deepest admiration and respect for the many brave law enforcement officers across Kentucky and across the Nation. Theirs is both an honorable profession and a dangerous one. It is also a necessary one because the peace and order of a civil society that we all take for granted would not exist without them. Kentucky is grateful for our law enforcement officers' service, and we are grateful for the service of Deputy Sheriff Ernest T. Franklin.

NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT

On a related note, I was proud to cosponsor and see to Senate passage this year of the National Blue Alert Act. The bill will establish a national Blue Alert system within the U.S. Department of Justice to help catch those criminals who kill, harm, or threaten law enforcement officers. The Blue Alert system will be similar to what the AMBER Alert system does for abducted children.

Should law enforcement officers be killed, seriously injured, threatened or go missing while in the line of duty, this system would be utilized to widely disseminate information to help identify and apprehend potential suspects.

Blue Alert will help bring to justice those who harm our police officers and hopefully help deter future violence. I was pleased to see that the House passed the bill earlier this week. With this bill, we will help protect those who put their lives on the line to protect us all.

FAIR AND EQUAL WAGES

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, last Sunday, I joined millions of people

across the country to celebrate the mothers in our lives—in mine, my wife Marcelle, my daughter, friends, and other family members. Mother's Day is an important reminder of just how essential these inspirational women are to their families, their friends, and their communities.

Mothers—and all women—are also essential to the fabric of our economy. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, just four decades ago, fewer than half of mothers were in the American work force. Today, 70 percent of mothers are working outside the home, and one-third of working mothers are the sole wage earners in their households. More than 30 percent of Vermont families rely on working moms as the exclusive wage earners in their homes.

The numbers are staggering. Yet working moms still fall behind in equal and fair pay. The Joint Economic Committee of Congress recently released a report showing that working mothers earn 3 percent less than women without children, while fathers earn 15 percent more than men without children. Working moms also face the potential of missing scheduled wage increases or bonuses, if they take time away from the workforce to care for a child.

Vermont has been a national leader in leveling the playing field for working moms. In 2002 the Green Mountain State enacted its own Equal Pay Act, making it illegal for employers to offer anything less than equal pay for equal work. The Federal Government has fallen behind, and it is far past time for Congress to approve the Paycheck Fairness Act. This legislation, authored by one of the trailblazers in the Senate, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI (D-MD), builds on efforts that date back more than 50 years to ensure a balanced and equal playing field in the workplace for women.

Of course, equal wages are not fair wages if they are not livable wages. According to the Joint Economic Committee, working mothers in families in the bottom 20 percent of households contribute an astounding 86 percent to their families' income. In an overwhelming majority of cases, these families are supported solely by a mother. That is just one of the many reasons we need to ensure that wages are not just equal and fair, but also livable. Two weeks ago I joined with Senator PATTY MURRAY (D-WA) and 31 other Democratic Senators to propose legislation to raise the minimum wage. The Raise the Wage Act will provide a staggered increase in the Federal minimum wage, from $7.25 to $12.00 by the year 2020. It is the right thing to do, and it is the fair thing to do, for working mothers, for our families, and for our Nation's economy as a whole.

Mother's Day is always an opportunity to show the moms in our lives just how valued they are. It is past time for Congress to do the same, and to act on commonsense bills like the Paycheck Fairness Act and the Raise the Wage Act.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD A. RITCHIE

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, this week, the Senate will say goodbye to the Chamber's current Historian, and welcome him to the ranks of Historian Emeritus. Donald Ritchie has observed, studied, and documented the workings of the U.S. Senate for almost four decades. Only the second person to serve as the Historian of the Senate, Don has been with the Senate Historical Office since shortly after its creation.

Beginning in 1976, Don spearheaded the Senate Oral History Program, for which he interviewed dozens of former senators and their staff. He documented firsthand recollections of those individuals' time with the Senate, major events and debates, and how the institution evolved during their tenure. In the 1990s, the Senate Historical Office began making transcripts of the interviews available at various libraries and archives, including the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress and the Senate Library. These accounts are fascinating, and remind us of the intricacies—both in public and behind the scenes—of legislating in the U.S. Senate. The Oral History Program was a colossal undertaking, and one congressional scholars will study for many years to come. Don's work on this program was exceptional.

In addition the Senate Oral History Program, Don and the Senate Historical Office maintain and make available historical documents, statistics, and provide historical background and how it may pertain to current events. In addition to his enormous undertaking, for years, Don has provided enlightening—sometimes humorous, always informative—vignettes to Members and staffers of moments in history, from now famous—or infamous—committee proceedings, to turning points in historical Senate debates, to the personal interactions and relationships among Senators that often don't make the history books.

My wife Marcelle tells me that Don is always welcomed at the Senate spouses' luncheon because of his valuable insights.

Don often reminds us of our roots—how our many traditions began—and how the Senate, as a continuing body, has evolved, decade to decade, generation to generation. He reminds us that for all our political disagreements, progress in the Senate requires some measure of consent. The history of the Senate is clearer because of the talents of Don Ritchie. The time has come to thank him for his decades of service and to wish him well as he assumes a new title of Historian Emeritus.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD FRANCIS ''PAT'' PATIERNO

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to one of the foundational figures of the U.S. global demining effort, Mr. Donald Francis ''Pat'' Patierno.

Pat is retiring after more than 20 years of global demining leadership both at the State Department's Office of Humanitarian Demining and subsequently as a member of the board of directors and four-term president of the 501(c)3 Mine Advisory Group, MAG, America.

Pat was the first Director of the Office of Humanitarian Demining where he organized and led the U.S. Government worldwide demining program for nearly 10 years. Under his determined and capable leadership in those formative years, U.S. participation expanded its efforts to remove the scourge of landmines, unexploded bombs and shells left behind in former areas of conflict. From its modest beginnings that program today is working around the world to save civilians from becoming limbless victims of past wars.

Before his retirement from the State Department in 2006, Mr. Patierno oversaw a $60 million program that supported humanitarian mine action assistance to over 40 countries. Subsequent to his retirement, he joined the board of directors of MAG America to carry on his humanitarian work in the area of demining and unexploded ordnance. At the same time Mr. Patierno served as the U.S. advocate for the Slovenian-based International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance. Mr. Patierno became president of the MAG America board in January 2011. So strong and dedicated was his leadership that at the request of the board, he served four 1-year terms as president.

Many Senators know of my long interest in stopping the death and maiming of civilians from landmines and other unexploded ordnance left behind when conflicts end. The carnage does not stop when the soldiers cease combat: civilians continue dying and suffering long after the fighting stops, and they continue to do so today. That is why I, as former chairman and now ranking member of the Department of State and Foreign Operations subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee have so strongly supported the dedicated work of Pat Patierno and his colleagues.

I close by expressing my admiration of and appreciation for Pat Patierno's selfless service, outstanding leadership, commitment, determination, and tenacity in this most noble and worthy cause.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, on May 14, 2015, the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library organized, elected a chairman, a vice chairman, and adopted committee rules for the 114th Congress. Members of the Joint Committee on the Library elected Senator ROY BLUNT as chairman and Congressman GREGG HARPER as vice chairman. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY, 114TH CONGRESS

TITLE I—MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. Regular meetings may be called by the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Vice-Chairman, as may be deemed necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standings Rules of the Senate.

2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(A) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personal or internal staff management or procedures;

(C) will tend to charge an individual with a crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy of an individual;

(D) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interest of effective law enforcement;

(E) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(F) may divulge matters required to kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulation. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.)

3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all members at least 3 days in advance. In addition, the committee staff will email or telephone reminders of committee meetings to all members of the committee or to the appropriate staff assistants in their offices.

4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of committee business will normally be sent to all members of the committee by the staff director at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any member of the committee from raising appropriate non-agenda topics.

5. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the Chairman may direct, unless the Chairman waived such a requirement for good cause.

TITLE II—QUORUMS

1. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 4 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 2 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony; provided, however, once a quorum is established, any one member can continue to take such testimony.

3. Under no circumstance may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

TITLE III—VOTING

1. Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

2. If a third of the members present so demand, a recorded vote will be taken on any question by roll call.

3. The results of the roll call votes taken in any meeting upon a measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall be include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast in opposition to each measure and amendment by each member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

4. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. However, the vote of the committee to report a measure or matters shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the committee who are physically present at the time of the vote. Proxies will be allowed in such cases solely for the purpose of recording a member's position on the question and then only in those instances when the absentee committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded. (Paragraph 7(a)(3) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

TITLE IV—DELEGATION AND AUTHORITY TO THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

1. The Chairman and Vice Chairman are authorized to sign all necessary vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide in the committee's behalf on all routine business.

2. The Chairman is authorized to engage commercial reporters for the preparation of transcripts of committee meetings and hearings.

3. The Chairman is authorized to issue, on behalf of the committee, regulations normally promulgated by the committee at the beginning of each session.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, on May 14, 2015, the Joint Committee on Printing organized, elected a chairman, a vice chairman, and adopted committee rules for the 114th Congress. Members of the Joint Committee on Printing elected Senator ROY BLUNT as vice chairman and Congressman GREGG HARPER as chairman. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING, 114TH CONGRESS

RULE 1.—COMMITTEE RULES

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the Committee.

(b) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record as soon as possible following the Committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the Committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a Committee meeting, unless the Ranking Minority Member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending Committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

RULE 2.—REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the Ranking Minority Member. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman, as he may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee.

(b) If the Chairman of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the Vice-Chairman or Ranking Member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE 3.—QUORUM

(a) Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders or changing the rules of the Committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE 4.—PROXIES

(a) Written or telegraphic proxies of Committee members will be received and recorded on any vote taken by the Committee, except for the purpose of creating a quorum.

(b) Proxies will be allowed on any such votes for the purpose of recording a member's position on a question only when the absentee Committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded.

RULE 5.—OPEN AND CLOSED MEETINGS

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b) No person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and other representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business session that has been closed to the public.

RULE 6.—ALTERNATING CHAIRMANSHIP AND VICE-CHAIRMANSHIP BY CONGRESSES

(a) The Chairmanship and Vice Chairmanship of the Committee shall alternate between the House and the Senate by Congresses: The senior member of the minority party in the House of Congress opposite of that of the Chairman shall be the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(b) In the event the House and Senate are under different party control, the Chairman and Vice Chairman shall represent the majority party in their respective Houses. When the Chairman and Vice-Chairman represent different parties, the Vice-Chairman shall also fulfill the responsibilities of the Ranking Minority Member as prescribed by these rules.

RULE 7.—PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions as to the order of business and the procedures of Committee shall in the first instance be decided by the Chairman; subject always to an appeal to the Committee.

RULE 8.—HEARINGS: PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chairman shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, all witnesses appearing before the Committee shall file advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 48 hours in advance of their appearance and their oral testimony shall be limited to brief summaries. Limited insertions or additional germane material will be received for the record, subject to the approval of the Chairman.

RULE 9.—OFFICIAL HEARING RECORD

(a) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all Committee proceedings and actions. Brief supplemental materials when required to clarify the transcript may be inserted in the record subject to the approval of the Chairman.

(b) Each member of the Committee shall be provided with a copy of the hearing transcript for the purpose of correcting errors of transcription and grammar, and clarifying questions or remarks. If any other person is authorized by a Committee Member to make his corrections, the staff director shall be so notified.

(c) Members who have received unanimous consent to submit written questions to witnesses shall be allowed two days within which to submit these to the staff director for transmission to the witnesses. The record may be held open for a period not to exceed two weeks awaiting the responses by witnesses.

(d) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee. Testimony received in closed hearings shall not be released or included in any report without the approval of the Committee.

RULE 10.—WITNESSES FOR COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) Selection of witnesses for Committee hearings shall be made by the Committee staff under the direction of the Chairman. A list of proposed witnesses shall be submitted to the members of the Committee for review sufficiently in advance of the hearings to permit suggestions by the Committee members to receive appropriate consideration.

(b) The Chairman shall provide adequate time for questioning of witnesses by all members, including minority Members and the rule of germaneness shall be enforced in all hearings notified.

(c) Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the minority on the Committee shall be entitled, upon unanimous request to the Chairman before the completion of such hearings, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

RULE 11.—CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FURNISHED TO THE COMMITTEE

The information contained in any books, papers or documents furnished to the Committee by any individual, partnership, corporation or other legal entity shall, upon the request of the individual, partnership, corporation or entity furnishing the same, be maintained in strict confidence by the members and staff of the Committee, except that any such information may be released outside of executive session of the Committee if the release thereof is effected in a manner which will not reveal the identity of such individual, partnership, corporation or entity in connection with any pending hearing or as a part of a duly authorized report of the Committee if such release is deemed essential to the performance of the functions of the Committee and is in the public interest.

RULE 12.—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The rule for broadcasting of Committee hearings shall be the same as Rule XI, clause 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 13.—COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) No Committee report shall be made public or transmitted to the Congress without the approval of a majority of the Committee except when Congress has adjourned: provided that any member of the Committee may make a report supplementary to or dissenting from the majority report. Such supplementary or dissenting reports should be as brief as possible.

(b) Factual reports by the Committee staff may be printed for distribution to Committee members and the public only upon authorization of the Chairman either with the approval of a majority of the Committee or with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member.

RULE 14.—CONFIDENTIALITY OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

No summary of a Committee report, prediction of the contents of a report, or statement of conclusions concerning any investigation shall be made by a member of the Committee or by any staff member of the Committee prior to the issuance of a report of the Committee.

RULE 15.—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The Committee shall have a staff director, selected by the Chairman. The staff director shall be an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate.

(b) The Ranking Minority Member may designate an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate as the minority staff director.

(c) The staff director, under the general supervision of the Chairman, is authorized to deal directly with agencies of the Government and with non-Government groups and individuals on behalf of the Committee.

(d) The Chairman or staff director shall timely notify the Ranking Minority Member or the minority staff director of decisions made on behalf of the Committee.

RULE 16.—COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman of the Committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Specifically, the Chairman is authorized, during the interim periods between meetings of the Committee, to act on all requests submitted by any executive department, independent agency, temporary or permanent commissions and committees of the Federal Government, the Government Publishing Office and any other Federal entity, pursuant to the requirements of applicable Federal law and regulations.

CONGRATULATING LIEUTENANT GENERAL CHARLES ''CHICK'' CLEVELAND

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate Lt. Gen. Charles ''Chick'' Cleveland of Montgomery, AL, for receiving the Congressional Gold Medal as one of the American Fighter Aces.

Lt. Gen. ''Chick'' Cleveland's distinguished Air Force career spanned nearly four decades, and more than 4,300 flight hours. His military decorations and awards include the Distinguished Service Medal (Air Force), Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross with oak leaf cluster, Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, Air Medal with three oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal and Republic of Korea Order of Military Merit, Chung Mu.

Less than 3 years after graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and within months of joining the 334th Fighter-Interceptor

Squadron at Kimpo Air Base, South Korea, he scored four confirmed MiG–15 kills. On September 21, 1952, Lieutenant Cleveland's squadron fought another flight of MiGs. Cleveland engaged one of the enemy aircraft and fired, scoring hits in the tail pipe, engine, and right wing. Within seconds, there was an explosion, and the MiG fell out of the sky. However, instead of watching the MiG to claim credit for the kill, Lieutenant Cleveland broke off the engagement to assist his squadron. He left Korea with those four confirmed kills—one confirmed victory short of becoming an ace.

After the war, he was stationed with the 27th Fighter-Bomber Wing at Bergstrom Air Force Base in Texas, where he led the transition team to the Air Force's new aircraft, the F–101 Voodoo. On August 10, 1962, Cleveland became the first pilot to achieve the 1000-flighthour mark in the Voodoo.

Lieutenant General Cleveland also served with distinction in Vietnam as the executive assistant to Gen. William Westmoreland, commander, Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

In 2008, 55 years after his aerial victories in Korea, he finally gained official recognition by the U.S. Air Force as a fighter ace. With the de-classification of Soviet records in 2003, his friend and fellow Korean war ace, Dolph Overton discovered the Soviets' account of the events on September 21, 1952. With those records, as well as the testimonies of Cleveland's wingman that day, Don Pascoe, and his former operations officer, Frederick ''Boots'' Blesse, the Air Force awarded Lieutenant General Cleveland credit for one of his two probable victories in Korea and officially recognized him as an Air Force Ace.

Lieutenant General Cleveland retired from the Air Force in 1984 and settled in Montgomery, AL, close to where he once had command of the Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base. He continues to involve himself in his community. I am proud to call Lieutenant General Charles ''Chick'' Cleveland a fellow Alabamian and to acknowledge and celebrate his receipt of the Congressional Gold Medal.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING SUN RIVER WATERSHED GROUP

● Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I rise to recognize Montana's Sun River Watershed Group from Cascade, MT, which was recently named one of four finalists for the 2015 North American Riverprize, a prestigious recognition from the International RiverFoundation. The award is meant to honor projects that have demonstrated excellence and diversity in river restoration.

The Sun River Watershed Group was formed in 1994 and has since prioritized the management and restoration of the river. Nineteen years later, the project is still succeeding. The group has formed a collaborative effort to discuss and solve natural resource issues and has acted as a seamless liaison between management agencies and the public.

Although the Sun River Watershed Group was not awarded the top prize, their tireless work makes all of Montana exceedingly proud. They should be commended for their dedication to restoring river flows to the Sun River as well as improving efficiency of water allocation for irrigation. To Montana, you are our winner for making our State a better place to live, work, and enjoy.●

CELEBRATING SIDNEY HUNTINGTON AND REMEMBERING DAN CUDDY

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, this is a bittersweet week in my home State of Alaska. On Saturday, the celebrated Athabascan Elder, Sidney Huntington, turned 100. That is indeed a cause for celebration. Sidney Huntington's life is the stuff of which legends are made. His book, ''Shadows on the Koyukuk'' published in 1993, details his remarkable life. Sidney's inspiring ways are the subject of a stage play, ''The Winter Bear.'' The Winter Bear is a play that tells the story of an abused, neglected Alaska Native teenager. He decides suicide is his best option until Athabascan elder Sidney Huntington shows him how to use traditional culture to work through his despair and find his true voice

Last evening as I approached the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial to honor the memories of Alaska State Troopers Patrick Scott Johnson and Gabriel Lenox Rich, I learned of the death of Dan Cuddy of Anchorage. Dan was president of First National Bank Alaska for some six decades. Dan was age 94. He leaves a remarkable legacy which is carried on today by his daughter Betsy Lawer and a large family of achievers. I will have more to say about the exemplary life of Dan Cuddy next week.

Dennis McMillan, the recently retired CEO of the Foraker Group spoke to KTVA last evening about Dan's passing. Dennis said, ''We're losing history, especially as we are losing these 90 plus citizens, but such a great legacy because they were still engaged with the community and totally involved in all sorts of things, and great role models.''

Dennis's words seem especially appropriate this week as we celebrate Dan's legacy while at the same time wishing Sidney another 100 years of inspiration to our Alaska community.●

TRIBUTE TO JON GEDNALSKE

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Jon Gednalske, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Jon is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, Jon is attending Luther College, where he is majoring in political science. Jon is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jon Gednalske for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CASSANDRA KRANZ

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Cassandra Kranz, an intern in my Sioux Falls office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Cassandra is a graduate of Watertown High School in Watertown, SD. Currently, Cassandra is attending Augustana College, where she is majoring in accounting, business administration, and government. Cassandra is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Cassandra Kranz for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JESSE NELSON

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Jesse Nelson, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Jesse is a graduate of Milbank High School in Milbank, SD. Currently, Jesse is attending Augustana College, where he is majoring in government and international affairs. Jesse is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jesse Nelson for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDRA STANLEY

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Alexandra Stanley, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Alexandra is a graduate of Washington High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Alexandra is a recent graduate of the University of Arizona, where she majored in English. Alexandra is a dedicated worker who has been committed

to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Alexandra Stanley for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN WEBER

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize John Weber, an intern in my Sioux Falls office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

John is a graduate of Highland Park Senior High School in Saint Paul, MN. John is also a recent graduate of South Dakota State University, where he majored in animal science. John is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to John Weber for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

RECOGNIZING CENTRAL PLUMBING CO.

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses have the unique opportunity to train skilled workers and create well-paying jobs for members of their communities, while also providing necessary services with quality customer service. These apprenticeship programs are becoming increasingly useful to add highly-skilled workers to the general workforce. In recognition of their contribution, this week's Small Business of the Week is Central Plumbing Co. of Baton Rouge, La.

Founded in 1974 by the Payne family, Central Plumbing began serving the Baton Rouge area with one truck and a commitment to quality plumbing service. In the more than 40 years since, the Payne family has grown their business into a 40-employee operation, operating 20 trucks across the Southern Louisiana region. Today, fourth generation Master Plumber Jay Payne oversees operations of the business, continuing their commitment to providing the highest level service in residential and commercial plumbing.

Central Plumbing's commitment to service does not stop with their customers. With generations of Paynes joining the family business, the company realized the need for an organized program to train the next generation of Master Plumbers. Central Plumbing apprenticeship program offers the opportunity to learn the trade through paid, hands-on training and support. Programs like this can often serve as an alternative for individuals who do not pursue higher education. Apprenticeship programs are beneficial opportunities to pave the way for folks to become experts in a highly specialized field and get paid accordingly, and also provide a certain amount of security for sustained future of the industry and the small businesses who administer them.

Congratulations again to Small Business of the Week—Central Plumbing Co. Thank you for your decades of service and ongoing commitment to create good quality, high-paying jobs and to train the next generation of Louisianians to be Master Plumbers.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) reported that he had signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office''.

H.R. 1075. An act to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the ''Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry''.

At 1:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 36. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2048. An act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), as amended by Public Law 114–6, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate jointly reappoint the following individuals each to a 2-year term on the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Ms. Barbara L. Camens of Washington, DC, Chair and Ms. Roberta L. Holzwarth of Rockford, Illinois.

The message further announced that pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statuses (20 U.S.C. 42–43), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Mr. BECERRA of California.

The message also announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2004(b), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation: Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. ISRAEL of New York and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 8162 of Public Law 106–79, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio, Mr. HONDA of California, and Mr. LIEU of California.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. COHEN of Tennessee, and Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2081, the Minority Leader re-appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission: Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4(c) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, the Minority Leader re-appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission: Mr. JAMES P. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, Co-Chair.

The message further announced that pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b) note), the Minority Leader re-appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the National Council on the Arts: Ms. BETTY MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 2:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 665. An act to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 1124. An act to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 2048. An act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1350. A bill to provide a short-term extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1357. A bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May, 14, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 665. An act to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 1124. An act to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 460. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–46).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KING:

S. 1338. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide licensing procedures for certain types of projects; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1339. A bill to permanently authorize the special immigrant nonminister religious worker program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1340. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to improve coal leasing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1341. A bill to amend section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act in order to improve the privacy protections available to students and their parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1342. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study and issue a report that quantifies the energy savings benefits of operational efficiency programs and services for commercial, institutional, industrial, and governmental entities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1343. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to maintain a project to improve hurricane forecasting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1344. A bill to clarify that nonprofit organizations such as Habitat for Humanity can accept donated mortgage appraisals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1345. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1346. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an e-prize competition pilot program to provide up to 4 financial awards to eligible entities that develop and verifiably demonstrate technology that reduces the cost of electricity or space heat in a high-cost region; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1347. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1348. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to high priority corridors on the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1349. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1350. A bill to provide a short-term extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1351. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1352. A bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1353. A bill to ensure appropriate judicial review of Federal Government actions by amending the prohibition on the exercise of jurisdiction by the United States Court of Federal Claims of certain claims pending in other courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1354. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for recognition of attending physician assistants as attending physicians to serve hospice patients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1355. A bill to provide for higher education reform; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1356. A bill to clarify that certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 will not take effect until after the Director of the Office of Personnel Management promulgates and makes effective regulations relating to such provisions; considered and passed.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1357. A bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1358. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1359. A bill to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 179. A resolution designating May 16, 2015, as ''Kids to Parks Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 30

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 81

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 81, a bill to authorize preferential treatment for certain imports from Nepal, and for other purposes.

S. 127

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to prohibit Federal funding for motorcycle checkpoints, and for other purposes.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 246

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 246, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 327

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 327, a bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 797

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 797, a bill to amend the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1006

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1006, a bill to incentivize early adoption of positive train control, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1101

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1101, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the regulation of patient records and certain decision support software.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1126

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

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1175, a bill to improve the safety of hazardous materials rail transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1252, a bill to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 1265

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1265, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to make certain certifications to Congress before retiring B–1, B–2, or B–52 bomber aircraft.

S. 1287

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1287, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for viral hepatitis surveillance, education, and testing in order to prevent deaths from chronic liver disease and liver cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1299

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1299, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. 1330

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1330, a bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sexual orientation or gender identity when extending credit.

S. 1334

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1334, a bill to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 157

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 157, a resolution recognizing the economic, cultural, and political contributions of the Southeast-Asian American community on the 40th anniversaries of the beginning of Khmer Rouge control over Cambodia and the beginning of the Cambodian Genocide and the end of the Vietnam War and the ''Secret War'' in the Kingdom of Laos.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1348. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to high priority corridors on the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I am introducing the Route to Opportunity and Development Act of 2015, which would amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, ISTEA, of 1991 to begin the process toward eventually making the Raleigh to Norfolk Corridor in North Carolina and

Virginia part of the Interstate system, and to help fully upgrade the corridor to interstate standards. My colleagues, Senator RICHARD BURR, Senator TIM KAINE, and Senator MARK WARNER have agreed to cosponsor the bill. In addition, Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The Route to Opportunity and Development Act of 2015 would designate the following as high priority: the Raleigh-Norfolk Corridor from Raleigh, NC, through Rocky Mount, Williamston, and Elizabeth City, NC, to Norfolk, VA.

If the Raleigh-Norfolk corridor becomes part of the Interstate system, it would connect vital centers of commerce in the Raleigh and Norfolk/Hampton Roads region. Raleigh and Hampton Roads are two of the largest east coast metropolitan regions served by a single primary interstate route and this act proposes a second primary interstate route for the two areas.

This act helps advance the North Carolina Department of Transportation's Strategic Transportation Corridors Vision, which aims to provide North Carolina with a network of high priority corridors to promote economic development and enhance interstate commerce. It is also an important part of the future vision for transportation in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Federal High Priority Corridors are eligible for Federal funds to assist states in the coordination, planning, design and construction of nationally significant transportation corridors for the purposes of economic growth and international and interregional growth.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1357. A bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1357

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) ROVING SURVEILLANCE AND ACCESS TO BUSINESS RECORDS.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (50 U.S.C. 1805 note) is amended by striking ''June 1, 2015'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

(b) INDIVIDUAL TERRORISTS AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN POWERS.—Section 6001(b)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking ''June 1, 2015'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1358. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today, I am reintroducing a piece of legislation which I strongly believe in and know that it is long overdue. The Hmong Veterans' Service Recognition Act is a bill to authorize the interment in national cemeteries of Hmong veterans who served in support of U.S. forces during the Vietnam War. I, along with a bipartisan group of colleagues, Senators Klobuchar, Sullivan, Franken, and Whitehouse believe this is an appropriate honor.

Public Law 106–207, The Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act of 2000 already acknowledges Hmong Special Guerilla Unit's contributions during Vietnam and recognizes the service of Hmong Special Guerilla Unit veterans for the purpose of naturalization. Today we try to write the next chapter for these brave veterans and grant them the one right they are requesting, to be buried in our U.S. national cemeteries.

The Hmong were ideal candidates for America's secret war—they were fighters known for their bravery and warrior traditions who knew the rocky mountain terrain of Northern Laos very well. The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency conducted covert operations in Laos which employed some 60,000 Hmong volunteers in Special Guerilla Units. The Hmong Fighters interrupted operations on the Ho Chi Minh trail and assisted in downed aircraft recovery operations of American Airmen. In Laos, they valiantly fought the Vietnamese and Laotian Communists for over a decade and were critical to America's war efforts in Vietnam.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War. More than 35,000 Hmong lost their lives and many more were injured and disabled. I would like to recognize several Hmong Combat Veterans who live in Alaska. Lieutenant Pasert Lee from Mountain View in Achorage, AK, was injured in 1972 when his bunker was bombed while providing radio support for American jets in Laos. He recovered after several days, made his way to a refugee camp and many years later he was able to come to America. Lieutenant Wilson Chong Neng Vang, Sergeant Tong Pao Less and Sergeant Xia Ger Vang reside in Anchorage, AK, and are recognized for their selfless service in the U.S. Secret Army, Kingdom of Laos.

There are currently over 260,000 Hmong people in America and according to the 2010 Census, the heaviest concentrations are in California, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Carolina, Michigan, Colorado, Georgia, Oklahoma, Oregon, and my home state of Alaska. Of the Hmong who became U.S. citizens, approximately 6,000 veterans are still with us today, and they deserve the choice to be buried in national cemeteries.

This concept is not without precedent. Currently, burial benefits are available for Philippine Armed Forces veterans who answered the call to serve during World War II, just like the Hmong. This legislation would not grant the small group of Hmong veterans full veteran benefits, but would simply authorize their interment in national cemeteries across the Nation. A small, but deserved token of appreciation and an appropriate honor for their sacrifices towards a common goal of democracy and freedom in the world.

I believe it is time to recognize the Hmong-American's bravery, sacrifice and loyalty to the United States. We would like to honor the Hmong Special Guerilla Unit Veterans' service and sacrifices by allowing them to be buried alongside their brothers in arms in our national cemeteries. Again, I appreciate the support of my colleagues who have joined me to introduce this legislation and look forward to working with them and others in the Senate to finally getting this approved into law.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, today marks the 40th anniversary of the beginning of the forced exit of many members of the Hmong community from Laos following the U.S. withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. Tens of thousands of the Hmong came to my State of Minnesota, and today in Minnesota, we are honoring this anniversary with Hmong American Day. I am proud to join my State in recognizing the remarkable service of those who fought on our behalf, and in celebrating the contributions of Hmong Americans to our shared community over the last 40 years.

The way I like to explain to people why there are so many Hmong Americans in Minnesota is by telling them that there are many fewer American names on the Vietnam War Memorial because of what the Hmong did for us during the ''secret war.'' Many people in America still do not realize that. But as the permanent memorial at Arlington says about the Hmong fighters and their American advisors: ''Their patriotic valor and loyalty in the defense of liberty and democracy will never be forgotten.'' In Minnesota, we recognize the remarkable service the Hmong fighters performed for our country, and we will never forget.

The Senate resolution I am proud to join Senator HIRONO and many of our colleagues in introducing in recognition of May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month states, ''the actions of the Hmong in Laos in support of the

United States during the Vietnam War saves the lives of countless people of the United States.'' The Hmong fought on our behalf and saved American lives. But as the new communist regime took control in Laos, the Hmong were forced to begin their journey as refugees. For many, this journey would eventually end in Minnesota. Today, the vibrant Hmong American community in the Twin Cities—the largest urban Hmong community in the country—and throughout Minnesota is tens of thousands strong and is woven into the fabric of our society.

You can see their tremendous contribution to American life every day in the many small businesses started by Hmong Americans on University Avenue, or at Hmong Village. You can see it in all the ways that Hmong Americans have brought their culture to the United States and helped to shape the culture of today's Minnesota. I also remain incredibly proud that Minnesota can boast that we had the Nation's very first Hmong American State legislator with my good friend Mee Moua, who has become a national leader on Asian American issues. I am glad others have followed in her wake.

Representing the Hmong American community in the Senate is an important part of my job. That is why I am a cosponsor of a bill being reintroduced by Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska along with my fellow Minnesota Senator, Senator KLOBUCHAR, to make sure that Hmong fighters in the ''secret war'' can be honored with burial in our national cemeteries. The Hmong Americans who fought for us deserve nothing less. It is also why I traveled to Laos several years ago to engage the Lao Government directly on protecting the Hmong people, including refugees who had been forcibly repatriated to Laos from Thailand.

And it is why I fight for the Hmong Americans of Minnesota every day in the Senate. Hmong Americans want the same things that all Americans want—good-paying jobs, a bright future for their children, excellent health care. It is my job to help make sure those things are within everyone's reach.

The Hmong American community has come through so much adversity as they left Laos and as they resettled in America, and they faced that adversity with resilience and courage. They serve as an inspiration to us all.

We are so proud that the Hmong American community is part of the Minnesota—and the American—community. I am very pleased to join Minnesota in celebrating Hmong American Day—to celebrate the community's achievements and to commemorate the sacrifices of their loved ones in support of American troops so many years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1358

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Hmong Veterans' Service Recognition Act''.

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY FOR INTERMENT IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2402(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) Any individual—

''(A) who—

''(i) was naturalized pursuant to section 2(1) of the Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–207; 8 U.S.C. 1423 note); and

''(ii) at the time of the individual's death resided in the United States; or

''(B) who—

''(i) the Secretary determines served with a special guerrilla unit or irregular forces operating from a base in Laos in support of the Armed Forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning February 28, 1961, and ending May 7, 1975; and

''(ii) at the time of the individual's death—

''(I) was a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States; and

''(II) resided in the United States.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an individual dying on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 179—DESIGNATING MAY 16, 2015, AS ''KIDS TO PARKS DAY''

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 179

Whereas the 5th annual Kids to Parks Day will be celebrated on May 16, 2015;

Whereas the goal of Kids to Parks Day is to promote healthy outdoor recreation and environmental stewardship, empower young people, and encourage families to get outdoors and visit the parks and public land of the United States;

Whereas on Kids to Parks Day, individuals from rural and urban areas of the United States can be reintroduced to the splendid national, State, and neighborhood parks located in their communities;

Whereas communities across the United States offer a variety of natural resources and public land, often with free access, to individuals seeking outdoor recreation;

Whereas the people of the United States, young and old, should be encouraged to lead more healthy and active lifestyles;

Whereas Kids to Parks Day is an opportunity for families to take a break from their busy lives and come together for a day of active, wholesome fun; and

Whereas Kids to Parks Day will broaden an appreciation for nature and the outdoors in young people, foster a safe setting for independent play and healthy adventure in neighborhood parks, and facilitate self-reliance while strengthening communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 16, 2015, as ''Kids to Parks Day;''

(2) recognizes the importance of outdoor recreation and the preservation of open spaces to the health and education of the young people of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1226. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. REED, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1227. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1228. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1229. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1230. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1231. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1232. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1233. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1234. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1235. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1236. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1237. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

SA 1238. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1239. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her

to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1240. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

SA 1241. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 644, to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.

SA 1242. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

SA 1243. Mr. HATCH (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

SA 1244. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1245. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1246. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1247. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1248. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1226. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. REED, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—EXPANDING TRADE EXPORTS

SEC. 301. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE INSPECTION AND GRADING PROGRAM.

(a) FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008.—Effective June 18, 2008, section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) is repealed.

(b) AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014.—Effective February 7, 2014, section 12106 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79; 128 Stat. 981) is repealed.

(c) APPLICATION.—The Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of law struck by this section had not been enacted.

SA 1227. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 109, add the following:

(c) OUTREACH AND INPUT FROM SMALL BUSINESSES TO TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.—Section 609 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f)(1) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits the notification required under section 5(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (in this subsection referred to as the 'Chief Counsel') shall convene an Interagency Working Group (in this subsection referred to as the 'Working Group'), which shall consist of an employee from each of the following agencies, as selected by the head of the agency or an official delegated by the head of the agency:

''(A) The Office of the United States Trade Representative.

''(B) The Department of Commerce.

''(C) The Department of Agriculture.

''(D) Any other agency that the Chief Counsel, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines to be relevant with respect to the subject of the trade agreement being negotiated pursuant to section 3(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (in this subsection referred to as the 'covered trade agreement').

''(2) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Chief Counsel convenes the Working Group under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel shall identify a diverse group of small entities, representatives of small entities, or a combination thereof, to provide to the Working Group the views of small businesses in the manufacturing, services, and agriculture industries on the potential economic effects of the covered trade agreement.

''(3)(A) Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Chief Counsel convenes the Working Group under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the economic impacts of the covered trade agreement on small entities, which shall—

''(i) identify the most important priorities, opportunities, and challenges to various industries from the covered trade agreement;

''(ii) assess the impact for new small entities to start exporting, or increase their exports, to markets in the covered trade agreement;

''(iii) analyze the competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the covered trade agreement;

''(iv) identify—

''(I) any State-owned enterprises in each country pertaining to the covered trade agreement that could be pose a threat to small entities; and

''(II) any steps to take to create a level-playing field for those small entities;

''(v) identify any rule of an agency that should be modified to become compliant with the covered trade agreement; and

''(vi) include an overview of the methodology used to develop the report, including the number of small entity participants by industry, how those small entities were selected, and any other factors that the Chief Counsel may determine appropriate.

''(B) To ensure that negotiations for the covered trade agreement are not disrupted, the President may require that the Chief Counsel delay submission of the report under subparagraph (A) until after the negotiations of the covered trade agreement are concluded, provided that the delay allows the Chief Counsel to submit the report to Congress not later than 45 days before the Senate or the House of Representatives acts to approve or disapprove the covered trade agreement.

''(C) The Chief Counsel shall, to the extent practicable, coordinate the submission of the report under this paragraph with the United States International Trade Commission, the United States Trade Representative, other agencies, and trade advisory committees to avoid unnecessary duplication of reporting requirements.''.

(d) STATE TRADE AND EXPORT PROMOTION GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 652) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (m); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

''(l) STATE TRADE AND EXPORT PROMOTION GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'eligible small business concern' means a business concern that—

''(i) is organized or incorporated in the United States;

''(ii) is operating in the United States;

''(iii) meets—

''(I) the applicable industry-based small business size standard established under section 3; or

''(II) the alternate size standard applicable to the program under section 7(a) of this Act and the loan programs under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.);

''(iv) has been in business for not less than 1 year, as of the date on which assistance using a grant under this subsection commences;

''(v) is export ready, as determined by the Associate Administrator; and

''(vi) has access to sufficient resources to bear the costs associated with exporting and doing business with foreign purchasers, including the costs of packing, shipping, freight forwarding, and customs brokers;

''(B) the term 'program' means the State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program established under paragraph (2);

''(C) the term 'rural small business concern' means an eligible small business concern located in a rural area, as that term is defined in section 1393(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

''(D) the term 'socially and economically disadvantaged small business concern' has the meaning given that term in section 8(a)(4)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(4)(A)); and

''(E) the term 'State' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin

Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Associate Administrator shall establish a trade and export promotion grant program, to be known as the 'State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program', to make grants to States to carry out export programs that assist eligible small business concerns in—

''(A) participation in a foreign trade mission;

''(B) a foreign market sales trip;

''(C) a subscription to services provided by the Department of Commerce;

''(D) the payment of website translation fees;

''(E) the design of international marketing media;

''(F) a trade show exhibition;

''(G) participation in training workshops;

''(H) a reverse trade mission;

''(I) procurement of foreign consultancy services (after consultation with the Department of Commerce to avoid duplication); or

''(J) any other export initiative determined appropriate by the Associate Administrator.

''(3) GRANTS.—

''(A) JOINT REVIEW.—In carrying out the program, the Associate Administrator may make a grant to a State to increase the number of eligible small business concerns in the State that export and to increase the value of the exports by eligible small business concerns in the State.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making grants under this subsection, the Associate Administrator may give priority to an application by a State that proposes an export program that—

''(i) focuses on eligible small business concerns as part of an export promotion program;

''(ii) demonstrates intent to promote exports by—

''(I) socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns;

''(II) small business concerns owned or controlled by women; and

''(III) rural small business concerns;

''(iii) promotes exports from a State that is not 1 of the 10 States with the highest percentage of exporters that are eligible small business concerns, based upon the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce; and

''(iv) includes—

''(I) activities which have resulted in the highest return on investment based on the most recent year; and

''(II) the adoption of shared best practices included in the annual report of the Administration.

''(C) LIMITATIONS.—

''(i) SINGLE APPLICATION.—A State may not submit more than 1 application for a grant under the program in any 1 fiscal year.

''(ii) PROPORTION OF AMOUNTS.—The total value of grants made under the program during a fiscal year to the 10 States with the highest percentage of exporters that are eligible small business concerns, based upon the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce, shall be not more than 40 percent of the amounts appropriated for the program for that fiscal year.

''(iii) DURATION.—The Associate Administrator shall award a grant under this program for a period of not more than 2 years.

''(D) APPLICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A State desiring a grant under the program shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Associate Administrator may establish.

''(ii) CONSULTATION TO REDUCE DUPLICATION.—A State desiring a grant under the program shall—

''(I) before submitting an application under clause (i), consult with applicable trade agencies of the Federal Government on the scope and mission of the activities the State proposes to carry out using the grant, to ensure proper coordination and reduce duplication in services; and

''(II) document the consultation conducted under subclause (I) in the application submitted under clause (i).

''(4) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—The Associate Administrator shall award grants under the program on a competitive basis.

''(5) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of an export program carried out using a grant under the program shall be—

''(A) for a State that has a high export volume, as determined by the Associate Administrator, not more than 65 percent; and

''(B) for a State that does not have a high export volume, as determined by the Associate Administrator, not more than 75 percent.

''(6) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of an export program carried out using a grant under the program shall be comprised of not less than 50 percent cash and not more than 50 percent of indirect costs and in-kind contributions, except that no such costs or contributions may be derived from funds from any other Federal program.

''(7) REPORTS.—

''(A) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Associate Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report, which shall include—

''(i) a description of the structure of and procedures for the program;

''(ii) a management plan for the program; and

''(iii) a description of the merit-based review process to be used in the program.

''(B) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Associate Administrator shall publish on the website of the Administration an annual report regarding the program, which shall include—

''(I) the number and amount of grants made under the program during the preceding year;

''(II) a list of the States receiving a grant under the program during the preceding year, including the activities being performed with each grant;

''(III) the effect of each grant on exports by eligible small business concerns in the State receiving the grant;

''(IV) the total return on investment for each State; and

''(V) a description of best practices by States that showed high returns on investment and significant progress in helping more eligible small business concerns to export.

''(ii) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—On the date on which the Associate Administrator publishes a report under clause (i), the Associate Administrator shall notify the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives that the report has been published.

''(8) REVIEWS BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Administration shall conduct a review of—

''(i) the extent to which recipients of grants under the program are measuring the performance of the activities being conducted and the results of the measurements; and

''(ii) the overall management and effectiveness of the program.

''(B) REPORTS.—

''(i) PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Inspector General of the Administration shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report regarding the use of amounts made available under the State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program under section 1207 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (15 U.S.C. 649b note).

''(ii) NEW STEP PROGRAM.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the first grant is awarded under this subsection, the Inspector General of the Administration shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report regarding the review conducted under subparagraph (A).

''(9) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the program—

''(A) $30,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(B) $35,000,000 for fiscal year 2017;

''(C) $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2018;

''(D) $45,000,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

''(E) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.''.

(e) MEMBERSHIP OF REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE TRADE PROMOTION AGENCIES ON TRADE PROMOTION COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—Section 2312 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4727) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) REPRESENTATIVES FROM STATE TRADE PROMOTION AGENCIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The TPCC shall also include 1 or more members appointed by the President, after consultation with associations representing State trade promotion agencies, who are representatives of State trade promotion agencies.

''(B) TERM.—A member appointed under subparagraph (A) shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

''(C) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

''(i) NO COMPENSATION.—A member of the TPCC appointed under subparagraph (A) shall serve without compensation.

''(ii) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the TPCC appointed under subparagraph (A) shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the homes or regular place of business of the member in the performance of services for the TPCC.

''(iii) ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Commerce, or the head of another agency, as appropriate, shall make available to a member of the TPCC appointed under subparagraph (A) administrative services and assistance, including a security clearance, as the member may reasonably require to carry out services for the TPCC.''; and

(2) in subsection (e), in the first sentence, by inserting ''(other than members described in subsection (d)(2))'' after ''Members of the TPCC''.

(f) STATE AND FEDERAL EXPORT PROMOTION COORDINATION WORKING GROUP.—Subtitle C of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4721 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2313 the following:

''SEC. 2313A. STATE AND FEDERAL EXPORT PROMOTION COORDINATION WORKING GROUP.

''(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to promote exports as an opportunity for small businesses. In exercising their powers and functions in order to advance that policy, all Federal departments and agencies shall work constructively with State and local agencies engaged in export promotion and export financing activities.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall establish a State and Federal Export Promotion Coordination Working Group (in this section referred to as the 'Working Group') as a subcommittee of the Trade Promotion Coordination Committee (in this section referred to as the 'TPCC').

''(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Working Group are—

''(1) to identify issues related to the coordination of Federal resources relating to export promotion and export financing with such resources provided by State and local governments;

''(2) to identify ways to improve coordination with respect to export promotion and export financing activities through the strategic plan developed under section 2312(c);

''(3) to develop a strategy for improving coordination of Federal and State resources relating to export promotion and export financing, including methods to eliminate duplication of effort and overlapping functions; and

''(4) to develop a strategic plan for considering and implementing the suggestions of the Working Group as part of the strategic plan developed under section 2312(c).

''(d) MEMBERSHIP.—The Secretary of Commerce shall select the members of the Working Group, who shall include—

''(1) representatives from State trade agencies representing regionally diverse areas; and

''(2) representatives of the departments and agencies that are represented on the TPCC, who are designated by the heads of their respective departments or agencies to advise the head on ways of promoting the exportation of United States goods and services.''.

(g) REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS TO EXPORT.GOV AS A SINGLE WINDOW FOR EXPORT INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Associate Administrator for International Trade of the Small Business Administration shall, after consultation with the entities specified in paragraph (2), submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the recommendations of the Associate Administrator for improving the experience provided by the Internet website Export.gov (or a successor website) as—

(A) a comprehensive resource for information about exporting articles from the United States; and

(B) a single website for exporters to submit all information required by the Federal Government with respect to the exportation of articles from the United States.

(2) ENTITIES SPECIFIED.—The entities specified in this paragraph are—

(A) small business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)) that are exporters; and

(B) the President's Export Council, State agencies with responsibility for export promotion or export financing, district export councils, and trade associations.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(h) SMALL BUSINESS INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE ON EXPORT FINANCING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall jointly establish a Small Business Inter-Agency Task Force on Export Financing to—

(A) review and improve Federal export finance programs for small business concerns; and

(B) coordinate the activities of the Federal Government to assist small business concerns seeking to export.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''small business concern'' has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(i) AVAILABILITY OF STATE RESOURCES GUIDES ON EXPORT.GOV.—The Secretary of Commerce shall make available on the Internet website Export.gov (or a successor website) information on the resources relating to export promotion and export financing available in each State—

(1) organized by State; and

(2) including information on State agencies with responsibility for export promotion or export financing and district export councils and trade associations located in the State.

SA 1228. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM FOR NICARAGUA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall proclaim an extension until December 31, 2024, of the preferential tariff treatment for apparel goods imported from Nicaragua—

(1) described in U.S. Note 15 to subchapter XV of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; and

(2) provided for under Annex 3.28 of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement and the letters described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1634(a)(2) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 (title XIV of Public Law 109–280; 120 Stat. 1167).

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF ONE-FOR-ONE PURCHASING RULE FOR COTTON WOVEN TROUSERS.—The limitation specified in clause (iv) of paragraph (7)(b) of the letter described in section 1634(a)(2)(A) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 shall apply with respect to the one-for-one purchasing rule described in paragraph (7)(b) of that letter in each year after the extension pursuant to subsection (a) of the preferential tariff treatment described in that subsection.

(c) AMENDMENT TO MISCELLANEOUS TRADE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2006.—Section 1634(c) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''under Annex 3.28 of the Agreement'' and inserting ''under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program''; and

(B) by striking ''provided in Annex 3.28 of the Agreement'' and inserting ''under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''provided in Annex 3.28 of the Agreement'' and inserting ''under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) NICARAGUAN TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'Nicaraguan tariff preference level program' means the preferential tariff treatment provided for under Annex 3.28 of the Agreement and extended pursuant to the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.''.

(d) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law, and subject to paragraph (2), any entry of an article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program would have applied if the entry had been made on December 31, 2014, that was made—

(A) after December 31, 2014, and

(B) before the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a),

shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred after the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a).

(2) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under paragraph (1) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a) that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(A) to locate the entry; or

(B) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(3) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of an article under paragraph (1) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(4) ENTRY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''entry'' includes a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM FOR BAHRAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—U.S. Note 13 to subchapter XIV of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (a)—

(A) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2025''; and

(B) by striking ''January 1, 2016, through July 31, 2016'' and inserting ''January 1, 2026, through July 31, 2026''; and

(2) in the matter following paragraph (d), by striking ''July 31, 2016'' and inserting ''July 31, 2026''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after January 1, 2016.

SEC. 303. EXTENSION OF TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM FOR MOROCCO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—U.S. Note 64(b) to subchapter XII of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended—

(1) by striking ''shall be as follows:'' and all that follows through ''As used in this note'' and inserting ''shall be 10,000,000 SME for each of the calendar years 2016 through 2025. As used in this note''; and

(2) by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2025''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after January 1, 2016.

SA 1229. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM FOR NICARAGUA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall proclaim an extension until December 31, 2024, of the preferential tariff treatment for apparel goods imported from Nicaragua—

(1) described in U.S. Note 15 to subchapter XV of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; and

(2) provided for under Annex 3.28 of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement and the letters described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1634(a)(2) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 (title XIV of Public Law 109–280; 120 Stat. 1167).

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF ONE-FOR-ONE PURCHASING RULE FOR COTTON WOVEN TROUSERS.—The limitation specified in clause (iv) of paragraph (7)(b) of the letter described in section 1634(a)(2)(A) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 shall apply with respect to the one-for-one purchasing rule described in paragraph (7)(b) of that letter in each year after the extension pursuant to subsection (a) of the preferential tariff treatment described in that subsection.

(c) AMENDMENT TO MISCELLANEOUS TRADE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2006.—Section 1634(c) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''under Annex 3.28 of the Agreement'' and inserting ''under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program''; and

(B) by striking ''provided in Annex 3.28 of the Agreement'' and inserting ''under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''provided in Annex 3.28 of the Agreement'' and inserting ''under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) NICARAGUAN TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'Nicaraguan tariff preference level program' means the preferential tariff treatment provided for under Annex 3.28 of the Agreement and extended pursuant to the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.''.

(d) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law, and subject to paragraph (2), any entry of an article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program would have applied if the entry had been made on December 31, 2014, that was made—

(A) after December 31, 2014, and

(B) before the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a),

shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred after the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a).

(2) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under paragraph (1) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a) that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(A) to locate the entry; or

(B) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(3) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of an article under paragraph (1) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(4) ENTRY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''entry'' includes a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SA 1230. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 105(a), add the following:

(6) OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS.—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the President shall take into account whether the government of that country engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

SA 1231. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(b)(14), add at the end the following:

(D) to seek commitments from United States trading partners to strengthen their legal institutions, including by establishing an independent judiciary, ensuring the independence of prosecutors, and ensuring that such institutions are fully funded.

SA 1232. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(c)(4), insert before the end period the following: '', including a discussion of those activities that strengthen good governance, rule of law, effective legal regimes, and protections for internationally recognized human rights''.

SA 1233. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) REQUIREMENT FOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 103(b)(3) of this Act and the provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) (relating to trade authorities procedures) shall not apply to any bill implementing a trade agreement between the United States and any other country or countries if such trade agreement or implementing legislation contains any provision that would permit, without the approval of Congress—

(i) modifications, amendments, or additions to the provisions of any such agreement or implementing legislation;

(ii) modification of the parties to any such agreement;

(iii) the adoption of an interpretation of any such agreement, if such interpretation affects United States law or policy; or

(iv) the granting of a waiver of any obligation under any such agreement, if such waiver affects United States law or policy.

(B) POINT OF ORDER IN SENATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering an implementing bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator against any part of the implementing bill or trade agreement that contains material in violation of subparagraph (A), and the point of order is sustained by the Presiding Officer, the Senate shall cease consideration of the implementing bill under the trade authorities procedures referred to in subparagraph (A).

(ii) WAIVERS AND APPEALS.—

(I) WAIVERS.—Before the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order described in clause (i), any Senator may move to waive the point of order. Such motion to waive shall not be subject to amendment. A point of order described in clause (i) may only be waived by the affirmative vote of 60 Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(II) APPEALS.—After the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order under this subparagraph, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on the point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled. A ruling of

the Presiding Officer on a point of order described in clause (i) is sustained unless a majority of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, vote not to sustain the ruling.

(III) DEBATE.—Debate on a motion to waive under subclause (I) or on an appeal of the ruling of the Presiding Officer under subclause (II) shall be limited to 1 hour. Such time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate, or their designees.

(C) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term ''approval of Congress'' means the affirmative vote of both chambers of Congress in accordance with the applicable rules and procedures of each chamber.

SA 1234. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 103(b)(3) of this Act and section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) (relating to trade authorities procedures) shall not apply to any bill implementing a trade agreement between the United States and any other country if the trade agreement or the implementing bill contains any provision relating to the immigration laws of the United States or the entry of aliens into the United States.

(8) POINT OF ORDER IN SENATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering an implementing bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator against any part of the implementing bill or trade agreement that contains material in violation of paragraph (7), and the point of order is sustained by the Presiding Officer, the Senate shall cease consideration of the implementing bill under the trade authorities procedures referred to in section 103(b)(3) of this Act or set forth in section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191).

(B) WAIVERS AND APPEALS.—

(i) WAIVERS.—Before the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order described in subparagraph (A), any Senator may move to waive the point of order and the motion to waive shall not be subject to amendment. A point of order described in subparagraph (A) is waived only by the affirmative vote of 60 Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(ii) APPEALS.—After the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order under this subparagraph, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on the point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled. A ruling of the Presiding Officer on a point of order described in subparagraph (A) is sustained unless a majority of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, vote not to sustain the ruling.

(iii) DEBATE.—Debate on a motion to waive under clause (i) or on an appeal of the ruling of the Presiding Officer under clause (ii) shall be limited to 1 hour, which shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate, or their designees.

SA 1235. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) ENERGY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in natural gas are—

(A) to ensure that energy expenditures by consumers, including households and businesses, in the United States do not increase;

(B) to protect key sectors of the United States economy that are energy intensive and exposed to the effects of trade, such as manufacturing, from price increases or job losses;

(C) to promote the energy security of the United States, including the ability of the United States to reduce its reliance on imported oil; and

(D) to ensure that domestic natural gas supplies are used to meet the future energy needs of the United States, including through use in the transportation, industrial, and electricity sectors of the United States.

SA 1236. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 3(b) if the agreement or agreements allow for national treatment for trade in natural gas.

SA 1237. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

At the end of section 2(a), add the following:

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

SA 1238. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike title II.

SA 1239. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—TRADE PREFERENCES FOR NEPAL

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Nepal Trade Preferences Act''.

SEC. 302. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may authorize the provision of preferential treatment under this title to articles that are imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States pursuant to section 703 if the President determines—

(1) that Nepal meets the requirements set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)); and

(2) after taking into account the factors set forth in paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (c) of section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2462), that Nepal meets the eligibility requirements of such section 502.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT; MANDATORY GRADUATION.—The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2462) shall apply with respect to Nepal to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions apply with respect to beneficiary developing countries under title V of that Act (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.).

SEC. 303. ELIGIBLE ARTICLES.

(a) CERTAIN MANUFACTURED AND OTHER ARTICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An article described in paragraph (2) may enter the customs territory of the United States free of duty.

(2) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An article is described in this paragraph if—

(i) the article is the growth, product, or manufacture of Nepal;

(ii) the article is imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States;

(iii) the article is described in subparagraphs (B) through (G) of subsection (b)(1) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463);

(iv) the President determines, after receiving the advice of the United States International Trade Commission in accordance with subsection (e) of that section, that the article is not import-sensitive in the context of imports from Nepal; and

(v) subject to subparagraph (C), the sum of the cost or value of the materials produced in, and the direct costs of processing operations performed in, Nepal or the customs territory of the United States is not less than 35 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—An article shall not be treated as the growth, product, or manufacture of Nepal for purposes of subparagraph (A)(i) by virtue of having merely undergone—

(i) simple combining or packaging operations; or

(ii) mere dilution with water or mere dilution with another substance that does not

materially alter the characteristics of the article.

(C) LIMITATION ON UNITED STATES COST.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(v), the cost or value of materials produced in, and the direct costs of processing operations performed in, the customs territory of the United States and attributed to the 35-percent requirement under that subparagraph may not exceed 15 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered.

(b) TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A textile or apparel article described in paragraph (2) or (3) may enter the customs territory of the United States free of duty.

(2) TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES WHOLLY ASSEMBLED IN NEPAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A textile or apparel article is described in this paragraph if the textile or apparel article is—

(i) wholly assembled in Nepal, without regard to the country of origin of the yarn or fabric used to make the articles; and

(ii) imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States.

(B) LIMITATIONS.—

(i) LOW VOLUME OF IMPORTS.—If, during a calendar year, imports of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) from Nepal are less than 1 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States during that calendar year, such imports from Nepal may be increased to an amount that is equal to not more than 1.5 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States during that calendar year for the succeeding calendar year.

(ii) HIGHER VOLUME OF IMPORTS.—If, during a calendar year, imports of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) from Nepal are at least 1 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States during that calendar year, such imports from Nepal may be increased by an amount that is equal to not more than ⅓ of 1 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States during that calendar year for the succeeding calendar year.

(iii) AGGREGATE COUNTRY LIMIT.—In no case may the aggregate quantity of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) imported into the customs territory of the United States from Nepal during a calendar year under this subsection exceed the applicable percentage set forth in paragraph (4)(B) for that calendar year.

(3) HANDLOOMED, HANDMADE, FOLKLORE ARTICLES AND ETHNIC PRINTED FABRICS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A textile or apparel article is described in this paragraph if the textile or apparel article is—

(i) imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States;

(ii) on a list of textile and apparel articles determined by the President, after consultation with the Government of Nepal, to be handloomed, handmade, folklore articles or ethnic printed fabrics of Nepal; and

(iii) certified as a handloomed, handmade, folklore article or an ethnic printed fabric of Nepal by the competent authority of Nepal.

(B) ETHNIC PRINTED FABRIC.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an ethnic printed fabric of Nepal is fabric—

(i) containing a selvedge on both edges and having a width of less than 50 inches;

(ii) classifiable under subheading 5208.52.30 or 5208.52.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States;

(iii) of a type that contains designs, symbols, and other characteristics of Nepal—

(I) normally produced for and sold in indigenous markets in Nepal; and

(II) normally sold in Nepal by the piece as opposed to being tailored into garments before being sold in indigenous markets in Nepal;

(iv) printed, including waxed, in Nepal; and

(v) formed in the United States from yarns formed in the United States or formed in Nepal from yarns originating in either the United States or Nepal.

(4) LIMITATIONS ON BENEFITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Preferential treatment under this subsection shall be extended in the 1-year period beginning January 1, 2016, and in each of the succeeding 10 1-year periods, to imports of textile and apparel articles from Nepal under this subsection in an amount not to exceed the applicable percentage of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States in the most recent 12-month period for which data are available.

(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''applicable percentage'' means 1.5 percent for the 1-year period beginning January 1, 2016, increased in each of the 10 succeeding 1-year periods by equal increments, so that for the 1-year period beginning January 1, 2025, the applicable percentage does not exceed 3.5 percent.

(5) SURGE MECHANISM.—The provisions of subparagraph (B) of section 112(b)(3) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)) shall apply to textile and apparel articles imported from Nepal to which preferential treatment is extended under this subsection to the same extent and in the same manner that such provisions apply to textile and apparel articles described in such section 112(b)(3) and imported from a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country.

(6) SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY RULES; PROTECTIONS AGAINST TRANSSHIPMENT.—The provisions of subsection (e) of section 112 and section 113 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721 and 3722) shall apply to textile and apparel articles imported from Nepal to which preferential treatment is extended under this subsection to the same extent and in the same manner that such provisions apply to textile and apparel articles imported from beneficiary sub-Saharan countries to which preferential treatment is extended under such section 112.

SEC. 304. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

The President shall monitor, review, and report to Congress, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the implementation of this title and on the trade and investment policy of the United States with respect to Nepal.

SEC. 305. TERMINATION OF PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

No preferential treatment extended under this title shall remain in effect after December 31, 2025.

SEC. 306. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this title shall take effect on January 1, 2016.

SA 1240. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

''An Act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.''

SA 1241. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 644, to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

''An Act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.''

SA 1242. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

On page 118, strike lines 19 through 23, and insert the following:

(b) TRAINING FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''shall not exceed'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $575,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021.''.

(2) OFFSET.—

(A) CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.—Subparagraph (B) of Section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income;'', and

(ii) by inserting ''(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)'' in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after ''In determining the amount omitted from gross income'', and

(iii) by inserting ''AMOUNT OMITTED FROM'' after ''DETERMINATION OF'' in the heading thereof.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subparagraph (A) shall apply to—

(i) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

SA 1243. Mr. HATCH (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-

exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

Strike title II.

SA 1244. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY TO INCREASE UNITED STATES EXPORTS TO AFRICA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(1) establish and implement a comprehensive strategy to increase United States exports to Africa by not less than 200 percent in real dollar value during the 10-year period beginning on such date of enactment; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the strategy.

SA 1245. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) ENERGY NEGOTIATIONS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in energy products and natural resources, including hydrocarbons such as oil, gas, and coal, and mineral and timber resources, are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of energy products and natural resources in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports of energy products and natural resources in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in energy products and natural resources.

SA 1246. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) FISHERIES NEGOTIATIONS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in fish, seafood, and shellfish products are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of fish, seafood, and shellfish products in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports of fish, seafood, and shellfish products in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in fish, seafood, and shellfish products.

SA 1247. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 6(b), add at the end the following:

(7) LIMITATIONS ON PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO AGREEMENTS THAT CHANGE IMMIGRATION LAWS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 3(b) that makes any changes to the immigration laws of the United States.

SA 1248. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

Subtitle A—Taxpayer Protection Provisions and Increased Accountability

SEC. 311. REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZED AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND INSURANCE.

Section 6(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) APPLICABLE AMOUNT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'applicable amount', for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, means $135,000,000,000.

''(3) FREEZING OF LENDING CAP IF DEFAULT RATE IS 2 PERCENT OR MORE.—If the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is 2 percent or more for a quarter, the Bank may not exceed the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding on the last day of that quarter until the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is less than 2 percent.''.

SEC. 312. INCREASE IN LOSS RESERVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) RESERVE REQUIREMENT.—The Bank shall build to and hold in reserve, to protect against future losses, an amount that is not less than 5 percent of the aggregate amount of disbursed and outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance of the Bank.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 313. REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.

Section 17(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a–6(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and every 4 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

''(1) review the adequacy of the design and effectiveness of the controls used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to prevent, detect, and investigate fraudulent applications for loans and guarantees and the compliance by the Bank with the controls, including by auditing a sample of Bank transactions; and

''(2) submit a written report regarding the findings of the review and providing such recommendations with respect to the controls described in paragraph (1) as the Comptroller General deems appropriate to—

''(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.''.

SEC. 314. OFFICE OF ETHICS.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) OFFICE OF ETHICS.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Office of Ethics within the Bank, which shall oversee all ethics issues within the Bank.

''(2) HEAD OF OFFICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Office of Ethics shall be the Chief Ethics Officer, who shall report to the Board of Directors.

''(B) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Ethics Officer shall be—

''(i) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

''(I) with a background in law who have experience in the fields of law and ethics; and

''(II) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Ethics Officer; and

''(ii) approved by the Board.

''(C) DESIGNATED AGENCY ETHICS OFFICIAL.—The Chief Ethics Officer shall serve as the designated agency ethics official for the Bank pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.).

''(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Ethics has jurisdiction over all employees of, and ethics matters relating to, the Bank. With respect to employees of the Bank, the Office of Ethics shall—

''(A) recommend administrative actions to establish or enforce standards of official conduct;

''(B) refer to the Office of the Inspector General of the Bank alleged violations of—

''(i) the standards of ethical conduct applicable to employees of the Bank under parts 2635 and 6201 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations;

''(ii) the standards of ethical conduct established by the Chief Ethics Officer; and

''(iii) any other laws, rules, or regulations governing the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities that are applicable to employees of the Bank;

''(C) report to appropriate Federal or State authorities substantial evidence of a violation of any law applicable to the performance of official duties that may have been disclosed to the Office of Ethics; and

''(D) render advisory opinions regarding the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of an employee or contractor of the Bank, and issue general guidance on such matters as necessary.''.

SEC. 315. CHIEF RISK OFFICER.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by section 314, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) CHIEF RISK OFFICER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Chief Risk Officer of the Bank, who shall—

''(A) oversee all issues relating to risk within the Bank; and

''(B) report to the President of the Bank.

''(2) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Risk Officer shall be—

''(A) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

''(i) with a demonstrated ability in the general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, financial risk evaluation practices in large governmental or business entities; and

''(ii) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Risk Officer; and

''(B) approved by the Board.

''(3) DUTIES.—The duties of the Chief Risk Officer are—

''(A) to be responsible for all matters related to managing and mitigating all risk to which the Bank is exposed, including the programs and operations of the Bank;

''(B) to establish policies and processes for risk oversight, the monitoring of management compliance with risk limits, and the management of risk exposures and risk controls across the Bank;

''(C) to be responsible for the planning and execution of all Bank risk management activities, including policies, reporting, and systems to achieve strategic risk objectives;

''(D) to develop an integrated risk management program that includes identifying, prioritizing, measuring, monitoring, and managing internal control and operating risks and other identified risks;

''(E) to ensure that the process for risk assessment and underwriting for individual transactions considers how each such transaction considers the effect of the transaction on the concentration of exposure in the overall portfolio of the Bank, taking into account fees, collateralization, and historic default rates; and

''(F) to review the adequacy of the use by the Bank of qualitative metrics to assess the risk of default under various scenarios.''.

SEC. 316. RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by sections 214 and 215, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a management committee to be known as the 'Risk Management Committee'.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The membership of the Risk Management Committee shall be the members of the Board of Directors, with the President and First Vice President of the Bank serving as ex officio members.

''(3) DUTIES.—The duties of the Risk Management Committee shall be—

''(A) to oversee, in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Bank—

''(i) periodic stress testing on the entire Bank portfolio, reflecting different market, industry, and macroeconomic scenarios, and consistent with common practices of commercial and multilateral development banks; and

''(ii) the monitoring of industry, geographic, and obligor exposure levels; and

''(B) to review all required reports on the default rate of the Bank before submission to Congress under section 8(g).''.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUDIT COMMITTEE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall revise the bylaws of the Bank to terminate the Audit Committee established by section 7 of the bylaws.

SEC. 317. INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF BANK PORTFOLIO.

(a) AUDIT.—The Inspector General of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall conduct an audit or evaluation of the portfolio risk management procedures of the Bank, including a review of the implementation by the Bank of the duties assigned to the Chief Risk Officer under section 3(l) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended by section 315.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every 3 years thereafter, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a written report containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out subsection (a).

SEC. 318. PILOT PROGRAM FOR REINSURANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.), the Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the ''Bank'') may establish a pilot program under which the Bank may enter into contracts and other arrangements to share risks associated with the provision of guarantees, insurance, or credit, or the participation in the extension of credit, by the Bank under that Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF RISK-SHARING.—

(1) PER CONTRACT OR OTHER ARRANGEMENT.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing pursuant to a contract or other arrangement entered into under subsection (a) may not exceed $1,000,000,000.

(2) PER YEAR.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing during a fiscal year pursuant to contracts or other arrangements entered into under subsection (a) during that fiscal year may not exceed $10,000,000,000.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2019, the Bank shall submit to Congress a written report that contains a detailed analysis of the use of the pilot program carried out under subsection (a) during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect, impede, or revoke any authority of the Bank.

(e) TERMINATION.—The pilot program carried out under subsection (a) shall terminate on September 30, 2019.

Subtitle B—Promotion of Small Business Exports

SEC. 321. INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS LENDING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b)(1)(E)(v) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)(E)(v)) is amended by striking ''20 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 322. REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.—The Bank shall include in its annual report to Congress under subsection (a) a report on the programs of the Bank for United States businesses with less than $250,000,000 in annual sales.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the report of the Export-Import Bank of the United States submitted to Congress under section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) for the first year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Modernization of Operations

SEC. 331. ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS AND DOCUMENTS.

Section 2(b)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(M) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Bank shall implement policies—

''(i) to accept electronic documents with respect to transactions whenever possible, including copies of bills of lading, certifications, and compliance documents, in such manner so as not to undermine any potential civil or criminal enforcement related to the transactions; and

''(ii) to accept electronic payments in all of its programs.''.

SEC. 332. REAUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY UPDATING.

Section 3(j) of the Export-Import Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''2012, 2013, and 2014'' and inserting ''2015 through 2019'';

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''(I) the funds'' and inserting ''(i) the funds''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''2012, 2013, and 2014'' and inserting ''2015 through 2019''.

Subtitle D—General Provisions

SEC. 341. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103–428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''the date on which the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States expires under section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f)''.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''the date on which the authority of the Bank expires under section 7''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SEC. 342. CERTAIN UPDATED LOAN TERMS AND AMOUNTS.

(a) LOAN TERMS FOR MEDIUM-TERM FINANCING.—Section 2(a)(2)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) with principal amounts of not more than $25,000,000; and''.

(b) COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITIES RELATING TO INSURANCE.—Section 2(d)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$25,000,000''.

(c) EXPORT AMOUNTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS LOANS.—Section 3(g)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(g)(3)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$25,000,000''.

(d) CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.—Section 11(a)(1)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635i–5(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000 or more'' and inserting the following: ''$25,000,000 (or, if less than $25,000,000, the threshold established pursuant to international agreements, including the Common Approaches for Officially Supported Export Credits and Environmental and Social Due Diligence, as adopted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Council on June 28, 2012, and the risk-management framework adopted by financial institutions for determining, assessing, and managing environmental and social risk in projects (commonly referred to as the 'Equator Principles')) or more''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 351. PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (6 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this Act, the Bank may not—

''(A) deny an application for financing based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns; or

''(B) promulgate or implement policies that discriminate against an application based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibitions under paragraph (1) apply only to applications for financing by the Bank for projects concerning the exploration, development, production, or export of energy sources and the generation or transmission of electrical power, or combined heat and power, regardless of the energy source involved.''.

SEC. 352. NEGOTIATIONS TO END EXPORT CREDIT FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11 of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a–5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the 'Secretary')'' and inserting ''President''; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''(OECD)'' and inserting ''(in this section referred to as the 'OECD')''; and

(ii) by striking ''ultimate goal of eliminating'' and inserting ''possible goal of eliminating, before the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015,'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''Secretary'' each place it appears and inserting ''President''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) REPORT ON STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the President shall submit to Congress a proposal, and a strategy for achieving the proposal, that the United States Government will pursue with other major exporting countries, including OECD members and non-OECD members, to eliminate over a period of not more than 10 years subsidized export-financing programs, tied aid, export credits, and all other forms of government-supported export subsidies.

''(d) NEGOTIATIONS WITH NON-OECD MEMBERS.—The President shall initiate and pursue negotiations with countries that are not OECD members to bring those countries into a multilateral agreement establishing rules and limitations on officially supported export credits.

''(e) ANNUAL REPORTS ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and annually thereafter through calendar year 2019, the President shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of any negotiations described in subsection (d).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to reports required to be submitted under section 11(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a–5(b)) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 353. STUDY OF FINANCING FOR INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

(a) ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY USE OF BANK PRODUCTS.—The Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the ''Bank'') shall conduct a study of the extent to which the products offered by the Bank are available and used by companies that export information and communications technology services and related goods.

(b) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Bank shall examine the following:

(1) The number of jobs in the United States that are supported by the export of information and communications technology services and related goods, and the degree to which access to financing will increase exports of such services and related goods.

(2) The reduction in the financing by the Bank of exports of information and communications technology services from 2003 through 2014.

(3) The activities of foreign export credit agencies to facilitate the export of information and communications technology services and related goods.

(4) Specific proposals for how the Bank could provide additional financing for the exportation of information and communications technology services and related goods through risk-sharing with other export credit agencies and other third parties.

(5) Proposals for new products the Bank could offer to provide financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods, including—

(A) the extent to which the Bank is authorized to offer new products;

(B) the extent to which the Bank would need additional authority to offer new products to meet the needs of the information and communications technology industry;

(C) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide increased financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank;

(D) specific proposals that would enable the Bank to provide increased outreach to the information and communications technology industry about the products the Bank offers; and

(E) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide the financing to build information and communications technology infrastructure, in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank, to allow for market access opportunities for United States information and communications technology companies to provide services on the infrastructure being financed by the Bank.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bank shall submit to Congress a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Regulatory Issues Impacting End-Users and Market Liquidity.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''A Pathway to Improving Care for Medicare Patients with Chronic Conditions.''

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Cybersecurity: Setting the Rules for Responsible Global Cyber Behavior.''

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

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 3:40 p.m.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Printing be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 3:50 p.m.

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

IRS BUREAUCRACY REDUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the passage of H.R. 1295 and H.R. 644, the title amendments, Nos. 1240 and 1241, be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 1240) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

''An act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.''

The amendment (No. 1241) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

''An act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.''

RELATING TO PROVISIONS OF THE BORDER PATROL AGENT PAY REFORM ACT OF 2014

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1356, introduced earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1356) to clarify that certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 will not take effect until after the Director of the Office of Personnel Management promulgates and makes effective regulations relating to such provisions.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1356) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1356

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2 of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–277) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) EFFECTIVE DATES.—Subsections (b), (c), (d), and (g), and the amendments made by such subsections, shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2016, except that—

''(1) any provision in section 5550(b) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (b), relating to administering elections and making advance assignments to a regular tour of duty, shall be applicable before such effective date to the extent determined necessary by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management; and

''(2) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may issue such regulations as may be necessary before such effective date.''.

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be deemed to have been enacted on the date of the enactment of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014.

KIDS TO PARKS DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 179.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 179) designating May 16, 2015, as ''Kids to Parks Day.''

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 179) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1350, S. 1357, and H.R. 2048

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand that there are three bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1350) to provide a short-term extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 1357) to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 18, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, May 18; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1314.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, Senators should expect at least two

rollcall votes at 5:30 p.m. on Monday in relation to amendments to the TPA bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 18, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:01 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 18, 2015, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

LESLIE E. BAINS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2015, VICE WILLIAM S. JASIEN, TERM EXPIRED.

LESLIE E. BAINS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

INTER–AMERICAN FOUNDATION

JUAN CARLOS ITURREGUI, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER–AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 26, 2020, VICE THOMAS JOSEPH DODD, TERM EXPIRED.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

KARL BOYD BROOKS, OF KANSAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE CRAIG E. HOOKS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LAURA FARNSWORTH DOGU, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA.

JOHN L. ESTRADA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO.

SAMUEL D. HEINS, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

THOMAS O. MELIA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE PAIGE EVE ALEXANDER, RESIGNED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(D):

To be rear admiral

PETER J. BROWN
SCOTT A. BUSCHMAN
MICHAEL F. MCALLISTER
JUNE E. RYAN
JOSEPH M. VOJVODICH

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. PAUL E. BAUMAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL ANTONIO A. AGUTO, JR.
COLONEL MARIA B. BARRETT
COLONEL JAMES E. BONNER
COLONEL JEFFERY D. BROADWATER
COLONEL XAVIER T. BRUNSON
COLONEL CHARLES H. CLEVELAND
COLONEL DOUGLAS C. CRISSMAN
COLONEL TIMOTHY J. DAUGHERTY
COLONEL BRADLEY K. DREYER
COLONEL JOHN R. EVANS, JR.
COLONEL ANTONIO M. FLETCHER
COLONEL PATRICK D. FRANK
COLONEL BRADLEY T. GERICKE
COLONEL STEVEN W. GILLAND
COLONEL KARL H. GINGRICH
COLONEL WILLIAMS H. GRAHAM, JR.
COLONEL CHARLES R. HAMILTON
COLONEL DIANA M. HOLLAND
COLONEL GARY W. JOHNSTON
COLONEL KENNETH L. KAMPER
COLONEL JOHN S. LASKODI
COLONEL DONNA W. MARTIN
COLONEL JOSEPH P. MCGEE
COLONEL RANDALL A. MCINTIRE
COLONEL JOHN E. NOVALIS II
COLONEL MARK W. ODOM
COLONEL PAUL H. PARDEW
COLONEL THOMAS A. PUGH
COLONEL JAMES H. RAYMER
COLONEL JOHN B. RICHARDSON IV
COLONEL ANDREW M. ROHLING
COLONEL MICHEL M. RUSSELL, SR.
COLONEL THOMAS H. TODD III
COLONEL JOEL K. TYLER
COLONEL KEVIN VEREEN
COLONEL DANIEL R. WALRATH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM W. WAY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 156:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DARSE E. CRANDALL

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT B. ALLMAN III
DAVID K. BEAVERS
BYRON V. BRIDGES
HOWARD F. CANTRELL
RAYNARD J. CHURCHWELL
DEAN A. DARROUX
RAYMOND E. FOLSOM
LESLIE J. FORBESMARIANI
JAMES J. FOSTER
EVERETT J. FRANKLIN
BRET J. GILMORE
COLLIN S. GROSSRUCK
ABDULLAH A. HULWE
ERNEST M. IBANGA
MICHAEL L. JEFFRIES
CRAIG M. JOHNSON
CARRON A. JONES
KRZYSZTOF A. KOPEC
VAIOA T. LEAU
SUN C. LEE
BRAD P. LEWIS
ROBERT E. MARSI
KEVIN B. MATEER
SHAWN E. MCCAMMON
ERIC R. MEYNERS
BYUNG K. MIN
FLORIO F. PIERRE
KELLY D. PORTER
DAVID A. SCHNARR
MICHAEL T. SHELLMAN
ROBERT R. STEVENSON
MARK A. STEWART
ANTHONY L. TAYLOR, SR.
STANTON D. TROTTER
SEAN S. C. WEAD
RICHARD F. WINCHESTER
EDWARD J. YURUS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

LYDE C. ANDREWS
JONATHAN D. BAILEY
HOWARD M. BANKSTON
RONALD BOYD
WILLIAM A. BRECKENRIDGE
APRILL M. BRIGHT
ROBERT A. CARGEL
BRYANT J. CASTEEL
HWA S. CHUNG
JOHN L. CRAVEN
TIMOTHY S. CRAWLEY
KEVIN M. DAUL
DAVID S. DENNIS
BENJAMIN S. DUNCAN
BENJAMIN F. ELLINGTON
JONATHAN P. ENTREKIN
JONATHAN R. FISHER
RONNY D. FISHER, JR.
JOHN B. GABRIEL
DAVID A. HICKS
DWAYNE W. HUGHES
LYNDON A. JONG
ABRAHAMYOUNG K. KIM
BILL E. KIM
EUN S. KIM
JOSEPH W. LAWHORN
SEAN A. LEVINE
ERIC L. LIGHT
CHARLES G. LOWMAN
PAUL LYNN
MATTHEW D. MADISON
SEAN R. MAGNUSON
MARK A. MCCORKLE
MATTHEW T. MILLER
KEVIN B. MUCHER
WILLIAM M. OLIVER
PATRICK A. OPP
JOEL S. PANZER
ERIC D. PARK
COLT L. RANDLES
PHILLIP P. RITTERMEYER
FRANTZO SAINTVAL
ABRAHAM SARMIENTO
WILLIAM J. SHEETS
BRIAN K. SMITH
STEVEN D. SMITH
WILLIAM J. SMITH
JOHN C. SNEED
ARLES C. SUTHERLAND
AARON R. SWARTZ
MICHAEL D. TURPIN, JR.
GEORGE A. TYGER
EVERETT E. ZACHARY
D012582

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ELIZABETH M. LIBAO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JOHN J. MORRIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER A. WODARZ

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

FATMATTA M. KUYATEH
LUCAS S. MCDONALD
MARY S. PADEN
PAUL J. ROSZKO
MICHAEL J. SCARCELLA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

MAREGINA L. WICKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

NIKKI K. CONLIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

MICHAEL R. CATHEY

To be lieutenant commander

SARAH BALLARD
LAURENCE J. BELIN
BRANDON G. CHEW
CRAIG S. COLEMAN
JUSTIN A. DYE
CHARLES L. EGAN
THOMAS M. HEARTY
JUSTIN R. HENNING
JASON D. KEHRER
DAVID J. KLIMASKI
PIROSKA K. KOPAR
LINDSAY J. LIPINSKI
CHRISTOPHER D. MAROULES
SEAN T. MEINER
EVELYN M. POTOCHNY

ANDREW E. SHEEP
JASON M. SOUZA
MATTHEW T. STEPANOVICH
ERIC H. TWERDAHL, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TERESA M. ALLEN
JARED L. ANTEVIL
STEPHEN P. ARLES
JOHN C. ARNOLD
SAIRA N. ASLAM
LUKE H. BALSAMO
JOHN T. BASSETT
ERIC E. BELIN
RODD J. BENFIELD
CLIFFORD A. BLUMENBERG
RODERICK C. BORGIE
BRIAN N. BOWES
RODNEY D. BOYUM
SHAUN D. CARSTAIRS
CHRISTOPHER B. CHISHOLM
CHRISTOPHER B. CORNELISSEN
CHARLES E. CRAVEN
MICHAEL E. EPPERLY
JESSE R. GEIBE
MARSHAL F. HARPE
JASON O. HEATON
JOSE HENAO
GEOFFREY S. JACOBY
JAMES W. KECK
PAMELA L. KRAHL
STEVEN M. KRISS
LAURENCE J. KUHN
CHRISTOPHER T. KUZNIEWSKI
TODD R. LAROCK
JONATHAN M. LIESKE
LUIS E. MARQUEZ
GREGG J. MONTALTO
WON K. MOON
KRISTINA V. MOROCCO
JOEL NATIONS
ETHEL L. ONEAL
CARL E. PETERSEN
ALICIA R. SANDERSON
GILBERT SEDA
MICHAEL SEXTON
INGRID V. SHELDON
PETER R. SHUMAKER
JAMES E. STEPENOSKY
NIMFA C. TENEZAMORA
MARK H. TUCKER
JOHN VANSLYKE
DAVID E. WEBSTER
CARLOS D. WILLIAMS
GORDON G. WISBACH
JOON S. YUN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MARTIN J. ANERINO
MARK R. BOONE
LARRY C. BURTON
WILLIE S. CHAO
RAYNESE S. FIKES
HEATHER L. GNAU
JULIET R. HOFFMAN
THOMAS B. JORDAN
TARAS J. KONRAD
PAUL I. LIM
LAURA S. MCFARLAND
SHAY S. RAZMI
MELISSA L. RUFF
MARTHA S. SCOTTY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DAVID J. BACON
THOMAS G. BODNOVICH, JR.
RODERICK L. BOYCE
TYSON J. BRUNSTETTER
JOSEPH V. COHN
GERALD T. DELONG
JODY A. DREYER
DOUGLAS W. FLETCHER
RICHARD V. FOLGA
EDRION R. GAWARAN
DAVID W. HARDY
MICHAEL J. KEMPER
JOHN P. KENDRICK
CARRIE H. KENNEDY
FRANCIS V. MCLEAN
DEVIN J. MORRISON
DAN K. PATTERSON
CHAD E. ROE
JERRY N. SANDERS, JR.
JENNIFER E. SMITH
MATTHEW J. SWIERGOSZ
SHANE A. VATH
ANTHONY S. WILLIAMS
RICHARD G. ZEBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ARTHUR R. BLUM
DANIEL CIMMINO
JUSTIN B. CLANCY
ROBERT C. DETOLVE
BRUCE A. GRAGERT
ANDREW R. HOUSE
DOMINIC J. JONES
JON D. PEPPETTI
LIA M. REYNOLDS
AARON C. RUGH
FLORENCIO J. YUZON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PATRICK K. AMERSBACH
DONNA N. BRADLEY
TRACI L. BROOKS
ANNE M. BROWN
MARNIE S. BUCHANAN
CAROL A. BURROUGHS
SARAH M. BUTLER
ANN M. CASE
DENISE M. GECHAS
ELIZABETH K. GILLARD
SANDRA K. HEAVEN
KATHLEEN A. HINZ
MICHELE C. HUDDLESTON
ETHAN B. JOSIAH
TERRI A. KINSEY
MARYANN C. MATTONEN
BARBARA A. MULLEN
CHRISTOPHER J. REDDIN
ERIN C. ROBERTSON
FRANCES C. SLONSKI
DENNIS L. SPENCE
KIMBERLY A. TAYLOR
EVELYN J. TYLER
ESTHER C. VOSSLER
BARBARA C. WHITESIDE
NANCY V. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CRAIG L. ABRAHAM
BRIAN J. ANDERSON
GEORGE E. BRESNIHAN
WILLIAM H. CLARKE
BRENT L. DESSING
FREDERICK M. DINI
TERREL J. FISHER
JAMES R. S. GAYTON
MATTHEW P. HOFFMAN
CHONG HUNTER
TRENT C. KALP
CHRISTOPHER D. LIGHT
SPENCER A. MOSELEY
CHRISTOPHER T. NELSON
SHAWN B. NORWOOD
RICHARD A. PAQUETTE
MARK C. RICE
CHAD R. RIDDER
BRIAN V. ROSA
DAVID E. SMITH
AARON S. TRAVER
SCOTT Y. YAMAMOTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CHAD M. BROOKS
SCOTT O. CLOYD
JOSEPH L. GREESON
ERIK J. KARLSON
MICHAEL D. KENNEY, JR.
SCOTT R. KING
KIRK A. LAGERQUIST
THOMAS M. MOSKAL
ROD W. TRIBBLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

HEATHER J. WALTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

WILLIAM A. HLAVIN
BASHON W. MANN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, May 14, 2015*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 14, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LOOKING AT THE BIG PICTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we are dealing with the defense authorization legislation, we should step back and look at the big picture. Are we taking tough stands dealing with escalating personnel costs, procurement issues, excess facilities? Are we honoring the responsibility of the military to clean up after itself? One of the best examples is a failure to deal with the rightsizing of our military facilities.

It is no secret that our nuclear triad, which includes our land-based missiles, nuclear submarines, and bombers, are wildly in excess of anything we need for deterrence.

The Pentagon's 2013 report on nuclear employment strategy declared that ''we can ensure the security of the United States and our allies and maintain a strong and credible strategic deterrence while safely pursuing up to a one-third reduction in deployed nuclear weapons from the level established in the New START Treaty.''

Other experts, including a commission chaired by former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General James Cartwright, suggest we could go even lower without jeopardizing security.

Yet we are on a trajectory to spend over a trillion dollars in the decades to come on weapons that are largely irrelevant to the challenges of today: ISIS, 9/11-type attacks, military activities in Iraq and Afghanistan, Russian aggression in the Ukraine.

We should be addressing what is an appropriate level for the nuclear deterrence. But until we face up to the fact that we ought to at least know what we are getting into, one simple step would have been to tell Congress what the longer term costs are going to be.

In the last legislation, I had an amendment that was successfully approved to require the CBO to publish every 2 years a 10-year cost estimate of our nuclear modernization. It has already proven extremely valuable to provide a set of numbers we can compare to the Pentagon's estimates. Unfortunately, more and more of these expenses are being pushed outside the 10-year window.

I had an amendment that would have at least required our being able to have a 25-year cost of modernization, an estimate the Pentagon said they can do and one that we already have for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

One other area that was equally puzzling was the failure to allow a bipartisan, fully offset amendment to upgrade our Air National Guard F–15s. The radar they are using dates to the 1970s. In fact, it went out of production 30 years ago. We had a simple, bipartisan, fully offset amendment to allow the Air Guard to at least get 10 planes modernized on an ongoing basis.

It is frustrating. We are failing to tackle the big issues. We are not even given an opportunity to guarantee Congress knows what the longer term costs are, and we are shortchanging small investments that would make a big difference for our Air National Guard.

I hope we are going to have an opportunity as the legislation moves forward for Congress to do a better job balancing our priorities, meeting the needs of our men and women in uniform, and protecting our long-term budget.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF SMITH WILDMAN BROOKHART, III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time this morning to celebrate the life of a remarkable American, the late Smith Wildman Brookhart, III.

Mr. Brookhart was born on January 22, 1935, and passed away last month. He is survived by his wife of 56 years, Gail Anderson Brookhart; three sons and their wives; and 10 grandchildren. One of Smith's sons, Tom Brookhart, and his wife, Debra Brookhart, are my constituents and good friends in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Let me talk for a moment about Smith Brookhart's life. After graduating from East High School in Duluth, Minnesota, Smith attended Iowa State College in Ames, Iowa, receiving his degree in 1957. He served our country in uniform as an ensign in the United States Navy. His service included two Antarctic expeditions. As a Navy pilot myself, I can tell you Antarctic expeditions are not something that are friendly; I will just say that.

Ultimately, Smith moved his family to Branson, Missouri, where he became the CEO of Ozark Mountain Bank. He served in that capacity for over three decades. He was very involved in the development of Branson, Missouri. My family and I have had occasion to visit Branson. It is a very family-friendly town where Christians are very welcome. I know that Smith's Christian faith was very important to him.

At age 69, Smith received a heart transplant and was given a new lease on life.

There is a beautiful line I read in Smith's obituary, which I would like to read:

''Smith would not want to be remembered for the accolades of his efforts, but for a life rich with friendships.''

Mr. Speaker, today, I honor Smith Brookhart, a remarkable American, father, grandfather, community leader, patriot, and servant of Christ.

I would like to close with Romans 8:38:

''For I am convinced that neither death nor life, nor angels nor demons, neither the present nor the future, nor any powers, neither height nor depth, nor anything else in all creation will be able to separate us from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our Lord.''

May God bless Mr. Brookhart.

LITTLE MOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, later today, the House will consider amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act. That is the bill that tells the military what to do with all the money we give them.

In the committee of jurisdiction over the military, the Democrats and Republicans whose job it is to examine these issues voted to include two studies of how immigrants are or are not included in military recruitment.

Republicans are in the majority, so on the Republican-led Republican majority committee these two amendments won their votes and were added to the bill. The Gallego and Veasey amendments were included.

But no matter how many times Republican leaders have appeased the hard-liners on the fringes of their right flank—to disastrous consequences, I might add—they have chosen to capitulate one more time and ruled last night that amendments can be stripped from the bill today, these two reasonable amendments.

It is another glaring example of why the Republicans, from their Presidential nominee all the way down to their local government candidates, are in very, very deep trouble when it comes to the immigration issue.

One amendment simply asked the Secretary of Defense to study the impact of letting immigrants who grew up for years in the United States, who have passed a criminal background check, and who have a legal work permit to be in the United States; it asked the Secretary to study whether including them in military recruitment would help diversify our military. A study.

The second did not call for any action or any study at all. It simply said it is a sense of Congress that the Secretary review whether recipients of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals be allowed to serve in the military. It is kind of telling the top brass: This is what we think you might want to do. That is the program where 700,000 young immigrants came forward, got right with the law, and got a work permit after they passed a criminal background check.

But do you know what the Secretary of Defense ''reviewing'' something is, when it comes to the hard-liners? Do you know what ''studying'' something related to immigrants who have deferred action is to the nativists? Do you know what the contingent of hardcore anti-immigration guys in the Republican Conference started shouting? You guessed it? The A word. Amnesty.

I have the language right here:

''It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10.''

And they yelled: Amnesty, amnesty, amnesty.

Members of Congress from Alabama to Iowa to Texas began throwing around the amnesty attack. It is a backdoor amnesty, they said. We shouldn't ''reward'' illegal aliens who want to risk their lives to defend their adopted country when we have red-blooded Americans who want to fight and die.

Breitbart, in one article a couple of days ago, used the word ''amnesty'' 20 times in less than 1,400 words while ticking off the Members of the House of Representatives who might lose elections to more anti-immigrant candidates if the two studies are allowed to be included in the defense bill.

This all reminds me of the story of the Little Mouse. I used to read it to my grandson, Luisito—the same story you probably read to your kids and grandkids.

It goes like this. If you give a mouse a cookie, he is going to ask you for a glass of milk. And if you give him a glass of milk, he is going to ask for a straw. Anything you give the little mouse is going to lead to a newer and bigger request. That is what it must feel like to Speaker of the House BOEHNER with his nativist wing of his party.

If you give them 30,000 more border patrol guards, Mr. Speaker, they are going to ask you for more deportation. If you give them a record number of deportations, they are going to ask the Speaker for a vote to more quickly deport vulnerable children. If you give them the vote for quicker deportation of children, they will demand a vote to deport all DREAMers who have permission to work in the United States legally—700,000. And if you give them a vote on deporting DREAMers, they will ask for a hearing on amending the Constitution to eliminate birthright citizenship.

That is what the mouse will do. He will change the Constitution of the United States. And then at some point they will demand that every single reference to anything related to immigrants without papers, even a research project, be declared an amnesty and stripped from legislation.

If you give a mouse a cookie, he is going to want some milk, Mr. Speaker. And if you give the restrictionists a vote or hearing on every crazy idea they come up with, you will be relegated as a party to being a provincial party with power in the House of Representatives, and maybe from time to time being able to run the Senate, but you will never win the White House and you will never run the Supreme Court.

At some point, I respectfully suggest you cut off the mouse's supply of cookies.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, today, this body will take up the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. It has the noble intention of reducing the risk that the Iranians will develop a nuclear arsenal. Unfortunately, I think passage of this bill will do just the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, Ben Rhodes, the President's Deputy National Security Adviser, has said that the Iranian nuclear deal is President Obama's second-term ObamaCare. He meant that as a good thing, but we all know what a disaster that law has been for this country. And in reality, the Iranian nuclear deal, as it is being negotiated by this President, is far worse for the American people and for future generations than that healthcare law could ever be.

This much-heralded framework agreement between the P5+1 and Iran that the President has talked about has never been written down. Everyone in this Chamber today knows exactly what the ultimate deal will entail, though. The United States and the international community will release Iran from its crushing sanctions in exchange for nearly nothing.

□ 1015

Let's be blunt. Iran will continue on the path of getting a nuclear weapon if this agreement is ultimately signed; but, instead of asserting congressional authority and constraining the President, the House today is considering a bill that will do just the opposite.

It will give President Obama a blank check to sign a really bad deal with the largest state sponsor of terror in the world. The mullahs will be allowed to enrich uranium and to continue to build their missile program.

It is unconscionable for Congress to grant such sweeping power to President Obama, allowing him to lift sanctions on Iran, no matter the cost to our national security, the security of Israel, and the entire world.

Even worse, the House is willing to do this today without having even one hearing, one amendment, a grand total of 40 minutes of debate about how we might actually reduce the risk to the world by constraining the President and the agreement he intends to sign. The House is giving this to the President without even trying. I can't be part of that.

We can't even use the excuse of timing. The President says we have until at least June 30 before any deal can be struck. On this immensely important issue, an issue that my colleagues tell me is one of the most important facing our Nation—and I certainly agree with that—we will give too short a shrift and move too quickly without doing all that we can.

For 35 years, since our Embassy in Tehran was taken over for 444 days by the Iranians, they have been killing Americans. They have killed my friends with IEDs in Iraq by the hundreds. Today, Shia militias run rampant through that country. They talk of

Baghdad as an extension of the caliphate.

Even today, as I walked here, I watched on the news as the Iranians were firing on cargo ships off the coast of Yemen. They have tried to kill an Ambassador to the United States in this very town; yet we are about to strike an agreement that will grant them the capacity to build a nuclear weapon. This body is not doing all that it can.

I urge my fellow Members to oppose this bill and work toward a real solution that has the opportunity to keep Iran from getting that nuclear arsenal.

TPP—GET IT RIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement is the biggest trade deal our country has seen since NAFTA. With 12 participating countries, it encompasses 40 percent of the world's gross domestic product, so we have to get it right.

Working men and women in our communities are counting on us to get it right, not just fast, and that is why I oppose granting fast-track authority. You can see the impact of fast-tracked trade agreements in communities across the country, in the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, factory jobs, middle class jobs, and lower wages for hard-working Americans.

In fact, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that since NAFTA, the U.S. has lost more than 700,000 jobs as production has moved to Mexico. The communities I represent in south central Wisconsin bear the scars of past trade agreements which have not lived up to what the supporters say for fast track.

Take Janesville, Wisconsin. Parker Pen has been in Janesville, Wisconsin, and employed at one time over 1,000 workers. Thanks to bad trade deals, in 2009, the remaining 150 jobs were shipped to Mexico. We are not just talking the last few years. We are talking the last few months.

In Darlington, Wisconsin, the Merkle-Korff Industries plant in Darlington, a town of 2,400 people, announced they are closing. Thirty-six family-supporting jobs are leaving that community. If that were proportional in Madison, Wisconsin, that would be like losing 3,600 jobs in a community that size.

Every time an American job is shipped out of the country, it pushes wages down for workers here.

Now, fast-track authority means that the American people, through their elected Representatives, will lose their voice in Congress by limiting the ability of Congress to debate and to amend the trade agreement.

Due to limited debate, because of the fast-track process, each Member would have a little over 2 minutes to debate that trade deal. Members would have no opportunity to offer amendments on an agreement that has 29 chapters, that covers everything from food safety to environmental standards, labor rights, intellectual property, and more.

It would give Congress' constitutional authority to the President for 6 years. That means this President, the next President, and potentially, the next President; and all Congress would be left with is a yes-or-no vote.

Before Congress grants fast-track authority, we need to get the Trans-Pacific Partnership right. What does it mean to get it right? Well, one, it means having strong enforcement language to protect American workers and our environment, which we don't currently have in the current deal.

On several occasions, I have reviewed the labor and environmental chapters of the law. While, in some instances, the language is marginally better, it still lacks enforcement.

With the Colombia free trade agreement, we can see exactly what happened. While language has been implemented in the law to protect labor rights, there has been absolutely no implementation of that language. In fact, in the 4 years since the Colombia free trade agreement has passed, 105 union organizers have been killed—murdered—in that country. The environmental chapter, I would argue, is arguably worse and still lacks the same enforcement capacity to protect our country.

Getting TPP means scrapping the investor state dispute settlement provisions that put corporate interests ahead of American sovereignty.

The ISDS provisions are unique. They create a tribunal run by the same corporate trade lawyers who, on Monday, represent the multinational corporations; on Tuesday, are supposed to be the fair arbitrators of the law; and on Wednesday, are back on the corporate payroll.

These provisions are only for multinational corporations and not for American small businesses or labor or environmental violations.

Getting the Trans-Pacific Partnership right means having other important provisions included, like currency manipulation, protections against human trafficking, and protections for human rights for LGBT individuals and for single mothers in countries that have implemented sharia law.

Getting the Trans-Pacific Partnership right means having open and transparent negotiations because there is still too much the American people don't know about this secretive agreement. After all, only about 600 people have been involved in drafting this agreement, largely corporate CEOs, but not you and not me.

The bottom line is that this will cost jobs and wages. Another bad trade deal will cost more American jobs and lower our wages.

We have seen how free trade agreements like NAFTA, CAFTA, and the U.S-Korea Free Trade Agreement passed using the same fast-track process have turned out to be a bad deal for American workers.

We need to get this right, not just fast. Congress must say ''no'' to the fast-track process.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to highlight and address, hopefully, an issue that needs to be held in check here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, our office has been contacted numerous times from individuals across the Nation about attacks on private property rights by Big Government. Big Government continues to increasingly address and impact private property rights day in and day out.

We have heard stories of family farmers, people like Neil Vitale in my district, in western New York, who has been farming his land on the Pennsylvania border for years and years and years. Just yesterday, our Governor in the great State of New York banned the development of natural gas by banning hydraulic fracturing across the State of New York.

How does that impact Mr. Vitale? Mr. Vitale was going to use the resources of the property rights represented in the natural gas mineral rights to the farm that he has taken care of for so many years in order to take care of the bills for him, his family, and his family farm, but now, that right has been lost because government action has taken that right away from Mr. Vitale.

There is Bob Brace in Pennsylvania, who was ordered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the EPA to stop farming 30 acres of his land as they were determining it to be a wetland.

Mr. Brace has been farming that land for years. He had to go through court. He went to the U.S. district court, and they said he is okay. He can keep farming the land.

That wasn't enough for Big Government. They took it up to the court of appeals, and ultimately, the court ordered that Mr. Brace had to stop farming that 30 acres and pay a $10,000 fine and also hundreds of thousands of dollars in order to restore that property to the property that he has been using in his family for generations. When Mr. Brace tried to go to court to seek compensation for that right that was taken away, the court said: No, you don't have a right here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is against my fundamental belief in this country of private property rights and freedom. In the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, it says that the government can act and it can take action, but it must provide just compensation when it impacts people's private property.

That is why here in Washington, D.C., I have taken two concrete actions to address this issue, Mr. Speaker. Recently, I started the Private Property Rights Caucus with my colleagues in Congress. This is a caucus that has been made up of 14 original members, spanning from Maine to California, to highlight this issue and to say to Big Government, enough is enough.

I choose to stand with the individuals and the fundamental property rights that they have paid for, they have earned, that they take care of in maintaining their property, paying taxes on their property, and living the American Dream.

I also introduced the Defense of Property Rights Act. The Defense of Property Rights Act is based on just a simple reading of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. It says just that, if you take action as Big Government has done, Big Government will have to take into consideration the impact on private property rights.

If private property rights are taken, we clarify the ability of individuals to go and follow the Constitution and at least get compensation from the government for taking those private property rights away from these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, these are commonsense, simple principles that I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can join with me and say that is only fair because, if you really care about our fellow Americans, when their property rights are taken away because of Big Government action, we should at least say to them: we will stand with you as individuals and as Americans who believe in the fundamental principles of freedom and of private property rights, and we will at least get you some sort of compensation for the injury that you have suffered.

As a result of that, I urge my colleagues to join the caucus, support the Defense of Property Rights Act, and join me in highlighting this issue so that we can say enough is enough.

It is time to stand with our individuals, the constituents that we represent here in Washington, D.C., rather than the interests of Big Government and Big Government on all levels, Federal, State, and local.

RECOGNIZING FRANK E. LEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Frank E. Lee who, after 35 years as the familiar afternoon personality at WXRT, Frank welcomed his much-deserved retirement last week.

As the afternoon voice of WXRT, he is a Chicago institution unto himself. Frank's boss, Norm Winer, put it best when he said: ''Frank's wide-ranging love and knowledge of music, his remarkable verbal skills, his wry and sardonic sense of humor, impressive sense of professionalism, and generous nature have distinguished him among Chicago's all-time great air personalities.''

I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring Frank E. Lee for his career as one of Chicago's finest radio personalities and most recognizable voices. We thank him for his years of service on the air.

I was there in the studio as he closed off his career with the Stones' classic, ''Moonlight Mile.'' We tried to capture the essence of how Chicagoans felt when he left. All I can say is I got silence on my radio.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAHAFFEY THEATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an institution that, for 50 years, has been the cultural heart of the city of St. Petersburg, Florida.

This month, in May, the Mahaffey Theater celebrates its 50th anniversary. Opening in 1965, the venue was originally called the Bayfront Center Complex, a combination arena and theater along the city's most beautiful downtown waterfront.

It quickly proved to be a gathering place for community and civic groups, and its many shows drew tourists from around the State. The artists that have performed at the Mahaffey could easily fill an entertainment hall of fame, from Louis Armstrong to Dionne Warwick to Liza Minelli to Johnny Mathis, Kenny Rogers, and even ''The President's Own'' United States Marine Band, an event that was secured by the invitation of my predecessor, Congressman Bill Young.

The first significant makeover for the venue occurred in 1987, and the Bayfront Theater became the Mahaffey Theater after a generous gift from St. Petersburg's Mahaffey family. In 2011, Big3 Entertainment took over the management of the Mahaffey, with CEO and chairman Bill Edwards privately funding a number of major enhancements.

Today, the Mahaffey is home to the Florida Orchestra, and it is the annual host site for the Miss Florida Pageant.

The Mahaffey also supports, very importantly, the highly successful Class Acts program, which enables school children to experience the performing arts through in-theater performances, as well as in-school outreach and extension programs.

□ 1030

The theater also has been the site of very important moments of American history. The theater was the site of the 1996 Vice Presidential debate between Al Gore and Jack Kemp. And in 2007, the Mahaffey hosted the nationally televised Republican Presidential primary debate, known as the very first YouTube debate, having Americans, for the very first time, submit questions via YouTube video clips.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Mahaffey Theater, celebrating a venue that today anchors a growing and thriving Pinellas County arts community and serves as a stage that celebrates the arts but, most importantly, celebrates the remarkable human spirit, the creativity of so many performers, and the dedication and commitment of the greater St. Petersburg community.

FREE AMERICAN POLITICAL PRISONERS IN IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House of Representatives again to introduce and talk to this body and to the American people about my constituent, Amir Hekmati. Amir is an American. He is a United States marine. He is a brother. He is a son. He is a Michigander. He grew up in my hometown of Flint, Michigan. He served this country in uniform, as I said, in the United States Marine Corps. He is of Iranian descent, though he was born in the United States.

In 2011, for the first time, he traveled to Iran to visit family he had never met, a grandmother he had never seen. He traveled under his own name, notified the Iranian Government that he was going to be there; and after just a couple of weeks, he was apprehended, disappeared. His family didn't know where he was for months until it was revealed that he had been tried, convicted, and sentenced to death for espionage, a charge that he is completely innocent of. In fact, the Iranian court of appeals, the appeals process, even set aside that conviction and set aside his death sentence. There was no evidence.

They did convict him and sentence him to 10 years, a conviction that is based on the fact that, under Iranian law, he is considered an Iranian citizen even though he was born in the United States and never had even been there before. But the fact that he had served in the Marine Corps created a set of facts that caused them to convict him of a crime and sentence him to 10 years.

It has been 3½ years. For 1,354 days, Amir Hekmati has sat in Evin prison, a notorious prison in Tehran.

I have introduced, along with a number of other Members, a resolution calling for the immediate release of the Americans that Iran holds. It has 28 Republican cosponsors, 27 Democrats, and we are adding them every day.

This is not even a bipartisan issue; this is a nonpartisan question. It is beyond politics. This is about the rights of a free man being held in Iran. So I am asking my colleagues and the American people to get engaged, to call upon Iran to do what is right and release the Americans that they hold. And it is really important that this Congress speak with one voice and carry the voices of all the people that we represent, asking, telling Iran that if they think they can join the global community and continue to hold innocent Americans as political prisoners, they are wrong.

So, please, for those who want to, use the hashtag #freeamirnow to send a message to thank those Members, as I will, to thank those Members of Congress who have joined this resolution. I will be sending out on Twitter a thank-you to each Member who has done so, using #freeamirnow. I hope other Members of Congress and those across the country will join us.

Later today we will consider legislation that will define how Congress will review and offer its input on the potential Iran nuclear deal. It is really important that we negotiate with those who make this world more dangerous first before attempting other methods, and it is important that we give this negotiation a chance. But it is also very clear that it will be very difficult for this Congress and the American people to consider any understanding, any agreement, with Iran without considering their other behavior, whether it is this nuclear agreement or other engagement with this country. If they continue to hold Americans as political prisoners, it is impossible for us to ignore that fact.

It is very clear that we should never trade the freedom of innocent Americans for concessions at the negotiating table with Iran over their nuclear capabilities. Again, we should not make their freedom a part of this deal. They, meaning the American families who are worrying about their loved ones, don't want this; and I know that Amir Hekmati, himself, does not want to be part of the consideration, does not want to be traded for concessions at the nuclear negotiating table.

The onus is on Iran to do what is right, and it is critical that this body and all the people that we represent speak with a single voice and make it clear, as the Senate did in their resolution calling upon Iran to release these Americans. It is important that the people's body speak for the people of the United States and tell Iran loud and clear that you cannot hold Americans as political prisoners and be accepted into the international community.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as the latest round of the P5+1 Iranian nuclear talks resume this week in Vienna, it is important for us to highlight just how weak and dangerous this deal is.

From the moment that President Obama took office, he has sought the legacy of having achieved a nuclear agreement with Iran, regardless of the cost to our national security. In his first inaugural address, he promised to unclench his fist to dictators and followed that up in Cairo, telling the Iranian regime that he was willing to move forward ''without preconditions on the basis of mutual respect.''

Mutual respect, Mr. Speaker? This regime has targeted and killed Americans since the Iranian revolution in 1979. This regime was responsible for killing and wounding thousands of our U.S. troops in Iraq. This murderous regime is destabilizing the region and mocking the U.S. by blowing up a mock U.S. aircraft carrier and chanting, continually, ''death to America.''

Now the President is giving Iran not only access to billions of dollars, but also international legitimacy. Countries and businesses no longer fear doing business with Iran, even though the sanctions are still in place. They no longer fear looking like international pariahs, helping one of the world's worst human rights abusers and the world's largest supporter of global terror because President Obama has telegraphed to the world that he trusts the Iranian regime, giving it the legitimacy that it would have never gotten without this nuclear deal.

So what do we see now? Well, Russia announced that it will resume sales of its surface-to-air missiles to Iran before the ink could even dry on the framework agreement, and Putin has said that Russia will trade assets like grain and construction equipment in exchange for Iranian oil. Iran has also announced that China is going to help it build five additional nuclear power plants.

According to reports, China and Russia have stated that they will not support snapback sanctions. Now, snapback sanctions are the cornerstone of the deal that the administration has praised as a victory. And U.S. oil executives have reportedly begun talks with Iranian officials in preparation for the opening of Iran's economy—in Iran, no less.

Now we hear reports that the Czechs stopped a potentially illegal nuclear technology purchase by the Iranians earlier this year. So I asked the administration: Did the administration know, and did the P5+1 know about this violation? Did they choose to ignore it in order to forge this framework agreement anyway? All of this in exchange for a deal that allows Iran to continue to enrich uranium and to keep every key element of its nuclear infrastructure intact.

The Iranians are winning concession after concession, giving up nothing but a few cosmetic and easily reversible changes. Since taking office, President Obama has capitulated to Iranian demands to cement his legacy of the President who normalized relations with Iran.

We won't even be able to adequately verify this nuclear agreement, despite what the President promises, because he knows that access to Iranian sites rests with the Iranian regime. Access to military sites—where they would more than likely hide some of their nuclear infrastructure—isn't in the deal either. It is foolhardy and dangerous to believe that Iran will give immediate and unobstructed access anytime, anywhere, to all of its sites.

We are not even forcing the regime to come clean on the possible military dimensions of its nuclear program, nor are we addressing its ballistic missile program, its support for terror, and its expansionist agenda throughout the Middle East. All we are doing is legitimizing one of the world's worst and most dangerous regimes at the expense of regional and U.S. national security.

Iran will use this influx of money to continue spreading terror and fomenting instability and sectarian conflict across the globe. We have seen it in Yemen. We have seen it elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, the Middle East is on the brink of collapsing, yet the President continues on this dangerous quest for his Iran nuclear deal legacy. He has ignored the reality on the ground for political considerations and, in doing so, is putting our national security in jeopardy and that of our ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, recently I visited the Newberg-Dundee bypass, a highway construction project in my district that will divert traffic around two small communities that are thriving but choked with congestion. Once completed, local residents and visitors will no longer be stuck in traffic, especially on the weekends. The many wineries and farms and other small businesses in the county won't have to wait hours to get their

customers in and their products out of the region. New businesses will see opportunity in relocating to the area, rather than obstacles to commerce.

For this growing county, a comprehensive transportation network is critical to its success. This isn't just true for my district; it is true across the country. Our roads, trains, buses, bridges, and ports are at the center of our economy. They are the way people get to work and businesses get their goods to market.

But unfortunately, funding for our transportation system continues to shrink. Spending on our infrastructure is now at its smallest share of GDP in the last 22 years.

In my State, in a 2014 report, the Oregon Department of Transportation estimates that the current 20-year forecast budget for the State highway system is insufficient to preserve and maintain pavement and bridges in their current condition. The report finds that not only will our roads deteriorate, but an increasing number of bridges will close to heavy trucks, forcing lengthy detours that will cost businesses time and money.

Poor-quality roads lead to greater maintenance costs, congested arteries, and traffic that delays the delivery of products; and, of course, the failure to update our trains and bridges threatens public safety. I implore this body, let us take action before another tragic accident.

The short-term extensions of the highway trust fund have left contractors and workers with uncertainty as they delay or even scrap construction plans. This costs us jobs and defers unnecessary maintenance and new construction while increasing expenses.

Recently, Ed Wytkind, president of the AFL–CIO Transportation Trades Department, said: ''Years of congressional inaction on a long-term surface transportation bill has harmed our economy.'' Congress needs to ''get to work on a robust long-term bill that expands investments and job creation and is paid for with a sustainable revenue stream.'' I couldn't agree more.

The Newberg-Dundee bypass was decades in the making. It is a partnership with local, State, tribal, and Federal support, and, quite simply, it wouldn't be under construction without previously approved funding. The Oregon Department of Transportation couldn't make a commitment without a commitment from the Federal Government as well.

When I visited the construction site last week, it was clear that this project is putting people to work: contractors, construction workers, people down the supply chain, and many others.

□ 1045

Now with just a few days until the current transportation bill expires, I call on my colleagues to take up a robust, multimodal, long-term transportation bill. Funding transportation provides our communities with an economic boost now and reinforces our infrastructure in a way that will sustain and strengthen our economy years from now.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many discussions in this Chamber about global competitiveness and the U.S. role in the world. World class infrastructure is critical to securing and maintaining this role. We need to act. We need to act now.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. While I wish it were stronger, it does force the administration to bring it before this body to review any deal. Last week, I traveled to Israel on a weeklong mission to strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship and convey the message that we stand with our Israeli partners on the security challenges that are in front of us.

The threat posed by Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon was at the forefront of literally everyone's mind. The Israeli leaders that I met with, individuals across the political spectrum, all reiterated what I have said all along: concern about the direction of the P5+1 nuclear talks with Iran is not—I repeat, is not—a partisan issue. In fact, there was multipartisan support and appreciation in Israel for Prime Minister Netanyahu's outspoken opposition to a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just an American and an Israeli issue. A nuclear Iran threatens the Middle East, and, I would argue, the entire world.

Our allies in the Gulf Cooperation Council are also skeptical of the deal taking shape. The leaders of Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Oman, and the United Arab Emirates have made their displeasure known by choosing to skip the President's Camp David summit this week.

Saudi Arabia, already fighting a proxy war with Iran in Yemen, will not sit idly by if we agree to a deal that legitimizes Iran as a nuclear threshold state. The last thing anyone in the P5+1 wants is a nuclear arms race further destabilizing the Middle East and, I believe, increasing the chance of a nuclear war.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation today to ensure that the American people have a say in any final agreement with Iran.

The legislation today guarantees that Congress will have an up-or-down vote on the future of any deal. It is that vote—the one which will occur after a deal is reached—that will be the pivotal moment in our efforts to stop Iran's nuclear program. That will be the vote that decides whether Iran has an internationally accepted and legitimized path to a bomb or whether we will hold the administration accountable to its assertion that no deal is better than a bad deal.

Looking ahead to that vote, we must withstand the pressure and unequivocally reject any deal that leaves intact Iran's nuclear infrastructure; cements Iran's position as a nuclear threshold state; unwinds the sanctions architecture, giving Iran an infusion of literally billions of dollars that it will use to finance terror against Israel and around the globe; and legitimizes a sure-to-fail inspection regime that falls short of ''anytime, anywhere'' inspections. Mr. Speaker, we must not be fooled into false choices, and Iran must not be left with any path to a nuclear weapon.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight something very concerning related to Syria which, I believe, has significant implications for any Iran agreement. Recent reports indicate a clear violation of the deal that this administration struck with Bashar al-Assad 2 years ago to remove chemical weapons from Syria. Unfortunately, these serious violations are not receiving the attention and scrutiny they deserve. According to reports, an international monitoring body found traces of chemical weapons in Syria and reported this breach to the administration earlier this year.

Former U.S. Ambassador to Syria Robert Ford is quoted as saying: ''The Syrian revelations shouldn't be a surprise given the regime's track record. It is a violation of the deal we struck with the Russians, and it is a violation of the deal the Syrian regime struck with the U.N.''

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let history repeat itself with a bad deal with Iran. This deal, if done incorrectly, has far-reaching implications not just for the United States, Israel, and our allies, but for the world and future generations.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the legislation coming before this body today so that we can give the American people an opportunity to review what the deal is and have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' or ''no'' based upon what is in this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. I strongly support the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, and encourage my colleagues to join me in voting yes later today.

I am extremely skeptical of the framework agreement released in April because, as written, I believe it will legitimize Iran's status as a nuclear threshold state. This is unacceptable, and we should not support any deal that permits this.

The American people deserve a voice on this critical matter of national security, and

Congress must have the opportunity to take an up-or-down vote on any final deal.

THE BILLY FRANK, JR., TELL YOUR STORY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about rap sheets these days. We hear of a lot of young people defined simply by their brushes with the law. But for this man, Billy Frank, Jr., his story was so much more than the crimes for which he was arrested—not convicted I might add. His rap sheet, Martin Luther King's rap sheet, Rosa Park's rap sheet, and Congressman JOHN LEWIS' rap sheet are just a piece of a larger narrative about the struggle for social justice.

Billy Frank, Jr., was the Pacific Northwest's foremost advocate for restoration of Native American fishing treaty rights, a dream he lived and saw realized. He cherished clean water and salmon, and he was a key voice in the recovery of the Puget Sound, the largest estuary in the United States of America. Billy was also a proud patriot. He served in the United States Marine Corps where, ironically, he was a member of the military police.

Billy passed away a year ago May 5. But he really isn't gone. His story is here in the Halls of Congress, in which he was so often seen and which he roamed on behalf of his beloved causes, including protecting the Puget Sound, our fisheries, and the cause of clean water.

His story is in the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, which we now protect to give our wildlife a clean and sustainable place to live and which was made possible by a great former Member of the House of Representatives, Norm Dicks. Billy was born, raised, and grew up at Frank's Landing, which was literally just a hop, skip, and a jump from the wildlife refuge and is where his family lived for perhaps thousands of years. He fished in the Nisqually River, which snakes through the Nisqually Wildlife Refuge, and that is the location of where he was arrested more than a dozen times—well, okay, it was actually 59 times.

The bill I introduced this week, H.R. 2270, will rename that refuge after Billy Frank, Jr., and it will also make the place of the signing of the Treaty of Medicine Creek a National Historic Site. It will make sure that the story of that site is told, especially by the descendants of those who lived that history. Those tribes will be involved in the development and the understanding behind that site and what it means to them now and before.

Mr. Speaker, Billy was often asked, How do you do this? How do you effectively advocate on behalf of clean water and salmon—as he did—over so many decades? Billy always had the same answer. He would say, ''Tell your story. Tell your story.''

So when people go to the Billy Frank, Jr., Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, they will be able to see why—why—he held fish-ins. They will see why he risked arrest so many times. They will see why he ultimately worked with others to help protect his home and the home of the fish. They will see why he did all these things.

Like many young people today, he fought for what he believed in, and later in his life he worked with lawmakers to build consensus. In fact, he was a master consensus builder. How do I know this? Well, he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. He actually won the extremely prestigious Albert Schweitzer Prize for Humanitarianism award, and he has had not one but two books written about him.

So my hope is that when people drive by the sign that directs them to the refuge, maybe they will feel a little bit of that Billy Frank, Jr., magic. Maybe they will wonder who he was, what he did, and find out about his story. For those of us who knew him, it will be a great reminder of a hero. In fact, I would count Billy Frank, Jr., a man I knew many decades and loved, more than a hero. He was truly a great man. He was the Pacific Northwest equivalent of Nelson Mandela or Martin Luther King, Jr. or Desmond Tutu.

That is how great a man he was. Here is what Billy said: ''I don't believe in magic. I believe in the Sun and the stars, the water, the tides, the floods, the owls, the hawks flying, the river running, the wind talking. They are measurements. They tell us how healthy things are because we and they are the same. That is what I believe in. Those who learn to listen to the world that sustains them can hear the message brought forth by the salmon.''

Billy Frank, Jr., and his stories have to be told, and that is why I invite my colleagues today to join in cosponsorship of H.R. 2270. Join me and all the members of the Washington State House delegation, and Mr. COLE and Ms. MCCOLLUM, the co-chairs of the Native American Caucus, in cosponsoring the Billy Frank, Jr., Tell Your Story Act.

MAY IS ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the month of May is Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. I am proud to say that we have many visitors—in fact, hundreds of visitors—who are here at the Capitol, many celebrating this month with us. Among those who are visiting are some of my friends and some of my colleagues, and some persons who are from other places than my congressional district, but they are still friends of mine.

Among them is Dawn Lin. She worked in our congressional office for sometime, and she is a visitor here today. She is the mother of the Confucius resolution that I brought before Congress and passed.

Another is the father of the International District in Houston, Texas, Mr. Wei Le. He is a dear friend, and I am honored that he is here today.

Another is Kenneth Li, known as the mayor of Chinatown in Houston, Texas, affectionately so.

We also have Chris Kang, Casey Kang, Dionne Cuello, Vickie Silvano, Ray Huang, and Lily Lee, all friends and visiting today.

I am honored today, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words about Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, because the truth is America the beautiful is a more beautiful America because of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

One such beautiful American was Wong Kim Ark. Wong Kim Ark was born in the United States, and in 1894, he decided that he would travel to China. Upon returning from China in 1895, he was denied entrance into the United States.

Wong Kim Ark was denied entrance into the United States because of the Chinese Exclusion Act. This act was one that was passed to prevent Chinese Americans from having ingress and egress into this country if you were not a citizen, of course.

The 14th Amendment to the Constitution became the subject of his reentry into the country because when they declared him ineligible to return to the country, it was because they were saying he was not a citizen, notwithstanding the fact that he was born in California. But if you read closely the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, you will find that it reads: ''All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof''—that is some key language, ''and subject to the jurisdiction thereof''—''are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.''

There were some persons who thought that the term ''and subject to the jurisdiction thereof'' meant that since their parents were the subjects of the Emperor of China, he could not be a citizen of the United States of America. This case went all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and it was all because of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.

The Supreme Court did the judicious thing. They ruled in his favor that he was a citizen of the United States of America. While that might seem such a small thing today, it is really a significant piece of world history in terms of how persons born in this country become citizens, because had they ruled

otherwise, there are a good many people who could be born in this country but not be citizens of the United States of America. He was the test case that went before the Supreme Court.

□ 1100

While many persons conclude that the 14th Amendment has its roots in those who were freed from slavery in the United States of America to accord them citizenship—and I concur with this, by the way—but I also would add this: while it was given birth to because of the freed slaves, it was given clarity because of Mr. Ark who was denied citizenship for a brief moment, but finally, the Supreme Court ruled that Wong Kim Ark was a citizen of the United States of America.

As I close today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to simply say there are many contributions that Asian American and Pacific Islanders have made to this great Nation to make America a more beautiful America.

I think we should not limit our thoughts to things such as dance, which is wonderful; the great food, which is great; to the beautiful clothing, which is a great thing as well. I think we have to go beyond these things and remember the transcontinental railroad that was constructed by the labor of tens of thousands of persons of Chinese ancestry.

I think we have to go beyond this country if we are going to take a global look at the great history. I think, Mr. Speaker, that America the beautiful is a more beautiful America because they are here.

BANK ON STUDENTS EMERGENCY LOAN REFINANCING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 13, was a significant day for 15 million college students who are entering next year's academic year because it is the day that the U.S. Department of Treasury, based on their auction of 10-year notes, sets the interest rates for the Stafford student loan program for all those students who will be borrowing for next year.

The good news is that, based on yesterday's auction, where 10-year notes sold for 2.29 percent, the interest rates for next year's Stafford student loan program will be 4.29 percent, which is actually lower than last year's Stafford student loan interest rates. It is a savings of about a third of a percent—not a huge amount, but certainly headed in the right direction.

This is because in 2013, we passed the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act which prevented a doubling of interest rates for the Stafford student loan program. It was slated to go to 6.8 percent and, tying it to the interest charged by the Department of Treasury, moderated those costs for, again, 15 million college students all across the country who used the Stafford student loan program.

That news event yesterday, though, begs the larger question, which is: What about all those people who are carrying high interest rate student loans who have already graduated over the last 10 years or so?

The Federal Reserve Board tells us that over $1 trillion of student loan debt overhangs the U.S. economy today, more than car loan debt and more than credit card loan debt.

The trap that many of those people find themselves in is that they cannot refinance that debt because it is noncollateralized loans and that those who hold it in the public sector, in the Stafford student loan sector, again, cannot, by law, refinance down and take advantage of these low interest rates that the Federal Government is benefiting from because of monetary trends in markets that exist today.

Well, the good news is that there is a measure before the Congress, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, H.R. 1434, which would allow people both with private student loan debt and public student loan debt to refinance those loans down to 3 percent, taking advantage, again, of the fact that we have a very beneficial environment right now in terms of government borrowing.

Today, the Federal Government actually makes money off those graduates who are paying 8 percent, 9 percent, 10 percent interest on their loans, which is unconscionable given the fact that that debt is causing great damage to those individuals in terms of starting their lives.

The Pew Research Center actually issued a report last year where it talked about the fact that 40 to 50 percent of people in their twenties and early thirties are delaying marriage, they are delaying starting a family, and they are basically denied the access to get a starter home or a real estate mortgage because their debt to income ratios are thrown completely off kilter due to the fact that they are carrying such high rates of student loan debt.

The Congressional Budget Office tells us that H.R. 1434 would basically result in half of that trillion dollars of debt being written down, putting millions of dollars of money into people's pockets that they can spend on things in terms of getting their lives started.

Again, it is important to note this is not a giveaway by the government; these folks are paying back the loans that they were able to acquire from the Stafford student loan program, but it allows them to moderate their interest rate to comport with what is out there for a 30-year loan for a house or for credit cards or for car loans which, again, are lower than what student loan debt is today.

H.R. 1434 has 128 cosponsors in the House. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to take up this emergency loan refinancing act to provide critical help for individuals who are getting killed out there with monthly payments and, again, inhibiting them to start their lives and do the steps in life that people in their twenties and thirties have done in generations before.

Sadly, we saw a budget resolution pass a couple weeks ago—the House Republican budget resolution—that not only failed to take advantage of the fact that the government is able to borrow at historic low rates, but, in fact, compounds the problem because it is going to allow the Federal Government to charge interest while students who are carrying Stafford student loans in school are going to have interest charged while they are in school.

Traditionally, the Stafford student loan program has provided one good benefit, which is they don't charge interest while a young person is in their freshman, sophomore, or junior year. The Republican budget actually changed that rule so that interest is going to accumulate while students are in college, adding to their debt burden at the time that they graduate.

We need to address this problem; pass H.R. 1434. Let's take advantage of these low interest rates. Let's help millions of Americans get a better start on life.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Help us this day to draw closer to You so that, with Your spirit and aware of Your presence among us, we may all face the tasks of this day.

Bless the Members of the people's House. Help them to think clearly, speak confidently, and act courageously in the belief that all noble service is based upon patience, truth, and love.

In the wake of the train derailment earlier this week, Americans are reminded of the needs of our domestic infrastructure. May all citizens feel empowered to encourage their Representatives to use their best judgment in considering how to address the many needs of our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WE MUST PASS THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives will consider the National Defense Authorization Act. Under the leadership of Armed Services Committee Chairman MAC THORNBERRY, the committee voted favorably, 60–2, with almost unanimous bipartisan support. Our national security depends on it.

While our Nation faces a complex and threatening environment at home and abroad, this year, the NDAA provides necessary resources to establish a strong national defense, protect American families, and support our brave servicemembers.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, working with Ranking Member JIM LANGEVIN, I am especially pleased this bill addresses the growing threats posed by cyber attacks and our enemies' use of advanced technologies and unconventional warfare.

This bill also preserves means to train and equip special operations and cyber forces to defend America now and in the future. The NDAA has always been widely supported. It should not be held hostage to other legislation.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy to the family of Midshipman Justin Zemser.

IT IS TIME TO INVEST IN OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, every year, our economy loses $33 billion to air traffic delays, $121 billion to highway congestion, and $200 billion to freight bottlenecks. Unless we increase spending on waterways, America will lose $270 billion in exports over the next 5 years.

According to the Chamber of Commerce, our declining infrastructure costs $1 trillion a year in lost economic growth. Ignoring these facts is economically irrational and governmentally negligent, but that is exactly what Congress has done.

We just spent $50 billion on our roads and bridges and transit, and only 8 percent, or $46 billion, in 2009 economic stimulus went to infrastructure; yet we spent over $150 billion rebuilding the infrastructure of Iraq and Afghanistan.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has identified an enormous deficit between the projected spending and what is needed to bring our infrastructure to a state of good repair.

Today, I introduced the Nation Building Here at Home Act to close this gap. It is time for Congress to make the investments we need and reject the pathetically weak policies that we can no longer afford.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Police Week and to honor the memory of law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty. All Americans are grateful for these brave men and women and the ultimate sacrifice they made.

During my time as deputy mayor of Indianapolis and U.S. attorney, I witnessed firsthand the burdens and challenges faced by our law enforcement officers and their amazing families. Even more importantly, I witnessed men and women in blue who have overcome these challenges while displaying so much compassion and commitment to duty. Our Nation must embrace them and be forever mindful of their integrity and service.

Sadly, we have learned it is estimated that, every 3½ days in this country, we lose an officer in the line of duty. This week, we will remember 117 officers killed in 2014, including four officers from Indiana: Jeffrey Westerfield of Gary, Perry Renn of Indianapolis, Nickolaus Schultz of Merrillville, and Jacob Calvin of Tipton County.

We are thankful for their service and send our thoughts and prayers to their loved ones. Without hesitation, we renew our appreciation and steadfast commitment to our heroic women and men in blue.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH AND OUR VETERANS

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my unqualified support for those struggling with mental health issues.

May is Mental Health Awareness Month and an opportune time to reach out to those battling with this issue, including this country's veterans and their families.

Many of our veterans endured trauma during their time of service and, as a result, are now forced to face the negative perceptions and stigma associated with mental health care. I want to lend my voice to a national program designed to reducing those negative views.

The Department of Veterans Affairs is encouraging veterans, along with their families and friends, to visit the Web site maketheconnection.net. Make the Connection allows veterans to tell their personal stories of mental health treatment and recovery.

Through the Web site, veterans and their loved ones hear from hundreds of other veterans who may be experiencing similar challenges and learn strategies for support and recovery. This is truly an excellent source of strength for veterans in need of hope.

USA FREEDOM ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed the USA FREEDOM Act, a bipartisan bill to reform the controversial domestic surveillance programs.

The passage of this legislation is the result of strong bipartisan negotiations to strike a balance in order to protect American citizens' rights without dealing a blow to lawful and warranted surveillance efforts.

Mr. Speaker, Congress did not intend for any law to authorize the indiscriminate collection of personal information

from Americans. The USA FREEDOM Act will help end government overreach, while ensuring intelligence agencies have the tools at their disposal to lawfully pursue suspected terrorists in efforts to protect all Americans.

As a member of the bipartisan Congressional Privacy Caucus, I applaud the Judiciary Committee and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for working together to write a bill that strikes a balance to protect our constitutional rights without compromising our national security.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPIRATION

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in just 5 legislative days, the highway trust fund authorization will expire. Transportation projects all across the country will come to a screeching halt. Thousands of workers will be unnecessarily laid off.

Despite the Republicans now having a majority in both House and Senate, we continue to find ourselves legislating by crisis.

Today, 65 percent of our Nation's roads are rated as less than good condition. Twenty-five percent are in poor condition. In Texas alone, we have over 300,000 miles of public roads, almost 10 percent of which are rated poorly.

I urge my colleagues to commit to a long-term plan that will provide certainty, increase transit revenues, and keep workers in our construction industries on the job, especially during this upcoming construction season.

As our roads erode and our transit system decays, it is imperative that we do our jobs and be responsible legislators. I urge my colleagues to enact a long-term bill as soon as possible.

WILLIAMS SYNDROME

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, Williams syndrome is a rare neurological disease. May is Williams Syndrome Awareness Month.

According to the Williams Syndrome Association, there are between 25,000 and 30,000 individuals living with this rare disease, at least one of whom is a constituent of mine. His name is Brian Weaver. I had the pleasure of meeting him.

My bill, the OPEN Act, would provide an incentive for companies to test their drugs on a rare disease population. Over 150 rare diseases organizations wrote to us saying the OPEN Act ''promises to improve the quality of life for the nearly 30 million Americans suffering from rare diseases.''

Research into Williams syndrome could lead to advances in treating Americans with high blood pressure, diabetes, autism, and anxiety disorders. We must continue to fight for millions of Americans who suffer from rare diseases like Williams syndrome.

WOMEN'S ECONOMIC SECURITY

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I appear here today filled with a sense of great pride but also deeply troubled.

I am proud of the work done by women every day in America, women like my grandmother, who raised family, put food on the table, and ensured that their children received the education and care that they deserved.

I am offended that, as I stand here today, more than 50 years after President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law, as a country, we are still, as women, seeking pay equality. Women are only earning 78 cents to every dollar earned by a man. For women of color, that gap is even greater.

I am deeply troubled by the lack of retirement security for women, American women, and all older Americans.

Today, I am alarmed at our failure to provide women who work hard with basic benefits like paid sick leave and paid family and medical leave.

I am not intimidated, as a Member of Congress, by these problems. I and my Democratic colleagues are energized and united to correct this page in American history because we know, when women succeed, America succeeds.

SUPPORTING THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the passage of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation, which I cosponsored and voted for yesterday, will help protect unborn children by limiting abortion after 5 months, the point at which they can experience pain.

This is not a divisive concept. In fact, the majority of Americans support limiting abortion after 5 months. It is a fundamental issue of human rights and dignity.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to pass the House Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and join us in protecting the right of life, without which all other rights are impossible.

□ 1215

FY 2016 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the important hard work of Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH of Washington and all of the members of the Armed Services Committee, as well as the committee staff, on the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. I am particularly proud of the work of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, and I am particularly proud of working with Chairman JOE WILSON of South Carolina on critical national security priorities such as things like cybersecurity, one of the chief threats facing our Nation today, and also the work we have done on R&D, special operations, and counterterrorism. I also applaud the bill's investment in important undersea capabilities, such as the Virginia class submarines, the Virginia Payload Module, as well as the Ohio replacement program.

However, I am deeply concerned that the NDAA reflects a budget approach that locks in sequestration and severs that critical link between our national security and our economic security. It is unfortunate that a measure that has historically represented such strong bipartisanship and regular order has been taken hostage by a refusal to address the Budget Control Act.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. We need to avoid sequestration, properly fund our national defense, and I hope that these concerns will be addressed as we continue working to support the brave men and women who defend this great Nation every day.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEVADA APPEAL

(Mr. AMODEI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, New York Times, get out of the way. Chicago Tribune, San Francisco Chronicle, not good enough; keep trying harder.

May 16 marks the 150th anniversary of the publishing of Nevada's oldest daily newspaper, the Nevada Appeal, published in its capital city, Carson City.

I am here to say happy sesquicentennial birthday to the Nevada Appeal, which, by the way, was one of the first newspapers in the land that was owned by a woman, from 1878 to 1880.

The paper has been a mainstay of Nevada journalistic enterprise. Forget it, Las Vegas Review-Journal, Las Vegas Sun, Reno Evening Gazette. These are

the folks that have been there for 150 years.

I couldn't be prouder because, as a matter of fact, in my more productive years, at the age of about 9 and 10, I was a paperboy for the Nevada Appeal and have a picture to prove it, with the paper bag with ''Nevada Appeal'' blazoned across it on the front of my Columbia Stingray bicycle that I delivered the papers on.

Go, Nevada Appeal. Happy birthday to the publisher, Mark Raymond, and the editor, Adam Trumble. Way to go.

IN MEMORY OF ED LYNCH

(Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life a remarkable philanthropist, family man, businessman, and friend from southwest Washington who has made a lasting impact on our region. He passed away this week at the age of 94.

Ed Lynch was a cornerstone of our community. Known by all as caring and humble, Mr. LYNCH was truly a representation of a servant leader. He was a neighbor and a friend.

In 1957, Ed and his wife, Dollie, moved to Washington State to make Vancouver their home. After serving as president of Kiewit Pacific, Ed dedicated the remaining years of his life to making our region, the region that he loved, a better place.

During his retirement, Ed poured his heart and soul into southwest Washington and taught us all that transforming one's community starts with a servant's heart. Ed remained active and provided unmatched support for businesses, historic societies, civics projects, the Columbia Springs Foundation, the Fort Vancouver National Trust, and the PeaceHealth Southwest Medical Center up until his last days.

Ed's vibrant personality made him one of the most beloved individuals of our entire region. Whether it was something as simple as remembering your name or giving you a book from his collection, he did more for our community than almost anyone, yet he was never more than just ''one of us.'' I honor his memory today.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the highway trust fund, this Congress has kicked the can down the road so many times that pretty soon we will not even have a road.

In just 5 legislative days—in 5 legislative days—the fund will expire, and with it, 660,000 good-paying jobs will be on the chopping block.

America cannot lead the next century with broken roads and bridges collapsing. We are spending barely enough to repair the infrastructure of yesterday, as China and Europe build a transit system worthy of the 21st century.

In my district alone, we have two large infrastructure projects—the Second Avenue Subway and the East Side Access—and both of them depend, as do large infrastructure projects, on Federal funding. They create thousands of jobs, and they will cut commute times. They are investments in productivity and economic growth for our country.

After a dozen short-term extensions, it is time for a long-term highway bill. Our future depends on it. Our economic growth depends on it.

KEEP THE PROMISE ACT

(Mr. GOSAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the serious issue facing my home State of Arizona.

For several years, I have been actively involved in a troubling off-reservation gaming issue in my home State of Arizona involving the Tohono O'odham Nation. The tribe has been attempting to move from their ancestral lands in Tucson into another tribe's former reservation in the Phoenix metropolitan area for the sole purpose of building a Las Vegas-style casino.

Tohono's dismissal of their promise of a voter-approved compact and their dismissal of a promise to build no additional casinos in Phoenix is not something that Congress can ignore when the result will be so harmful to what has been a national model.

Furthermore, Tohono has falsely been claiming a victory in court. This sentiment is factually wrong. The Tohono won nothing based on the merits. Rather, the case was dismissed on the draconian doctrine of sovereign immunity, which we, Congress, have jurisdiction and oversight of, rather than the courts.

I urge immediate adoption of this commonsense legislation that has passed this same body last Congress and has already passed committee by unanimous consent.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, once again, we are seeing a dose of demagoguery from the Republican leadership, who continue to threaten the elimination of the Export-Import Bank.

The Ex-Im Bank ensures that American companies of all sizes have access to financing for the export of American goods, from electronics, to medical equipment, to smartphones and cases of soap. These exports contribute to the strength of the economy and support millions of American jobs. In fact, since 2009, the bank has supported 1.3 million private sector jobs.

Republican threats to eliminate the bank are threats to American workers, manufacturers, and our economy. Last year, New Jersey exported $36.8 billion in merchandise. Failure to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank would put billions of dollars in New Jersey exports at risk.

I urge my colleagues to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, there are only 5 legislative days until the highway trust fund expires. Once again, this House is governing by crisis and needlessly endangering 660,000 good-paying jobs. This needs to stop.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives America's infrastructure an overall grade of D-minus. Mr. Speaker, 35 percent of my State of Connecticut's bridges are structurally deficient, functionally obsolete, or both.

We shouldn't wait until the trains derail, the bridges collapse, or projects shut down before we fund our infrastructure in this Nation. A great nation does not respond to crisis with duct tape. A great nation leads by bold action.

I join Democrats and Republicans who are ready to work together to pass a long-term, sustainable, robust highway and infrastructure bill. The time is act is now.

POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are still shaken by this week's Amtrak derailment that took the lives of seven people and left more than 200 injured. Our thoughts and prayers are with the families who have suffered a loss.

The NTSB said that this tragedy could have been prevented if the corridor had been outfitted with positive train control technology, PTC. All of us in southern California have known the importance of PTC since the horrible train accident in Chatsworth in 2008 that killed 25 people. Congress mandated that year that PTC be installed on all our Nation's rail lines.

Across the country, rail lines are in the process of installing this lifesaving technology, but many are behind schedule. There was no PTC in place where this recent crash occurred.

Yesterday, former Republican Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood said,

''The idea that Amtrak doesn't need more money to implement positive train control . . . is nonsense.'' And yet yesterday, Republicans in the House Appropriations Committee voted to cut the Amtrak budget by $252 million.

This Congress' policy of starving our infrastructure system is endangering Americans. Enough is enough.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mr. NORCROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk with my colleagues about passing a long-term reauthorization of the highway trust fund. If we don't do it now, it is about kicking the can down the road once again.

It is because of this dysfunction that we have here in Congress that we can't get something done. People talk to us day in and day out about how disgusted they are. We can't do things. They are crying out for predictability.

If you were only going to get two paychecks, would you be thinking about buying a house? Of course not. Industries that rely on our roads and bridges to move goods and services need that predictability, that funding, to make good business decisions. Otherwise, it would be foolish for them to do that.

We all say we want to help our economy grow, and certainly I do. Let's give the job creators a reason to create jobs. Let's reauthorize the highway trust fund for the long term.

□ 1230

WHEN WOMEN SUCCEED, AMERICA SUCCEEDS: AN ECONOMIC AGENDA FOR WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the ''When Women Succeed, America Succeeds: An Economic Agenda for Women and Families.''

Let me first thank Leader PELOSI, of course, and Representatives MATSUI and FRANKEL for their unwavering dedication to our Democratic Women's Working Group and for women and families all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, this agenda is about improving the future of our families and the economic security of all women. It is about increasing access to child care, retirement security, and equal pay for equal work. It is simply unacceptable in 2015 that women are still being paid 78 cents for every dollar that a man makes. African American women and Latinas are being paid even less, at 64 cents and 56 cents respectively, despite doing the same work as men. This is wrong. It is an embarrassment.

We must do more to advance the economic security of all women, like providing access to high quality and affordable child care. As a single mother who raised two amazing boys, I know what it is like to struggle to make ends meet. When I was a student at Mills College in Oakland, California, oftentimes I took my sons to class with me because I could not afford child care. Now, that was in the day. This is 2015, and women deserve better. So let's support this agenda and lift women up. When women succeed, America succeeds.

WOMEN AND RETIREMENT SECURITY

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of retirement security for women. We celebrate the month of May as Older Americans Month. This year also marks the 50th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid and the 80th anniversary of Social Security.

There is no better time to recognize the profound impact that these important programs have had on our country. They are vital programs to all Americans. We also know that they are especially key for women.

Women on average live longer, have lower retirement savings, and spend more on health care. I am committed to protecting and expanding Medicare and Social Security for women and for all seniors.

Congress must also pass legislation to support caregivers—women and men—who may leave the workforce to care for a child or a sick family member. Strong retirement security policies help women succeed and America succeed.

THE DEFENSE BILL

(Mr. MOULTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee just rejected an amendment to the defense bill that I offered to protect our troops on the front line by shifting funds from the A–10, an airplane the Air Force and the Department of Defense don't want, to unfunded priorities for IED protection and other things our front-line infantry troops desperately need.

Thousands of young American men and women have been killed by IEDs in the past decade. If the A–10 is so critical, why has neither the Army nor the Marine Corps, which many troops feel provides the best close air support in the world, asked for A–10s themselves? With a limitless budget we would all love to have the A–10 and other weapons. But our troops know that we live in a real world with real tradeoffs. And America expects us to make the politically difficult decisions to protect our shared national security and the lives of young Americans whom we ask to defend it.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Natural Resources:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, It is a tremendous privilege to represent the people of the First Congressional District of Alabama in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I have greatly appreciated the opportunity to serve on the Natural Resources Committee. However, due to my appointment to the Committee on Rules, I hereby resign my seat on the Natural Resources Committee.

I look forward to continuing to serve the constituents of Alabama's First Congressional District on the Committee on Rules during the 114th Congress.

Sincerely,

BRADLEY BYRNE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 14, 2015 at 9:49 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 10.

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy.

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN RELATING TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 134 the following new section:

''SEC. 135. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.

''(a) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN AND VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT WITH RESPECT TO SUCH AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS.—Not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership—

''(A) the agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1), including all related materials and annexes;

''(B) a verification assessment report of the Secretary of State prepared under paragraph (2) with respect to the agreement; and

''(C) a certification that—

''(i) the agreement includes the appropriate terms, conditions, and duration of the agreement's requirements with respect to Iran's nuclear activities and provisions describing any sanctions to be waived, suspended, or otherwise reduced by the United States, and any other nation or entity, including the United Nations; and

''(ii) the President determines the agreement meets United States non-proliferation objectives, does not jeopardize the common defense and security, provides an adequate framework to ensure that Iran's nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and ensures that Iran's nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose.

''(2) VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall prepare, with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), a report assessing—

''(i) the extent to which the Secretary will be able to verify that Iran is complying with its obligations and commitments under the agreement;

''(ii) the adequacy of the safeguards and other control mechanisms and other assurances contained in the agreement with respect to Iran's nuclear program to ensure Iran's activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose; and

''(iii) the capacity and capability of the International Atomic Energy Agency to effectively implement the verification regime required by or related to the agreement, including whether the International Atomic Energy Agency will have sufficient access to investigate suspicious sites or allegations of covert nuclear-related activities and whether it has the required funding, manpower, and authority to undertake the verification regime required by or related to the agreement.

''(B) ASSUMPTIONS.—In preparing a report under subparagraph (A) with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assume that Iran could—

''(i) use all measures not expressly prohibited by the agreement to conceal activities that violate its obligations and commitments under the agreement; and

''(ii) alter or deviate from standard practices in order to impede efforts to verify that Iran is complying with those obligations and commitments.

''(C) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—A report under subparagraph (A) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but shall include a classified annex prepared in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information.

''(3) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Neither the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1), nor subsections (b) through (g) of this section, shall apply to an agreement described in subsection (h)(5) or to the EU-Iran Joint Statement made on April 2, 2015.

''(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any agreement as defined in subsection (h)(1) and any related materials, whether concluded before or after the date of the enactment of this section, shall not be subject to the exception in subparagraph (A).

''(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 30-calendar day period following transmittal by the President of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a), the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review such agreement.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) shall be 60 calendar days if an agreement, including all materials required to be transmitted to Congress pursuant to subsection (a)(1), is transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) between July 10, 2015, and September 7, 2015.

''(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), prior to and during the period for transmission of an agreement in subsection (a)(1) and during the period for congressional review provided in paragraph (1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a).

''(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes both Houses of Congress, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 12 calendar days following the date of such passage.

''(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes both Houses of Congress, and the President vetoes such joint resolution, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 10 calendar days following the date of the President's veto.

''(6) EXCEPTION.—The prohibitions under paragraphs (3) through (5) do not apply to any new deferral, waiver, or other suspension of statutory sanctions pursuant to the Joint Plan of Action if that deferral, waiver, or other suspension is made—

''(A) consistent with the law in effect on the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; and

''(B) not later than 45 calendar days before the transmission by the President of an agreement, assessment report, and certification under subsection (a).

''(7) DEFINITION.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this subsection, the terms 'transmittal,' 'transmitted,' and 'transmission' mean transmittal, transmitted, and transmission, respectively, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

''(c) EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

''(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(A) the sanctions regime imposed on Iran by Congress is primarily responsible for bringing Iran to the table to negotiate on its nuclear program;

''(B) these negotiations are a critically important matter of national security and foreign policy for the United States and its closest allies;

''(C) this section does not require a vote by Congress for the agreement to commence;

''(D) this section provides for congressional review, including, as appropriate, for approval, disapproval, or no action on statutory sanctions relief under an agreement; and

''(E) even though the agreement may commence, because the sanctions regime was imposed by Congress and only Congress can permanently modify or eliminate that regime, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity, in an orderly and deliberative manner, to consider and, as appropriate, take action affecting the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

''(2) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, action involving any measure

of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to an agreement subject to subsection (a) or the Joint Plan of Action—

''(A) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), there is enacted a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does favor the agreement;

''(B) may not be taken if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), there is enacted a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the agreement; or

''(C) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, following the period for review provided in subsection (b), there is not enacted any such joint resolution.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase 'action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States' shall include waiver, suspension, reduction, or other effort to provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to, Iran under any provision of law or any other effort to refrain from applying any such sanctions.

''(d) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF IRANIAN COMPLIANCE WITH NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of all aspects of Iranian compliance with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a).

''(2) POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT BREACHES AND COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS.—The President shall, within 10 calendar days of receiving credible and accurate information relating to a potentially significant breach or compliance incident by Iran with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a), submit such information to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

''(3) MATERIAL BREACH REPORT.—Not later than 30 calendar days after submitting information about a potentially significant breach or compliance incident pursuant to paragraph (2), the President shall make a determination whether such potentially significant breach or compliance issue constitutes a material breach and, if there is such a material breach, whether Iran has cured such material breach, and shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership such determination, accompanied by, as appropriate, a report on the action or failure to act by Iran that led to the material breach, actions necessary for Iran to cure the breach, and the status of Iran's efforts to cure the breach.

''(4) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 calendar days after entering into an agreement described in subsection (a), and not less frequently than once every 180 calendar days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on Iran's nuclear program and the compliance of Iran with the agreement during the period covered by the report, including the following elements:

''(A) Any action or failure to act by Iran that breached the agreement or is in noncompliance with the terms of the agreement.

''(B) Any delay by Iran of more than one week in providing inspectors access to facilities, people, and documents in Iran as required by the agreement.

''(C) Any progress made by Iran to resolve concerns by the International Atomic Energy Agency about possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program.

''(D) Any procurement by Iran of materials in violation of the agreement or which could otherwise significantly advance Iran's ability to obtain a nuclear weapon.

''(E) Any centrifuge research and development conducted by Iran that—

''(i) is not in compliance with the agreement; or

''(ii) may substantially reduce the breakout time of acquisition of a nuclear weapon by Iran, if deployed.

''(F) Any diversion by Iran of uranium, carbon-fiber, or other materials for use in Iran's nuclear program in violation of the agreement.

''(G) Any covert nuclear activities undertaken by Iran, including any covert nuclear weapons-related or covert fissile material activities or research and development.

''(H) An assessment of whether any Iranian financial institutions are engaged in money laundering or terrorist finance activities, including names of specific financial institutions if applicable.

''(I) Iran's advances in its ballistic missile program, including developments related to its long-range and inter-continental ballistic missile programs.

''(J) An assessment of—

''(i) whether Iran directly supported, financed, planned, or carried out an act of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

''(ii) whether, and the extent to which, Iran supported acts of terrorism, including acts of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

''(iii) all actions, including in international fora, being taken by the United States to stop, counter, and condemn acts by Iran to directly or indirectly carry out acts of terrorism against the United States and United States persons;

''(iv) the impact on the national security of the United States and the safety of United States citizens as a result of any Iranian actions reported under this paragraph; and

''(v) all of the sanctions relief provided to Iran, pursuant to the agreement, and a description of the relationship between each sanction waived, suspended, or deferred and Iran's nuclear weapon's program.

''(K) An assessment of whether violations of internationally recognized human rights in Iran have changed, increased, or decreased, as compared to the prior 180-day period.

''(5) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—

''(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Following submission of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, the Department of State, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense shall, upon the request of any of those committees or leadership, promptly furnish to those committees or leadership their views as to whether the safeguards and other controls contained in the agreement with respect to Iran's nuclear program provide an adequate framework to ensure that Iran's activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

''(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON NUCLEAR INITIATIVES WITH IRAN.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of any initiative or negotiations with Iran relating to Iran's nuclear program, including any new or amended agreement.

''(6) COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION.—After the review period provided in subsection (b), the President shall, not less than every 90 calendar days—

''(A) determine whether the President is able to certify that—

''(i) Iran is transparently, verifiably, and fully implementing the agreement, including all related technical or additional agreements;

''(ii) Iran has not committed a material breach with respect to the agreement or, if Iran has committed a material breach, Iran has cured the material breach;

''(iii) Iran has not taken any action, including covert activities, that could significantly advance its nuclear weapons program; and

''(iv) suspension of sanctions related to Iran pursuant to the agreement is—

''(I) appropriate and proportionate to the specific and verifiable measures taken by Iran with respect to terminating its illicit nuclear program; and

''(II) vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

''(B) if the President determines he is able to make the certification described in subparagraph (A), make such certification to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

''(7) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(A) United States sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1);

''(B) issues not addressed by an agreement on the nuclear program of Iran, including fair and appropriate compensation for Americans who were terrorized and subjected to torture while held in captivity for 444 days after the seizure of the United States Embassy in Tehran, Iran, in 1979 and their families, the freedom of Americans held in Iran, the human rights abuses of the Government of Iran against its own people, and the continued support of terrorism worldwide by the Government of Iran, are matters critical to ensure justice and the national security of the United States, and should be expeditiously addressed;

''(C) the President should determine the agreement in no way compromises the commitment of the United States to Israel's security, nor its support for Israel's right to exist; and

''(D) in order to responsibly implement any long-term agreement reached between the P5+1 countries and Iran, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity to review any agreement and, as necessary, take action to modify the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

''(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION.—

''(1) INITIATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the event the President does not submit a certification pursuant to subsection (d)(6) during each 90-day period following the review period provided in subsection (b), or submits a determination pursuant to subsection (d)(3) that Iran has materially breached an agreement subject to subsection (a) and the material breach has not been cured, qualifying legislation introduced within 60 calendar days of such event shall be entitled to expedited consideration pursuant to this subsection.

''(B) DEFINITION.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this paragraph, the terms 'submit' and 'submits' mean submit and submits, respectively, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

''(2) QUALIFYING LEGISLATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualifying legislation' means only a bill of either House of Congress—

''(A) the title of which is as follows: 'A bill reinstating statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.'; and

''(B) the matter after the enacting clause of which is: 'Any statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran pursuant to _____ that were waived, suspended, reduced, or otherwise relieved pursuant to an agreement submitted pursuant to section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 are hereby reinstated and any action by the United States Government to facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to such agreement, or provide any further waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief pursuant to such agreement is hereby prohibited.',

with the blank space being filled in with the law or laws under which sanctions are to be reinstated.

''(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the 60-calendar day period provided for in paragraph (1), qualifying legislation may be introduced—

''(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

''(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

''(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House to which qualifying legislation has been referred has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 legislative days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration thereof.

''(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which qualifying legislation has been referred reports it to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the qualifying legislation in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the qualifying legislation with regard to the same agreement. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(C) CONSIDERATION.—The qualifying legislation shall be considered as read. All points of order against the qualifying legislation and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the qualifying legislation to final passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the qualifying legislation (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the qualifying legislation shall not be in order.

''(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

''(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—Qualifying legislation introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

''(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the Committee on Foreign Relations has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 session days after the date of referral of such legislation, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such legislation and the qualifying legislation shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

''(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the committee authorized to consider qualifying legislation reports it to the Senate or has been discharged from its consideration (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of qualifying legislation, and all points of order against qualifying legislation (and against consideration of the qualifying legislation) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the qualifying legislation is agreed to, the qualifying legislation shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

''(D) DEBATE.—Debate on qualifying legislation, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the qualifying legislation is not in order.

''(E) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the qualifying legislation and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate, if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

''(F) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to qualifying legislation shall be decided without debate.

''(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to qualifying legislation, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such qualifying legislation, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

''(6) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of qualifying legislation of that House, that House receives qualifying legislation from the other House, then the following procedures shall apply:

''(i) The qualifying legislation of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(ii) With respect to qualifying legislation of the House receiving the legislation—

''(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no qualifying legislation had been received from the other House; but

''(II) the vote on passage shall be on the qualifying legislation of the other House.

''(B) TREATMENT OF A BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce qualifying legislation under this section, the qualifying legislation of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

''(C) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the qualifying legislation in the Senate, the Senate then receives a companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

''(D) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to qualifying legislation which is a revenue measure.

''(f) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (e) is enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of legislation described in those sections, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(g) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the section shall be construed as—

''(1) modifying, or having any other impact on, the President's authority to negotiate, enter into, or implement appropriate executive agreements, other than the restrictions on implementation of the agreements specifically covered by this section;

''(2) allowing any new waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief from statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law, or allowing the President to refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) during the period for review provided in subsection (b);

''(3) revoking or terminating any statutory sanctions imposed on Iran; or

''(4) authorizing the use of military force against Iran.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AGREEMENT.—The term 'agreement' means an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future.

''(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

''(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees and leadership' means the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

''(4) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'Iranian financial institution' has the meaning given the term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

''(5) JOINT PLAN OF ACTION.—The term 'Joint Plan of Action' means the Joint Plan of Action, signed at Geneva November 24, 2013, by Iran and by France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Plan of Action, including the technical understandings reached on January 12, 2014, the extension thereto agreed to on July 18, 2014, the extension agreed to on November 24, 2014, and any materially identical extension that is agreed to on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015.

''(6) EU-IRAN JOINT STATEMENT.—The term 'EU-Iran Joint Statement' means only the Joint Statement by EU High Representative Federica Mogherini and Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif made on April 2, 2015, at Lausanne, Switzerland.

''(7) MATERIAL BREACH.—The term 'material breach' means, with respect to an agreement described in subsection (a), any breach of the

agreement, or in the case of non-binding commitments, any failure to perform those commitments, that substantially—

''(A) benefits Iran's nuclear program;

''(B) decreases the amount of time required by Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon; or

''(C) deviates from or undermines the purposes of such agreement.

''(8) NONCOMPLIANCE DEFINED.—The term 'noncompliance' means any departure from the terms of an agreement described in subsection (a) that is not a material breach.

''(9) P5+1 COUNTRIES.—The term 'P5+1 countries' means the United States, France, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and Germany.

''(10) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term 'United States person' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8511).''.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 13, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to claim the time in genuine opposition to H.R. 1191.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New York in favor of the motion?

Mr. ENGEL. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that basis, pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota will control 30 minutes in opposition.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and ask unanimous consent that he control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), my ranking member, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of this body have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to ensure that Congress is positioned to effectively and decisively judge and to constrain President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran should a bad deal be struck. I commend Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN for bringing this measure before their body. This bill received near unanimous support in the other body. I appreciate, as always, Ranking Member ENGEL's cooperation in bringing this to the floor.

With today's vote, this legislation will go to the President for his signature. The Foreign Affairs Committee has held a series of hearings on the administration's nuclear negotiations with Iran, a radical state sponsor of terrorism, which is creating turmoil in a strategically vital region. It is fair to say that there are deep, bipartisan concerns about where these negotiations are heading. I fear that the agreement that is coming will be too short, sanctions relief will be too rapid, inspectors will be too restricted, and Iran's missile program will be plain ignored.

Of course, we all hope that Iran's march toward a nuclear weapon can be diplomatically stopped. This legislation should strengthen the administration's hand at the negotiating table. But Secretary Kerry must put its added leverage to use immediately so that the U.S. can gain much-needed ground in the negotiations over the next 2 months.

Mr. Speaker, much of the pressure that brought the Islamic Republic of Iran to the negotiating table was put in place by Congress over the objections of the White House and over the objections of both Republican and Democratic Presidents, and this is unfortunate. We would have had more pressure on Iran today if the Obama administration hadn't pressured the Senate to sit on the Royce-Engel sanctions bill that the Foreign Affairs Committee produced and that this House passed by a margin of 400–20.

Let's be clear. The administration has come around to support the legislation we are debating here today, but not with any enthusiasm. Having followed these negotiations since they began in November of 2013, I can tell you that the President would like nothing more than to have no such bill, to have Congress sit on the sideline and watch him negotiate an agreement, whether good or bad, and I fear bad.

Today, without this legislation in place, what is Congress' position if the President reaches a deal with Iran? Currently, there is no limitation on the President's use of waivers to suspend the sanctions Congress put in place, no requirement that Congress receive full details of any agreement with Iran, no review period for Congress to examine and weigh in on the agreement, no requirement that the President certify that Iran is complying, and no way for Congress to rapidly reimpose sanctions should Iran cheat.

Today, the President can sign a bad deal, and we, the United States Congress, are left to read about it in the paper. But with the passage of this bill, all that changes. Sanctions relief is frozen until Congress receives the agreement and then holds a referendum on its merits. Again, I believe that this gives the administration a better chance to get to a lasting and meaningful agreement.

Consider the outstanding and critical issue of verification. The ink wasn't even dry on the framework announcement and the chants of ''death to America'' led by the Supreme Leader were still fresh when the leader asserted—when the Ayatollah asserted—that Iran wouldn't allow international inspectors access to its military facilities. The deputy head of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps seconded that. He said: ''They will not even be permitted to inspect the most normal military site in their dreams.''

When it comes to negotiating this inspections regime over the next 2 months, U.S. negotiators must know that these critical issues will determine Congress' assessment of any final deal.

□ 1245

Once this legislation is signed, when Secretary Kerry sits across from the Iranians, he will now have on his mind: I have got to take this to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, that prospect can only improve these negotiations. I just hope it is not too late and that we aren't too deep into a bad deal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this legislation.

Our negotiators continue to hammer out the details of an agreement with Iran that will hopefully foreclose all pathways to a nuclear weapon. As I have said again and again, if a deal is struck, Congress must have a proper role in assessing that deal. That is what we are doing now. That is the purpose of this legislation before us today. This legislation passed the other body by a vote of 98–1.

If a deal is reached, what are the things I will be looking for? First, what will sanctions really look like? Will it be a step-by-step process, so that Iran is forced to comply with the agreement? How will we ensure that this financial windfall for Iran won't just be used to fund terrorism around the world?

Second, will a deal compel Iran to come clean on its weaponization work?

Third, will Iran's leaders agree to a verification and inspection regime that will allow for snap inspections of nuclear sites? Snap inspections mean that the inspectors can go all over Iran. They don't need special permission. We have not been hearing such positive things from the Iranian leadership who

say that they will never allow inspectors on their military grounds.

We need answers to these questions. We need time to take a hard look at any deal and make sure there are no loopholes that Iran's leaders might be able to exploit. The bill we are debating today will give us that time.

My frustrations with these negotiations have stemmed from the fact that Iran was not required to cease its uranium enrichment while negotiating. When we sat down with Iran at the very beginning, more than a year ago, to negotiate with them, we should have said, While we are talking, you stop enriching. We didn't say that. I think that was a mistake.

Additionally, we negotiate as Iran continues its nefarious behavior around the world—in Syria, in Yemen, against Israel, support for terrorism. There is no sign that this agreement will lead to Iran stopping its support for terrorism or human rights violations; yet massive sanctions relief is on the table.

The fact of the matter is it is very frustrating that we are talking with Iran only about their nuclear weapons; we are not talking about the fact that they are a leading sponsor of terrorism or they are making trouble in Syria, where so many hundreds of thousands of innocents have died, or making trouble in Yemen or supporting Hezbollah, supporting Hamas.

It really is frustrating that we are talking about one aspect—their nuclear program—and meanwhile, they are free, apparently, to do whatever else they want. This really should not stand.

Perhaps the biggest question I have is whether Iran's leaders will ultimately be able to make the tough choices necessary to show the world that they are serious about living up to their commitments. This is a high bar to clear, and Iran's leaders, unfortunately, have given us no reason to trust them.

I remain concerned that the messages we are hearing from Iran directly contradict what the administration has told us. Iran's leaders have said that sanctions will be lifted immediately upon the signing of an agreement and that Iran will never accept inspections of their military sites.

This begs the question: Is Iran serious about these negotiations? We are told that any kind of sanctions relief will be incremental as Iran complies. The Iranian leaders are telling their public differently. We obviously have to settle this glaring discrepancy.

That is why this bill also includes provisions in case Iran reneges on its commitments. If Iran cheats, it would trigger immediate consideration of legislation that puts sanctions back in place, but let's hope it doesn't come to that.

The best way to avoid another war in the Middle East is a negotiated solution to the Iranian nuclear crisis. I wish our negotiators success. I hope this legislation sends a clear message that Congress is taking its role seriously, that we aren't playing politics with this issue and that we want these negotiations to result in a strong, verifiable deal that keeps a nuclear bomb out of Iran's hands.

I agree with Secretary Kerry when he says that no deal is better than a bad deal. The question is we want to make sure a bad deal isn't sold as a good deal. That is why it is important for Congress to be engaged.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. ELLISON. I don't object to the gentleman taking the 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and Senators CORKER, CARDIN, and MENENDEZ for doing their level best in the face of an administration which, throughout this process, has ignored and sought to exclude the legislature from its constitutional role in ratifying what is, in essence, a treaty—it is called an executive agreement, but it is a treaty—with the vicious, rights-abusing regime in Tehran, to salvage what we all can from an egregiously flawed framework and process.

It is clear, from the trajectory of negotiations to date, that the administration has squandered the leverage gained through sanctions, and there has been slippage—or, rather, retreat—from the strong position staked out in a number of U.N. Security Council resolutions, including resolution 1929 agreed to in 2010. Resolution 1929 demanded that Iran: one, suspend all uranium enrichment; two, cooperate fully with the IAEA ensuring unfettered onsite inspection; and, three, refrain from any activity related to ballistic missiles.

Iran is now closer to achieving access to nuclear weapons and to the missiles to carry them to targets, including cities in the United States, while being relieved of sanctions.

From what we know now of the proposed framework, over 5,000 centrifuges will be allowed. Furthermore, it is Iran's understanding that military sites will be off limits—what?—off limits to inspection and that ballistic missiles, the delivery systems for nuclear bombs, are not part of the framework.

As a prerequisite to sitting down with the regime in Tehran, I and others have argued that the administration should have insisted that all Americans held or missing in Iran, including Christian pastor Saeed Abedini be released.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that an agreement under these terms—terms which, underscore that, we have backtracked in these negotiations—will give new meaning to the phrase ''Pyrrhic victory.''

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for the time.

Also, I just want to acknowledge to my colleagues that we are here to talk about the best way to make sure that Iran does not acquire a nuclear weapon. I am convinced that what we do here today is not the best way to do that.

I am convinced that the best way to make sure that Iran does not have a nuclear weapon is to allow the Commander in Chief, Chief Executive of this country, to negotiate a deal, and then Congress will be asked to relieve any sanctions, if that is warranted, and we will be able to weigh in at that time, which is the proper time. We will be able to have oversight hearings without regard to this legislation or any other, at any time we choose.

This piece of legislation, I believe, improperly, in an unhelpful manner, restrains the President by tying his hands, significantly delaying the implementation of a peace agreement, weakens our negotiating position by strengthening Iranian hard-liners—who will argue that the U.S. will not repeal sanctions even if Iran complies with the final deal—and sends a signal to the international community that the U.S. Congress is setting the stage to vote down a final agreement, compromising our relationships with NATO allies and international partners that have implemented the sanctions regime and that brought about Iran to the negotiating table.

It is very important that we acknowledge it was not the U.S. sanctions alone that has brought Iran to the negotiating table. It has been the international community and the cooperation we have enjoyed with the international community that has brought them to the negotiating table.

If we start operating as if we are going to change the deal, we signal to our partners that we are operating in less than good faith, which could collapse the whole sanctions regime internationally. This is not U.S.-Iran negotiating; this is the P5+1, and we must keep that in due regard.

Congress has an important role to play in this agreement with Iran repealing statutory sanctions. The deal cannot be implemented without congressional action. There is no reason

for us to act right now. The only thing that acting now will achieve is to undermine the chance of an agreement.

Now, I believe Congress must have oversight, but I don't believe we should make this deal stillborn in the crib before it is even allowed to emerge. We don't want to abort the deal before it is born.

The deal should be allowed to come forward and the President should be allowed to make peace with a hostile nation before we start talking about what is wrong with it. We are anticipating what is wrong with it, and I don't think that is a helpful thing.

We are certainly not under any illusions about human rights, about exporting conflict from Iran. We know these things are the case.

What do you do when you want to deescalate the prospect of war? You negotiate. That is what the President is doing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me say that I agree with my friend who is, I think, one of our very responsible and able leaders in this Congress, Mr. ELLISON. I appreciate his comments.

I presume that everybody on this floor, whatever their perspective is, thinks that the objective that the United States seeks and the objective that our P5 partners seek and the objective that the United Nations seeks—and that is a non-nuclear-armed Iran—is best achieved through agreement.

I think all of us would agree on that. The question is, however, for us to make it very clear the objective of that agreement and how it is achieved and how we are assured that that objective is, in fact, achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Senator CARDIN, my dear friend, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, for his hard work to reach this compromise with Chairman CORKER. I want to congratulate Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for bringing it to the floor for quick consideration.

This compromise bill allows Congress to look carefully at the final agreement. For something of such consequence, that is essential. Not only is it desirable, it is essential that we do so. It will help ensure that our common goal is achieved, a non-nuclear-armed Iran.

I will say to my friend from Minnesota, my presumption is the Iranians want to get to this. They say they are not looking for nuclear arms; they want to have relief of the sanctions. It seems to me this is in their best interest, so they ought to be trying to accommodate this. I think, in fact, this can help, not hurt, our negotiating position.

I believe this bill reflects the consensus among Members of both the House and Senate that Congress, which authored the sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table—I would say, again, to my friend from Minnesota, the reason the sanctions were effective in bringing the Iranians to the table is because our European allies joined in them. I think he is absolutely right.

Unilaterally, we couldn't have done that because we don't do that much business with Iran; the Europeans do. He is absolutely right that it was in partnership that we brought the Iranians to the table.

I want to also thank, Mr. Speaker, our negotiating team for their tireless efforts to reach a framework agreement.

A letter was recently signed by 150. I didn't sign the letter, but I absolutely agreed with the substance of the letter, which said the best way to get there is through agreement, and we ought to support our negotiators who are pursuing that end.

As I have said before, any final agreement must prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and include the most intrusive inspections and access regime we have ever seen in order to verify Iran's compliance. There is no reason for us to trust Iran.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. It must address potentially military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program and bring about Iran's full cooperation with the U.N. Security Council resolutions.

The United States must never permit Iran to develop a nuclear weapon, and we will continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with Israel in defense of its security, which is very tied to our own security. That means ensuring Israel maintains its Qualitative Military Edge, including through robust support for antimissile systems and antitunneling defense programs. It also means supporting our gulf partners from Iran's destabilizing activities.

Preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon is directly in America's national security interest. A nuclear-armed Iran is a threat to us all. This bill will ensure that Congress can review any final nuclear agreement with Iran to make certain that it meets the goals we and the President share and which he has articulated emphatically and repeatedly. I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is probably no more critical issue on our national agenda today than this matter with Iran. 151 Members of the House have joined together to encourage the President to ''exhaust every avenue toward a verifiable, enforceable, diplomatic solution in order to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran.''

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD this communication.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington DC, May 7, 2015.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As negotiations over Iran's nuclear program continue, we urge you to stay on course, building on the recently announced political framework and continuing to work toward a strong and verifiable agreement between the P5+1 countries and Iran that will prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon. We commend you and your negotiating team, as well as our coalition partners, for the significant progress made thus far.

This issue is above politics. The stakes are too great, and the alternatives are too dire. We must exhaust every avenue toward a verifiable, enforceable, diplomatic solution in order to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. If the United States were to abandon negotiations or cause their collapse, not only would we fail to peacefully prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, we would make that outcome more likely. The multilateral sanctions regime that brought Iran to the table would likely collapse, and the Iranian regime would likely decide to accelerate its nuclear program, unrestricted and unmonitored. Such developments could lead us to war.

War itself will not make us safe. A U.S. or Israeli military strike may set back Iranian nuclear development by two or three years at best—a significantly shorter timespan than that covered by a P5+1 negotiated agreement. We must pursue diplomatic means to their fullest and allow the negotiations to run their course—especially now that the parties have announced a strong framework—and continue working to craft a robust and verifiable Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action by June 30.

We must allow our negotiating team the space and time necessary to build on the progress made in the political framework and turn it into a long-term, verifiable agreement. If we do not succeed, Congress will remain at-the-ready to act and present you with additional options to ensure that Iran is prevented from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Thank you for your resolve in preventing a nuclear-armed Iran. We look forward to continuing our shared work on this important matter.

Sincerely,

JAN SCHAKOWSKY,
Member of Congress.
LLOYD DOGGETT,
Member of Congress.
DAVID E. PRICE,
Member of Congress.

Alma S. Adams, Pete Aguilar, Brad Ashford, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Sanford D. Bishop, Earl Blumenauer, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cárdenas.

John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro,

Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Steve Cohen, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Joe Courtney, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio.

Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Mark DeSaulnier, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bill Foster, Marcia L. Fudge, Ruben Gallego, John Garamendi, Al Green, Raúl M. Grijalva.

Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Denny Heck, Brian Higgins, Rubén Hinojosa, Michael M. Honda, Jared Huffman, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Robin L. Kelly, Daniel T. Kildee, Ron Kind, Joseph P. Kennedy, III, Ann M. Kuster, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen.

John B. Larson, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Alan S. Lowenthal, Ben Ray Luján, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Stephen F. Lynch, Sean Patrick Maloney, Doris O. Matsui, Betty McCollum, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Jerry McNerney, Gregory W. Meeks, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton.

Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Richard M. Nolan, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Beto O'Rourke, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Jared Polis, David E. Price, Charles B. Rangel, Cedric L. Richmond, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush.

Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Janice D. Schakowsky, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, David Scott, José E. Serrano, Terri A. Sewell, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Jackie Speier, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, Niki Tsongas.

Chris Van Hollen, Marc A. Veasey, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Timothy J. Walz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Peter Welch, Frederica S. Wilson, John A. Yarmuth.

Mr. DOGGETT. While not signing this particular call for diplomacy, additional colleagues have made clear that they intend to prevent any attempted congressional veto of a strong, verifiable agreement. An agreement not based on trust, not based on liking Iran, but an agreement based on strong verification and intrusive verification.

Unfortunately, others here in this body who have embraced the wrongheaded advice of former President Bush's U.N. Ambassador John Bolton, who said that, ''To stop Iran's bomb, bomb Iran.'' These are some of the same Members who rejected the interim nuclear Joint Plan of Action before they had even read it. They are some of the same Members who were so eager to launch an unnecessary war in Iraq that only strengthened Iran and who seem to have learned very little from their previous failure, and they forget that Iran is bigger than Afghanistan and Iraq put together.

Another war will not make us safe. Bombing may set back Iranian nuclear development by two or three years at best—a significantly shorter time than that covered by a P5+1 negotiated agreement—but it will make an Iranian nuclear weapon more likely. Bombing will enflame sectarian and regional tensions. It will threaten the security of Israel and of our other allies and ultimately, it will jeopardize the safety of every American family.

That does not mean that any agreement with Iran is an acceptable agreement. Iranian hard-liners, like hardliners elsewhere, may, ultimately, prevent an adequate verification in this agreement, but we must use every diplomatic means available, especially now with the announcement of this strong framework, and continue to work and craft a robust Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. To do otherwise—to withdraw, to fail to support such an agreement—would likely collapse the multilateral sanctions among our allies and some that are not our allies but have joined with us in this regime that brought Iran to the table in the first place and would only accelerate an Iranian nuclear program that would then be unrestricted and unmonitored. Final sanctions—certainly sanctions which I have personally voted on a number of occasions in favor of—cannot be lifted without a vote of Congress, but that would not occur until we have conclusive evidence of Iranian compliance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. All of us who do not trust war as the answer must continue working together to support a peaceful resolution and overcome the bellicose voices whose only alternative is the perilous course of war. We want a strong, verifiable arms accord. I favor and will vote for oversight and review today, but President Obama should know that he has the support in this House to fulfill our obligations under a verifiable agreement for a safer world and to avoid war.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

While far from perfect, the passage of this bill will ensure that Congress has a final say on the Obama administration's naive negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program.

Last week, in Israel, I met with Israeli Prime Minister Bibi Netanyahu, where I heard, once again, from our top ally in the region about the deep concern his country has over the dangerous agreement currently being hammered out by President Obama and the Ayatollah.

For years, my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee have worked to ratchet up the pressure on Tehran through the toughest and most comprehensive sanctions ever devised. The sanctions passed in Congress brought Iran to the negotiating table. Last Congress, our committee, once again, passed another robust sanctions bill to give President Obama even more leverage over Tehran; but rather than accept our help, the President and his allies in the Senate opted, instead, to relieve Iran of the sanctions we had worked so hard to build.

And for what, Mr. Speaker?—for an agreement that allows the world's leading state sponsor of terror to maintain a vast nuclear infrastructure whose centrifuges will never stop spinning and, according to President Rouhani, for an agreement that does nothing to address the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program, such as the development of intercontinental ballistic missiles, which the Ayatollah says it should mass produce, or for an agreement that frees up billions of dollars that Iran can use to fund terror around the world.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must have a say in any final agreement with Iran, and this bill will do just that. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which will ensure Congress a role in evaluating any final deal reached between the P5+1 countries and Iran.

As the author of the crippling sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table, Congress' continued oversight role is critical. Serious concerns remain about the proposed framework, particularly of the enforcement and verifiability of any deal, and whether it will, indeed, close all possible pathways to a bomb.

Any deal must include full and unfettered inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency of any facility, military or otherwise—including Parchin, Fordow, Natanz—and Iran must account for the possible military dimensions of its past activities. Given Iran's history of deception, sanctions should remain in place until Iran has taken major nuclear-related steps that demonstrate their sincerity.

We all want a diplomatic solution, but as long as Iran's leaders continue to refer to Israel as the ''barbaric'' Jewish state that ''has no cure but to be annihilated,'' we must approach any deal with the utmost scrutiny. That is why I urge the immediate passage of this important legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, none of us want nuclear weapons in Iran; and while the White House may regard this bill as the least harmful option offered by a persistently intractable Congress—a Congress that has sought to derail all of his efforts in the past—I cannot and will not support this particular piece of legislation.

Of all of President Obama's foreign policy objectives, this is the boldest and the one that could have a meaningful impact on regional and global stability. The option of war or of increasing the sanctions simply has run its course. The time has come for diplomacy. The framework that the administration has presented to us is fair and smart. It is a good deal, one that guarantees a world safe from the threat of Iranian nuclear weapons.

We all await the details. All of this argument out here is about people who are sure of what the details are going to be. That is why this is not the time to be passing this legislation. President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and our partners—and don't forget that this is an historic thing in that we have partners of the P5+1. They deserve immense credit in their determination and commitment to a diplomatic solution to, arguably, the most dangerous and complex foreign policy challenge of our time.

We need to give the President and the negotiators the time they need. The time for us to make decisions about what happens about the sanctions will come to this floor. There is no question about it. We don't need to pass a bill saying we don't like what the President is doing. We ought to be grateful for the tenacity with which he has persisted in this diplomatic effort.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I very much thank the chairman for his leadership on our committee.

Mr. Speaker, this bill serves as a reminder of the unanswered questions surrounding the nuclear negotiations with Iran.

We know Iran can't be trusted. Everything we have seen from Iran since 1979 shows that the regime is willing to lie, to cheat, to obfuscate to achieve its agenda, and part of that agenda is to attack and to undermine the United States and our regional interests.

Can we verify Iran's compliance?

No, because Iran controls the access of the IAEA to its sites. Iran hasn't even come clean on its possible military dimension of its nuclear program yet. The regime is also likely to get a $50 billion signing bonus, when a deal is signed, in exchange for nothing.

What will Iran do with that money, Mr. Speaker?

It will continue to support terror around the globe, stoke sectarian violence as we have seen all over the Middle East, repress its own citizens, and, just today, five Iranian boats fired shots across the bow of a Singapore-flagged cargo vessel in the gulf.

Can we have snapback sanctions? Oh, please, the idea is laughable at best.

According to reports, China and Russia have stated that there will not be any automatic snapback sanctions whatsoever to reimpose on Iran even if the regime is caught in violation.

Once again, the Obama administration is playing a game of smoke and mirrors to get this deal finalized and to cement a legacy that the President has been seeking since he entered office. The deal is dangerous and will only jeopardize our national security.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), the ranking member on the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee and a very valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

□ 1315

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. When it comes to the security of our Nation and our partners around the world, the American people deserve a voice, but when Congress is unable to review or respond to policies of great consequence, like a potential nuclear deal with Iran, the American people have no voice.

In recent days, we have heard another debate about another major international agreement also negotiated in secret, the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Why do I bring that up in this context? Well, some of my colleagues who oppose this critical legislation have serious concerns about TPA and TPP. I share those concerns. I oppose fast-tracking TPP without the details on protecting jobs and workers and the environment and consumers and without any chance at making changes.

Likewise, today, I ask my colleagues to acknowledge and respect my concerns about approving a deal today with Iran when too many questions remain unanswered. On matters of national and international security, bullet points in a framework just won't do. Before Iran gains access to billions of dollars in frozen assets, I want the details. I want details on conditions for sanctions relief and access to military sites and unannounced inspections, and you should, too. No one here knows what a final deal would look like or even if we will get one, but I know you agree that, if we do, Congress should get to review the terms.

On behalf of our constituents, Congress must have a say. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and also for his tremendous leadership on this very important issue. Also, I want to thank our ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, and Chairman ROYCE for their leadership on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and for all of the bipartisan work that you have done over the years together.

The poison pills have been taken out of this bill by the other body, and I still have concerns about the timing and effect of considering this legislation, but the President believes that this legislation, as written, will not undermine the administration's efforts. All of us have the same goal, and that is to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

As negotiations over Iran's nuclear program enter a critical phase, Congress must give the President and our negotiators the space they need to succeed, and with the announcement of a framework agreement last month, we are closer to a strong and verifiable agreement between the P5+1 countries and Iran.

H.R. 1191 would require that Congress be given an opportunity to review any final agreement on Iran's nuclear program before the President can waive or suspend any sanctions. Supporters of this bill argue that they simply want to ensure congressional oversight of any final international agreement, and of course we all believe that there is a role for that, but we know that since negotiations began, there have been countless initiatives by Congress to purposely and deliberately thwart the success of a final deal.

Any efforts to undermine the negotiations or a final deal with Iran over its nuclear program will not make us safer, and it will not stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. In fact, it will do just the opposite.

Negotiations with Iran have already led to a first-step agreement that has significantly reduced Iran's nuclear stockpile and their ability to create a nuclear weapon. Without these negotiations and the current framework agreement, Iran's nuclear program would be unmonitored and unrestrained. Continued negotiations remain the best route to ensuring national and regional security while preventing us from going back on the path to a confrontation with Iran.

A deal with Iran has the support of the majority of the American people. An April ABC-Washington Post poll found that Americans by a nearly 2–1 margin support striking a deal with Iran that restricts the nation's nuclear program in exchange for loosening

sanctions. We simply cannot afford the alternative to the negotiations, and the alternative to the negotiations, I believe, is war with Iran.

Instead of taking actions to undermine our President and international negotiators as they work to secure a final deal, Congress should be working to ensure their success. Now, let's hope that this bill does that. I hope that this Congress does not use passage of this bill as a cynical ploy to set up a vote against any final deal should there be a deal, one that prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. Simply put, diplomacy is the best way to cut off any potential pathway to an Iranian nuclear weapon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. May I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. I will conclude by just saying in 2013 I introduced legislation calling for an end to the no contact policy with Iran and calling for a diplomatic initiative. I am convinced that that is the only way to ensure regional stability. Let's hope that the President's legacy does include preventing a war with Iran. What a great legacy to leave for the world.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I want to thank Mr. ROYCE from California for his leadership on this issue as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as well as Mr. ENGEL from New York for his leadership as the ranking member.

Americans want to know what is in an Iran nuclear deal. They want their Representatives in Congress to debate it. If facts come out that it turns out that this is a bad deal, which many are concerned we are on that pace for, they want Congress to reject it. I have had colleagues just now listening to those speaking in opposition talking about a nuclear framework agreement that was announced last month, people saying it is a good deal. There is no framework agreement.

The President released a fact sheet, and within 24 hours the Iranian Foreign Minister went on his Twitter feed saying it was just spin, the Ayatollah chanting ''death to America'' on the streets of Iran, saying that that fact sheet was just spin.

In order to have a deal to reach an agreement, both sides need to agree. The message to the colleagues today, I mean, this vote matters, but the work is not over. The tough work, the tough votes are still ahead.

Let's talk about what is not even part of the negotiations: Iran's state sponsorship of terrorism, work to overthrow foreign governments, development of ICBMs, pledging to wipe Israel off the map, chanting ''death to America'' on the streets, unjustly imprisoning United States citizens. That is not even part of the deal. That is not even part of the negotiations.

I want to read it. My constituents want to read a deal in English. They want to know that it is accurately translated, and the Iranians are reading their deal the same way that we are. If there is no agreement on specific terms, is there broad, vague language being used so that both sides can spin whatever they want to interpret this deal is for whatever best serves their own domestic politics?

We are elected to represent our constituents, and they are concerned about the direction of this deal. I have grave concerns. I feel like it is on pace to trigger a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. I urge a ''yes'' vote. I thank the chairman, again, for his effort on this.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), a very respected member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, and I want to remind everyone why it is so important that we prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear state. Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism supporting Hamas, Hezbollah, and the brutal crackdown in Syria. Iran's efforts to expand its influence is destabilizing Iraq, Lebanon, and now Yemen.

The Iran regime systematically violates its own citizens' basic rights and, as terrifying, has the potential for nuclear proliferation. If Iran becomes a nuclear state, we will see a regional race for the bomb spreading the world's most dangerous weapons through the world's most unstable region.

Mr. Speaker, Congress played a critical role in bringing Iran to the negotiating table. Iran cannot be trusted, and Congress must continue to be vigilant.

Mr. ROYCE. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague from Minnesota and rise today in cautious support of this legislation.

Our nuclear negotiators, with the cooperation of a fragile coalition of longstanding allies and new partners, have made historic progress toward preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon, a critical foreign policy imperative for our country.

We must continue to give diplomacy a chance and allow our negotiators to build on the framework agreement they negotiated earlier this spring.

Many of our colleagues in the House of Representatives agree, Mr. Speaker. Just last week, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, Congressman DOGGETT, and I sent a letter to the President urging persistence in negotiations, a letter that was signed by 148 of our colleagues.

Diplomacy isn't just the best way of preventing a nuclear-armed Iran; it is the only way. Opponents of the President's efforts have yet to provide a single viable alternative to diplomacy short of military action, and military action, defense experts tell us, would only delay nuclear development for a few years.

While I can understand why some Members of the House and Senate insisted upon congressional review of a final deal with such historic implications, I have strongly refused to support legislation or other congressional intervention that was likely to drive Iran from the negotiating table or to alienate our international partners. We must not set impossible goals for these negotiations or insist that every outstanding issue our country has with Iran be resolved before the core nuclear issue can be addressed.

The bill before us, which is a product of a thoughtful compromise between Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN, Republicans and Democrats, does none of these harmful things. It is free of riders designed to undermine the negotiations, and it provides a reasonable path forward that allows for Congress to weigh in on a final deal without setting it up for failure.

So I rise in cautious support of this bill because I believe it clears the way for the President's negotiators to do their job, to work with our international partners to secure a comprehensive, verifiable nuclear agreement that will prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon and thereby will make the world a safer place.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership and Ranking Member ENGEL for his leadership as well.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, I believe the greatest threat we have to our own national security here is a nuclear-armed Iran, an entity that has said time and again that they want to wipe Israel off the face of the map, that they want to drive them into the sea, that they are the Little Satan, which naturally begs the question, Mr. Speaker, as to who is the Big Satan, and it is the United States of America.

This is a framework, the framework that has been announced, the one that

Iran basically said, We didn't think that was the framework. The chants of ''death to America.'' What they said is that they have to take all the sanctions off immediately upon the signature of a deal and that the IAEA will not be granted access to inspect facilities that are military facilities. Well, frankly, that is not a deal. I recognize that is a framework.

What we are debating today is really talking about Congress having the ability to say: Is this a deal that we can live with or is it not? Because, frankly, leaving Iran as a nuclear threshold state is not going to be a deal. What we are going to be debating today is, in essence, just allowing us to be able to take the next vote. That is the important one.

Madam Speaker, this is not left versus right. This isn't about Republicans and Democrats. This is about right versus wrong. This is about making sure that we do this right. If we don't do this right, if Iran is set for a path to a nuclear weapon, it is going to set an arms race in a dangerous neighborhood that will be devastating for peace and security around the globe. This is one where we are going to join hands together as a nation to make sure that the safety and security of the world is what we are going to put first and foremost.

Madam Speaker, I just got back from Israel. I had the opportunity to speak with people on multiple sides. To the person, they are all united behind the idea that a nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable and that this will be a bad deal.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this piece of legislation to allow us to have the opportunity to take a look at this deal to move forward. With that, I sincerely hope that this is a bipartisan effort.

□ 1330

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I will yield to Chairman ROYCE for a colloquy, and I will ask him the following questions.

As I read this bill, if Congress does not enact a Joint Resolution of Disapproval, that failure to enact a Resolution of Disapproval cannot be read as Congress approving an agreement.

As I read the bill, if Congress does not enact a Resolution of Disapproval, the sole effect of that is to continue current statutes so that the President would retain his authority to provide sanctions relief.

Do you agree?

Mr. ROYCE. That is correct, Mr. SHERMAN. I see no way that a failure to override a Presidential veto or otherwise enact a joint resolution of disapproval would be construed as Congress approving a bad Iran deal. It would be that the Congress didn't have a supermajority of votes to stop the President from exercising the considerable leeway he has for the sanctions that are in place.

I would also remind the gentleman that this bill gives us the chance to have that vote. Otherwise, the President could act to waive sanctions the day after a deal is struck.

And if people are really worried about congressional intent being misconstrued, we always have the ability to make our intent crystal clear by passing a resolution or concurrent resolution, which are not subject to Presidential presentment or veto.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for his clarification.

If this deal is signed, I do not think that Congress will enact a Resolution of Disapproval over the President's veto—maybe not even vote for it on the floor. It is even less likely that Congress will enact a Resolution of Approval.

So we will be in a situation where Congress will not have acted, and as the chairman points out, Congress would not have approved this agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the President signs an agreement, Iran will get certain benefits and certain funds will be made available to them. At the same time, Iran will ship its stockpiles out of the country—or a substantial portion of them—decommission some centrifuges, and thereby delay its effort to get a nuclear weapon.

That means in 2017, and every year thereafter, future Congresses and future Presidents will have to determine what American policy is. We would be free to demand a renegotiation of the agreement, or to simply continue it in force. A President could reactivate sanctions, or continue to waive them. Congress could enact new sanctions, or repeal existing sanctions.

All options will be on the table in the years to come. And the only thing I am certain of is that we will be on this floor debating Iran and its nuclear program for many years to come.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The measure we are debating today is much better, through the hard work of Senators Corker and Cardin, and I appreciate their efforts to deescalate the conversation. I fear it is the wrong message at the wrong time. There are no good alternatives to letting negotiators prevent a nuclear-armed Iran.

Now, Congress seldom advances diplomacy. Usually, we politicize issues, playing to the bleachers. Our judgment is often suspect: the record from ignoring the lead up to World War II; misjudgments on Vietnam; the reckless rush into the war in Iraq; even maintaining a foolish policy regarding Cuba, until the President exercised leadership lately.

There is no good reason to interfere now with what the P5+1 have done, making unprecedented progress—progress we wouldn't have imagined 2 or 3 years ago. They did so using a unified force with these six countries, using the tools of the sanctions that we could not have imposed unilaterally. And we don't want to lose the leverage of those allies.

Now, I am painfully aware of the issues with Iran. It is troubling, a number of their activities. It is also ironic that our interests are aligned in some areas. And I will never forget on 9/11 there were demonstrations of support for America in Tehran. The Iranian people actually like Americans, their leaders do not—and that is why working forward to make this historic agreement a reality could be an important pivot point for the troubled relationships between our countries.

Make no mistake, there are hard-liners in Iran, just as there are hard-liners in the United States, who want to blow this agreement up. But I have been impressed, taking advantage of offers from the White House for numerous briefings on this issue, reviewing the materials, that we have made tremendous progress. We shouldn't complicate it.

As my friends have referenced here, there is no good alternative to a negotiated agreement with Iran. It is the only way we can prevent them from getting nuclear weapons.

A reckless rush to war, which some people hinted at, others would welcome, would not stop their ultimate acquisition of nuclear weapons. It is very likely to accelerate it. And to imagine going back into that area, fighting a country with a population that is larger than Iraq and Afghanistan combined—over a huge area—would be devastating.

Let's stay the course. Let's be patient. Let's try to constrain congressional interference.

Mr. ROYCE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me first say I appreciate the thoughtfulness that I have heard during this debate from all sides. And I think that is really Congress at its best. I am proud to be a Member of Congress when I hear debates like this.

This legislation was negotiated very carefully to ensure that Iran would hear a unified and bipartisan message from Congress. Why is this important?

It was Congress' work with the layers and layers of sanctions. And Mr. ROYCE has been my partner from day one. We have worked together so hard on sanctions and speaking with a unified voice in the Foreign Affairs Committee, and we have tried so hard to make the Foreign Affairs Committee the most bipartisan committee of Congress because foreign policy should be bipartisan. And what I have heard today from all across the aisle here is bipartisanship. And it is a good feeling. But it was Congress' work—the layers and layers of sanctions—that brought Iran to its knees and compelled Iran to come to the negotiating table.

I believe that it will be the threat of congressional action that will compel Iran to make the tough choices in these negotiations. But this congressional action must be bipartisan. Iran must not be able to dismiss a bill as a partisan stunt.

Congress must speak with a unified voice. We are stronger when we are unified. We are stronger when we act in a bipartisan manner. The international community followed our lead on Iran when we were unified. Iran came to the negotiating table when we were unified. And this vote should be no different: no poison pills, no extraneous messaging items that could torpedo this carefully crafted bill. Let's get this bill to the President's desk with a single voice.

Again, I want to repeat some of my trepidation. The fact that Iran was allowed to enrich uranium all these months and months of talking I think was a mistake. The fact that we are talking only with Iran about their nuclear program, not about their support for terrorism, not about Americans held in Iranian prisons, not about their ballistic weapons, not about their mischief in Iran, not about their support for international terrorism, not about their support for Hezbollah and Hamas, not about their threats of death to Israel and death to America, I think is a mistake.

But I do think negotiations are important, so I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this very, very sensible bipartisan piece of legislation. Let's get this bill to the President's desk with a single voice.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I want to thank the ranking member and the chairman for this considered debate. I will say that I do believe that this is a big deal. It is important that we debate this. I respect the position that I have heard here today, but ultimately I don't think what we are doing is necessary, and I don't believe it will help enhance peace for the United States or the world.

I think the things that we need are already in place, which is our right to have hearings on anything we want, the role we will have to play to remove any sanctions if we are satisfied, and the fact that we don't have to if we are not. We have the cards. We do not have to choke this deal in the crib, which is what I think this particular bill threatens.

Now, let me say there is nothing new, Madam Speaker, about what the President is doing here. I have a list of examples that very closely correlate to the President's effort to negotiate a nuclear deal with Iran: the Helsinki Act in 1975, the Nuclear Suppliers Group in 1975, and the Australia Group in 1985. I don't have time to go into what all these things are, but I can say there are a number of situations where Presidents, Republican and Democrat, have used their authority to negotiate agreements with other countries in which Congress did not have to try to intervene.

Let me also point out that this situation that we are in, where we have had the framework agreement and now we are hoping to get a full agreement, I am hopeful and optimistic it will be something that is good and meaningful. So far, so good, in my opinion.

But I just want to remind everybody that the framework deal that has been struck already between the P5+1 in Iran would destroy about 14,000 centrifuges. That is what we are talking about here. Iran would destroy 97 percent of its uranium. That is 97 percent. Iran will have zero military nuclear capability.

We are at a historic moment that one keeps Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, and we need to support this effort. I intend to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we have heard today, Iran's rush to a nuclear weapon is a mortal threat to the United States and to our allies. And when I say it is a threat, consider for a minute the fact that Iran has, with its Quds forces, forces right now in Lebanon. It has forces in Syria. It has forces in Iraq. Its forces have just helped lead a militia to topple the government in Yemen, a government that was our ally. So that is the type of regime that we are talking about.

Just weeks ago, it was reported that Iran was passing tens of millions of dollars to Hamas. But they gave a reason. It was to rebuild the three dozen or so tunnels that were built underneath Israel so that Hamas could conduct attacks to try to capture hostages and take them back into Gaza.

□ 1345

The reason for the strategy is pretty clear. That kind of strategy would ensure that our ally Israel would have to fight block by block by block to get captives back. The one that I was in with Mr. ENGEL was not far from where it came up close to a nursery school.

This is the reality of the type of regime we are dealing with. It is not just transferring the money. It is also transferring the new rockets and the new missiles to Hamas.

Why were they doing that? Because they said the inventory is low because of the rockets fired off—this is the reality of the types of intentions that this regime has. Many times, they telegraph those intentions. When they are yelling, ''Death to the Great Satan, death to the little Satan,'' it is not as though they are not telling us the Ayatollah's intent. He is, after all, the Supreme Leader here.

Iran's support of terrorism and destabilization in the region will be far more intense, frankly, if it possesses a nuclear weapon or, indeed, if it had undetectable nuclear breakout capability.

The stakes could not be higher. That is why we need a good agreement, and I hope that all the Members support this legislation. It may not be a perfect bill, but it is a good bill. It is an important and responsible response to an administration that otherwise would shut out Congress.

I am sorry it took the White House so long to embrace it. Weeks ago, the White House was issuing veto threats and pushing back hard. Were it to pass, it would be the end of diplomacy as we know it, they said at the time. Now, they are on board, and it is good that they are on board.

With this legislation in place—and this is the great upside—Congress will be in a much better position to judge any final agreement that the President strikes with Iran, and I believe that our diplomacy will have a better shot because of it.

Instead of Iranian negotiators knowing that they can wear down the administration, this now injects Congress as an important backstop. It gives us leverage to address these issues like what we discussed today, to address the issue of: Will our inspectors, the international inspectors, have the right to go on military bases?

Let me tell you, I was part of the 1994 framework agreement, and the consequences of not getting the ability of weapons inspectors, international inspectors, to go on to military bases, not having that right to go anywhere, anytime, had profound consequences. It is why we are dealing with North Korea having the weapon today that they possess.

We should not repeat that error. U.S. diplomats should now head to the negotiating table with a stronger hand. They should work for a credible deal, a verifiable deal, and then present it to Congress to be judged. That is only appropriate, given the incredible consequences for the region, for our allies, and for the national security of the United States.

I urge the passage of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this important legislation to provide for Congressional review of any final nuclear agreement with Iran.

It is the policy of the United States to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. That is my position, and it has been the position of both President Obama and a majority in the United States Congress.

As I indicated in a statement a few weeks ago, I support President Obama's ongoing effort to work with our P5+1 partners to achieve a strong and verifiable agreement to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. This legislation makes clear that Congress must exercise its responsibilities in this process.

As the Administration has acknowledged, many important details remain to be worked out before the June 30 deadline. These include ensuring that inspectors are able to visit all nuclear sites in Iran, that sanctions only begin to unwind after the International Atomic Energy Agency confirms that Iran is complying with the terms of the final agreement, that the "snap back" of sanctions is assured should Iran violate the agreement, and that Iran implements an agreed set of measures to address the IAEA's concerns regarding the possible military dimensions of its program. I will be carefully monitoring and reviewing the ongoing negotiations to determine whether the final agreement meets the objectives we established.

The legislation before us today ensures the very important role that Congress must play in this process. It provides that Congress will review this agreement and have the opportunity to act. Moreover, it makes clear that any repeal of sanctions legislation will require congressional action. As negotiations continue, I look forward to working with the president and my congressional colleagues to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. I agree with President Obama that it would be best if we can achieve that objective by negotiating a verifiable agreement. But I also agree with him that no deal is better than a bad deal.

Madam Speaker, the President and a majority in the Congress are united in our commitment to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Let us continue to pursue that objective together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1191.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HEZBOLLAH INTERNATIONAL FINANCING PREVENTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2297) to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2297

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(1) prevent Hezbollah's global logistics and financial network from operating in order to curtail funding of its domestic and international activities; and

(2) utilize all available diplomatic, legislative, and executive avenues to combat the global criminal activities of Hezbollah as a means to block that organization's ability to fund its global terrorist activities.

TITLE I—PREVENTION OF ACCESS BY HEZBOLLAH TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 101. BRIEFING ON IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS ON CERTAIN SATELLITE PROVIDERS THAT CARRY AL-MANAR TV.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall provide to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a briefing on the following:

(1) The activities of all satellite, broadcast, Internet, or other providers that knowingly provide material support to al-Manar TV, and any affiliates or successors thereof.

(2) With respect to all providers described in paragraph (1)—

(A) an identification of those providers that have been sanctioned pursuant to Executive Order No. 13224 (September 23, 2001); and

(B) an identification of those providers that have not been sanctioned pursuant to Executive Order No. 13224 and, with respect to each such provider, the reason why sanctions have not been imposed.

SEC. 102. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) PROHIBITIONS AND CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACCOUNTS HELD BY FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the heads of other applicable departments and agencies, shall prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, engages in an activity described in paragraph (2).

(2) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—A foreign financial institution engages in an activity described in this paragraph if the foreign financial institution—

(A) knowingly facilitates a significant transaction or transactions for Hezbollah;

(B) knowingly facilitates a significant transaction or transactions of a person designated for acting on behalf of or at the direction of, or owned or controlled by, Hezbollah;

(C) knowingly engages in money laundering to carry out an activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B);

(D) knowingly facilitates a significant transaction or transactions or provides significant financial services to carry out an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C), including—

(i) facilitating a significant transaction or transactions; or

(ii) providing significant financial services that involve a transaction of covered goods; or

(E)(i) knowingly facilitates, or participates or assists in, an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D), including by acting on behalf of, at the direction of, or as an intermediary for, or otherwise assisting, another person with respect to the activity described in any such subparagraph;

(ii) knowingly attempts or conspires to facilitate or participate in an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D); or

(iii) is owned or controlled by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D).

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under paragraph (4) of this

subsection to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206(a).

(4) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe and implement regulations to carry out this subsection.

(b) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the heads of other applicable departments and agencies, may waive, on a case-by-case basis, the application of a prohibition or condition imposed with respect to a foreign financial institution pursuant to subsection (a) for a period of not more than 180 days, and may renew such waiver for additional periods of not more than 180 days, on and after the date that the Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State—

(A) determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(B) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the reasons for such determination.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1)(B) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(A) identifies each foreign central bank that the Secretary determines engages in one or more activities described in subsection (a)(2)(D); and

(B) provides a detailed description of each such activity.

(2) SPECIAL RULE TO ALLOW FOR TERMINATION OF SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall not be required to apply sanctions to a foreign financial institution described in subsection (a) if the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the heads of other applicable departments and agencies, certifies in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) such foreign financial institution—

(i) is no longer engaging in the activity described in subsection (a)(2); or

(ii) has taken and is continuing to take significant verifiable steps toward terminating the activity described in such subsection; and

(B) the Secretary has received reliable assurances from the government with primary jurisdiction over such foreign financial institution that such foreign financial institution will not engage in any activity described in such subsection in the future.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section:

(A) ACCOUNT; CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms ''account'', ''correspondent account'', and ''payable-through account'' have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(C) COVERED GOODS.—The term ''covered goods'' has the meaning given the term in section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(D) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''financial institution'' means a financial institution specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (M), (N), (P), (R), (T), (Y), or (Z) of section 5312(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code.

(E) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION; DOMESTIC FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—

(i) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''foreign financial institution'' has the meaning of such term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, and includes a foreign central bank.

(ii) DOMESTIC FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''domestic financial institution'' has the meaning of such term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(F) HEZBOLLAH.—The term ''Hezbollah'' means—

(i) any person—

(I) the property of or interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(II) who is identified on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury as an agent, instrumentality, or affiliate of Hezbollah; and

(ii) the entity designated by the Secretary of State as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(G) MONEY LAUNDERING.—The term ''money laundering'' means any of the activities described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 1956(a) of title 18, United States Code, with respect to which penalties may be imposed pursuant to such section.

(2) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury may further define the terms used in this section in the regulations prescribed under this section.

TITLE II—REPORTS ON DESIGNATION OF HEZBOLLAH AS A SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN NARCOTICS TRAFFICKER AND A SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATION

SEC. 201. REPORT ON DESIGNATION OF HEZBOLLAH AS A SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN NARCOTICS TRAFFICKER.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on whether Hezbollah meets the criteria for designation under the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) as a significant foreign narcotics trafficker, and if the President determines that Hezbollah does not meet such criteria, a detailed justification as to which criteria have not been met.

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 202. REPORT ON DESIGNATION OF HEZBOLLAH AS A SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Hezbollah meets the criteria for designation as a significant transnational criminal organization under Executive Order No. 13581 (76 Fed. Reg. 44757); and

(2) the President should so designate Hezbollah as a significant transnational criminal organization.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed report on whether the Hezbollah meets the criteria for designation as a significant transnational criminal organization under Executive Order No. 13581 (76 Fed. Reg. 44757), and if the President determines that Hezbollah does not meet such criteria, a detailed justification as to which criteria have not been met.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 203. REWARDS FOR JUSTICE AND HEZBOLLAH'S FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING ACTIVITIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that details actions taken by the Department of State through the Department of State rewards program under section 36 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act (22 U.S.C. 2708) to obtain information on fundraising, financing, and money laundering activities of Hezbollah and its agents and affiliates.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the actions described in subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 204. REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO DISRUPT GLOBAL LOGISTICS NETWORKS AND FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING ACTIVITIES OF HEZBOLLAH.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) a list of countries that support Hezbollah, or in which Hezbollah maintains important portions of its global logistics networks;

(B) with respect to each country on the list required by subparagraph (A)—

(i) an assessment of whether the government of such country is taking adequate measures to disrupt the global logistics networks of Hezbollah within the territory of such country; and

(ii) in the case of a country the government of which is not taking adequate measures to disrupt such networks—

(I) an assessment of the reasons such government is not taking such adequate measures; and

(II) a description of measures being taken by the United States to encourage such government to improve measures to disrupt such networks;

(C) a list of countries in which Hezbollah, or any of its agents or affiliates, conducts significant fundraising, financing, or money laundering activities;

(D) with respect to each country on the list required by subparagraph (C)—

(i) an assessment of whether the government of such country is taking adequate measures to disrupt the fundraising, financing, or money laundering activities of Hezbollah and its agents and affiliates within the territory of such country; and

(ii) in the case of a country the government of which is not taking adequate measures to disrupt such activities—

(I) an assessment of the reasons such government is not taking such adequate measures; and

(II) a description of measures being taken by the United States to encourage such government to improve measures to disrupt such activities; and

(E) a list of methods that Hezbollah, or any of its agents or affiliates, utilizes to raise or transfer funds, including trade-based money laundering, the use of foreign exchange houses, and free-trade zones.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form to the greatest extent possible, and may contain a classified annex.

(3) GLOBAL LOGISTICS NETWORKS OF HEZBOLLAH.—In this subsection, the term ''global logistics networks of Hezbollah'', ''global logistics networks'', or ''networks'' means financial, material, or technological support for, or financial or other services in support of, Hezbollah.

(b) BRIEFING ON HEZBOLLAH'S ASSETS AND ACTIVITIES RELATED TO FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING WORLDWIDE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the heads (or their designees) of other applicable Federal departments and agencies shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the disposition of Hezbollah's assets and activities related to fundraising, financing, and money laundering worldwide.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 205. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

Except as otherwise provided, in this title, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall apply to the authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

SEC. 302. REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Not less than 10 days before the promulgation of regulations under subsection (a), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees (as such term is defined in section 203) of the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

SEC. 303. TERMINATION.

This Act shall terminate on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to Congress that Hezbollah—

(1) is no longer designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(2) is no longer listed in the Annex to Executive Order No. 13224 (September 23, 2001; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism); and

(3) poses no significant threat to United States national security, interests, or allies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material they might wish for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this measure, and I want to especially thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. MARK MEADOWS, along with Mr. TED DEUTCH of Florida and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL of New York for their bipartisan leadership on this critically important issue.

Last July, the House passed legislation by a vote of 404–0. This was the bill that was passed by that measure, with a few tweaks, but 404–0. Unfortunately, the other body, the Senate, failed to take it up. The threat posed by Hezbollah and other Iranian proxies has only expanded since then, and now, Hezbollah is ascendant in the region.

Consider, now, Hezbollah's arsenal aimed at Israel; that arsenal has exploded. I was in Haifa in 2006 as Hezbollah's rockets rained down on that city, targeting civilian neighborhoods. Those Iranian and Syrian-made rockets were slamming into people's homes, and they were being targeted, and the hospital also was being targeted. Every rocket contained 90,000 ball bearings. The only intent was mass killing and maiming.

In the Rambam trauma hospital, I talked to many of the victims. There were 600 victims of these rockets in there, and that was nearly 10 years ago. At that time, Hezbollah started that effort with about 15,000 rockets at their disposal, and they fired close to 5,000 at civilian targets. That was their work.

Hezbollah has expanded its arsenal in size and in sophistication. By the way, it has been done at the behest of Iran. They have given these new rockets, with longer range, to Hezbollah. Now, they have an arsenal; the estimate is some 100,000 unguided rockets. It has also expanded its arsenal to include the sophisticated antiship and antiaircraft missiles and ground-to-ground rockets.

Hezbollah has been able to expand both its arsenal and activities, with Iranian backing, and its long-established worldwide network of members and supporters and sympathizers to provide this terrorist group financial and logistical and military and other types of support.

To cut the international support and reach of Hezbollah, to deny it the funds needed for its terrorist activities, we must effectively target its financial network. That is the goal of the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015.

This bill builds on the existing sanctions regime by placing Hezbollah's sources of financing under additional scrutiny, particularly those resources outside of Lebanon, given that many Lebanese banks have stepped up their game to prevent money laundering.

In addition to targeting the terrorist organization's diverse financial networks, the legislation also requires the U.S. Government to focus on Hezbollah's global logistics network and its transnational organized criminal enterprises, including its vast drug smuggling operations.

The goal is to improve coordination and cooperation with allies and other responsible countries in confronting the increasing threat posed by Hezbollah, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this critical measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2297, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by, once again, thanking Chairman ROYCE for his thoughtfulness, his intellect, his bipartisanship. I agree with everything he said in his opening statement.

I want to also thank Representative DEUTCH, Representative MEADOWS, and Representative MENG for their hard work on this important legislation to sanction Hezbollah, Iran's terrorist proxy.

Over a decade ago, I introduced and Congress passed into law the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act, which was designed to

end Syrian support for terrorism, including Hezbollah. I was proud to have that bill pass both Houses of Congress and signed into law by then-President Bush.

Now, Hezbollah is a more sophisticated terrorist organization, but their goals remain the same. They continue to support Iran's dangerous agenda throughout the region.

They have tipped the Syrian civil war in favor of Assad. Assad would most likely be losing or out of power by now if not for the fact that Hezbollah has come in from Lebanon into Syria to aid Assad in his murderous treachery against his own people, where hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians have perished.

He would not be in power today if it wasn't for Iran and if it wasn't for Iran's proxy, Hezbollah, fighting that civil war. He would be losing that civil war. It is Hezbollah that has propped him up and caused him to be ahead in that war.

When we debated the Corker-Cardin bill just before, I mentioned my concerns about a potential nuclear deal with Iran. At the top of their list is how sanctions relief will be handled and what Iran will do with a new influx of resources.

Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and its Quds Force sow instability throughout the region. Perhaps the most destructive has been Iran's support for Hezbollah.

Hezbollah, again, has prevented the people of Lebanon from building a better future. Hezbollah's support has allowed the Assad regime to cling to power, and Hezbollah has stockpiled tens of thousands of rockets on Israel's front doorstep.

What concerns me most is that Iran has been able to funnel resources to Hezbollah, despite the burden of the most crippling sanctions regime in history. What is going to happen if that pressure is lifted?

Well, we shouldn't wait to find out. Congress must act now to impose stronger sanctions on Hezbollah. We should choke them off from their Iranian patrons. This bill would give the administration every tool it needs to confront this dangerous group.

It would sanction foreign banks for knowingly doing business with Hezbollah. We need to send a clear message to companies getting tangled with this terrorist group: Walk away. Walk away, or face the consequences.

The bill would also shine a bright light on Al-Manar, Hezbollah's television station, itself a Specially Designated Terrorist Group. Hezbollah uses Al-Manar for logistical, propaganda, and fundraising purposes. It defies reason that this station is still carried by the satellite providers all over the world. We need to expose this puppet organization and this dangerous organization for what it is.

We passed this bill in the last Congress by a vote of 404–0. Today, let's take another stand against the violence, murder, and terrorism that Hezbollah has sown in the region. It is time for an independent and free Lebanon. It is time for an end to terror and for a transition in Syria, and it is time for the threats against Israel to end.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on Government Operations.

He is also the author of the prior year's legislation on this subject which passed with 404 votes, and he is a principal coauthor, along with Mr. TED DEUTCH, of this bill which we are bringing up today.

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his kind words and for his leadership because we would not be here today without the great work of the chairman; the ranking member, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL; and my good friend from Florida, TED DEUTCH, who has dropped everything to try to make sure that we address this critical issue.

Because of the incredible Department of Defense and the military men and women that we have serving the great American interests, many Americans believe that the terrorist organizations are poorly organized, they are rogue operations, and some, most of them believe that they are just thousands of miles away; yet terrorist organizations have been thriving for decades and have killed thousands of Americans.

□ 1400

These terrorists will be stopped one day, and hopefully today is the beginning of what we do to make sure that that happens.

With the growth of technology and globalization, Hezbollah has become illusive and has found ways to raise millions of dollars. You would think that it is just in some faraway place, but we find them as close as our own borders in this hemisphere and, indeed, in my home State of North Carolina.

We must do all that we can to cripple Hezbollah and send a message to other terrorist organizations that the United States will not back down. We will protect our people and our allies. We can do this today by enacting the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act.

This is more important today than ever before because, as we discuss this particular potential deal with Iran, what we do know is that, as sanctions are relieved, that money will flow. And because the real leader and founder of this vicious terrorist organization is really the Iranian regime, we must act today, Madam Speaker, because we will save American lives, we will save allied lives, and we will stand with our greatest ally in the Middle East, Israel.

So I want to close by, indeed, thanking Chairman ED ROYCE for his willingness to engage with our leadership and for their decision to bring this to the floor in a very expeditious manner. I thank Chairman TOM PRICE of Georgia, Ms. GRACE MENG, Mr. LEE ZELDIN, along with Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL.

I would also like to give a thank-you to the Lebanese bankers because many would believe that everybody there is involved in this. We had credible Lebanese bankers who came in and said, ''We want some help.'' We want to make sure that the good actors are rewarded and the bad actors are put away.

And finally, I would like to thank the staff that has worked incredibly hard—Matt Zweig, Ansley Rhyne, and Mira Resnick—from the Foreign Affairs Committee. They have worked very closely together to make this a good piece of legislation, one that will be a tool so that this administration can finally put the boot on the throat of Hezbollah and all like-minded terrorists.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), who is also the ranking member of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015.

I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership on this critical piece of national security legislation. I especially want to acknowledge the leadership of my friend from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) in championing this effort and diligently pushing to make sure that we have the opportunity to hear this important bill. And I want to thank Representatives MENG, ZELDIN, and TOM PRICE of Georgia for the key role that they have played in bringing this bill to the House floor.

Since its inception in 1982, Hezbollah has attacked American citizens: in the bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Beirut in 1983, killing 63, including 17 Americans; in the U.S. Marine barracks bombing in October 1983, which killed 241 American and 58 French servicemen; in the bombing of the U.S. Embassy annex in Beirut in 1984, which killed 24; in the hijacking of TWA flight 847 in 1985, in which a U.S. Navy diver was shot in the head and his body dumped on the tarmac; and in the Khobar Towers attack in Saudi Arabia in 1996 that killed 19 airmen.

Hezbollah has been a U.S.-designated terrorist organization since 1997. And while it claims to be a resistance group, it is a very dangerous terrorist organization. It does not just attack Americans. It launches attacks not just on Israel. It attacks around the world.

It is responsible for the 1992 Israeli Embassy bombing in Argentina, which killed 29, and the 1994 bombing of the AMIA Jewish center that killed 85 people. It attacked a busload of tourists in Bulgaria in 2012. And since 2008, attacks plotted by Hezbollah have been foiled in Cyprus, Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Turkey.

In 2012, a Hezbollah plot to assassinate the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to the United States right here in a Washington, D.C., restaurant was uncovered. This attack, had it gone forward, would have resulted in innocent civilian deaths here in our Nation's Capital.

Madam Speaker, today Hezbollah is helping Bashar al Assad slaughter innocent civilians in Syria. Hezbollah's fighters and operatives are on the ground in Syria, propping up the Assad regime as it drops barrel bombs on Syrian towns and uses chlorine gas on its own people.

It is no secret that Hezbollah does Iran's bidding. Backed by millions of dollars from Iran, Hezbollah is keeping Assad's grip on power to preserve Iran's lifeline to its proxy.

This reign of terror must be stopped before it has the potential to become even stronger.

With Iranian support, Hezbollah has set up cells all around the world. It gets significant funding for its worldwide terror through its criminal activities, such as money laundering, narcotics trafficking, and the selling of counterfeit goods. And shockingly, it fund raises in communities all over Latin America and Europe.

This bill will take significant steps toward cutting off Hezbollah's global reach by imposing sanctions on those financial institutions that facilitate Hezbollah's activities. We can severely hamper its ability to move the funds needed to fund its terror campaigns.

This bill will also require the administration to look into satellite providers that continue to broadcast the Hezbollah-run Al-Manar television station. A terrorist organization should not be allowed to freely broadcast its propaganda and its messages of hate. In fact, more than 10 years ago, back in 2004, France's highest administrative court moved to ban Al-Manar, ruling that the Beirut-based outlet had repeatedly violated the country's hate laws and made anti-Semitic statements.

Our legislation would give Congress and the administration greater insight into Hezbollah's criminal activities by requiring reports on Hezbollah's narcotrafficking and its transnational criminal network.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. It will also give us a clearer sense of Hezbollah's global reach, as it requires reporting on what countries around the world are doing to disrupt Hezbollah's activities.

Madam Speaker, Hezbollah has destabilized the Middle East for over 30 years. It has been a significant and deadly threat to U.S. interests. It stands ready, with more than 100,000 rockets and missiles aimed at Israel, many capable of striking anywhere with high precision. This is one of the most deadly organizations in the world, and the U.S. must use all of its economic might to shut down Hezbollah's global operations.

Madam Speaker, people often ask what Congress can do to address the many dangers that we face in the world. This legislation is a step forward in protecting Americans and American interests and American lives. Similar legislation passed the House unanimously last year, and I urge my colleagues to again support this vitally important national security bill.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE for the wonderfully bipartisan way in which he leads our committee, and I especially want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for his incredible leadership on this important topic.

Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of this bill, to broaden sanctions against Hezbollah, a U.S.-designated Foreign Terrorist Organization.

The Iranian proxy, Hezbollah, has been responsible for propping up the murderous Assad regime in Syria. Hezbollah continues to be a major threat to our closest friend and ally, the Democratic Jewish State of Israel. Hezbollah and its patron Iran continue to seek ways to attack and undermine U.S. national security interests, especially with its increased presence in our own area, in the Western Hemisphere, and its increasing role in global narcotics trafficking.

Madam Speaker, one way we have of countering Hezbollah's illicit activities is by cutting off its major source of funding and support. Once the administration gives Iran a signing bonus of $50 billion and lifts the sanctions against the regime, when this bad and dangerously weak nuclear deal gets signed, you can be sure, Madam Speaker, that the spigots will open and that money will flow directly to Hezbollah. So we must make sure that the administration fully and vigorously enforces these sanctions against Hezbollah and doesn't find any loophole or waive any of the provisions.

After seeing the administration's willingness to work with the Iranian regime and the Cuban regime, I might add, it wouldn't surprise me to see the administration take steps to follow the European Union and split Hezbollah into a military and political wing to try to avoid these sanctions and appease the Iranian regime.

We all know, Madam Speaker, that Hezbollah is a terrorist organization and that there is no split among the terror group whatsoever. You cannot differentiate between its supposed wings. It is all one terrorist organization. That is why I strongly support this bill, and I call upon the President to do more to counter this threat from Iran and its proxy, Hezbollah.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be a lead cosponsor of the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act. This legislation will broaden financial sector sanctions against Hezbollah, compel other critical designations against it, and target Hezbollah's media outlet Al-Manar.

A lot of work has gone into this bill over two Congresses, and we have worked hard, especially with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), to ensure the inclusion of language that would disrupt Hezbollah's global logistics networks and its fundraising and money-laundering activities.

This section requires the Obama administration to shed light on those countries that either covertly or overtly enable any sort of Hezbollah activities within their borders. The provision is particularly important in the Hezbollah context because there are far too many countries that outwardly condemn Hezbollah's military and terrorist activities while privately fostering environments where Hezbollah can operate politically and financially. Well, no more, not if you want to do business with the United States.

This legislation is also timely because it sends a strong message to Iran that no matter what happens in relation to nuclear negotiations, the United States will aggressively counter its promotion of terror in the Middle East.

In the last decade, our sanctions policy has led the way in crippling rogue regimes and terrorist groups, and today we take a big step forward in crippling, among the worst of them all, Hezbollah.

I want to thank Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. DEUTCH for their hard work,

and my cosponsors, Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, one of the principal cosponsors of this bill, and a leader in confronting Iran in its support for terrorism around the world.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as Ranking Member ENGEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. MENG, and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

This has been a strong bipartisan effort that was started before I came to Congress this past January. Some of my fellow lead cosponsors on this bill have worked tirelessly over years.

America's greatness is nothing to apologize for. We are a great, free, exceptional nation. Being the leader of the free world is, this body, today, passing legislation, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act, to tackle a rising threat in the Middle East and to United States interests all around the world. American leadership is on display here in the Halls of Congress.

Hezbollah has helped Assad fight Syrian rebels in that country. It is estimated that Iran has provided Hezbollah $60 million to $100 million per year in financial assistance.

The Dubai-based Gulf Research Center estimates Hezbollah's armed wing at about 1,000 full-time fighters and 6,000 to 10,000 volunteers. According to the Iranian Fars News Agency, Hezbollah has up to 65,000 fighters.

□ 1415

This legislation, H.R. 2297, addresses the need to pursue foreign banks that knowingly do business with entities that facilitate Hezbollah's activities. This legislation addresses the need to counter Hezbollah's other criminal enterprises, which include money laundering and counterfeiting of goods and pharmaceuticals.

Madam Speaker, this legislation helps address the need to obtain more information on Hezbollah's fundraising, financing, and money-laundering networks. It requires the administration to provide a comprehensive overview of countries supporting Hezbollah as well as those countries that aren't doing enough.

Again, I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership with this legislation, Mr. ENGEL, and my fellow co-lead sponsors as we tackle this rising tide of radical Islamic extremism in the Middle East with Hezbollah, Hamas, al Qaeda, Boko Haram, and ISIS. Every day, our 24-hour news cycle is dominated with our constituents watching, reading, and hearing about this threat that exists in the Middle East, understanding that if we do not defeat it overseas, we will be facing it here at home.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand with my fellow co-leads and my colleagues from both parties as American exceptionalism is on display here. I rise in support today, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, Hezbollah's actions in the Middle East and around the world have only added to the volatility that has plagued the region. Hezbollah's stockpile of rockets is growing on Israel's doorstep, threatening to ''confront aggression at any time, any place, and in any form whatsoever.'' The irony is they are the aggressors. Hezbollah fighters terrorize the people of Syria, serving as the only thing between Assad and his own demise. Hezbollah has made itself into a state within a state of Lebanon, denying the Lebanese people their right to self-determination.

Madam Speaker, it is time to redouble our efforts to stop Hezbollah from continuing its campaign of terror across the region. So I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation because it is so important. The United States has the clout to do so, and we should always let the people—the average people—know that the United States stands by them.

Hezbollah is one of the worst terrorist organizations. Hezbollah tries to terrorize Israel, but they have never succeeded and will never succeed, and they terrorize the people of Lebanon and Syria. We need to put an end to that. That is why this legislation is so important.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it. I thank Chairman ROYCE once again for his leadership, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a member of the Committee on Financial Services, a cosponsor of the bill, and someone who has been relentless in warning about the threat of Iran and Hezbollah.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for your leadership and for yielding the time. I also want to thank Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DEUTCH, and all those who have worked tirelessly on this bill.

The Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act is one that is important. We need to choke off funds to a well-known terrorist organization that has been engaged in terror for decades. We know a lot, Madam Speaker, and we have talked a lot about the threat of ISIS, what is going on in Syria, what is happening with Iran, Iran being the greatest state sponsor of terror in the world, using its proxies, one of which is Hezbollah. But I want to make sure that we are not losing sight of Hezbollah and the dangers that they pose. That is why this is such an important piece of legislation.

Hezbollah has killed Americans. They are one of the most deadly terrorist organizations in the world. They are a major threat not only to the United States; they are a threat to our one true ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel. The buildup of Hezbollah's rocket arsenal is a concern, Madam Speaker, to everyday Israelis, and it should be a concern for all of us.

As we think about terror and choking off that financing, it is absolutely critical that we speak with one clear voice here in the United States, that we focus on these cells, and that we focus on how Hezbollah is getting its resources. This is, again, another issue on which I am delighted that we are working together in a bipartisan fashion because this is not about partisanship. This is about making sure that the world is a safer place and shining a light on terrorist organizations, Hezbollah being one of the worst.

Just last week, Madam Speaker, I was in Israel, and we went into the Golan. We went north to the border, and we looked off over the border, not only into Syria; we looked into Lebanon as well. We met with lone soldiers, members from Chicago who went over to Israel to join the IDF and fight, and they are terrified and prepared for attacks from Hezbollah.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, this is an important bill, one that makes sure we do not lose sight of the threat posed by Hezbollah, and one that we have to make sure that we are vigilant, that we know where the resources are going.

This is a bill that, again, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on, and I want to thank Mr. ENGEL, the ranking member, for his leadership, and TED DEUTCH, a good friend, and MARK MEADOWS for all that they are doing. This is something that, again, I encourage my colleagues in this body to come together and unite behind another unanimous vote to make sure the world knows that we will not sit idly by, that we will do everything in our power to make sure that we track down the funders of this terrorist organization to make sure that they do not have the tools necessary for a reign of terror on Israel and the West.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Madam Speaker.

When we think about Hezbollah, we think about an organization that was once a limited regional threat. Today, it really is global. It is an organization conducting terrorist and criminal activities all over the world, one that has actively targeted the United States now, if we think about it, for 30 years. I think it shows no signs of letting up

as Iran, the regime there, shows no signs in letting up in its support for Hezbollah.

So prior to the attacks of September 11, Iran's proxy was responsible for the largest number of American deaths by terrorist organizations up until that point when al Qaeda carried out that attack. This included the 1993 bombing of the United States Embassy in Beirut and the bombing of our United States Marine Corps barracks again that same year. Hezbollah was responsible for providing funding and weapons to Iraqi militias that killed hundreds of Americans in Iraq at the behest of Iran. Hezbollah is behind the Iranian-sponsored slaughter that is going on right now in Syria, and it is Hezbollah that is now not only on the northern border of Israel, but also, with the support from Iran, it is now up on the Golan Heights. It is now up just off the Golan Heights in Syria there.

Hezbollah is now involved in supporting the Iranian-supported Houthi takeover in Yemen. Hezbollah is a model; and as you heard the debate recently on the Internet, should the Hezbollah model be replicated not only among the Shia Houthi but in other parts of the region, we must remember that any sanctions relief that we provide to Iran for a nuclear agreement will have an impact on Iran's ability to further support Hezbollah and the ability of that organization to carry out future attacks on Americans, on our allies, or on other unfortunate souls who oppose an Iranian takeover of that region.

Yet Hezbollah and their sponsor remain vulnerable. They are still reliant on Iran's largesse and on proceeds from Hezbollah's illicit activities. It is precisely those illicit activities, those vulnerabilities, that we must target. So, Madam Speaker, passing the Iran and the Hezbollah bills today will be a one-two punch against terrorists backing Iran's nuclear weapons drive.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of the Members to support this measure. Again, I thank Mr. ELIOT ENGEL for his work and the other cosponsors of the bill as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2297, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act.

The aim of the bill is to curtail the funding of Hezbollah's domestic and international terrorist activities by disrupting its logistics and financial network. The bill proposes diplomatic, legislative, and executive strategies to combat Hezbollah including directing the Treasury Department to prohibit or impose strict restrictions on the activities of financial institutions that knowingly facilitate transactions for the terrorist group.

Some of the world's most powerful banks are suspected of knowingly helping Hezbollah fund its terror operations by concealing billions of dollars in transactions with its Iranian sponsor. This bill will help to curb those activities.

H.R. 2297 is largely the same bill as that which passed the House unanimously last July. The only differences are minor and include the stripping of the findings clauses and the removal of the section on conflict minerals.

Hezbollah's global logistics and financial network is a lifeline to the organization that strengthens its power to consolidate within countries such as Lebanon and Syria.

I encourage my colleagues join me again in supporting the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2297.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 260 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 260

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. No further general debate shall be in order.

SEC. 2. (a) In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-14. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1430

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, H. Res. 260 provides a structured rule for consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. It is my privilege to present this rule to the House as a member of the Rules Committee. It is also my privilege to do so as a member of the committee of jurisdiction over this bill, the House Armed Services Committee.

The Rules Committee received a record number of amendments to the bill; heard nearly 6 hours of testimony from our colleagues; and, in this rule, have made in order 135 amendments for consideration on the House floor.

As is traditional, the rule gives the chair of the Armed Services Committee

authority to offer such amendments en bloc to facilitate consideration of such a large number of amendments.

This is a good rule that helps pave the way for the passage of the National Defense Authorization Act. This law, this bill, governs the defense of the United States of America, provides for the servicemen and -women that defend this country. It is the single most important function of this House.

We are going to hear spirited debate today, but we need to make sure, as we hear this debate, that we focus on what we are here about, and that is to defend the people of the United States. While there are other things that may be brought up that are important and good, they are not about the defense of the United States and would not be in order for this bill.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have followed this bill from the start. Counting the Rules Committee hours and the hours in committee, I have personally spent over 25 hours in debate on this bill.

This has been an incredibly open process: 335 amendments were filed at the Armed Services Committee level; 211 amendments were adopted by the House Armed Services Committee in markup, including 96 Democrat amendments; 135 amendments were made in order by the rule—69 of those are Democrat or bipartisan amendments. That is over 450 amendments that have been considered since we started this process.

The National Defense Authorization Act has a history of bipartisanship, which is only appropriate on the single most important thing that we do, defending the people of the United States.

It passed out of the Committee on Armed Services on a vote of 60–2. It has been completed every year since 1962 on a bipartisan basis. That is 53 straight years, and we need to make it 54.

This bill is vitally important to our country. For the first time in a long time, Americans are ranking national security as their number one concern, even ahead of the economy.

Former CIA leader Mike Morell said he has never seen more threats to our country at any other time in his 33 years in the business. Most alarmingly, he says that we are at risk of another attack here in the United States. Our military men and women need this bill to do their job and help keep us safe.

The administration has issued a Statement of Administration Policy and indicated in there that the President's advisers would recommend a veto of this bill. I sincerely hope the President would not do so, given the bipartisan effort to pass a bill so critical to the security of our Nation.

President Obama requested authorization for $612 billion in military spending, and this bill matches that request dollar for dollar.

Now, some of my colleagues quibble with that, and they quibble with that because, as you can see in this light blue area at the very top, in the President's recommendation, there is a certain amount of money that he wants to be in the categorization of overseas contingency operations, OCO.

The bill does the same thing except it increases OCO by a small amount—that you can see here—and increases the base by a larger amount. In essence, what we have done here is gotten to the same place as the President by making a very small alteration to the OCO.

Some of my colleagues are trying to use our military men and women as pawns in an effort to boost nondefense discretionary spending. That is plainly wrong and reprehensible.

Those other issues are important to our country, and it is important that we debate them, but we should never hold up this piece of legislation that is historically bipartisan to make a point on something that has nothing to do with the defense of the United States of America.

This bill is for the men and women who are keeping our Nation safe. They have elected to serve our Nation. The least we can do is give them the resources and the policy they need to do their job. Now, some of my colleagues want to use them as political bargaining chips. That is hard for me to believe that anyone would consider doing that in this House.

This bill is complex. It deals with a number of very complicated issues. There are a couple that I know we are going to talk about today that I briefly want to touch on now.

The first one is this whole issue of the overseas contingency operations account and how it affects this whole issue of sequestration. Long before I got here, there was this deal within Congress that was proposed by the President that, in essence, resulted in this artificial sequestration of funds that would otherwise be appropriately sent to the military, and we are operating under the artificial constraints of that sequestration law today.

I don't know what the rationale was back then because I wasn't here, but that rationale, whatever it was, doesn't make sense today when the number one concern of the American people is defending the United States of America, when experts on this issue are telling us, over and over again, the American interests abroad—and, yes, here at home—are threatened.

Why should we feel that we should be limited to that at a time when we need to be stepping forth and defending the American people?

Now, there may be a time and a place to revisit the sequestration law, but that time and that place is not on this law. This law is for us to do what we must do to defend the United States of America, and this bill does that.

Another issue that we will be hearing a lot today is a proposed amendment by my colleague from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), and that deals with the issue of immigration. Now, you may ask: Why are we talking about immigration in regard to a bill on national defense? That is a good question. We should not be.

During the Armed Services Committee's consideration of this bill—and it went for 18 hours late in the process—one of our members offered an amendment to insert the immigration issue into this bill. It was unfortunate, and it was inappropriate.

The Brooks amendment proposes to take it out, and we are going to have spirited debate during this rule, I predict, and during the debate on the bill; but make no mistake about it, however important you think or I think the immigration issue is, however much we think that that should come to this floor for consideration, this bill, a bill on the defense of the United States of America, is not the right bill for us to consider it in.

There are other committees of jurisdiction that are supposed to do that—Homeland Security, for example. Those committees need to go through their process and make sure they do what they need to do, and then it can come to this floor, but it should not come to this floor to confuse this bill that deals with the defense of the United States of America.

This rule, Madam Speaker, is an extremely fair rule made after a lot of debate, allowing an enormous number of amendments, and I urge its support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, 355 amendments were submitted to the House Rules Committee on a wide variety of issues relevant to the National Defense Authorization Act. Of those, only 135 were made in order, or about 38 percent. That means that the Republican majority of the Rules Committee rejected over 60 percent of amendments submitted by their House colleagues.

This is a very exclusive structured rule. The amendments included under this rule are important amendments, worthy of the time and attention of this House, but I believe that all the amendments submitted merited debate and should have been included under an open rule.

Further, each amendment included under this rule only receives 10 minutes of debate maximum, equally divided. That is no way to treat debate of significant issues regarding our national security.

Madam Speaker, I have served in Congress long enough that I remember when it used to take 4 or 5 entire days to debate the NDAA. Amendments that would significantly affect our defense policies and operations were provided with enough debate time so that all Members had the opportunity to speak and air their views.

Of course, that was back in the days when the House actually worked 4 or 5 full days each week. That simply doesn't happen anymore. There are fewer and fewer Members in this Chamber who remember when matters of substance were given the time, attention, and debate that they deserve.

There is much to admire in the FY 2016 defense authorization bill, but there is also much to be concerned about, from dangerous spending to increase our nuclear arsenal, to continuing to tie the hands of the administration on how to handle the transfer of prisoners out of Guantanamo who have been cleared of all charges.

One of the most blatant and egregious demonstrations of excess spending in the NDAA is what the bill has done to the President's overseas contingency operations fund, the so-called OCO fund.

This bill adds $38 billion to the OCO fund on top of the $51 billion requested by the President to fund our various wars. This $38 billion will not be spent on war-related costs, but instead, it transfers money from the operations and maintenance account to the OCO to fund what should be base bill requirements, all as a ruse to evade the Budget Control Act caps.

In the coming weeks, my House colleagues will see at least four appropriations bills come to the House floor that are prepared to cut more than $20 billion in urgently needed domestic programs, all in the name of staying within the caps set by the Budget Control Act; yet, when it comes to the Pentagon, nearly twice that amount is added to the OCO as a slush fund in order to avoid those very same caps. This is madness, Madam Speaker, absolute madness.

The strength of our Nation—the health, welfare, and prosperity of our people and our communities—requires that we invest in our transportation and infrastructure; in our urban and rural development; in science, engineering, and technology; in medical research and our healthcare and education systems; in our children, our families, our workers; in our local businesses and new entrepreneurs.

Our national and economic security is based on so much more than just our force of arms. It is based on the role of the Federal Government in supporting strong quality of life for each and every one of our people, regardless of age, income, geography, or political affiliation. No one is offering them a slush fund; instead, we are cutting those programs to the bare bone.

When it comes to helping the neediest among us, Madam Speaker, the majority in this House has, once again, prevented debate on this critical issue. I am disappointed that an amendment offered by my friend from California (Mr. VARGAS) was not made in order for debate under this rule.

Under current law, military servicemembers who do not live on base are provided with a basic allowance for housing. Because this stipend is offered to military families in lieu of on-base housing, it is exempted from Federal taxes and from being considered as income when determining eligibility for certain tax credits. Unfortunately, there is still a lack of uniformity in how the allowance is treated for various basic needs programs.

For example, the basic housing allowance is being considered as income for the purpose of calculating SNAP benefits, which results in eligible households receiving a lesser SNAP benefit or being cut off from the program altogether. These are families who are struggling, and it makes absolutely no sense that receiving housing assistance means our military families should receive less food assistance.

It is shameful that an ever-increasing number of military families are struggling to make ends meet. More and more of these families are relying on SNAP benefits to put food on their tables, and we need to be having a larger conversation about how to make sure that our servicemen and servicewomen and their families who have sacrificed so much for our country have economic security.

Military families have unique needs, and we must make sure that they are receiving all the necessary assistance that they deserve.

□ 1445

Mr. VARGAS' amendment would have simply excluded the basic housing allowance from any calculation of income or resources for any purpose under Federal, State, and local law. It is a good amendment, and it is a commonsense amendment, and this House should have had the opportunity to debate this important amendment; but while we shortchange the American people, local communities, and our neighbors living in poverty, we have plenty of time to add to the national deficit and debt by funding a myriad of wars on the national credit card.

Speaking of the many wars in which the U.S. is currently engaged, last night in the Rules Committee, Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina, the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee—Congressman ADAM SMITH of Washington—and I offered an amendment that would do one simple thing: it would have the President tell Congress next year what our mission is in Afghanistan and how much longer our servicemen and servicewomen would continue to be deployed over there. Then Congress would have 30 days to vote on whether or not to authorize or to modify that mission.

We have been in Afghanistan for nearly 14 years. It is the longest military engagement in U.S. history. Over the past few years, the mission of our Armed Forces has been constantly altered. Supposedly, we ended combat operations at the end of last December; yet our forces still engage in combat. We are now supposed to be engaged in training the Afghan military and police forces and be out of Afghanistan by the end of 2016; but every day, I open up the newspaper, and I read how we are going to need to remain in Afghanistan for much, much, much longer.

In the underlying bill, this NDAA says that the U.S. should remain engaged in counterterrorism and special operations after 2016. All the President is required to do is let us know if he wants to keep our troops in Afghanistan to continue training Afghan forces until they can stand on their own.

Is it too much to ask for the President to tell us next spring what the plan is for keeping our uniformed men and women in Afghanistan and then having a vote on that plan? Don't our troops and don't their families deserve much more from us?

I guess it is too much to ask because this Congress—once again, the majority on the Rules Committee—decided not to make the McGovern-Jones-Smith amendment in order.

So U.S. engagement in Afghanistan—our blood and our treasure—simply continues on and on and on and on. It is a long, endless war that Congress barely pays attention to anymore, not even as members of our Armed Forces come home in coffins or wounded in body, heart, and mind. One of my constituents was the first to fall this year under our new post-combat operations mission in Afghanistan. Who will be the last U.S. servicemember to die in Afghanistan?

These are brave and honorable men and women. This House, however, is a disgrace.

This House—this Congress—is incapable of being accountable for the wars we so easily send our servicemembers to fight and die in, and it is completely incapable of carrying out its constitutional responsibilities to specifically and explicitly authorize these military operations.

It has been over 8 months since the United States began sustained combat operations in Iraq and Syria against the Islamic State. Last year, the Speaker said that it was not right for the 113th Congress to vote on this new war started on its watch. It should be up to the next Congress—this Congress, the 114th Congress—to authorize the war. Then the Speaker complained that

Congress couldn't act until the President sent us an AUMF. Madam Speaker, the President sent Congress an AUMF on February 11. That was over 3 months ago. It is not an AUMF that I would support, but the President did his job, and still Congress fails to act. Why? Because the leadership of this House says it can't find its way to 218 on an AUMF.

I am sorry, Madam Speaker, but that is not how it works. The job of the Congress is to take a vote on an AUMF—period. If you don't like what the President's proposal is, then change it, vote against it, or bring another version to the House floor. Congress has the constitutional obligation to authorize the use of military force to combat the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria or elsewhere. Congress has the responsibility to specifically debate and authorize sending servicemen and servicewomen into hostilities in Iraq and Syria. The party in charge of the House and the Senate has a responsibility to legislate. We don't have the right to say, ''Oh, this is just too tough of a job, and we don't want to deal with it.''

If you want to be in charge, then you have to govern. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, I don't see the leadership interested in governing on this most serious matter.

Once again, reluctantly, Congressman WALTER JONES, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, and I will be introducing a privileged resolution under the provisions of the War Powers Resolution to force a debate on whether our troops should remain engaged in combat operations against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria or whether they should withdraw.

We have been patient. We have waited and waited and waited for the Republican leadership of this House to tell us when it would act on an AUMF for Iraq and Syria, but it has now become clear that this House has no intention of debating an AUMF on the fight against the Islamic State. It is perfectly happy to just drift along and not take any responsibility whatsoever for the lives that we are putting at risk in Iraq and Syria and for the millions of taxpayer dollars that we are spending each and every day.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this rule, and I oppose this underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In listening to the remarks that we have just heard from the gentleman from Massachusetts, I was struck by the fact that so much of it had to do with things other than national defense. I said in the very beginning that this is the authorization of the defense of America. Those are important issues—health care, education, transportation—and we need to debate those, but not in this bill. That is why those sorts of amendments were not made in order.

Madam Speaker, we are here today to debate the defense of the United States of America.

I did hear the gentleman criticize the President's policy in Afghanistan, and I do think that we should consider at some point in time an appropriate AUMF for the conflict in Iraq. This House has been asking the leadership for briefings and other information about the proposed AUMF that we got from the administration, and we haven't received them yet, so we can't have the sort of deliberative-type review of his AUMF until we receive that information.

I would say, as important as those issues are, they are not in order under this bill. This is a bill that we have historically adopted in a bipartisan fashion. Let's stay focused on the defense of the United States of America in this bipartisan bill and not wander off onto other things that we are either not prepared for or that are not in order under this bill.

At this point in time, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), my colleague.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, the NDAA, as amended by Congressman RUBEN GALLEGO, undermines America's border security and ratifies parts of Obama's illegal amnesty for illegal aliens.

During the early morning, sleep-deprived portion of the Armed Services Committee NDAA hearing, the Gallego amendment, which encourages the Secretary of Defense to take military service opportunities from Americans and from lawful immigrants in order to give them to illegal aliens, passed on a close 33–30 vote. As Members ponder my amendment to strike the Gallego amendment, we should consider how much American families are struggling in an anemic job and wage market and how much the Gallego amendment makes job and income prospects for Americans even worse.

From 2000 to 2014—and although the American economy gained 5.6 million jobs in the 16 to 65 age bracket—American-born citizens suffered a net loss of 127,000 jobs. These job losses, combined with population growth, mean that there were 17 million more jobless American-born citizens than there were 14 years earlier. Hispanic Americans, African Americans, Caucasian Americans—American men and women—all lost economic ground. While American-born citizens suffered economic hardship, job losses, and wage suppression, foreign-born persons gained 5.7 million jobs.

In the context of this anemic economy, GALLEGO's amendment to take military service jobs from Americans and from lawful immigrants in order to give them to illegal aliens is outrageous and unconscionable. I encourage Members to represent the interests of Americans and lawful immigrants by voting to strike the Gallego amendment from the NDAA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to respond to something that my friend on the Rules Committee said when he said that this bill is all about issues that have to do with the national defense of our country.

I don't know what we are doing in Afghanistan or what we are doing in Iraq again or what we are doing in Syria now if it isn't supposedly in the name of the national defense of our country. I mean, this is the bill considered by the Armed Services Committee. If this is not an appropriate place to talk about war and about all of the military equipment we are sending halfway around the world, then I don't know what bill is appropriate. We are told over and over and over again that these are inappropriate vehicles in which to talk about war. This is the Armed Services Committee. This is the National Defense Authorization Act. This is the bill. This funds the wars.

There is this notion that it doesn't belong here. Well, where the hell does it belong? This is important stuff, and we treat war as if it is nothing.

We have men and women in harm's way, and we don't even debate whether or not the mission is something that we support or not. This is ridiculous. This is disgraceful. It is outrageous that amendments that are germane to this bill—that the Parliamentarian tells us are germane to this bill—are denied over and over and over again. These aren't just mine. Ms. LEE has amendments on repealing the old AUMFs from 2001 to 2002—denied, denied. They are germane, but no one wants to talk about it. We are going to force you to talk about it. We are going to have a privileged resolution. We are going to force this debate.

Just one other thing on the Gallego amendment. I have to tell you that I am always amazed at the anti-immigrant rhetoric on the other side of the aisle. The notion that we can't allow the Secretary of Defense to make decisions on whether or not DREAMers can actually serve our country in the Armed Forces to defend our Nation is ludicrous.

Just so people understand this, unlike a lot of things that my friends on the other side of the aisle do, this was not snuck into something. This actually went through regular order. It was actually debated and voted on by the House Armed Services Committee. They voted ''yes'' to accept it. By the

way, the Army has already allowed almost 50 DREAMers to enlist in our Armed Forces.

What are you going to do—go and try to find these people and tell them that they have now been discharged?

I feel a great kind of sense of pride that there are people in this country who have been mostly raised in this country and who want to serve this country. That is something, I think, that every American takes pride in. That the rhetoric is so nasty and so demeaning, I think, is beneath what this House is about.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I rise against the rule that we are considering to the National Defense Authorization bill.

I was extremely disappointed late last night, as you can imagine, when the Rules Committee decided not to make my amendment in order for today.

My amendment would have provided a token thank-you to the World War II merchant mariners. These brave men suffered the highest losses of any military branch in World War II, and they did not receive veterans' benefits under the GI Bill.

Time is running out. These merchant mariners are now in their eighties and their early nineties. There are only 5,000 living today. We can't continue with the slow wheels of bureaucracy. We can't do a study to see if they deserve it or if we can afford it. Congress should act swiftly and with a sense of urgency.

As President Eisenhower said:

When final victory is ours, there is no organization that will share its credit more deservedly than the merchant marine.

It is too late for this bill today, but it is sad, as we are about to vote on a bill that authorizes our defense of this country, that we couldn't take a moment to give a token thank-you to those who were involved in the defense of this country.

□ 1500

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, MO BROOKS. The Brooks amendment is simple. It keeps the immigration debate out of the national security debate. That is it.

My colleague, Mr. GALLEGO, inserted language during the markup to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review under section 504 of title 10, United States Code, relating to whether or not those who have received amnesty under President Obama's DACA initiative should be able to enlist in the services, but that very statute already provides the Secretary of Defense the authority he or she needs to make such a determination if there is a readiness crisis. It is already there.

Specifically, paragraph (b)(2) entitles him to ''authorize the enlistment of a person . . . if the Secretary determines that such enlistment is vital to the national interest.''

Now, while the Gallego language may appear to be simple, a sense of Congress to some, in function it will be cited by the lawyers arguing on behalf of the President's executive overreach. Those lawyers will say, you see, even the House of Representatives has passed language that recognizes DACA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. The Center for Immigration Studies agrees the Gallego language is unnecessary and is simply meant to undercut the ongoing litigation about the legality and unconstitutionality of DACA.

If the Brooks amendment is not accepted and this language is left in the NDAA, it potentially jeopardizes passage of critical legislation. My colleagues, I have fought the President on his executive actions and will fight here again. It is our purview. Once again, I said, the House has moved three times to demonstrate that DACA is illegitimate. This should be the fourth time. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Brooks amendment, stripping the Gallego language.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the latest efforts by leadership to appease hard-liners on immigration. Today, this body is allowing their loudest anti-immigrant voices to overrule the adoption of the Gallego amendment by none other than the Republican-controlled Armed Services Committee, controlled by the Republican majority. Not only are they throwing their highly touted regular order out of the window, they are taking one more dive down the anti-immigrant rabbit hole.

The amendment by my friend from Arizona simply expresses a sense of the House that the Secretary of Defense should review whether recipients of deferred action should be allowed to serve in the military. It doesn't say the military must allow them to serve. It says, let's do a review, a study, a sense of Congress. We woke up today and this is how we feel. Remember that these same 700,000 recipients who grew up here in America, passed a criminal background check, and now have a legal work permit to reside in the United States, they are ready to risk their lives to defend the only country they know. It just says, Hey, do you guys want to take a look?

Meanwhile, you totally missed the Veasey amendment calling for a similar study of how executive actions of President Obama and prosecutorial discretion could expand the pool of potential military recruits and how enlistment of DACA applicants would impact military readiness. They missed that one. I guess NumbersUSA didn't give you a call over on the other side or Heritage Action forgot to tell you about that provision.

So, Republican hard-liners fixated on the Gallego amendment. Seeing the word ''review,'' all they heard was the word ''amnesty.'' If the majority party is unable to allow a nonbinding study approved by the committee of jurisdiction where they are the majority because it includes the word ''immigrants'' without slapping the amnesty label on it, how on Earth will you be able to fix our broken immigration system or win over the fastest-growing group of voters in this country?

It is clear to me that the candidate who is ready to embrace immigrants and protect DREAMers and their families may as well start measuring the drapes at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and I think I know what her name is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), my friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, first of all, that neither the gentleman from Massachusetts nor the one from Chicago can quote any anti-immigrant statements from anybody over on this side. That is their tired rhetoric. It is not a fact.

What is a fact is we initiated a lawsuit called Crane v. Napolitano clear back when these first unconstitutional acts were delivered by the President. He clearly has violated the Constitution. I don't actually think there is any worthy debate to the contrary, and this Congress has voted three times—three times—to shut off the funding or to eliminate the President's lawless, unconstitutional actions, Mr. Speaker. That includes June of 2013, King amendment, and very similar language in August of 2014 and January of 2015.

So I wanted to announce to this Congress that we will stand on the Constitution. This Congress cannot send a message to ratify the President's lawless actions. We must defend the Constitution because that is our oath, to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. His oath is to take care to faithfully execute the laws, and instead, he has done the opposite. So we have pro-amnesty people on the other side.

I will support the rule, the Brooks amendment, but I will not support the NDAA if the amendment fails.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding but also for his tremendous leadership on the Committee on Rules and also just in terms of making sure that we, as Members of Congress, do our job. So thank you very much.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the bill. I offered three bipartisan amendments to H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act, and I am very disappointed to say that, once again, two of my amendments to address the Authorization for Use of Military Force were not made in order. The first, offered with Representative WALTER JONES, would have repealed the 2001 blank check for endless war, which has been used more than 30 times, mind you, to justify military action around the world.

The other, that I also offered with Representative JONES, would have removed the unnecessary 2002 Iraq Authorization for Use of Military Force that continues to be on the books. This is years after the White House has said they no longer needed it and encouraged Congress to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time for Congress to live up to its constitutional obligations in matters of war and peace. We need to rip up that 2001 blank check for endless war, and we need to repeal the unnecessary 2002 Iraq AUMF instead of leaving it on the books indefinitely.

I do want to thank the committee for making in order a commonsense, bipartisan amendment offered by Representatives BURGESS, SCHAKOWSKY, and myself that would require the DOD to rank all departments and defense agencies in order of how advanced they are in their audit readiness. As the only Federal agency that has yet to complete an audit, the Pentagon has never been held accountable for the potential loss of billions of dollars to waste, fraud, and abuse; so we need to bring vital congressional oversight and accountability to the Pentagon and to ensure that the Pentagon follows the law.

Let me also just address a few more troubling provisions in this bill. This bill authorized $715 million to train and equip Iraqi forces and an additional $600 million for Syrian opposition forces. That is more than a billion dollars for the now 8-month-long war against ISIL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Let me go back and remind you how much that is. That is more than a billion dollars for the now 8-month-long war against ISIL. That is a war that Congress has yet to debate and authorize.

Again, I call on Speaker BOEHNER to make Congress do its job and to schedule this critical debate.

I want to thank Congressman MCGOVERN for offering a privileged resolution. It is really a shame that we must do this, but we must take our heads out of the sand here and be responsible to our constituents and our country.

This bill also funnels $89 billion into the Pentagon slush fund known as the overseas contingency account; $38 billion of this would go back into the base budget to avoid the budget cuts. This is simply unacceptable. Instead of continuing to use budget gimmicks to further bloat the Pentagon budget, Congress should be working to ensure accountability and transparency by forcing an audit of the Pentagon.

I urge my colleagues to support the Burgess-Schakowsky-Lee amendment and to oppose the underlying bill. It is time for Congress to stop the policy of endless war and to bring some accountability to the Pentagon.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for the time.

I rise today with mixed feelings on this important legislation, the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. I appreciate the leadership of Chairman THORNBERRY for bringing a transformative bill to the floor that will strengthen our armed services and provide stability to the brave men and women of our military.

I am also grateful for section 841, which includes the text of the SESO Act, a bill I have introduced that ensures small entrepreneurs have a fair seat at the table.

But on the other side of this dichotomy is what I fear to be a truly unfortunate path for this body to take. Included in the underlying text of this bill is language that would request the Defense Secretary study the feasibility of allowing young men and women who were brought to this country as children the opportunity to serve in our armed services.

I am very supportive of this sentiment, Mr. Speaker, and let's keep in mind, this is a nonbinding sense of the House. However, there are Members of this body who are threatening to vote against final passage of the NDAA if this sense of Congress isn't stricken from the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, these young men and women were brought to our great country very early in life, often by no choice of their own. They have grown up in our neighborhoods and attended the same schools as our own children. For most of these young people, the United States is the only country they have ever called home. Allowing the Secretary of Defense to consider their service in our military should be something our country is proud to support, not something that will kill this bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Brooks amendment and look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this bill that will benefit all those who serve.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say I want to commend the gentleman for his very sensible remarks, and I appreciate it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to ask my esteemed colleagues to stand with me in declaring, Let our DREAMers serve. Let the young men and women who were brought here as children, through no fault of their own, serve their country. Let them serve the country that educated them. Let them serve the country they love. Their ability to serve benefits us all. It provides an expanded pool of willing and capable applicants helping to uphold and even increase the rigorous standards to enlist in our military. The Army recently tripled its pool of immigrant applicants, and DREAMers should be a part of that pool.

To those who claim that this is amnesty, I have a simple message. As a Marine Corps combat veteran, I can assure you, Parris Island ain't amnesty. As my late father, a career soldier, told me, serving your nation in uniform is the highest expression of American citizenship. From German immigrants serving in the Continental Army at Valley Forge to over 100,000 who have been naturalized through the military since 2002, immigrants have always been a part of our fighting forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN. If DREAMers want to put their life on the line for this Nation, we should give them the opportunity and honor their willingness to serve.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Brooks amendment, which would strip this provision from the NDAA.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman who just spoke as well. I think we wouldn't be having any of this debate if my friends on the other

side of the aisle would have allowed us to vote on a comprehensive immigration reform package last year, the one that the Senate passed in a bipartisan way. Anyway, they chose to deny us that ability to even have a debate and a vote on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

□ 1515

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today allows for an amendment that touches on a matter very personal to me, an issue that impacts our Nation on the battlefield and for families struggling with an immigration system that is certainly dysfunctional.

November 12, last year, right there in that seat, I was sitting by my grandson's side when I was sworn in as a Member of this House, one of the proudest days of my life. Certainly, my grandson was looking forward to it.

If the Gallego amendment on DREAMers that we are debating here later today were in effect, my grandson wouldn't be here. My granddaughter wouldn't be here.

My son was serving in the Army in South Korea when he met a girl who was serving our great Nation. They fell in love and got married. They moved back to Fort Hood, Texas, serving our country, where they had my first grandchild, one of the proudest days I have ever seen. They continued to serve our great country, raising their child, when I got a call late one night with my son crying, saying: ''They are going to deport my wife.''

We didn't know she wasn't an American. She volunteered to lay down her life for our country. My son didn't know she wasn't an American citizen; yet she is that DREAMer that we are talking about. She is the American Dream, one who comes to this country and decides to serve it.

This brings us forward to today. My grandson is here; yet we are still debating. For the people that volunteer, the greatest thing they can do is lay down their lives for our country, and we are denying them an opportunity for them to serve our country.

Where are we as a nation, that great melting pot? The strength that makes our country is where we all come from.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NORCROSS. My daughter-in-law only knew America. As far as her memory went, she was here. She went to school with all the other kids, as you heard other people speak about. That is why I am urging us to reject what I think is one of the most cruel things we can do to those who come to our country and want to be American citizens.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment and not deny those people who want to serve our country that ability to serve.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Rules Committee for allowing Mr. BROOKS' amendment to be in order. I want to also address these concerns about allowing people to join the military.

I fought with my own leadership against a bill that would allow sequester, allow the gutting of our Defense Department. I said it was a mistake. I was told it would never happen. Well, it did.

If both sides of the aisle want to find cuts in other programs so we can rebuild our military and let anybody that wants to join the military that is qualified, I am for it, but right now, we are gutting our military. We are telling people who have put their lives in harm's way for us that they are going to have to leave.

This language basically can be taken up as judicial notice by the appellate courts to tell Judge Hanen in south Texas Federal court: You were wrong. We are lifting the injunction, the very injunction that our Republican leader said we were relying on in breaking our promise.

We need this language removed, and then let's work on building the military back up.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that we are not cutting the military. My friends created a slush fund so they can get around sequestration, with regard to the Pentagon.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman. I know a lot of hard work has gone into the preparation of the underlying bill. We are approaching Memorial Day and then celebrating Veterans Day, as we acknowledge our soldiers on the front line.

I hope my colleagues will support the Jackson Lee amendments dealing with the outreach to small businesses and minority-owned businesses with the Department of Defense to deal with HBCUs, which are very, very important in equalizing the research opportunities and working to ensure the protection of the DOD software.

I am hopeful that we will have an opportunity to address my issue dealing with post-traumatic stress disorder. I put the first center that was not in a veterans hospital in Houston. I believe we need to realize how devastating PTSD is and ensure that we have the opportunity for more funding.

The overseas contingency fund needs to be restrained and brought in.

I want to support the amendment by Mrs. DINGELL to assist those American citizens who are stuck in Yemen. We must address that.

I also want to make sure that we do not strike the very favorable language dealing with our DREAMers who want to serve their country.

We should have comprehensive immigration form. We should not vote for the Mo Brooks amendment.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker—although not dealing with this—let us acknowledge with sadness those who lost their lives in Pennsylvania and do a better job in infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the rule for H.R. 1735, the ''National Defense Authorization Act of 2015'' and the underlying bill.

I would like to thank both Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their dedication and hard work on the 2015 NDAA.

The U.S. war on terror has been waged for over a decade and the lesson is clear: our adversaries adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations.

In the beginning it was only Al Qaeda—now the list includes Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, and ISIS/ISIL.

The message is clear—the United States must expand its capacity to meet the terrorist threat where it emerges.

At the same time, we must be constantly searching for innovative ways to utilize defense technologies and resources for the betterment of the American people.

The National Defense Authorization Act of 2015 takes important steps toward achieving these goals, and I am proud to have authored several amendments which were made in order on this bill.

Jackson Lee Amendment #55 calls for outreach for small business concerns owned and controlled by women and minorities prior to conversion of certain functions to contractor performance.

Contracts issued by the Department of Defense represent a substantial portion of.

These same concerns drove the proposal and adoption of Jackson Lee Amendment #64, which provides guidance to the Secretary of Defense on identifying HBCUs and minority serving institutions to assist them in developing scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics capabilities.

Knowledge of STEM fields will be integral in the coming years, both for a powerful economy and for the Department of Defense to operate at its maximum potential.

By identifying and engaging HBCUs and other minority serving institutions, such as Houston's own Texas Southern University, which have strong science and engineering programs, the DOD can greatly expand its pool of qualified applicants.

The final Jackson Lee Amendment which was made in order is #125, which ensures that changes made to DOD computing systems using software bought and modified for agency operations will not result in the disruption of DOD operations.

Increasing cooperation between the DOD and other agencies has resulted in incredible breakthroughs in operations and efficiency.

However, given the importance of DOD functions for the security of our nation, it is imperative that steps be taken to ensure those

functions will continue unhindered by any changes to their computing systems.

Although I am proud to have these amendments included in the NDAA of 2015, several of my other amendments were not included, each of which would have a substantial impact on the well-being of the men and women of the armed services as well as veterans who bravely serve our nation.

Jackson Lee Amendment #76 calls for increased collaboration between the DOD and the National Institutes of Health to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer.

TNBC is a rare from of breast cancer which is highly difficult to detect, and which disproportionately affects African American and Hispanic women.

TNBC is especially difficult to treat, because it is unaffected by what are normally the most effective and targeted treatments, as well as being extremely aggressive.

70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

In addition, according to the Army Times, 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer between 2000 and 2011.

As a breast cancer survivor myself, I believe that we should commit all available resources to combating this horrible condition, including those from the DOD.

Jackson Lee Amendment #77 seeks to relieve the terrible realities of post-traumatic stress disorder by authorizing an additional $2.5 million in funding specifically for this purpose.

Post-traumatic stress disorder is a devastating condition that affects an estimated 20% of veterans.

Less than 40% of individuals suffering from PTSD seek assistance, and those who do often receive care that is only ''minimally adequate''.

When untreated, PTSD can cause veterans to lose their jobs, their homes, and even their own lives.

Conservative estimates place the suicide rate for veterans at approximately 5,000 per year, and male veterans are more than twice as likely as civilians to attempt suicide.

In the State of Texas we have 1,099,141 veterans under the age of 65 and 590,618 who are over the age of 65. There are over 1,689,759 veterans living in our State.

These statistics are especially concerning for me, since Houston is both the third largest military retirement community in the United States and the second largest recruiting district among all the armed services.

It is clear that our veterans deserve more from us, and we must do everything in our power to ensure that they receive the proper care.

A final issue regarding the NDAA is the concerns expressed by the White House over the spending levels and other provisions included in the bill as written.

The administration has expressed its objection to funding levels that it considers too low and incapable of adequately providing for necessary force structure and weapon systems reforms, leading senior advisors to recommend that the President veto the bill if it leaves Congress in its current state.

I hope that the amendments proposed by myself and by my fellow Members of Congress, as well as by the leaders in the Senate, will address the President's concerns, and that we can resolve this impasse quickly and effectively.

Mr. BYRNE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

No greater love is there than to lay down your life for another. It is a paraphrase. It is biblical, secular.

Here, we have individuals, the DREAMers, who are American in every way possible. They have been schooled here in America, raised here in the United States. Their dream is to become American citizens, and they want to give back to a nation that has helped make them who they are.

I want to congratulate Mr. GALLEGO for his amendment and his success in committee. I want to congratulate the bipartisan Rules Committee that saw this amendment through here to the floor. I want my Republican colleagues to question the motivations of those who would try to strip this out.

No greater love—we hope that it never comes to actually sacrificing one's life, but please don't deny those who want to help serve and protect the interests of our country and deny them the opportunity to serve in some capacity and to sacrifice maybe their lives for this country, the country that we love, the country that they love, the only country that they have ever known.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. Don't deny the best, the brightest, and the bravest the opportunity to serve in our Nation's Armed Forces.

Mr. BYRNE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, there is a lot in this bill that we all support, and there is much in this bill that many of us find very objectionable.

I still have a tough time understanding why this House refuses to deal with the fact that we are engaged in a number of wars around the world and this Congress refuses to live up to its constitutional responsibilities to deal with it.

The gentleman tells us that this is not the place. Well, the OCO account is in this bill. It funds some of the wars, so the bill that funds wars seems like the place you would go to talk about these wars; yet not only the amendment that I offered, along with the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SMITH, and WALTER JONES of North Carolina, but the amendments that my colleague BARBARA LEE of California offered on the AUMFs, we were told we can't debate them—no debate.

We have got men and women in harm's way, but we are not going to debate the wars. We are not going to talk about whether this is a good mission. We are not going to talk about the future of the missions. We are not going to talk about how much it is going to cost. We are not going to talk about anything. We are going to make believe that that is not part of our national defense discussion. It is unconscionable.

For the life of me, I can't quite understand why the leadership of this House and the leadership in the Senate refuse to do their job. If you can't handle it, then maybe it is time to leave.

The second thing is this debate over the Gallego amendment. I remind my colleagues it is germane to this bill. This is not some extraneous thing that has nothing to do with this bill. The Parliamentarian said it is germane. The Armed Services Committee, the committee of jurisdiction, debated it. That is what committees are supposed to do. They even voted on it, which is what committees are supposed to do, and they voted ''yes'' in favor of it.

If you don't like it, fine; you can strike it, but save all this anti-immigrant rhetoric, this nastiness. Stop belittling these men and women who came to this country as children, who know no other country than this country, who want to serve this country, who want to put their lives on the line for this country. Please don't diminish what they want to do or what some of them are already doing.

My colleague says this bill is not about immigration. It isn't about immigration. This is about the military. The only people that are making this about immigration are my friends on the other side of the aisle, the ones that are saying: If we don't strip the Gallego amendment from this bill, we are going to vote against the whole NDAA.

This resentment, this contempt for immigrants has resulted in this kind of knee-jerk reaction that we can't support anything because of that. It is ludicrous.

The bottom line here is that I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle vote against the Brooks amendment and vote for the Gallego amendment. We can do better than this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I predicted in my opening statement, we have heard a lot about a number of things that don't have to do with the defense of the United States of America.

For 53 straight years, the Congress of the United States and the Presidents of the United States have worked together in a bipartisan fashion to pass a

National Defense Authorization Act to provide for the defense of the American people, the number one job we have under the Constitution; yet we find ourselves here today literally tearing ourselves apart as a body over issues that don't have anything to do with defending America.

I want to urge people on both sides, however they feel about all these issues, to understand that whether you win or lose your amendment on the committee or the floor, at the end of the day, we come together as Americans, and we defend our country. That is what our constituents send us here to do. If we can't come together on that, then we are truly lost as a nation.

I don't think we are lost, but we wander off in places we shouldn't go when we have debates like we have had today. It is unfortunate.

I am the descendant of immigrants. I dare say virtually everybody in this body is a descendant of immigrants. It is not even debatable that immigration is good for this country, or the vast majority of us wouldn't even be here. That is not the point of this bill. The point of this bill is to defend the country.

We heard a lot about the OCO account. It was called a slush fund. This President and Presidents before him have asked for an OCO account every year since it was first created. Not once has it been a slush fund. It has been used to defend the United States of America, as the OCO account that is in this bill will be used to defend the United States of America.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has been around here longer than I have, but I am sure he knows that the primary jurisdiction of the House for an AUMF—and this Congress—is with the Foreign Affairs Committee, not with the Armed Services Committee that was the committee of jurisdiction on this bill.

The Foreign Affairs Committee is working on an AUMF, but they are waiting for information from the White House, which they haven't gotten yet.

Maybe we can get that information from the White House, get to work on the AUMF, and get it to this floor in the appropriate vehicle, but the National Defense Authorization Act is not the appropriate vehicle and so ruled the Rules Committee, and that is what is in this rule.

I have heard a lot of talk about what is germane to the bill and what is not germane to the bill. This is not about germaneness. This is about a central function of the Federal Government. It is about defending the American people.

As I stand here today during this debate, I am reminded of the great sacrifices our men and women in uniform and their families make on a daily basis so that we may continue to debate and deliberate in an open way.

□ 1530

Debate and discussion have been the foundation of our democracy, and we owe that to our Nation's military. The least we can do is honor that tradition of service and sacrifice by continuing the bipartisan tradition of passing an NDAA for the 54th straight year.

Whether there are people on one side that want to vote against the bill because there is something in the there they don't like about immigration or people on the other side are trying to make a partisan point by telling their side, ''Don't vote for the bill because of OCO,'' or because we are worried about what it might do to domestic policy programs, we need to put that out of our minds.

At the end of the day, whatever amendments are added or not added to this bill, it is our job to pass this bill to defend the country.

There will be plenty of opportunity for partisan disagreement down the road, but not on this issue. At this time, we need to come together, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans.

Let's pass this rule. Let's debate these amendments, all 135 of them, but most importantly, let's pass this act. Let's give our military men and women the resources they need to do their job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1191; and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2297.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

YEAS—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy

Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Barletta
Capps
Cleaver
Davis, Danny
Ribble
Sanchez, Loretta
Speier
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1600

Mses. EDWARDS, SLAUGHTER, JACKSON LEE, Messrs. CARNEY and GARAMENDI changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO MOURN THE TORNADO VICTIMS OF TEXAS AND ARKANSAS

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, many of us are taught that death can come unexpectedly, like a thief in the night. The thief came to Texas and Arkansas this past weekend in the form of deadly tornadoes and flash floods.

In the wake of their destructive path were left two dead in Nashville, Arkansas; one in Cisco, Texas; one in Corsicana, Texas; and in the Fifth District that I am proud to represent, one in Henderson County, Texas, and two next door in Van Zandt County, Van, Texas. They have left families, they have left friends, and they have left great holes in their communities that cannot be filled.

Besides the tragic loss in life, there were many who are left injured, and in the case of Van, Texas, one-third of the town is either damaged or destroyed by tornado.

Should anyone have wonder about the future of Van, Texas, as the Member of Congress, I can tell you you need not worry. The citizens of Van, I know their resilience, I know their values, I know their faith, and I know their can-do optimism. Van, Texas, will be rebuilt.

I am joined, Mr. Speaker, today by Congressman WESTERMAN of Arkansas, Congressman BARTON of Texas, Congressman BURGESS of Texas, and Congressman CONAWAY of Texas. Their districts were hit. Lives were lost in their districts as well.

Mr. Speaker, as Members, we are called upon to vote, we are called upon to speak, we are called upon to lead, and there are times we are called upon to mourn. In many of our faiths, we are taught there is a time for everything, including a time to mourn. Now is that time.

On behalf of my colleagues in the well, I would ask that all Americans remember these good citizens in their prayers and their thoughts. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the House join us in honoring those who perished by observing a moment of silence.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 25, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—400

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—25

Babin
Blumenauer
Brat
Buck
Burgess
Collins (GA)
Conyers
DeFazio
Ellison
Farenthold
Fleming
Garrett
Gohmert
Harris
Hudson
Huelskamp
Johnson (GA)
Jordan
Massie
McClintock
McDermott
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—7

Barletta
Capps
Cleaver
Davis, Danny
Grijalva
Ribble
Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1611

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEZBOLLAH INTERNATIONAL FINANCING PREVENTION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2297) to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

YEAS—423

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Barletta
Capps
Cleaver
Davis, Danny
Hurt (VA)
Perlmutter
Ribble
Sanchez, Loretta
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1617

Ms. KAPTUR changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 227 on H.R. 2297. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes and would like the record to reflect that I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 225: "no," rollcall No. 226: "yes," rollcall No. 227: "yes."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 606. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

CLARIFICATION OF EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE BORDER PATROL AGENT PAY REFORM ACT OF 2014

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2252) to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2252

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE BORDER PATROL AGENT PAY REFORM ACT OF 2014.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2 of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–277) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (b), (c), (d), and (g), and the amendments made by such subsections, shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2016, except that—

''(1) any provision in section 5550(b) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (b), relating to administering elections and making advance assignments to a regular tour of duty shall be applicable before such effective date to the extent determined necessary by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management; and

''(2) the Director may issue regulations as necessary prior to such effective date.''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be deemed to have been enacted on the date of enactment of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–277).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1735.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 260 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1735.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1622

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 13, 2015, all time for general debate pursuant to House Resolution 255 had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 260, no further general debate shall be in order. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–14. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1735

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016''.

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) DIVISIONS.—This Act is organized into four divisions as follows:

(1) Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations.

(2) Division B—Military Construction Authorizations.

(3) Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations.

(4) Division D—Funding Tables.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.

In this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for procurement for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities, as specified in the funding table in section 4101.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

SEC. 111. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR AN/TPQ–53 RADAR SYSTEMS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for AN/TPQ–53 radar systems, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics submits to the congressional defense committees the review under subsection (b).

(b) REVIEW.—The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall—

(1) review the appropriateness of the current delegation of milestone decision authority for the AN/TPQ–53 radar program to the Program Executive Officer for Missiles and Space; and

(2) submit to the congressional defense committees such review.

SEC. 112. PRIORITIZATION OF UPGRADED UH-60 BLACKHAWK HELICOPTERS WITHIN ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) PRIORITIZATION OF UPGRADES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall issue guidance regarding the fielding of upgraded UH–60 Blackhawk helicopters to units of the Army National Guard. Such guidance shall prioritize for such fielding the units of the Army National Guard with assigned UH–60 helicopters that have the most flight hours and the highest annual usage rates within the UH–60 fleet of the Army National Guard, consistent with the force generation unit readiness requirements of the Army.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after which the Chief of the National Guard Bureau issues the guidance under subsection (a), the Chief shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that details such guidance.

SEC. 113. REPORT ON OPTIONS TO ACCELERATE REPLACEMENT OF UH–60A BLACKHAWK HELICOPTERS OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing detailed options for the potential acceleration of the replacement of all UH–60A helicopters of the Army National Guard by not later than September 30, 2020. The report shall include the following:

(1) The additional funding and quantities required, listed by each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020, for H–60M production, UH–60A-to-L RECAP, and UH-60L-to-V RECAP that is necessary to achieve such replacement of all UH-60A helicopters by September 30, 2020.

(2) Any industrial base limitations that may affect such acceleration, including with respect to the production schedules for the other variants of the UH–60 helicopter.

(3) The potential effects of such acceleration on the planned replacement of all UH–60A helicopters of the regular components of the Armed Forces by September 30, 2025.

(4) Identification of any additional funding or resources required to train members of the National Guard to operate and maintain UH–60M aircraft in order to achieve such replacement of all UH-60A helicopters by September 30, 2020.

(5) Any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

SEC. 121. MODIFICATION TO MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR ARLEIGH BURKE CLASS DESTROYERS AND ASSOCIATED SYSTEMS.

Section 123(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1655) is amended by inserting ''or Flight III'' after ''Flight IIA''.

SEC. 122. PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR AIRCRAFT CARRIER PROGRAMS.

(a) PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF CONSTRUCTION OF FORD CLASS AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.—

(1) AUTHORITY FOR ECONOMIC ORDER QUANTITY.—The Secretary of the Navy may procure materiel and equipment in support of the construction of the Ford class aircraft carriers designated CVN–80 and CVN–81 in economic order quantities when cost savings are achievable.

(2) LIABILITY.—Any contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose, and that total liability to the Government for termination of any contract entered into shall be limited to the total amount of funding obligated at time of termination.

(b) REFUELING AND COMPLEX OVERHAUL OF NIMITZ CLASS AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy may carry out the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of each of the following Nimitz class aircraft carriers:

(A) U.S.S. George Washington (CVN–73).

(B) U.S.S. John C. Stennis (CVN–74).

(C) U.S.S. Harry S. Truman (CVN–75).

(D) U.S.S. Ronald Reagan (CVN–76).

(E) U.S.S. George H.W. Bush (CVN–77).

(2) USE OF INCREMENTAL FUNDING.—With respect to any contract entered into under paragraph (1) for the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of a Nimitz class aircraft carrier, the Secretary may use incremental funding for a period not to exceed six years after advance procurement funds for such nuclear refueling and complex overhaul effort are first obligated.

(3) CONDITION FOR OUT-YEAR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.—Any contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2016 is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose for that later fiscal year.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

SEC. 131. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS UPGRADES FOR C–20 AND C–37 AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided by subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to upgrade the executive communications of C–20 and C–37 aircraft until the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such upgrades do not—

(1) cause such aircraft to exceed any weight limitation; or

(2) reduce the operational capability of such aircraft.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary—

(1) determines that such waiver is necessary for the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver.

SEC. 132. BACKUP INVENTORY STATUS OF A–10 AIRCRAFT.

(a) MAXIMUM NUMBER.—In carrying out section 133(b)(2)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3315), the Secretary of the Air Force may not move more than 18 A–10 aircraft in the active component to backup flying status pursuant to an authorization made by the Secretary of Defense under such section.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Such section 133(b)(2)(A) is amended by striking ''36'' and inserting ''18''.

SEC. 133. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF A–10 AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT.—Except as provided by section 132, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status any A–10 aircraft.

(b) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by section 132, and in addition to the limitation in subsection (a), during the period before December 31, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force may not retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup flying status any A–10 aircraft.

(2) MINIMUM INVENTORY REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall ensure the Air Force maintains a minimum of 171 A–10 aircraft designated as primary mission aircraft inventory.

(c) PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN MANNING LEVELS.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to make significant reductions to manning levels with respect to any A–10 aircraft squadrons or divisions.

(d) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN MANNING LEVELS.—-In addition to the limitation in subsection (c), during the period before December 31, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force may not make significant reductions to manning levels with respect to any A–10 aircraft squadrons or divisions.

(e) STUDY ON REPLACEMENT CAPABILITY REQUIREMENTS OR MISSION PLATFORM FOR THE A–10 AIRCRAFT.—

(1) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall commission an appropriate entity outside the Department of Defense to conduct an assessment of the required capabilities or mission platform to replace the A–10 aircraft. This assessment would represent preparatory work to inform an analysis of alternatives.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required under subparagraph (A) shall include each of the following:

(i) Future needs analysis for the current A–10 aircraft mission set to include troops-in-contact/close air support, air interdiction, strike control and reconnaissance, and combat search and rescue support in both contested and uncontested battle environments. At a minimum, the needs analysis should specifically address the following areas:

(I) The ability to safely and effectively conduct troops-in-contact/danger close missions or

missions in close proximity to civilians in the presence of the air defenses found with enemy ground maneuver units.

(II) The ability to effectively target and destroy moving, camouflaged, or dug-in troops, and artillery.

(III) The ability to engage, target, and destroy tanks and armored personnel carriers, including with respect to the carrying capacity of armor-piercing weaponry, including mounted cannons and missiles.

(IV) The ability to remain within visual range of friendly forces and targets to facilitate responsiveness to ground forces and minimize re-attack times.

(V) The ability to safely conduct close air support beneath low cloud ceilings and in reduced visibilities at low airspeeds in the presence of the air defenses found with enemy ground maneuver units.

(VI) The ability of the pilot and aircraft to survive direct hits from small arms, machine guns, MANPADs, and lower caliber anti-aircraft artillery organic or attached to enemy ground forces and maneuver units.

(VII) The ability to communicate effectively with ground forces and downed pilots, including in communications jamming or satellite-denied environments.

(VIII) The ability to execute the missions described in subclauses (I), (II), (III), and (IV) in a GPS- or satellite-denied environment with or without sensors.

(IX) The ability to deliver multiple lethal firing passes and sustain long loiter endurance to support friendly forces throughout extended ground engagements.

(X) The ability to operate from unprepared dirt, grass, and narrow road runways and to generate high sortie rates under these austere conditions.

(ii) Identification and assessment of gaps in the ability of existing and programmed mission platforms in providing required capabilities to conduct missions specified in clause (i) in both contested and uncontested battle environments.

(iii) Assessment of operational effectiveness of existing and programmed mission platforms to conduct missions specified in clause (i) in both contested and uncontested battle environments.

(iv) Assessment of probability of likelihood of conducting missions requiring troops-in-contact/close air support operations specified in clause (i) in contested environments as compared to uncontested environments.

(v) Any other matters the independent entity or the Secretary of the Air Force determines to be appropriate.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the assessment required under paragraph (1).

(B) FORM.—The report required under subparagraph (A) may be submitted in classified form, but shall also contain an unclassified executive summary and may contain an unclassified annex.

(3) NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORT.—If any information required under paragraph (1) has been included in another report or notification previously submitted to Congress by law, the Secretary of the Air Force may provide a list of such reports and notifications at the time of submitting the report required under paragraph (2) in lieu of including such information in the report required under paragraph (2).

SEC. 134. PROHIBITION ON RETIREMENT OF EC–130H AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status any EC–130H aircraft.

(b) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT.—In addition to the limitation in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Air Force may not retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup flying status any EC–130H aircraft until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary submits the report under subsection (c)(3)(A).

(c) STUDY ON REPLACEMENT CAPABILITY REQUIREMENTS OR MISSION PLATFORM FOR THE EC–130H AIRCRAFT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall commission an assessment of the required capabilities or mission platform to replace the EC–130H aircraft. This assessment would represent preparatory work to inform an analysis of alternatives.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required under paragraph (1) shall include each of the following:

(A) Future needs analysis for the current EC–130H aircraft electronic warfare mission set to include suppression of sophisticated enemy air defense systems, advanced radar jamming, avoiding radar detection, communications, sensing, satellite navigation, command and control, and battlefield awareness.

(B) A review of operating concepts for airborne electronic attack.

(C) An assessment of upgrades to the electronic warfare systems of EC–130H aircraft, the costs of such upgrades, and expected upgrades through 2025, and the expected service life of EC–130H aircraft.

(D) A review of the global proliferation of more sophisticated air defenses and advanced commercial digital electronic devices which counter the airborne electronic attack capabilities of the United States by state and non-state actors.

(E) An assessment of the ability of the current EC–130H fleet to meet to meet tasking requirements of the combatant commanders.

(F) Any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the assessments required under subparagraph (1).

(B) FORM.—The report under subparagraph (A) may be submitted in classified form, but shall also contain an unclassified executive summary and may contain an unclassified annex.

(4) NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORT.—If any information required under paragraph (1) has been included in another report or notification previously submitted to the congressional defense committees by law, the Secretary of the Air Force may provide a list of such reports and notifications at the time of submitting the report required under paragraph (1) instead of including such information in such report.

SEC. 135. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DIVESTMENT OR TRANSFER OF KC–10 AIRCRAFT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended during such fiscal year to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, KC–10 aircraft.

Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters

SEC. 141. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR JOINT BATTLE COMMAND–PLATFORM.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for joint battle command–platform equipment, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics submits to the congressional defense committees the report under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that provides a detailed test and evaluation plan to address the effectiveness, suitability, and survivability shortfalls of the joint battle command–platform identified by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation in the fiscal year 2014 report of the Director submitted to Congress.

SEC. 142. STRATEGY FOR REPLACEMENT OF A/MH–6 MISSION ENHANCED LITTLE BIRD AIRCRAFT TO MEET SPECIAL OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS.

(a) STRATEGY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a strategy for replacing A/MH–6 Mission Enhanced Little Bird aircraft to meet the rotary-wing, light attack, reconnaissance requirements particular to special operations.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An updated schedule and display of programmed A/MH–6 Block 3.0 modernization and upgrades, showing usable life of the fleet, and the anticipated service life extensions of all A/MH–6 platforms.

(2) A description of current and future rotary-wing, light attack, reconnaissance requirements and platforms particular to special operations, including key performance parameters of future platforms.

(3) The feasibility of military department-common platforms satisfying future rotary-wing, light attack, reconnaissance requirements particular to special operations.

(4) The feasibility of commercially available platforms satisfying future rotary-wing, light attack, reconnaissance requirements particular to special operations.

(5) The anticipated funding requirements for the special operation forces major force program for the development and procurement of an A/MH–6 replacement platform if military department-common platforms described in paragraph (3) are not available or if commercially available platforms described in paragraph (4) are leveraged.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 143. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF UNITED STATES COMBAT LOGISTIC FORCE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center with appropriate expertise and analytical capability to conduct an assessment of the anticipated future demands of the combat logistics force ships of the Navy and the challenges such ships may face when conducting and supporting future naval operations in contested maritime environments.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the programmed ability of the United States Combat Logistic Force to support the Navy and the naval forces of allies of the United States that are operating in a dispersed manner and not concentrated in carrier or expeditionary strike groups, in accordance with the concept of distributed lethality of the Navy.

(B) An assessment of the programmed ability of the United States Combat Logistic Force to support the Navy and the naval forces of allies of the United States that are engaged in major combat operations against an adversary possessing maritime anti-access and area-denial capabilities, including anti-ship ballistic and cruise missiles, land-based maritime strike aircraft, submarines, and sea mines.

(C) An assessment of the programmed ability of the United States Combat Logistic Force to support distributed and expeditionary air operations from an expanded set of alternative and austere air bases in accordance with concepts under development by the Air Force and the Marine Corps.

(D) An assessment of gaps and deficiencies in the capability and capacity of the United States Combat Logistic Force to conduct and support operations of the United States and allies under the conditions described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

(E) Recommendations for adjustments to the programmed ability of the United States Combat Logistic Force to address capability and capacity gaps and deficiencies described in subparagraph (D).

(F) Any other matters the federally funded research and development center considers appropriate.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the assessment under subsection (a) and any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the federally funded research and development center that conducts the assessment under subsection (a) with timely access to appropriate information, data, resources, and analyses necessary for the center to conduct such assessment thoroughly and independently.

SEC. 144. REPORT ON USE OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF ENHANCED 5.56 MM AMMUNITION BY THE ARMY AND THE MARINE CORPS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the use in combat of two different types of enhanced 5.56 mm ammunition by the Army and the Marine Corps.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An explanation of the reasons for the Army and the Marine Corps to use in combat two different types of enhanced 5.56 mm ammunition.

(2) An explanation of the appropriateness, effectiveness, and suitability issues that may arise from the use of such different types of ammunition.

(3) An explanation of any additional costs that have resulted from the use of such different types of ammunition.

(4) An explanation of any future plans of the Army or the Marine Corps to eventually transition to using in combat one standard type of enhanced 5.56 mm ammunition.

(5) If there are no plans described in paragraph (4), an analysis of the potential benefits of a transition described in such paragraph, including the timeline for such a transition to occur.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation as specified in the funding table in section 4201.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 211. EXTENSION OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM.

Subsection (d) of section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (10 U.S.C. 2359 note) is amended by striking ''through 2015'' and inserting ''through 2020''.

SEC. 212. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES PROGRAM.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, for advanced development and manufacturing activities under the medical countermeasure program, not more than 50 percent may be obligated or expended until 45 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees the report under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the advanced development and manufacturing activities under the medical countermeasure program that includes the following:

(1) An overall description of the program, including validated Department of Defense requirements.

(2) Program goals, proposed metrics of performance, and anticipated procurement and operations and maintenance costs during the period covered by the current future years defense program under section 221 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The results of any analysis of alternatives and efficiency reviews conducted by the Secretary that justifies the manufacturing and privately financed construction of an advanced manufacturing and development facility rather than using other programs and facilities of the Federal Government or industry facilities for advanced development and manufacturing of medical countermeasures.

(4) An independent cost-benefit analysis that justifies the manufacturing and privately financed construction of an advanced manufacturing and development facility described in paragraph (3).

(5) If no independent cost-benefit analysis makes the justification described in paragraph (4), an explanation for why such manufacturing and privately financed construction cannot be so justified.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report under subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a review of such report.

SEC. 213. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR F–15 INFRARED SEARCH AND TRACK CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for F–15 infrared search and track capability, not more than 50 percent may be obligated or expended until a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees the report under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the requirements and cost estimates for the development and procurement of infrared search and track capability for F/A–18 and F–15 aircraft of the Navy and the Air Force. The report shall include the following:

(1) A comparison of the requirements between the F/A–18 and F–15 aircraft infrared search and track development efforts of the Navy and the Air Force.

(2) An explanation of any differences between the F/A–18 and F–15 aircraft infrared search and track capability development efforts of the Navy and the Air Force.

(3) A summary of the schedules and required funding to develop and field such capability.

(4) An explanation of any need for the Navy and the Air Force to field different F/A–18 and F–15 aircraft infrared search and track systems.

(5) Any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 214. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF F135 ENGINE PROGRAM.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an assessment of the F135 engine program.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the reliability, growth, and cost reduction efforts with respect to the F135 engine program, including—

(A) a detailed description of the reliability and cost history of the engine;

(B) the identification of key reliability and cost challenges to the program as of the date of the assessment; and

(C) the identification of any potential options for addressing such challenges.

(2) In accordance with subsection (c), a thorough assessment of the incident on June 23, 2014, consisting of an F135 engine failure and subsequent fire, including—

(A) the identification and definition of the root cause of the incident;

(B) the identification of potential actions or design changes needed to address such root cause; and

(C) the associated cost, schedule, and performance implications of such incident to both the F135 engine program and the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter program.

(c) CONDUCT OF ASSESSMENT.—The federally funded research and development center selected to conduct the assessment under subsection (a) shall carry out subsection (b)(2) by analyzing data collected by the F–35 Joint Program Office, other elements of the Federal Government, or contractors. Nothing in this section may be construed as affecting the plans of the Secretary to dispose of the aircraft involved in the incident described in such subsection (b)(2).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than March 15, 2016, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the assessment conducted under subsection (a).

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 221. EXPANSION OF EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS TO SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND TRANSITION.

Section 2194(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''mathematics,'' the following: ''technology transfer or transition,''.

SEC. 222. STRATEGIES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—

(1) STRATEGY.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall each develop a strategy for how to engage with and support the development of scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics capabilities of covered educational institutions in carrying out section 2362 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each strategy under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Goals and vision for maintaining a credible and sustainable program relating to the engagement and support under the strategy.

(B) Metrics to enhance scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics capabilities at covered educational institutions, including with respect to measuring progress towards increasing the success of such institutions to compete for broader research funding sources other than set-aside funds.

(C) Promotion of mentoring opportunities between covered educational institutions and other research institutions.

(D) Regular assessment of activities that are used to develop, maintain, and grow scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics capabilities.

(E) Inclusion of faculty of covered educational institutions into program reviews, peer reviews, and other similar activities.

(F) Targeting of undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate students at covered educational institutions for inclusion into research or internship opportunities within the military department.

(b) OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a strategy for how to engage with and support the development of scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics capabilities of covered educational institutions pursuant to the strategies developed under subsection (a).

(c) SUBMISSION.—

(1) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of the military departments shall each submit to the congressional defense committees the strategy developed by the Secretary under subsection (a)(1).

(2) OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees the strategy developed under subsection (b).

(d) COVERED INSTITUTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered educational institution'' has the meaning given that term in section 2362(e) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 223. PLAN FOR ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY WAR GAMES.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall develop a plan for integrating advanced weapons technologies into exercises carried out individually and jointly by the military departments to improve the development and experimentation of various concepts for employment by the Armed Forces.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Identification of specific exercises to be carried out individually or jointly by the military departments under the plan.

(2) Identification of emerging advanced weapons technologies based on joint and individual recommendations of the military departments, including with respect to directed-energy weapons, hypersonic strike systems, autonomous systems, or other technologies as determined by the Secretary.

(3) A schedule for integrating either prototype capabilities or table-top exercises into relevant exercises.

(4) A method for capturing lessons learned and providing feedback both to the developers of the advanced weapons technology and the military departments.

(c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the plan under subsection (a).

SEC. 224. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF AUTONOMIC LOGISTICS INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR F–35 LIGHTENING II AIRCRAFT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than April 1, 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the autonomic logistics information system for the F–35 Lightening II aircraft program.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) The fielding status, in terms of units equipped with various software and hardware configurations, for the autonomic logistics information system element of the F–35 Lightening II aircraft program, as of the date of the report.

(2) The development schedule for upgrades to the autonomic logistics information system, and an assessment of the ability of the F–35 Lightening II aircraft program to maintain such schedule.

(3) The views of maintenance personnel and other personnel involved in operating and maintaining F–35 Lightening II aircraft in testing and operational units.

(4) The effect of the autonomic logistics information system program on the operational availability of the F–35 Lightening II aircraft program.

(5) Improvements, if any, regarding the time required for maintenance personnel to input data and use the autonomic logistics information system.

(6) The ability of the autonomic logistics information system to be deployed on both ships and to forward land-based locations, including any limitations of such a deployable version.

(7) The cost estimates for development and fielding of the autonomic logistics information system program and an assessment of the capability of the program to address performance problems within the planned resources.

(8) Other matters regarding the autonomic logistics information system that the Comptroller General determines of critical importance to the long-term viability of the system.

SEC. 225. BRIEFING ON SHALLOW WATER COMBAT SUBMERSIBLE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the first article delivery date of the shallow water combat submersible program of the United States Special Operations Command, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on such program.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An updated acquisition strategy, schedule, and costs for the shallow water combat submersible program.

(2) Major milestones for the program during the period beginning with the delivery of additional articles and ending on the full operational capability date.

(3) Performance of contractors and subcontractors under the program.

(4) Integration with dry deck shelter and other diving technologies.

(5) Any other element the Secretary or the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command determine appropriate.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4301.

Subtitle B—Energy and Environment

SEC. 311. LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OF DROP-IN FUELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2922h. Limitation on procurement of drop-in fuels

''(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may not make a bulk purchase of a drop-in fuel for operational purposes unless the fully burdened cost of that drop-in fuel is cost-competitive with the fully burdened cost of a traditional fuel available for the same purpose.

''(b) WAIVER.—(1) Subject to the requirements of paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation under subsection (a) with respect to a purchase.

''(2) Not later than 30 days after issuing a waiver under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees notice of the waiver. Any such notice shall include each of the following:

''(A) The rationale of the Secretary for issuing the waiver.

''(B) A certification that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

''(C) The expected fully burdened cost of the purchase for which the waiver is issued.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'drop-in fuel' means a neat or blended liquid hydrocarbon fuel designed as a direct replacement for a traditional fuel with comparable performance characteristics and compatible with existing infrastructure and equipment.

''(2) The term 'traditional fuel' means a liquid hydrocarbon fuel derived or refined from petroleum.

''(3) The term 'operational purposes'—

''(A) means for the purposes of conducting military operations, including training, exercises, large scale demonstrations, and moving and sustaining military forces and military platforms; and

''(B) does not include research, development, testing, evaluation, fuel certification, or other demonstrations.

''(4) The term 'fully burdened cost' means the commodity price of the fuel plus the total cost of all personnel and assets required to move and, when necessary, protect the fuel from the point at which the fuel is received from the commercial supplier to the point of use.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2922g the following new item:

''2922h. Limitation on procurement of drop-in fuels.''.

SEC. 312. SOUTHERN SEA OTTER MILITARY READINESS AREAS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SOUTHERN SEA OTTER MILITARY READINESS AREAS.—Chapter 631 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 7235. Establishment of the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Navy shall establish areas, to be known as

'Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas', for national defense purposes. Such areas shall include each of the following:

''(1) The area that includes Naval Base Ventura County, San Nicolas Island, and Begg Rock and the adjacent and surrounding waters within the following coordinates:

''N. Latitude/W. Longitude

33°27.8′/119°34.3′
33°20.5′/119°15.5′
33°13.5′/119°11.8′
33°06.5′/119°15.3′
33°02.8′/119°26.8′
33°08.8′/119°46.3′
33°17.2′/119°56.9′
33°30.9′/119°54.2′.

''(2) The area that includes Naval Base Coronado, San Clemente Island and the adjacent and surrounding waters running parallel to shore to 3 nautical miles from the high tide line designated by part 165 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, on May 20, 2010, as the San Clemente Island 3NM Safety Zone.

''(b) ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE SOUTHERN SEA OTTER MILITARY READINESS AREAS.—

''(1) INCIDENTAL TAKINGS UNDER ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.—Sections 4 and 9 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533, 1538) shall not apply with respect to the incidental taking of any southern sea otter in the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas in the course of conducting a military readiness activity.

''(2) INCIDENTAL TAKINGS UNDER MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1972.—Sections 101 and 102 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371, 1372) shall not apply with respect to the incidental taking of any southern sea otter in the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas in the course of conducting a military readiness activity.

''(3) TREATMENT AS SPECIES PROPOSED TO BE LISTED.—For purposes of conducting a military readiness activity, any southern sea otter while within the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas shall be treated for the purposes of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) as a member of a species that is proposed to be listed as an endangered species or a threatened species under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533).

''(c) REMOVAL.—Nothing in this section or any other Federal law shall be construed to require that any southern sea otter located within the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas be removed from the Areas.

''(d) REVISION OR TERMINATION OF EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior may revise or terminate the application of subsection (b) if the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, determines that military activities occurring in the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas are impeding the southern sea otter conservation or the return of southern sea otters to optimum sustainable population levels.

''(e) MONITORING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy shall conduct monitoring and research within the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas to determine the effects of military readiness activities on the growth or decline of the southern sea otter population and on the nearshore ecosystem. Monitoring and research parameters and methods shall be determined in consultation with the Service.

''(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section and every three years thereafter, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to Congress and the public on monitoring undertaken pursuant to paragraph (1).

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) SOUTHERN SEA OTTER.—The term 'southern sea otter' means any member of the subspecies Enhydra lutris nereis.

''(2) TAKE.—The term 'take'—

''(A) when used in reference to activities subject to regulation by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), shall have the meaning given such term in that Act; and

''(B) when used in reference to activities subject to regulation by the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) shall have the meaning given such term in that Act.

''(3) INCIDENTAL TAKING.—The term 'incidental taking' means any take of a southern sea otter that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity.

''(4) MILITARY READINESS ACTIVITY.—The term 'military readiness activity' has the meaning given that term in section 315(f) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (16 U.S.C. 703 note) and includes all training and operations of the armed forces that relate to combat and the adequate and realistic testing of military equipment, vehicles, weapons, and sensors for proper operation and suitability for combat use.

''(5) OPTIMUM SUSTAINABLE POPULATION.—The term 'optimum sustainable population' means, with respect to any population stock, the number of animals that will result in the maximum productivity of the population or the species, keeping in mind the carrying capacity of the habitat and the health of the ecosystem of which they form a constituent element.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''7235. Establishment of the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1 of Public Law 99–625 (16 U.S.C. 1536 note) is repealed.

SEC. 313. REVISION TO SCOPE OF STATUTORILY REQUIRED REVIEW OF PROJECTS RELATING TO POTENTIAL OBSTRUCTIONS TO AVIATION SO AS TO APPLY ONLY TO ENERGY PROJECTS.

(a) SCOPE OF SECTION.—Section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4200; 49 U.S.C. 44718 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(3), by striking ''from State and local officials or the developer of a renewable energy development or other energy project'' and inserting ''from a State government, an Indian tribal government, a local government, a landowner, or the developer of an energy project'';

(2) in subsection (c)(4), by striking ''readiness, and'' and all that follows and inserting ''readiness and to clearly communicate actions being taken by the Department of Defense to the party requesting an early project review under this section.'';

(3) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking ''as high, medium, or low'';

(4) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k); and

(5) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection (j):

''(j) APPLICABILITY OF SECTION.—This section does not apply to a non-energy project.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (k) of such section, as redesignated by paragraph (4) of subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) The term 'energy project' means a project that provides for the generation or transmission of electrical energy.

''(5) The term 'non-energy project' means a project that is not an energy project.

''(6) The term 'landowner' means a person or other legal entity that owns a fee interest in real property on which a proposed energy project is planned to be located.''.

SEC. 314. EXCLUSIONS FROM DEFINITION OF "CHEMICAL SUBSTANCE" UNDER TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ACT.

Section 3(2)(B)(v) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2602(2)(B)(v)) is amended by striking '', and'' and inserting ''and any component of such an article (including, without limitation, shot, bullets and other projectiles, propellants when manufactured for or used in such an article, and primers), and''.

SEC. 315. EXEMPTION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FROM ALTERNATIVE FUEL PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENT.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 42 U.S.C. 17142) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''This section shall not apply to the Department of Defense.''.

SEC. 316. LIMITATION ON PLAN, DESIGN, REFURBISHING, OR CONSTRUCTION OF BIOFUELS REFINERIES.

The Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract for the planning, design, refurbishing, or construction of a biofuels refinery any other facility or infrastructure used to refine biofuels unless such planning, design, refurbishing, or construction is specifically authorized by law.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

SEC. 321. ASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN NEW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON DETERMINATIONS OF COST-EFFICIENCY.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 146 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2463 the following new section:

''SEC. 2463a. ASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN NEW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON DETERMINATIONS OF COST-EFFICIENCY.

''(a) ASSIGNMENTS BASED ON DETERMINATIONS OF COST-EFFICIENCY.—(1) Except as provided in

paragraph (2) and subject to subsection (b), the assignment of performance of a new requirement by the Department of Defense to members of the Armed Forces, civilian employees, or contractors shall be based on a determination of which sector of the Department's workforce can perform the new requirement in the most cost-efficient manner, based on an analysis of the costs to the Federal Government in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction 7041.04 (''Estimating and Comparing the Full Costs of Civilian and Active Duty Military Manpower and Contract Support'') or successor guidance, consistent with the needs of the Department with respect to factors other than cost, including quality, reliability, and timeliness.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of a new requirement that is inherently governmental, closely associated with inherently governmental functions, critical, or required by law to be performed by members of the Armed Forces or Department of Defense civilian employees.

''(3) Nothing in this section may be construed as affecting the requirements of the Department of Defense under policies and procedures established by the Secretary of Defense under section 129a of this title for determining the most appropriate and cost-efficient mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel to perform the mission of the Department of Defense.

''(b) WAIVER DURING AN EMERGENCY OR EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) for a specific new requirement in the event of an emergency or exigent circumstances, as long as the head of an agency, within 60 days of exercising the waiver, submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives notice of the specific new requirement involved, where such new requirement is being performed, and the date on which it would be practical to subject such new requirement to the requirements of subsection (a).

''(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO ASSIGNMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.—If a new requirement is assigned to a Department of Defense civilian employee consistent with the requirements of this section—

''(1) the Secretary of Defense may not—

''(A) impose any constraint or limitation on the size of the civilian workforce in terms of man years, end strength, full-time equivalent positions, or maximum number of employees; or

''(B) require offsetting funding for civilian pay or benefits or require a reduction in civilian full-time equivalents or civilian end-strengths; and

''(2) the Secretary may assign performance of such requirement without regard to whether the employee is a temporary, term, or permanent employee.

''(d) NEW REQUIREMENT DESCRIBED.—For purposes of this section, a new requirement is an activity or function that is not being performed, as of the date of consideration for assignment of performance under this section, by military personnel, civilian personnel, or contractor personnel at a Department of Defense component, organization, installation, or other entity. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an activity or function that is performed at such an entity and that is re-engineered, reorganized, modernized, upgraded, expanded, or changed to become more efficient but is still essentially providing the same service shall not be considered a new requirement.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2463 the following new item:

''2463a. Assignment of certain new requirements based on determinations of cost-efficiency.''.

SEC. 322. INCLUSION IN ANNUAL TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITY ASSESSMENTS OF A DETERMINATION ABOUT DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

Section 2505(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) determine the extent to which the requirements associated with defense acquisition programs can be satisfied by the present and projected performance capacities of industries supporting the sectors or capabilities in the assessment and evaluate the reasons for any variance from applicable preceding determinations;''.

SEC. 323. AMENDMENT TO LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE SUSTAINMENT, MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, OR OTHER OVERHAUL OF THE F117 ENGINE.

Section 341 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3345) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics'' and all that follows through ''is paying'' and inserting ''Senior Acquisition Executive of the Air Force has determined that the Air Force has obtained sufficient data to establish that the Air Force is paying''; and

(2) by striking the sentence beginning with ''The Secretary may waive''.

SEC. 324. PILOT PROGRAMS FOR AVAILABILITY OF WORKING-CAPITAL FUNDS FOR PRODUCT IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAMS REQUIRED.—During fiscal year 2016, each of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, and the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition shall initiate a pilot program pursuant to section 330 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 68), as amended by section 332 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1697).

(b) LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—A minimum of $5,000,000 of working-capital funds shall be used for each of the pilot programs initiated under subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 325. REPORT ON EQUIPMENT PURCHASED FROM FOREIGN ENTITIES THAT COULD BE MANUFACTURED IN UNITED STATES ARSENALS OR DEPOTS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the budget of the President for fiscal year 2017 is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, Unites States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the equipment, weapons, weapons systems, components, subcomponents, and end-items purchased from foreign entities that identifies those items which could be manufactured in the military arsenals of the United States or the military depots of the United States to meet the goals of subsection (a) or section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, as well as a plan for moving that workload into such arsenals or depots.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) An identification of items purchased by foreign manufacturers—

(A) described in section 8302(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code, and purchased from a foreign manufacturer by reason of an exception under section 8302(a)(2)(A) or section 8302(a)(2)(B) of such title;

(B) described in section 2533b(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, and purchased from a foreign manufacturer by reason of an exception under section 2533b(b); and

(C) described in section 2534(a) of such title and purchased from a foreign manufacturer by reason of a waiver exercised under paragraph (1), (2), (4), or (5) of section 2534(d) of such title.

(2) An assessment of the skills required to manufacture the items identified in paragraph (1) and a comparison of those skills with skills required to meet the critical capabilities identified by the Army Report to Congress on Critical Manufacturing Capabilities and Capacities dated August 2013 and the core logistics capabilities identified by each military service pursuant to section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) An identification of the tooling, equipment, and facilities upgrades necessary for a military arsenal or depot to perform the manufacturing workload identified under paragraph (1).

(4) An identification of workload identified in paragraph (1) most appropriate for transfer to military arsenals or depots to meet the goals of subsection (a) or the requirements of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) Such other information the Secretary considers necessary for adherence to paragraphs (4) and (5).

(6) An explanation of the rationale for continuing to sole-source manufacturing workload identified in paragraph (1) from a foreign source rather than a military arsenal, depot, or other organic facility.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 333. IMPROVEMENTS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than June 30, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the improved management and oversight of the systems, processes, and controls involved in the disposition of excess non-mission essential equipment and materiel by the Defense Logistics Agency Disposition Services.

(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—At a minimum, the plan shall address each of the following:

(1) Backlogs of unprocessed property at disposition sites that do not meet Defense Logistics Agency Disposition Services goals.

(2) Customer wait times.

(3) Procedures governing the disposal of serviceable items in order to prevent the destruction of excess property eligible for utilization, transfer, or donation before potential recipients are able to view and obtain the property.

(4) Validation of materiel release orders.

(5) Assuring adequate physical security for the storage of equipment.

(6) The number of personnel required to effectively manage retrograde sort yards.

(7) Managing any potential increase in the amount of excess property to be processed.

(8) Improving the reliability of Defense Logistics Agency Disposition Services data.

(9) Procedures for ensuring no property is offered for public sale until all requirements for utilization, transfer, and donation are met.

(10) Validation of physical inventory against database entries.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.—By not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the actions taken to implement the plan required under subsection (a).

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

SEC. 401. END STRENGTHS FOR ACTIVE FORCES.

The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 2016, as follows:

(1) The Army, 475,000.

(2) The Navy, 329,200.

(3) The Marine Corps, 184,000.

(4) The Air Force, 320,715.

SEC. 402. REVISIONS IN PERMANENT ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTH MINIMUM LEVELS.

Section 691(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (4) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(1) For the Army, 475,000.

''(2) For the Navy, 329,200.

''(3) For the Marine Corps, 184,000.

''(4) For the Air Force, 317,000.''.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

SEC. 411. END STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for Selected Reserve personnel of the reserve components as of September 30, 2016, as follows:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 342,000.

(2) The Army Reserve, 198,000.

(3) The Navy Reserve, 57,400.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 38,900.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 105,500.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 69,200.

(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 7,000.

(b) END STRENGTH REDUCTIONS.—The end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by—

(1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at the end of the fiscal year; and

(2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at the end of the fiscal year.

(c) END STRENGTH INCREASES.—Whenever units or individual members of the Selected Reserve of any reserve component are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the end strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be increased proportionately by the total authorized strengths of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

SEC. 412. END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES.

Within the end strengths prescribed in section 411(a), the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 2016, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 30,770.

(2) The Army Reserve, 16,261.

(3) The Navy Reserve, 9,934.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,260.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 14,748.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 3,032.

SEC. 413. END STRENGTHS FOR MILITARY TECHNICIANS (DUAL STATUS).

The minimum number of military technicians (dual status) as of the last day of fiscal year 2016 for the reserve components of the Army and the Air Force (notwithstanding section 129 of title 10, United States Code) shall be the following:

(1) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 26,099.

(2) For the Army Reserve, 7,395.

(3) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 22,104.

(4) For the Air Force Reserve, 9,814.

SEC. 414. FISCAL YEAR 2016 LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.

(a) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) NATIONAL GUARD.—Within the limitation provided in section 10217(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, the number of non-dual status technicians employed by the National Guard as of September 30, 2016, may not exceed the following:

(A) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 1,600.

(B) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 350.

(2) ARMY RESERVE.—The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Army Reserve as of September 30, 2016, may not exceed 595.

(3) AIR FORCE RESERVE.—The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Air Force Reserve as of September 30, 2016, may not exceed 90.

(b) NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''non-dual status technician'' has the meaning given that term in section 10217(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 415. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF RESERVE PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR OPERATIONAL SUPPORT.

During fiscal year 2016, the maximum number of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who may be serving at any time on full-time operational support duty under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, is the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 17,000.

(2) The Army Reserve, 13,000.

(3) The Navy Reserve, 6,200.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 3,000.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 16,000.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 14,000.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 421. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for military personnel, as specified in the funding table in section 4401.

(b) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION.—The authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) supersedes any other authorization of appropriations (definite or indefinite) for such purpose for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

SEC. 501. EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF JUNIOR OFFICERS EXCLUDED FROM AN ALL-FULLY-QUALIFIED-OFFICERS LIST BECAUSE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ERROR.

(a) OFFICERS ON ACTIVE-DUTY LIST.—Section 624(a)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that one or more officers or former officers were not placed on an all-fully-qualified-list under this paragraph because of administrative error, the Secretary may prepare a supplemental all-fully-qualified-officers list containing the names of any such officers for approval in accordance with this paragraph.''.

(b) OFFICERS ON RESERVE ACTIVE-STATUS LIST.—Section 14308(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that one or more officers or former officers were not placed on an all-fully-qualified-list under this paragraph because of administrative error, the Secretary may prepare a supplemental all-fully-qualified-officers list containing the names of any such officers for approval in accordance with this paragraph.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SPECIAL SELECTION BOARD AUTHORITY.—

(1) REGULAR COMPONENTS.—Section 628(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or the name of a person that should have been placed on an all-fully-qualified-officers list under section 624(a)(3) of this title was not so placed,''.

(2) RESERVE COMPONENTS.—Section 14502(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or whose name was not placed on an all-fully-qualified-officers list under section 14308(b)(4) of this title because of administrative error,''.

SEC. 502. AUTHORITY TO DEFER UNTIL AGE 68 MANDATORY RETIREMENT FOR AGE OF A GENERAL OR FLAG OFFICER SERVING AS CHIEF OR DEPUTY CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, OR AIR FORCE.

(a) DEFERRAL AUTHORITY.— Section 1253 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) DEFERRED RETIREMENT OF CHAPLAINS.—(1) The Secretary of the military department concerned may defer the retirement under subsection (a) of an officer serving in a general or flag officer grade who is the Chief of Chaplains or Deputy Chief of Chaplains of that officer's armed force.

''(2) A deferment of the retirement of an officer referred to in paragraph (1) may not extend beyond the first day of the month following the month in which the officer becomes 68 years of age.

''(3) The authority to defer the retirement of an officer referred to in paragraph (1) expires December 31, 2020. Subject to paragraph (2), a deferment granted before that date may continue on and after that date.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 1253 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1253. Age 64: regular commissioned officers in general and flag officer grades; exceptions''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1253 and inserting the following new item:

''1253. Age 64: regular commissioned officers in general and flag officer grades; exceptions.''.

SEC. 503. IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL RECOMMENDATION ON THE DEFINITION AND AVAILABILITY OF COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS AND THEIR AIDES.

(a) DEFINITION OF COSTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall direct the Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Secretaries of the military departments, to define the costs that

could be associated with general and flag officers, such as security details, Government air travel, enlisted and officer aide housing costs, additional support staff, official residences, and any other associated costs incurred due to the nature of their position, for the purpose of providing a consistent approach to estimating and managing the full costs associated with these officers and aides.

(b) REPORT ON COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS AND AIDES.—Not later than June 30, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report describing the costs associated with general and flag officers and their enlisted and officer aides.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management

SEC. 511. CLARIFICATION OF PURPOSE OF RESERVE COMPONENT SPECIAL SELECTION BOARDS AS LIMITED TO CORRECTION OF ERROR AT A MANDATORY PROMOTION BOARD.

Section 14502(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''a selection board'' and inserting ''a mandatory promotion board convened under section 14101(a) of this title''; and

(B) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking ''selection board'' and inserting ''mandatory promotion board''; and

(2) in the first sentence of paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''Such board'' and inserting ''The special selection board''; and

(B) by striking ''selection board'' and inserting ''mandatory promotion board''.

SEC. 512. READY RESERVE CONTINUOUS SCREENING REGARDING KEY POSITIONS DISQUALIFYING FEDERAL OFFICIALS FROM CONTINUED SERVICE IN THE READY RESERVE.

Section 10149 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) That members who also occupy a Federal key position whose mobilization in an emergency would seriously impair the capability of the parent Federal agency or office to function effectively are not retained in the Ready Reserve.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) In this section, the term 'Federal key position' means a Federal position that shall not be vacated during a national emergency or mobilization without seriously impairing the capability of the parent Federal agency or office to function effectively. There are four categories of Federal key positions, the first three of which are, by definition, key positions while the fourth category requires a case-by-case determination and designation, as follows:

''(1) The Vice President of the United States or any official specified in the order of presidential succession in section 19 of title 3.

''(2) The heads of the Federal agencies appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, except that this paragraph does not include any position on a multi-member board or commission. Such a position may be designated as a Federal key position only in accordance with paragraph (4).

''(3) Article III Judges. However, each Article III Judge, who is a member of the Ready Reserve and desires to remain in the Ready Reserve, must have his or her position reviewed by the Chief Judge of the affected Judge's Circuit. If the Chief Judge determines that mobilization of the Article III Judge concerned will not seriously impair the capability of the Judge's court to function effectively, the Chief Judge will provide a certification to that effect to the Secretary concerned. Concurrently, the affected Judge will provide a statement to the Secretary concerned requesting continued service in the Ready Reserve and acknowledging that he or she may be involuntarily called to active duty under the laws of the United States and the directives and regulations of the Department of Defense and pledging not to seek to be excused from such orders based upon his or her judicial duties.

''(4) Other Federal positions determined by the head of a Federal Agency.''.

SEC. 513. EXEMPTION OF MILITARY TECHNICIANS (DUAL STATUS) FROM CIVILIAN EMPLOYEE FURLOUGHS.

Section 10216(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''reductions'' the following: ''(including temporary reductions by furlough or otherwise)''.

SEC. 514. ANNUAL REPORT ON PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NON-FEDERALIZED NATIONAL GUARD TO SUPPORT CIVILIAN AUTHORITIES IN PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TO NON-CATASTROPHIC DOMESTIC DISASTERS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Section 10504 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''REPORT.—'' and inserting ''REPORT ON STATE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.—(1)'';

(2) by striking ''(b) SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO CONGRESS.—'' and inserting ''(2)'';

(3) by striking ''annual report of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau'' and inserting ''annual report required by paragraph (1)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection (b):

''(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON NON-FEDERALIZED SERVICE NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Not later than January 31 of each of calendar years 2016 through 2022, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the officials specified in paragraph (5) a report setting forth the personnel, training, and equipment required by the National Guard during the next fiscal year to carry out its mission, while not Federalized, to provide prevention, protection mitigation, response, and recovery activities in support of civilian authorities in connection with non-catastrophic natural and man-made disasters.

''(2) To determine the annual personnel, training, and equipment requirements of the National Guard referred to in paragraph (1), the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall take into account, at a minimum, the following:

''(A) Core civilian capabilities gaps for the prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery activities in connection with natural and man-made disasters, as collected by the Department of Homeland Security from the States.

''(B) Threat and hazard identifications and risk assessments of the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, and the States.

''(3) Personnel, training, and equipment requirements shall be collected from the States, validated by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and be categorized in the report required by paragraph (1) by each of the following:

''(A) Emergency support functions of the National Response Framework.

''(B) Federal Emergency Management Agency regions.

''(4) The annual report required by paragraph (1) shall be prepared in consultation with the chief executive of each State, other appropriate civilian authorities, and the Council of Governors.

''(5) In addition to the congressional defense committees, the annual report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the following officials:

''(A) The Secretary of Defense.

''(B) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

''(C) The Council of Governors.

''(D) The Secretary of the Army.

''(E) The Secretary of the Air Force.

''(F) The Commander of the United States Northern Command.

''(G) The Commander of the United States Cyber Command.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 10504. Chief of the National Guard Bureau: annual reports''.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1011 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 10504 and inserting the following new section:

''10504. Chief of the National Guard Bureau: annual reports.''.

SEC. 515. NATIONAL GUARD CIVIL AND DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AND RELATED MATTERS.

(a) OPERATIONAL USE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 116. OPERATIONAL USE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—This section authorizes the operational use of the National Guard and recognizes that the basic premise of both the National Incident Management System and the National Response Framework is that—

''(1) incidents are typically managed at the local level first; and

''(2) local jurisdictions retain command, control, and authority over response activities for their jurisdictional areas.

''(b) ASSISTANCE TO CIVILIAN FIREFIGHTING ORGANIZATIONS.—

''(1) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—Members and units of the National Guard shall be authorized to support firefighting operations, missions, or activities, including aerial firefighting employment of the Modular Airborne Firefighting System (MAFFS), undertaken in support of a civilian authority or a State or Federal agency.

''(2) ROLE OF GOVERNOR AND STATE ADJUTANT GENERAL.—For the purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) the Governor of a State shall be the principal civilian authority; and

''(B) the adjutant general of the State shall be the principal military authority, when acting in his or her State capacity, and has the primary authority to mobilize members and units of the National Guard of the State in any duty status under this title the adjutant general deems appropriate to employ necessary forces when funds to perform such operations, missions, or activities are reimbursed.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''116. Operational use of the National Guard.''.

(b) ACTIVE GUARD AND RESERVE (AGR) SUPPORT.—Section 328(b) of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''duty as specified in section 116(b) of this title or may perform'' after ''subsection (a) may perform''; and

(2) by inserting ''(A) and (B)'' after '' specified in section 502(f)(2)''.

(c) FEDERAL TECHNICIANS SUPPORT.— Section 709(a)(3) of title 32, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''duty as specified in section 116(b) of this title or'' after ''(3) the performance of''.

Subtitle C—Consolidation of Authorities to Order Members of Reserve Components to Perform Duty

SEC. 521. ADMINISTRATION OF RESERVE DUTY.

Chapter 1209 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting before section 12301 the following subchapter heading:

''SUBCHAPTER I—ADMINISTRATION OF RESERVE DUTY''.

(2) by striking sections 12301, 12302, 12303, 12304, 12310, 12319 and 12322;

(3) in subsections (a) and (b) of section 12305, by striking ''section 12301, 12302, or 12304 of this title'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for a purpose specified under subsections (a) through (e) of section 12351(a) of this title'';

(4) in section 12306—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 12301'' and inserting ''section 12351''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''section 12301(a) of this title'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a) of this title''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 12301(a)'' and inserting ''section 12351(a)'';

(5) in section 12307, by striking ''12301(a)'' and inserting ''12351(a)'';

(6) in section 12318—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 12302 or 12304 of this title'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for a purpose specified under subsection (b) or (c) of section 12351''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''section 12310'' and inserting ''section 12353(c)''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 12302 or 12304'' and inserting ''subsection (b) or (c) of section 12351''; and

(7) by inserting after section 12321 the following new section:

''§ 12323. Policies and procedures

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall prescribe such policies and procedures for the armed forces under their respective jurisdictions as the Secretary considers necessary to carry out this chapter.

''(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—When members of the Ready Reserve are ordered to active duty pursuant to section 12351(b) of this title, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report, at least once a year, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives describing the policies and procedures prescribed under subsection (a).''.

SEC. 522. RESERVE DUTY AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1209 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after section 12323, as added by section 521(7) of this Act, the following new subchapter:
''

''SUBCHAPTER II—RESERVE DUTY AUTHORITIES

''§ 12341. Active duty

''(a) AUTHORITY TO ORDER A MEMBER TO PERFORM ACTIVE DUTY.—At any time, the Secretary concerned may order a member of a reserve component under the Secretary's jurisdiction to active duty, or retain the member on active duty, subject to the purpose and limitations described in subsections (b) and (c).

''(b) PURPOSE AND LIMITATIONS.—The purposes and limitations referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

''(1) PURPOSE OF ORDER.—To account for manpower utilization and expenditure of appropriations, each order shall cite the purpose of the order to active duty as provided under subchapter III of this chapter.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—A member of a reserve component shall not be ordered to active duty or retained on active duty beyond the limitations and restrictions specified in the purpose of the order to active duty.

''(c) CONTINUOUS PERIOD OF DUTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—When the purpose for the member to serve on active duty changes, the order to active duty shall be amended to cite the new purpose and applicable funding code, but the member shall remain on the same order to active duty.

''(2) CONTINUOUS FEDERAL SERVICE.—If a member is released from active duty and subsequently ordered to active duty or full-time National Guard duty with a break in service of 24 hours or fewer, the period of service shall be treated as continuous Federal service for the purposes of pay and benefits, unless otherwise specified in law.

''§ 12342. Call to Federal service

''(a) AUTHORITY TO CALL A MEMBER INTO FEDERAL SERVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may call into Federal service the militia of any State, and use such of the armed forces, as the President considers necessary for the purposes specified in chapter 15 of this title.

''(2) STATE REQUEST REQUIRED.—A call into Federal service for the purposes specified in section 331 of this title shall only be made upon the request of the legislature of a State or of the Governor of a State if the legislature cannot be convened.

''(b) NATIONAL GUARD IN FEDERAL SERVICE.—The President may call into Federal service members and units of the National Guard of any State in such numbers as the President considers necessary for the purposes specified in section 12406 of this title.

''§ 12343. Inactive duty

''(a) AUTHORITY TO ORDER A MEMBER TO PERFORM INACTIVE DUTY.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, the Secretary concerned may, at any time, order a member of a reserve component under the Secretary's jurisdiction to perform inactive duty, subject to the purpose and limitations described in subsection (b).

''(b) PURPOSE AND LIMITATIONS.—The purpose and limitations referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

''(1) PURPOSE.—To account for manpower utilization and expenditure of appropriations, the Secretary concerned shall document the purpose for inactive duty.

''(2) HOSTILE FIRE OR IMMINENT DANGER AREA.—Inactive duty shall not be performed in designated hostile fire or imminent danger area.

''(3) DURATION.—Each period of inactive duty shall be for duration of at least two hours.

''(4) COMPENSATION.—Compensation under section 206 of title 37 and service credit under section 12732(a)(2)(E) of this title shall not exceed two periods of inactive duty in a calendar day.''.

(b) REDESIGNATION OF INACTIVE DUTY TO ENCOMPASS OPERATIONAL AND OTHER DUTIES PERFORMED WHILE IN AN ACTIVE DUTY STATUS.—

(1) REFERENCES.—Any reference that is made in any law, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to inactive-duty training, as such term applies to members of the reserve components of the uniformed services, shall be deemed to be a reference to inactive duty.

(2) DEFINITION OF UNIFORMED SERVICES.—In this subsection the term ''uniformed services'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 523. PURPOSE OF RESERVE DUTY.

Chapter 1209 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after section 12343, as added by section 522(a), the following new subchapter:

''SUBCHAPTER III—PURPOSE OF RESERVE DUTY

''§ 12351. Reserve component: required duty

''(a) MOBILIZATION OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In time of war or of national emergency declared by Congress, or when otherwise authorized by law, an authority designated by the Secretary concerned may, without the consent of the persons affected, order any unit, and any member not assigned to a unit organized to serve as a unit, of a reserve component under the jurisdiction of that Secretary to active duty under section 12341 of this title for the duration of the war or emergency and for six months thereafter. However a member on an inactive status list or in a retired status may not be ordered to active duty under this subsection unless the Secretary concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of the Secretary of a military department, determines that there are not enough qualified Reserves in an active status or in the inactive National Guard in the required category who are readily available.

''(2) EXPANSIONS.—So far as practicable, during any expansion of the active armed forces that requires that units and members of the reserve components be ordered to active duty as provided in paragraph (1), members of units organized and trained to serve as units who are ordered to that duty without their consent shall be so ordered with their units. However, members of those units may be reassigned after being so ordered to active duty.

''(3) PERIOD OF TIME.—The period of time allowed between the date when a Reserve ordered to active duty pursuant to paragraph (1) is alerted for that duty and the date when the Reserve is required to enter upon that duty shall be determined by the Secretary concerned based upon military requirements at that time.

''(b) READY RESERVE MOBILIZATION.—In time of national emergency declared by the President after January 1, 1953, or when otherwise authorized by law, an authority designated by the Secretary concerned may, without the consent of the persons concerned, order any unit, and any member not assigned to a unit organized to serve as a unit, in the Ready Reserve under the jurisdiction of that Secretary to active duty under section 12341 of this title for not more than 24 consecutive months. Not more than 1,000,000 members of the Ready Reserve may be on active duty, without their consent, under this section at any one time.

''(c) CALL-UP OF THE SELECTED RESERVE AND CERTAIN INDIVIDUAL READY RESERVE MEMBERS; OTHER THAN DURING WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) or any other provision of law, when the President determines that it is necessary to augment the active forces for any operational mission or that it is necessary to provide assistance referred to in paragraph (2), the President may authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, without the consent of the members concerned, to order any unit, and any member not assigned to a unit organized to serve as a unit, of the Selected Reserve, or any member in the Individual Ready Reserve mobilization category and designated as essential under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, under their respective jurisdictions, to active duty under section 12341 of this title for not more than 365 days.

''(2) EMERGENCIES.—The augmentation under paragraph (1) includes providing assistance in responding to an emergency involving—

''(A) a use or threatened use of a weapon of mass destruction; or

''(B) a terrorist attack or threatened terrorist attack in the United States that results, or could result, in significant loss of life or property.

''(3) FUNCTION LIMITATION.—No unit or member of a reserve component may be ordered to active duty pursuant to this subsection to perform any of the functions authorized by chapter 15 of this title or section 12406 of this title or, except as provided in paragraph (2), to provide assistance to the Federal Government or a State in time of a serious natural or manmade disaster, accident, or catastrophe.

''(4) NUMERICAL LIMITATION.—Not more than 200,000 members of the Selected Reserve and the Individual Ready Reserve may be on active duty pursuant to this subsection at any one time, of whom not more than 30,000 may be members of the Individual Ready Reserve.

''(5) RESPONSE CAPABILITIES.—No unit or member of a reserve component may be ordered to active duty pursuant to this subsection to provide assistance referred to in paragraph (2) unless the President determines that the requirements for responding to an emergency referred to in that subsection have exceeded, or will exceed, the response capabilities of local, State, and Federal civilian agencies.

''(6) TERMINATION.—Whenever any unit of the Selected Reserve or any member of the Selected Reserve not assigned to a unit organized to serve as a unit, or any member of the Individual Ready Reserve, is ordered to active duty pursuant to paragraph (1), the service of all units or members so ordered to active duty may be terminated by—

''(A) order of the President; or

''(B) law.

''(7) REPORT.—Whenever the President authorizes the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to order any unit or member of the Selected Reserve or Individual Ready Reserve to active duty, pursuant to paragraph (1), the President shall, within 24 hours after exercising such authority, submit to Congress a report setting forth the circumstances necessitating the action taken under this section and describing the anticipated use of these units or members.

''(8) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed as amending or limiting the application of the provisions of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

''(d) ANNUAL ACTIVE DUTY.—At any time, an authority designated by the Secretary concerned may, without the consent of the persons affected, order any unit, and any member not assigned to a unit organized to serve as a unit, in an active status in a reserve component under the jurisdiction of that Secretary to active duty under section 12341 of this title for not more than 15 days a year. However, units and members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States may not be ordered to active duty under this subsection without the consent of the governor of the State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia National Guard, the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard). The consent of a Governor may not be withheld (in whole or in part) with regard to active duty outside the United States, its territories, and its possessions, because of any objection to the location, purpose, type, or schedule of such active duty.

''(e) READY RESERVE: UNSATISFACTORY PARTICIPATION.—

''(1) AUTHORITY TO ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may order to active duty under section 12341 of this title any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who—

''(i) is not assigned to, or participating satisfactorily in, a unit of the Ready Reserve;

''(ii) has not fulfilled the member's statutory reserve obligation; and

''(iii) has not served on active duty for a total of 24 months.

''(B) DURATION AND EXTENSION.—A member who is ordered to active duty pursuant to paragraph (1) may be required to serve on active duty until the member's total service on active duty equals 24 months. If the member's enlistment or other period of military service would expire before the member has served the required period under this paragraph, the enlistment or other period of military service may be extended until the member has served the required period.

''(2) FAILURE TO PERFORM SATISFACTORILY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Ready Reserve covered by section 12352 of this title who fails in any year to perform satisfactorily the training duty prescribed in that section, as determined by the Secretary concerned under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, may be ordered without the member's consent to perform additional active duty for training under section 12341 of this title for not more than 45 days. If the failure occurs during the last year of the member's required membership in the Ready Reserve, the member's membership is extended until the member performs that additional active duty for training, but not for more than six months.

''(B) ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OR AIR NATIONAL GUARD.—A member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States who fails in any year to perform satisfactorily the training duty prescribed by or under law for members of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, as determined by the Secretary concerned, may, upon the request of the Governor of the State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard) be ordered, without the member's consent, to perform additional active duty for training under section 12341 of this title for not more than 45 days. A member ordered to active duty under this subsection shall be ordered to duty as a Reserve of the Army or as a Reserve of the Air Force, as the case may be. However, the consent of a Governor may not be withheld (in whole or in part) with regard to active duty outside the United States, its territories, and its possessions, because of any objection to the location, purpose, type, or schedule of such active duty.

''(f) CAPTIVE STATUS.—A member of a reserve component may be ordered to active duty under section 12341 of this title without the member's consent if the Secretary concerned determines that the member is in a captive status. A member ordered to active duty under this section may not be retained on active duty, without the member's consent, for more than 30 days after the member's captive status is terminated.

''(g) MUSTER DUTY.—A member of the Ready Reserve may be ordered without the member's consent to muster duty under section 12343 of this title one time each year. A member ordered to muster duty under this section shall be required to perform a minimum of two hours of muster duty on the day of muster. The muster duty shall be subject to the following requirements:

''(1) PERIOD OF TIME.—The period which a member may be required to devote to muster duty under this section, including round-trip travel to and from the location of that duty, may not total more than one day each calendar year.

''(2) TREATMENT AS INACTIVE DUTY AND TRAVEL.—Except as specified in paragraph (3), muster duty (and travel directly to and from that duty) under this section shall be treated as inactive duty (and travel directly to and from that duty) for the purposes of this title and the provisions of title 37 (other than section 206(a) of title 37) and title 38, including provisions relating to the determination of eligibility for and the receipt of benefits and entitlements provided under those titles for Reserves performing inactive duty and for their dependents and survivors.

''(3) NOT CREDITED FOR RETIRED PAY PURPOSES.—Muster duty under this subsection shall not be credited in determining entitlement to, or in computing, retired pay under chapter 1223 of this title.

''(h) CONSIDERATION FOR MOBILIZATION.—To achieve fair treatment between members in the Ready Reserve who are being considered for recall to duty without their consent pursuant to subsection (b), (c) or (e)(1), consideration shall be given to—

''(1) the length and nature of previous service, to assure such sharing of exposure to hazards as the national security and military requirements will reasonably allow;

''(2) the frequency of assignments during service career;

''(3) family responsibilities; and

''(4) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest.

''(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CAPTIVE STATUS.—The term 'captive status' means the status of a member of the armed forces who is in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of title 37) which occurs as the result of a hostile action and is related to the member's military status.

''(2) INDIVIDUAL READY RESERVE MOBILIZATION CATEGORY.—The term 'Individual Ready Reserve mobilization category' means, in the case of any reserve component, the category of the Individual Ready Reserve described in section 10144(b) of this title.

''(3) WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.—The term 'weapon of mass destruction' has the meaning given that term in section 1403 of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 2302).

''§ 12352. Reserve component: required training

''(a) PURPOSE.—Except as specifically provided in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or by the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, each person who is enlisted, inducted, or appointed in an armed force, and who becomes a member of the Ready Reserve under any provision of law except section 513 or 10145(b) of this title, shall be required, while in the Ready Reserve, to maintain readiness as determined by the Secretary concerned by—

''(1) participating in at least 48 scheduled drills or training periods during each year pursuant to section 12343 of this title and serve on active duty for training under section 12341 of this title for not less than 14 days (exclusive of travel time) during each year; or

''(2) serving on active duty for training under section 12341 of this title for not more than 30 days during each year.

''(b) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS.—A member who has served on active duty for one year or longer may not be required to perform a period of active duty for training if the first day of that period falls during the last 120 days of the member's required membership in the Ready Reserve.

''§ 12353. Reserve component: optional duty

''(a) ACTIVE DUTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At any time, an authority designated by the Secretary concerned may order a member of a reserve component under his jurisdiction to active duty under section 12341 of this title, or retain the member on active

duty, with the consent of that member for training, to provide operational support or perform other duty as determined by the Secretary concerned.

''(2) PURPOSES.—Such duty includes service on active duty for the purpose specified in section or section 802(d), 1491, 3038, 5143, 5144, 8038, 10211, 10301 through 10305, 10502, 10505, 10506, 10507, 12402, or 12405 of this title.

''(3) ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OR AIR NATIONAL GUARD.—However, a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States may not be ordered to active duty under this subsection without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State concerned. The consent of a Governor may not be withheld (in whole or in part) with regard to active duty outside the United States, its territories, and its possessions, because of any objection to the location, purpose, type, or schedule of such active duty.

''(b) ACTIVE DUTY FOR HEALTH CARE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—When authorized by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of a military department may, with the consent of the member, order a member of a reserve component to active duty under section 12341 of this title—

''(A) to receive authorized medical care;

''(B) to be medically evaluated for disability or other purposes; or

''(C) to complete a required Department of Defense health care study, which may include an associated medical evaluation of the member.

''(2) TREATMENT FOR OR RECOVERY FROM AN INJURY, ILLNESS OR DISEASE.—A member of a uniformed service described in paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B) of section 1074a(a) of this title may be ordered to active duty under section 12341 of this title, and a member of a uniformed service described in paragraph (1)(A) or (2)(A) of section 1074a may be continued on active duty under section 12341 of this title, for a period of more than 30 days while the member is being treated for (or recovering from) an injury, illness, or disease incurred or aggravated in the line of duty as described in any of such paragraphs.

''(3) RETENTION ON ACTIVE DUTY.—A member ordered to active duty under this subsection may, with the member's consent, be retained on active duty, if the Secretary concerned considers it appropriate, for medical treatment for a condition associated with the study or evaluation, if that treatment of the member is otherwise authorized by law.

''(4) ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OR AIR NATIONAL GUARD.—However, a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States may not be ordered to active duty under this subsection without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State concerned.

''(c) ORGANIZING, ADMINISTERING, ETC., RESERVE COMPONENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned may order a member of a reserve component under the Secretary's jurisdiction to active duty pursuant to section 12341 of this title to perform Active Guard and Reserve duty to organize, administer, recruit, instruct, or train the reserve components.

''(2) RESERVE GRADE; ELIGIBILITY FOR PROMOTION.—A Reserve ordered to active duty under paragraph (1) shall be ordered in the Reserve's reserve grade. While so serving, the Reserve continues to be eligible for promotion as a Reserve, if otherwise qualified.

''(3) ADDITIONAL DUTIES.—A Reserve on active duty under this subsection may perform the following additional duties to the extent that the performance of those duties does not interfere with the performance of the Reserve's primary Active Guard and Reserve duties described in paragraph (1):

''(A) SUPPORTING RESERVE COMPONENTS.—Supporting operations or missions assigned in whole or in part to the reserve components.

''(B) SUPPORTING UNITS.—Supporting operations or missions performed or to be performed by—

''(i) a unit composed of elements from more than one component of the same armed force; or

''(ii) a joint forces unit that includes—

''(I) one or more reserve component units; or

''(II) a member of a reserve component whose reserve component assignment is in a position in an element of the joint forces unit.

''(C) ADVISING.—Advising the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the commanders of the combatant commands regarding reserve component matters.

''(D) INSTRUCTION OR TRAINING.—Instructing or training in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or possessions of the United States of—

''(i) active-duty members of the armed forces;

''(ii) members of foreign military forces (under the same authorities and restrictions applicable to active-duty members providing such instruction or training);

''(iii) Department of Defense contractor personnel; or

''(iv) Department of Defense civilian employees.

''(4) OPERATIONS RELATING TO DEFENSE AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND TERRORIST ATTACKS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), a Reserve on active duty as described in paragraph (1), or a Reserve who is a member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32 in connection with functions referred to in paragraph (1), may, subject to subparagraph (C), perform duties in support of emergency preparedness programs to prepare for or to respond to any emergency involving any of the following:

''(i) WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.—The use or threatened use of a weapon of mass destruction (as defined in section 1403 of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 2302) in the United States.

''(ii) TERRORIST ATTACK OR THREATENED TERRORIST ATTACK.—A terrorist attack or threatened terrorist attack in the United States that results, or could result, in catastrophic loss of life or property.

''(iii) RELEASE OF CERTAIN MATERIALS.—The intentional or unintentional release of nuclear, biological, radiological, or toxic or poisonous chemical, materials in the United States that results, or could result, in catastrophic loss of life or property.

''(iv) NATURAL OR MAN-MADE DISASTER.—A natural or manmade disaster in the United States that results in, or could result in, catastrophic loss of life or property.

''(B) COSTS.—The costs of the pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for a Reserve performing duties under the authority of paragraph (1) shall be paid from the appropriation that is available to pay such costs for other members of the reserve component of that Reserve who are performing duties as described in paragraph (1).

''(C) CIVIL SUPPORT TEAM.—A Reserve may perform duty described in subparagraph (A) only while assigned to a reserve component weapons of mass destruction civil support team.

''(D) ANNUAL END STRENGTH AUTHORIZATION AND JUSTIFICATION MATERIAL.—Reserves on active duty who are performing duties described in subparagraph (A) shall be counted against the annual end strength authorizations required by sections 115(a)(1)(B) and 115(a)(2) of this title. The justification material for the defense budget request for a fiscal year shall identify the number and component of the Reserves programmed to be performing duties described in subparagraph (A) during that fiscal year.

''(E) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—A reserve component weapons of mass destruction civil support team, and any Reserve assigned to such a team, may not be used to respond to an emergency described in subparagraph (A) unless the Secretary of Defense has certified to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives of that team, or that Reserve, possesses the requisite skills, training, and equipment to be proficient in all mission requirements.

''(F) REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION.—If the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress any request for the enactment of legislation to modify the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (C), the Secretary shall provide with the request—

''(i) justification for each such requested modification; and

''(ii) the Secretary's plan for sustaining the qualifications of the personnel and teams described in subparagraph (C).

''(G) DEFINITION OF UNITED STATES.—In this subsection, the term 'United States' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

''(5) TRAINING.—A Reserve on active duty as described in this subsection may be provided training consistent with training provided to other members on active duty, as the Secretary concerned sees fit.

''(d) INACTIVE DUTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At any time, an authority designated by the Secretary concerned may require a member of a reserve component under the Secretary's jurisdiction, with the consent of the member, to perform inactive duty under section 12343 of this title to provide readiness training, perform administrative function to prepare for unit training, perform funeral honors functions at the funeral of a veteran as defined in section 1491 of this title (other than for members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States who perform funeral honors duty under section 502(g) of title 32), or perform other inactive duty as determined by the Secretary concerned.

''(2) PAY.—As directed by the Secretary concerned, a member performing funeral honors functions may be paid—

''(A) the allowance under section 495 of title 37; or

''(B) compensation under section 206 of title 37.

''(3) TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES.—A member who performs funeral honors functions may be reimbursed for travel and transportation expenses incurred in conjunction with such duty as authorized under section 495 of title 37 if such duty is performed at a location 50 miles or more from the member's residence.''.

SEC. 524. TRAINING AND OTHER DUTY PERFORMED BY MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) CHAPTER HEADING.—The chapter heading for chapter 5 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''***AND OTHER DUTY***'' after ''***TRAINING***'';

(b) OTHER AMENDMENTS.—Section 502 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''§ 502. Required training, field exercises, and other duty'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''drill'' and inserting ''training''; and

(ii) by inserting ''under subsection (g)'' before ''at least'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''under subsection (f)(1)'' before ''at least'';

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''drill'' each place the term appears and inserting ''training'';

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''drill'' and inserting ''training''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''one and one-half hours'' and inserting ''two hours'';

(5) in subsection (e), by striking ''drill'' each place the term appears and inserting ''training'';

(6) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', which regulations shall conform to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for Reserve component members,'' after ''as the case may be,''; and

(ii) in the matter following subparagraph (B), by inserting ''to full-time National Guard duty'' after ''be ordered''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) Support for funerals of veterans of the armed forces pursuant to section 1491 of title 10.'';

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (8); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2), as amended by subparagraph (B), the following new paragraphs:

''(3) FULL-TIME NATIONAL GUARD DUTY.—Full-time National Guard duty shall not be performed on land outside the United States, its territories or possessions.

''(4) PURPOSE OF CALL ORDER.—To account for manpower utilization and expenditure of appropriations, each order to full-time National Guard duty shall cite the purpose of the call or order as provided in this section or section 112, 114, 316, 503, 504, 505, 509, or 904 of this title.

''(5) LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS.—A member of the National Guard shall not be ordered to full-time National Guard duty or retained on full-time National Guard duty beyond the limitations and restrictions specified in the purpose of the order to full-time National Guard duty.

''(6) AMENDED ORDERS.—When the purpose for the member to serve on full-time National Guard duty changes, the order to full-time National Guard duty shall be amended to cite the new purpose and applicable funding code, but the member shall remain on the same order to full-time National Guard duty.

''(7) CONTINUOUS FEDERAL SERVICE.—If a member is released from full-time National Guard duty and subsequently ordered to active duty with a break in service of 24 hours or fewer, the period of service shall be treated as continuous Federal service for the purposes of pay and benefits unless otherwise specified in law.''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) INACTIVE DUTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall conform to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for reserve component members, a member of the National Guard may be required to perform inactive duty, in addition to that prescribed under subsection (a), to provide additional readiness training, perform administrative function to prepare for unit training, perform funeral honors functions for veterans of the armed forces pursuant to section 1491 of title 10, or perform other inactive duty as authorized by the Secretary concerned.

''(2) DOCUMENTATION.—To account for manpower utilization and expenditure of appropriations, the purpose for inactive duty and the associated funding code shall be documented.

''(3) DESIGNATED HOSTILE FIRE OR IMMINENT DANGER AREA.—Inactive duty shall not be performed in designated hostile fire or imminent danger area.

''(4) LAND OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES, ITS TERRITORIES OR POSSESSIONS.—Inactive duty shall not be performed on land outside the United States, its territories or possessions.

''(5) DURATION OF INACTIVE DUTY.—Each period of inactive duty shall be for duration of at least two hours.

''(6) DURATION OF COMPENSATION AND SERVICE CREDIT.—Compensation under section 206 of title 37 and service credit under section 12732(a)(2)(E) of title 10 shall not exceed two periods of inactive duty in a calendar day.

''(7) PAY FOR PERFORMING FUNERAL HONORS.—As directed by the Secretary concerned, a member performing funeral honors functions may be paid—

''(A) the allowance under section 495 of title 37; or

''(B) compensation under section 206 of title 37.''.

SEC. 525. CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.— (1) Paragraph (2) of section 5517(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''under section 10147'' and inserting ''as provided under section 12352''.

(2) Section 6323 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1) of subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(ii) by striking ''funeral honors duty (as described in section 12503 of title 10 and section 115 of title 32)'' and inserting ''funeral honors functions (as described in section 12353 of title 10 and section 114 of title 32)''; and

(B) in paragraph (1) subsection (d), by striking ''section 12301(b) or 12301(d)'' and inserting ''section 12341 of title 10 for the purposes specified in section 12351(d) or 12353(a)''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 7, UNITED STATES CODE.—Paragraph (1) of section 332(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1982(a)) is amended by striking ''12301(a), 12301(g), 12302, 12304, 12306, or 12406,'' and inserting ''12341 for the purpose specified in section 12306, 12342, 12351(a)(1), 12351(b), 12351(c), or 12351(f), 12342 for the purpose specified in section 12406,''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.— (1) Section 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B) of subsection (a)(13), by striking ''section 688, 12301(a), 12302, 12304, 12304a, 12305, or12406 of this title, chapter 15 of this title'' and inserting ''section 688 or 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12304a, 12305, 12351(a)(1), 12351(b), 12351(c) of this title, section 12342 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12406, chapter 15 of this title'';

(B) in paragraph (16) of subsection (b), by striking ''section 12301(d) of this title'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12353(c) of this title'';

(C) in paragraph (5) of subsection (d)—

(i) by inserting ''502(f) of title 32 for the purpose specified in section'' after ''under section''; and

(ii) by striking ''505 of title 32'' and inserting ''505 of such title'';

(D) in paragraph (7) of subsection (d)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 206 of title 37'' and inserting ''section 12352(a)(1) of this title, section 502(a)(1) of title 32,''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by inserting ''under section 12353(d) of this title or section 502(g) of title 32'' after ''special additional duties authorized''; and

(II) by inserting '', or other activities that a member may perform when authorized by the designated authority'' before the period.

(2) Section 115 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 12301(d)'' and inserting ''section 12341'';

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''section 12301(d)'' and inserting ''section 12341'';

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking ''section 12301(g)'' and inserting ''section 12341''; and

(II) by inserting ''as provided under section 12351(f) of such title'' before the semicolon; and

(iv) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) by striking ''12301(h) or 12322'' and inserting ''section 12341''; and

(II) by inserting ''as provided under section 12353(b) of this title'' before the semicolon;

(B) in subsection (i)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''section 12301(a) of this title'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a) of this title'';

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 12301(b) of this title'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(d) of this title'';

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 12302 of this title'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(b) of this title'';

(iv) in paragraph (4), by striking ''section 12304 of this title'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(c) of this title'';

(v) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''section 12342 of this title for the purpose specified in'' after ''Federal service under'';

(vi) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''section 12342 of this title for the purpose specified in'' after '' Federal service under''; and

(vii) in paragraph (11), by inserting ''12341 for the purpose specified in section'' after ''active duty under section''.

(3) Section 331 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''under section 12342 of this title'' after ''call into Federal service''.

(4) Section 332 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''under section 12342 of this title'' after ''call into Federal service''.

(5) Paragraph (3) of section 511(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 10147(a)(1)'' and inserting ''section 12352(a)(1)''.

(6) Subparagraph (B) of section 523(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section'' after ''on active duty under section''.

(7) Subparagraph (B) of section 641(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''section 12341 for the purpose described in'' after ''on active duty under''.

(8) Section 802 of title 10, United States Code, is amended in each of subsections (a)(3), (d)(2)(B), and (d)(5)(B), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(9) Subsection (d) of section 803 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(10) The matter preceding paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and the matter preceding paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 936 of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(11) Paragraph (1) of section 976(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(12) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1061(b) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(13) Subsection (a) of section 1074a of title 10, United States Code, is amended in each of paragraphs (1)(B), (2)(B), and (3) by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(14) Subsection (a) of section 1074a of title 10, United States Code, is amended further—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(C) by striking paragraph (4).

(15) Subsection (a) of section 1076 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in each paragraphs (2)(B)(i), (2)(B)(ii), and (2)(C), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (E).

(16) Clauses (i) and (ii) of section 1086(c)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(17) Paragraph (2) of section 1175(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(18) Section 1175a(j) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ''under section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a)(1), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(d), 12351(e)(1), or 12351(f) of this title'' after ''involuntarily recalled to active duty''; and

(ii) by striking ''in accordance with section 12301(a), 12301(b), 12301(g), 12302, 12303, or 12304 of this title or'' and inserting ''under''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''12301(d)'' and inserting ''12353(a)'';

(ii) by striking ''12319, or 12503'' and inserting ''12351(g)''; and

(iii) by striking '', 115,''.

(19) Paragraph (2) of section 1201(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''under section 10148(a)'' and inserting ''pursuant to section 12351(e)(2)''.

(20) Section 1204 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**inactive-duty training**'' and inserting ''**inactive duty**''; and*

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in each of subparagraphs (A)(i), (A)(iii), (B)(i), and (B)(iii), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty'';

(ii) in clause (iii) of subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;

(iii) in clause (iii) of subparagraph (B), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and

(iv) by striking subparagraph (C).

(21) Section 1206 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**inactive-duty training**'' and inserting ''**inactive duty**'';*

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) the disability is a result of an injury, illness, or disease incurred or aggravated in line of duty while—

''(A) performing active duty or inactive duty;

''(B) traveling directly to or from the place at which such duty is performed; or

''(C) remaining overnight immediately before the commencement of inactive duty, or while remaining overnight between successive periods of inactive duty, at or in the vicinity of the site of the inactive duty, if the site is outside reasonable commuting distance of the member's residence;''; and

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty'';

(22) Subparagraph (B) of section 1448(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(23) Clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 1471(b)(3)(A) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive duty for training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(24) Section 1475 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**inactive-duty training**'' and inserting ''**inactive duty**''; and*

(B) in each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a), by striking ''inactive duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(25) Paragraphs (1)(B) and (2)(A) of section 1476(a) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(26) Paragraphs (3), (4), (8), and (9) of section 1478(a) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(27) Section 1481(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in each of subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (F), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(28) Paragraph (2) of section 1481(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended further—

(A) in subparagraph (E) (as amended by paragraph (27)(B)), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (F) (as amended by paragraph (27)(A)), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (G).

(29) Subsections (d)(2) and (e)(5) of section 2031 of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(30) Subparagraph (D) of section 2107(c)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty for training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(31) Subparagraph (D) of section 2107a(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty for training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(32) The matter preceding paragraph (1) of section 2601a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(33) Paragraph (3) of section 9446(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(34) Subsection (a) of section 10142 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''as provided in sections 12301 and 12302 of this title'' and inserting ''under section 12341 of this title for the purposes specified in sections 12351(a) and 12351(b) of this title''.

(35) Subsection (a) of section 10143 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''10147(a)(1)'' and inserting ''12352''.

(36) The matter preceding subparagraph (A) of section 10144(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''in accordance with section 12304'' and inserting ''under section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(c)''.

(37) Chapter 1005 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by repealing section 10147; and

(B) by repealing section 10148.

(38) Section 10151 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''sections 12301 and 12306'' and inserting ''section 12351(a)''.

(39) Subsection (b) of section 10204 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(40) Subsection (a) of section 10215 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), by striking ''section 12301(d)'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title as provided in section 12353(a)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2), by striking ''section 12301(d)'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title as provided in section 12353(a)''.

(41) Paragraph (9) of section 10541(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''12304(b)'' and inserting ''12351(c)(2)''.

(42) Paragraph (1) of section 12011(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''12310'' and inserting ''12353(c)''.

(43) Subsection (a) of section 12012 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 10211 or 12310'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 10211 or 12353(c) of this title''.

(44) Section 12305 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 12301, 12302, or 12304'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), or 12351(c)''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''section 12301, 12302, or 12304'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), or 12351(c)''.

(45) Section 12306 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 12301'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(d), 12351(f), 12353(a), or 12353(b)''; and

(B) in paragraph (1) of subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''section 12301(a)'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a)(1) of this title''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2) of subsection (b), by striking ''12301(a)'' and inserting ''12351(a)''.

(46) Section 12307 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''12301(a)'' and inserting ''12351(a)''.

(47) Section 12317 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(48) Section 12318 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 12302 or 12304'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(b) or 12351(c)''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''referred to section 12310'' and inserting ''performing duty referred to in section 12353(c)''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 12302 or 12304'' and inserting ''section 12351(b) or 12351(c)''.

(49) Section 12321 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components'' and inserting ''specified in section 12353(c) of this title''.

(50) Section 12408 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 12301(a),

12302, or 12304 of this title'' and inserting ''12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a)(1), 12351(b) or 12351(c) of this title''.

(51) Section 12503 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(52) Section 12552 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(53) Subsections (a)(3) and (b)(3) of section 12602 of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(54) Section 12603 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**inactive-duty training**'' and inserting ''**inactive duty**''; and*

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(55) Section 12604 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**inactive-duty training**'' and inserting ''**inactive duty**''; and*

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(56) Subsection (b) of section 12686 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 12301'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(d), 12351(f), 12353(a) or 12353(b)''.

(57) Subparagraph (B) of section 12731(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''under section 12301(d)'' and inserting ''for the purpose specified in section 12353(a)''; and

(ii) by striking ''under section 12310'' and inserting ''for the purpose specified in 12353(c)''; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking ''section 12301(h)(1)'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12353(b)(1)''.

(58) Section 12732(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the matter following subparagraph (E), by striking ''clauses (A), (B), (C), (D) and (E)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A), (B), (C) and (D)''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (E).

(59) Clause (i) of section 16131(c)(3)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a)(1), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f), or 12353(a)''.

(60) The matter preceding subparagraph (A) of section 16133(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a)(1), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f), or 12353(a)''.

(61) Clause (i) of section 16162(d)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of this title'' and inserting ''section 12341 of this title for the purpose specified in section 12351(a)(1), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f), or 12353(a) of this title''.

(62) Section 18505 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**inactive-duty training**'' and inserting ''**inactive duty**''; and*

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE.— (1) Section 704 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 705 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(3) Paragraph (1) of section 712(c) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''10147'' and inserting ''12352''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 20, UNITED STATES CODE.— (1) Subsection (c) of section 1404 of the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 923) is amended—

(A) in clause (i) of paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''section 12301 or 12302'' and inserting ''section 12341 of title 10, United States Code, for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(d), 12351(f), 12353(a) or 12353(b)''; and

(B) in clause (i) of paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''section 12301 or 12302'' and inserting ''section 12341 of title 10, United States Code, for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(d), 12351(f), 12353(a) or 12353(b)''.

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 481(d)(4) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088(d)(4)) is amended by striking ''section 12301(a), 12301(g), 12302, 12304, or 12306'' and inserting ''section 12341 of title 10, United States Code, for a purpose specified in section 12306, 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), or 12351(f)''.

(3) Subparagraph (C) of section 484C(c)(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091c(c)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(g), 12302, 12304, or 12305 of title 10, United States Code,'' and inserting ''of title 10, United States Code, under section 12341 of such title for the purpose specified in section 12305, 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), or 12351(f) of such title,''; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking ''section 12304 of title 10, United States Code'' and inserting ''section 12341 of title 10, United States Code, for the purpose specified in section 12351(c) of such title''.

(4) Subparagraph (A) of section 5 of Higher Education Relief Opportunities for Students Act of 2003 (20 U.S.C. 1098ee(5)) is amended by striking ''section 12301(a), 12301(g), 12302, 12304, or 12306 of title 10, United States Code,'' and inserting ''section 12341 of title 10, United States Code, for the purpose specified in section 12306, 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), or 12351(f) of such title,''.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Subsection (m) of section 206 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 3121) is amended—

(1) in each of paragraphs (1)(B) and (3), by striking ''inactive duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(2) in the heading for paragraph (3), by striking ''INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING'' and inserting ''INACTIVE DUTY''.

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE.— (1) Paragraph (19) of section 101 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505'' and inserting ''section 502(f) of this title for the purpose specified under section in section 112, 114, 316, 502, 503, 504, 505, 509, or 904''.

(2) Section 114 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking ''may not be considered to be a period of drill or training, but may be performed as funeral honors duty under section 115 of this title.'' and inserting ''may be performed under section 502 of this title.''.

(3) Section 115 of title 32, United States Code, is repealed.

(h) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE.— (1) The matter preceding subparagraph (A) of section 101(22) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(2) Section 204 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1) of subsections (g)—

(i) in each of subparagraphs (B) and (D), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (E);

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and

(B) in paragraph (1) of subsections (h)—

(i) in each of subparagraphs (B) and (D), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (E);

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period.

(3) Subparagraph (A) of section 205(e)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(4) Section 206 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**inactive-duty training**'' and inserting ''**inactive duty**''; and*

(B) in each of paragraphs (3)(A)(ii) and (3)(C) of subsection (a), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(5) Section 305b of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading for subsection (c), by striking ''INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING'' and inserting ''INACTIVE DUTY''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''12310(c)'' and inserting ''12353(c)(4)''.

(6) Subsection (a) of section 308d of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty for training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(7) The heading for subsection (e) of section 320 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING'' and inserting ''INACTIVE DUTY''.

(8) Section 334 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading for subsection (e), by striking ''INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING'' and inserting ''INACTIVE DUTY''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''for inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''for inactive duty''.

(9) Section 352 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading for subsection (d), by striking ''INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING'' and inserting ''INACTIVE DUTY''; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''for inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''for inactive duty''.

(10) Subparagraph (B) of section 353(c)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(11) Section 415 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3) of subsection (a), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(B) in paragraph (1) of subsection (c), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(12) Section 433 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''12319'' and inserting ''12351(g)''; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(13) Subsection (a) of section 433a of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''12319'' and inserting ''12351(g)''.

(14) Paragraph (1) of section 474(i) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(15) Section 478a of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**inactive duty training**'' and inserting ''**inactive duty**''; and*

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''inactive duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(16) Paragraph (1) of section 495(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''funeral honors duty pursuant to section 12503 of title 10 or section 115 of title 32'' and inserting ''funeral honors functions pursuant to section 12353(d)(2) of title 10 or section 502(g)(7) of title 32''.

(17) The matter preceding paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the matter following paragraph (2) of subsection (a), and subsection (d), of section 552 of title 37, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive-duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(18) Subparagraph (B) of section 910(b)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 12301(h)(1) of title 10'' and inserting ''section 12341 of title 10 pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 12353(b)(1) of such title''.

(i) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.— (1) Section 101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (22), by striking ''section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of title 32'' and inserting ''section 502(f) of title 32'';

(B) in paragraph (23)—

(i) by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(ii) in the matter following paragraph (C), by striking ''sections 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of title 32'' and inserting ''section 502(g) of title 32''; and

(C) in the matter preceding clause (i) of paragraph (24)(C), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(2) Subparagraph (B) and the matter following subparagraph (B) of section 106(d)(1) of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(3) Clause (ii) of section 1112(c)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(4) Paragraph (2) of section 1302(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(5) Subparagraph (A) of section 1312(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(6) Section 1965 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2), by striking ''sections 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of title 32'' and inserting ''section 502(f) of title 32'';

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''sections 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of title 32'' and inserting ''section 502(g) of title 32'';

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''inactive duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty'';

(D) in each of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (5), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(E) in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (5), by striking ''a mobilization category in the Individual Ready Reserve, as defined in section 12304(i)(1)'' and inserting ''a mobilization category in the Individual Ready Reserve, as defined in section 12351(i)(2)''.

(7) Section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (5), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in each of paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(ii) in the matter following paragraph (2), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(8) Section 1968 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty'';

(II) by striking ''scheduled training period'' and inserting ''scheduled period of duty''; and

(III) by striking ''such training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''such duty''; and

(B) in paragraph (2) of subsection (b), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(9) Paragraph (3) of section 1969(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(10) Subsection (e) of section 1977 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(11) Paragraph (2) of section 2402(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(12) Paragraph (3) of section 3011(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''which an individual in the Selected Reserve was ordered to perform under section 12301, 12302, 12304, 12306, or 12307 of title 10'' and inserting ''under section 12341 of title 10, which an individual in the Selected Reserve was ordered to perform duty for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f), 12353(a), or 12353(b) of title 10''.

(13) Subparagraph (A) of section 3013(f)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10'' and inserting ''or 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title''.

(14) Subsection (f) of section 3103 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10'' and inserting ''or 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title''.

(15) Paragraph (2) of section 3105(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10'' and inserting ''or 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title''.

(16) Clause (i) of section 3231(a)(5)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10'' and inserting ''or 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title''.

(17) Subparagraph (B) of section 3301(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10 or'' and inserting ''or 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title, or under''.

(18) Clause (i) of section 3312(c)(2)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10'' and inserting ''or 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title''.

(19) Clause (i) of section 3511(a)(2)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10'' and inserting ''or 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title''.

(20) Subsection (h) of section 3512 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10'' and inserting ''or 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title''.

(21) Subparagraph (C) of section 4211(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 12301(a), (d), or (g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10'' and inserting ''section 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title''.

(22) Section 4303 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (13)—

(i) by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''; and

(ii) by striking ''funeral honors duty as authorized by section 12503 of title 10 or section 115 of title 32'' and inserting ''funeral honors functions as provided under section 12353 of title 10 or section 114 of title 32''; and

(B) in paragraphs (16), by striking ''inactive duty training'' and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(23) Subsection (c) of section 4312 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''10147''; and inserting ''12352'';

(B) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4), by striking '', 12301(a), 12301(g), 12302, 12304, or 12305 of title 10'' and inserting ''or 12341 of title 10 for a purpose specified in section 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), 12351(f) or 12353(a) of such title'';

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''12304 of title 10'' and inserting ''12341 of title 10 for the purpose specified in section 12351(c) of such title'';

(ii) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) by inserting ''under section 12342 of title 10'' after ''Federal service''; and

(II) by inserting ''for a purpose specified'' following ''National Guard''; and

(iii) by striking ''under'' each place the term appears and inserting ''in''.

(24) Paragraph (1) of section 4316(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''funeral honors duty as authorized by section 12503 of title 10 or section 115 of title 32'' and inserting ''funeral honors functions as provided under section 12353 of title 10 or section 114 of title 32''.

(j) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 42, UNITED STATES CODE.— (1) Subparagraph (D) of section 202(t)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(t)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''or inactive duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''or inactive duty''; and

(B) by striking ''on inactive duty training'' and inserting ''performing inactive duty''.

(2) Subsection (l) of section 210 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), by striking ''on inactive duty training'' and inserting ''performing inactive duty''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''inactive duty training'' each place the term appears and inserting ''inactive duty''.

(k) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 50, APPENDIX, UNITED STATES CODE.— (1) Section 6 of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 456) is amended—

(A) in the matter following subsection (c)(2)(A)(iii), by striking ''10147'' and inserting ''12352''; and

(B) in paragraph (1) of subsection (d), by striking ''under section 10147'' and inserting ''pursuant to section 12352''.

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 703(a) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 593(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''sections 688, 12301(a), 12301(g), 12302, 12304, 12306, or 12307 of title 10, United States Code,'' and inserting ''section 688 or 12341 of title 10, United States Code, for a purpose specified in section 12306, 12307, 12351(a), 12351(b), 12351(c), or 12351(f) of such title,''; and

(B) by striking ''12301(d)'' and inserting ''12341 for the purpose specified in section 12353(a)''.

(l) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.— (1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the item related to section 1204 and inserting the following:

''1204. Members on active duty for 30 days or less or on inactive duty: retirement.'''';

and

(B) by striking the item relating to section 1206 and inserting the following:

''1206. Members on active duty for 30 days or less or on inactive duty: separation.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item related to section 1475 and inserting the following:

''1475. Death gratuity: death of members on active duty or inactive duty and of certain other persons.''.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1005 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 10147 and 10148.

(4) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1209 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''SUBCHAPTER I—ADMINISTRATION OF RESERVE DUTY

''Sec.
''12304a. Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve: order to active duty to provide assistance in response to a major disaster or emergency.
''12304b. Selected Reserve: order to active duty for preplanned missions in support of the combatant commands.
''12305. Authority of President to suspend certain laws relation to promotion, retirement, and separation.
''12306. Standby Reserve.
''12307. Retired Reserve.
''12308. Retention after becoming qualified for retired pay.
''12309. Reserve officers: use of in expansion of armed forces.
''12311. Active duty agreements.
''12312. Active duty agreements: release from duty.
''12313. Reserves: release from active duty.
''12314. Reserves: kinds of duty.
''12315. Reserves: duty with or without pay.
''12316. Payment of certain Reserves while on duty.
''12317. Reserves: theological students; limitations.
''12318. Reserves on active duty: duties; funding.
''12320. Reserve officers: grade in which ordered to active duty.
''12321. Reserve Officer Training Corps units: limitation on number of Reserves assigned.
''12323. Policies and procedures.

''SUBCHAPTER II—RESERVE DUTY AUTHORITIES

''Sec.
''12341. Active duty.
''12342. Call to Federal service.
''12343. Inactive duty.

''SUBCHAPTER III—PURPOSE OF RESERVE DUTY

''Sec.
''12351. Reserve component: required duty.
''12352. Reserve component: required training.
''12353. Reserve component: optional duty.''.

(5) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1213 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 12503.

(6) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1215 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 12552.

(7) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1217 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the items related to sections 12603 and 12604 and inserting the following:

''12603. Attendance at inactive duty assemblies: commercial travel at Federal supply schedule rates.
''12604. Billeting in Department of Defense facilities: Reserves attending inactive duty.''.

(8) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1805 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item related to section 18505 and inserting the following:

''18505. Reserves traveling for inactive duty: space-required travel on military aircraft.''.

(9) The table of chapters at the beginning of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 5 and inserting the following new item:

''5. Training and Other Duty.....501''.

(10) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 115.

(11) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 502 and inserting the following:

''502. Required training, field exercises, and other duty.''.

SEC. 526. EFFECTIVE DATE AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 2017.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing a plan to implement the amendments made by this subtitle when they take effect on the date specified in subsection (a).

(c) ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The report required by subsection (b) shall contain a draft of such legislation as may be necessary to make any additional technical and conforming changes to titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, and other provisions of law that are required or should be made by reason of the amendments made by this subtitle.

Subtitle D—General Service Authorities

SEC. 531. TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP AND PROVIDE ADDITIONAL RECRUITMENT INCENTIVES.

(a) ADDITIONAL RECRUITMENT INCENTIVES AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of a military department may develop and provide incentives, not otherwise authorized by law, to encourage individuals to accept an appointment as a commissioned officer, to accept an appointment as a warrant officer, or to enlist in an Armed Force under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(b) RELATION TO OTHER PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.—A recruitment incentive developed under subsection (a) may be provided—

(1) without regard to the lack of specific authority for the recruitment incentive under title 10 or 37, United States Code; and

(2) notwithstanding any provision of such titles, or any rule or regulation prescribed under such provision, relating to methods of providing incentives to individuals to accept appointments or enlistments in the Armed Forces, including the provision of group or individual bonuses, pay, or other incentives.

(c) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of a military department may not provide a recruitment incentive developed under subsection (a) until—

(1) the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a plan regarding provision of the recruitment incentive, which includes—

(A) a description of the incentive, including the purpose of the incentive and the potential recruits to be addressed by the incentive;

(B) a description of the provisions of titles 10 and 37, United States Code, from which the incentive would require a waiver and the rationale to support the waiver;

(C) a statement of the anticipated outcomes as a result of providing the incentive; and

(D) a description of the method to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the incentive; and

(2) the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the plan was received by Congress.

(d) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF INCENTIVES.—The Secretary of a military department may not provide more than three recruitment incentives under the authority of this section.

(e) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING INCENTIVES.—The number of individuals who receive one or more of the recruitment incentives provided under subsection (a) by the Secretary of a military department during a fiscal year for an Armed Force under the jurisdiction of the Secretary may not exceed 20 percent

of the accession objective of that Armed Force for that fiscal year.

(f) DURATION OF DEVELOPED INCENTIVE.—A recruitment incentive developed under subsection (a) may be provided for not longer than a three-year period beginning on the date on which the incentive is first provided, except that the Secretary of the military department concerned may extend the period if the Secretary determines that additional time is needed to fully evaluate the effectiveness of the incentive.

(g) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—If the Secretary of a military department provides an recruitment incentive under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report, not later than 60 days after the end of the fiscal year, containing—

(1) a description of each incentive provided under subsection (a) during that fiscal year; and

(2) an assessment of the impact of the incentives on the recruitment of individuals for an Armed Force under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(h) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES.—Notwithstanding subsection (f); the authority to provide recruitment incentives under this section expires on December 31, 2020.

SEC. 532. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT PILOT PROGRAMS ON CAREER FLEXIBILITY TO ENHANCE RETENTION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—Subsection (b) of section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 10 U.S.C. prec. 701 note) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS.—Subsection (c) of section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 10 U.S.C. prec. 701 note) is repealed.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 10 U.S.C. prec. 701 note) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) through (m) as subsections (b) through (k), respectively; and

(2) in subsections (b)(1), (d), and (f)(3)(D) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subsection (e)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (c)''.

SEC. 533. MODIFICATION OF NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS FOR CHANGE IN GROUND COMBAT EXCLUSION POLICY FOR FEMALE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) RULE FOR GROUND COMBAT PERSONNEL POLICY.—Section 652(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''before any such change is implemented'' and inserting ''not less than 30 calendar days before such change is implemented''; and

(B) by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by striking paragraph (5).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 652(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''calendar'' before ''days''.

SEC. 534. ROLE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN DEVELOPMENT OF GENDER-NEUTRAL OCCUPATIONAL STANDARDS.

Section 524(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3361; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) measure the combat readiness of combat units, including special operations forces.''.

SEC. 535. BURDENS OF PROOF APPLICABLE TO INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS RELATED TO PROTECTED COMMUNICATIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND PROHIBITED RETALIATORY ACTIONS.

(a) BURDENS OF PROOF.—Section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (i) and (j) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection (i):

''(i) BURDENS OF PROOF.—The burdens of proof specified in section 1221(e) of title 5 shall apply in any investigation conducted by an Inspector General under subsection (c) or (d), any review performed by a board for the correction of military records under subsection (g), and any review conducted by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (h).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to allegations pending or submitted under section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, on or after that date.

SEC. 536. REVISION OF NAME ON MILITARY SERVICE RECORD TO REFLECT CHANGE IN GENDER IDENTITY AFTER SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REVISION REQUIRED.—Section 1551 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) SERVICE UNDER ASSUMED NAME.—'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) CHANGE IN GENDER IDENTITY.—The Secretary concerned shall reissue a certificate of discharge or an order of acceptance of resignation in the new name of any person who, after separation from the armed forces, undergoes a change in gender identity and assumes a different name.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 1551 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1551. Correction of name after separation from service''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1551 and inserting the following new item:

''1551. Correction of name after separation from service.''.

SEC. 537. ESTABLISHMENT OF BREASTFEEDING POLICY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY.

The Secretary of the Army shall develop a comprehensive policy regarding breastfeeding by female members of the Army who are breastfeeding. At a minimum, the policy shall address the following:

(1) The provision of a designated room or area that will provide the member with adequate privacy and cleanliness and that includes an electrical outlet to facilitate the use of a breast pump. Restrooms should not be considered an appropriate location.

(2) An allowance for appropriate breaks, when practicable, to permit the member to breastfeed or utilize a breast pump.

SEC. 538. SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE REVIEW OF SECTION 504 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, REGARDING ENLISTING CERTAIN ALIENS IN THE ARMED FORCES.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for the purpose of making a determination and authorization pursuant to subsection (b)(2) of such section regarding the enlistment in the Armed Forces of an alien who possesses an employment authorization document issued under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program of the Department of Homeland Security established pursuant to the memorandum of the Secretary of Homeland Security dated June 15, 2012.

Subtitle E—Military Justice, Including Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Prevention and Response

SEC. 541. IMPROVEMENTS TO SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL PROGRAM.

(a) QUALIFICATIONS AND DESIGNATION.—Section 1044e(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''An individual'';

(2) by designating existing paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall direct the Secretary of each military department to implement additional selection criteria requiring that judge advocates have adequate criminal justice experience before they are assigned as Special Victims' Counsel.

''(3) The Secretary of Defense shall develop a policy to standardize both the time frame within which Special Victims' Counsel receive training and the training that each Special Victims' Counsel receives.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY.—Section 1044e(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs

''(3) The Secretary of Defense shall establish appropriate program performance measures and standards, including evaluating, monitoring, and reporting on the Special Victims' Counsel programs, establishing guiding principles for the military departments, and ensuring centralized, standardized assessment of program effectiveness and client satisfaction.

''(4) The Secretary of Defense shall direct the Secretary of each military department to perform regular evaluations to ensure that Special Victims' Counsel are assigned to locations that maximize the opportunity for face-to-face interactions between counsel and clients and to develop effective means by which a Special Victims' Counsel may communicate with a client when face-to-face communication is not feasible.''.

SEC. 542. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEE ACCESS TO SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL.

Section 1044e(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subparagraph:

''(C) A civilian employee of the Department of Defense who is not eligible for military legal assistance under section 1044(a)(7) of this title, but who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense, and the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned waives the condition in such section for the purposes of offering Special Victims' Counsel services to the employee.''.

SEC. 543. ACCESS TO SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL FOR FORMER DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 1044e(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subparagraph (C), as added by section 542, the following new subparagraph:

''(D) An individual who is a former dependent of a member or former member of the armed forces described in subparagraph (A) or (B), if the alleged sex-related offense—

''(i) was perpetrated by a person who is, or is reasonably believed to be, a person subject to chapter 47 of this title (the Uniform Code of Military Justice) pursuant to section 802 of this title (article 2(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice); and

''(ii) occurred while the individual was a dependent of the member or former member.''.

SEC. 544. REPRESENTATION AND ASSISTANCE FROM SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL IN RETALIATORY PROCEEDINGS.

Section 1044e(b) of title 10, United States Code is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

''(9) Legal representation and assistance in any action or proceeding that, in the judgment of the Special Victims' Counsel, may have been undertaken in retaliation for the victim's report of an alleged sex-related offense or for the victim's involvement in related military justice proceedings.''.

SEC. 545. TIMELY NOTIFICATION TO VICTIMS OF SEX-RELATED OFFENSES OF THE AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE FROM SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL.

Section 1044e(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Notice of the availability of a Special Victims' Counsel shall be provided to the victim before any of the personnel identified or designated by the Secretary concerned under this paragraph interviews, or requests any statement from, the victim regarding the alleged sex-related offense.''.

SEC. 546. PARTICIPATION BY VICTIM IN PUNITIVE PROCEEDINGS AND ACCESS TO RECORDS.

(a) VICTIM SUBMISSION OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY COMMANDING OFFICER IN NONJUDICIAL PUNISHMENT PROCEEDINGS.—Section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) VICTIM PARTICIPATION IN NONJUDICIAL PUNISHMENT PROCEEDINGS.—(1) For any offense that involves a victim, in any case in which a commanding officer or other person authorized to act under this section (article) is considering imposing a punishment authorized in subsection (b) on a member of the command, mitigation of a punishment under subsection (d), or an appeal of a punishment under subsection (e), the victim shall be provided an opportunity to submit written matters for consideration by the person authorized to act under this section (article).

''(2) The victim shall be notified of a commander's decision to consider a punishment, consider mitigating a punishment, or consider an appeal under this section (article). The victim shall also be notified of the opportunity to submit matters for consideration under this subsection.

''(3) The submission of matters under paragraph (1) shall be made within the three-day period the accused is given to seek legal counsel.

''(4) A victim may waive the right under this subsection to make a submission to the commanding officer or other person taking action under this section (article). Such a waiver shall be made in writing and may not be revoked.

''(5) In the case of proceedings under this section (article) for an offense that involved a victim, a copy of all prepared records of the proceedings, including a written copy of any admonition or reprimand, shall be given to the victim without charge and as soon as a decision is finalized. The victim shall be notified of the opportunity to receive the records of the proceedings under this subsection.

''(6) In this section, the term 'victim' means a person who has suffered a direct physical, emotional, or pecuniary loss as a result of a commission of an offense under this chapter (the Uniform Code of Military Justice) and on which a commanding officer or other person authorized to take action under this section (article) is taking action under this section (article).

''(7) This subsection applies only with respect to the Department of Defense.''.

(b) VICTIM SUBMISSION OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE SEPARATION PROCEEDINGS.—Chapter 59 of title 10, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1159. Victim participation in administrative separation proceedings

''(a)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall ensure that, when administrative separation is considered for a member of the of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps in connection to an offense that involved a victim, the person or board authorized to provide recommendations and act on recommendations for retention or separation under this chapter must consider the impact of the offense on the victim and the views of the victim on retention.

''(2) Such regulations shall ensure that victims are provided an opportunity to submit written matters for consideration, including, but not limited to, written testimony, to the person or board authorized to provide recommendations and act on recommendations for administrative separation proceedings under this chapter. A victim may waive the right under this section to make a submission.

''(b) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall ensure that a copy of all prepared records of the proceedings, including, but not limited to, the decision on retention or separation and any written explanation thereof, shall be given to the victim without charge and as soon as a decision is finalized. The victim shall be notified of the opportunity to receive the records of the proceedings under this subsection.

''(c) In this section, the term 'victim' means a person who has suffered a direct physical, emotional, or pecuniary loss as a result of a commission of an offense under chapter 47 of this title (the Uniform Code of Military Justice) and on which the armed forces are considering administrative separation or retention.''.

(c) VICTIM SUBMISSION OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE SEPARATION PROCEEDINGS OF OFFICERS.—Section 1185 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(c) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, when a board of inquiry is held under this section for an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps in connection with an offense that involved a victim, the board of inquiry—

''(1) shall consider the impact of the offense on the victim and the views of the victim on retention;

''(2) shall provide victims an opportunity to submit matters for consideration, including in-person testimony, although a victim may waive the right under this subsection to make a submission; and

''(3) shall provide victims with all prepared records of the proceedings, including the decision on retention or separation and any written explanation thereof.

''(d) When a record is withheld under subsection (a)(4), the victim shall, to the extent that the interest of national security permits, be furnished a summary of the record so withheld.

''(e) In this section, the term 'victim' means a person who has suffered a direct physical, emotional, or pecuniary loss as a result of a commission of an offense under chapter 47 of this title (the Uniform Code of Military Justice) and on which an officer is required to show cause for retention on active duty under section 1181 of this title.'''.

SEC. 547. VICTIM ACCESS TO REPORT OF RESULTS OF PRELIMINARY HEARING UNDER ARTICLE 32 OF THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

Section 832(c) of title 10, United States Code (article 32(c) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''REPORT OF RESULTS.—''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The report prepared under paragraph (1) shall be provided to the victim, without charge, at the same time as the report is delivered to the accused.''.

SEC. 548. MINIMUM CONFINEMENT PERIOD REQUIRED FOR CONVICTION OF CERTAIN SEX-RELATED OFFENSES COMMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) MANDATORY PUNISHMENTS.—Section 856(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code (article 56(b)(1) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) is amended by striking ''at a minimum'' and all that follows through the period at the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: ''at a minimum except as provided for in section 860 of this title (article 60)—

''(A) dismissal or dishonorable discharge; and

''(B) confinement for two years.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of section 856(b) of title 10, United States Code (article 56(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by subsection (a), shall apply to offenses specified in paragraph (2) of such section committed on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 549. STRATEGY TO PREVENT RETALIATION AGAINST MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO REPORT OR INTERVENE ON BEHALF OF THE VICTIM IN INSTANCES OF SEXUAL ASSAULT.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a comprehensive strategy to prevent retaliation carried out by members of the Armed Forces against other members who report or otherwise intervene on behalf of the victim in instances of sexual assault.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The comprehensive strategy required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Bystander intervention programs emphasizing the importance of guarding against such retaliation.

(2) Department of Defense and military department policies and requirements to ensure protection from retaliation against victims of sexual assault and members who intervene on behalf of a victim.

(3) Additional training for commanders on methods and procedures to combat attitudes and beliefs that lead to retaliation acts by members.

(c) RETALIATION DESCRIBED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''retaliation'' has the meaning given that term in the regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 1709(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) and shall include ostracism and other acts of maltreatment designated by the Secretary pursuant to subparagraph (B) of such section.

(d) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on the comprehensive strategy required by subsection (a).

SEC. 550. IMPROVED DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TO SEXUAL ASSAULTS IN WHICH THE VICTIM IS A MALE MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) PLAN TO IMPROVE PREVENTION AND RESPONSE.—The Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall develop a plan to improve Department of Defense prevention and response to sexual assaults in which the victim is a male member of the Armed Forces.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Sexual assault prevention and response training to more comprehensively and directly address the incidence of male members of the Armed Forces who are sexually assaulted and how certain behavior and activities, such as hazing, can constitute a sexual assault.

(2) Methods to evaluate the extent to which differences exist in the medical and mental health-care needs of male and female sexual assault victims, and the care regimen, if any, that will best meet those needs.

(3) Data-driven decision making to improve male-victim sexual assault prevention and response program efforts.

(4) Goals with associated metrics to drive the changes needed to address sexual assaults of male members of the Armed Forces.

(5) Information about the sexual victimization of males in communications to members that are used to raise awareness of sexual assault and efforts to prevent and respond to it.

(6) Guidance for the department's medical and mental health providers, and other personnel as appropriate, based on the results of the evaluation described in paragraph (2), that delineates these gender-specific distinctions and the care regimen that is recommended to most effectively meet those needs.

SEC. 551. SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TRAINING FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND INSTRUCTORS OF THE JUNIOR AND SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS.

(a) TRAINING AND EDUCATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary of a military department shall ensure that the commander of each unit of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps and all Professors of Military Science, senior military instructors, and civilian employees detailed, assigned, or employed as administrators and instructors of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps receive regular sexual assault prevention and response training and education.

(b) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Secretary of a military department shall ensure that information regarding the availability of legal assistance and the sexual assault prevention and response program is made available to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps personnel referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 552. MODIFICATION OF MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL TO REQUIRE CONSISTENT PREPARATION OF THE FULL RECORD OF TRIAL.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, Rule 1103 of the Manual for Courts-Martial (relating to preparation of the record of trial) shall be amended to ensure that, for any general or special court-martial proceeding under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), trial counsel shall prepare a complete record of trial, consisting of each available content item, matter, or attachment specified in the Rule. No content item, matter, or attachment may be exempted based on the outcome of the court-martial proceeding.

SEC. 553. INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN ANNUAL REPORTS REGARDING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE.

(a) ROLE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY ADVOCACY PROGRAM.—Section 1631(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting after ''by the report,'' the following: ''including all cases under the purview of the Department of Defense Family Advocacy Program pursuant to section 1058 of title 10, United States Code,'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''by the report,'' the following: ''including all cases under the purview of the Department of Defense Family Advocacy Program pursuant to such section 1058,''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by inserting after ''substantiated case,'' the following: ''including each case under the purview of the Department of Defense Family Advocacy Program pursuant to such section 1058,''.

(b) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION REGARDING SEXUAL HARASSMENT INVOLVING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1631(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12) Information and data collected on sexual harassment involving members of the Armed Forces during the year covered by the report. The information shall include the number of substantiated and unsubstantiated cases, a synopsis of each such substantiated case, and the action taken in each substantiated case, including the type of disciplinary or administrative sanction imposed, if any, such as conviction and sentence by court-martial, imposition of non-judicial punishment under section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or administrative separation or other type administrative action imposed.''.

(2) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ASSESSMENT OF INFORMATION IN REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 1631(d)(2) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by striking ''subsection (b)(11)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (11) and (12) of subsection (b)''.

(c) RETALIATION AGAINST ALLEGED VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT.—Section 1631(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by inserting after paragraph (12), as added by subsection (b), the following new paragraph:

''(13)(A) Information and data collected on reports of retaliation against alleged victims of sexual assault, including the number of substantiated and unsubstantiated cases.

''(B) In this paragraph, the term 'retaliation' has the meaning given such term by the Secretary of Defense as required by section 1709(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 962; 10 U.S.C. 113 note).''.

(d) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply beginning with the reports required to be submitted by March 1, 2016, under section 1631 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note).

SEC. 554. RETENTION OF CASE NOTES IN INVESTIGATIONS OF SEX-RELATED OFFENSES INVOLVING MEMBERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, OR MARINE CORPS.

(a) RETENTION OF ALL INVESTIGATIVE RECORDS REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall update Department of Defense records retention policies to ensure that, for all investigations relating to an alleged sex-related offense (as defined in section 1044e(g) of title 10, United States Code) involving a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, all elements of the case file shall be retained as part of the investigative records retained in accordance with section 3500 of title 18, United States Code, and section 586 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note).

(b) ELEMENTS.—In updating records retention policies as required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall address, at a minimum, the following matters:

(1) The elements of the case file to be retained must include, at a minimum, the case activity record, case review record, investigative plans, and all case notes made by an investigating agent or agents.

(2) All investigative records must be retained for no less than 50 years.

(3) No element of the case file may be destroyed until the expiration of the time that investigative records must be kept.

(4) Records may be stored digitally or in hard copy, in accordance with existing law or regulations or additionally prescribed policy considered necessary by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(c) CONSISTENT EDUCATION AND POLICY.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that existing policy, education, and training are updated to reflect policy changes in accordance with subsection (a).

(d) UNIFORM APPLICATION TO MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, the policy developed under subsections (a) is implemented uniformly by the military departments.

SEC. 555. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE REGARDING RELEASE OF MENTAL HEALTH RECORDS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES IN CASES INVOLVING ANY SEX-RELATED OFFENSE.

The Secretary of Defense shall establish and issue uniform guidance to ensure that, with respect to any case involving any sex-related offense, mental health records of the alleged victim of the sex-related offense and communications related to such mental health records that are maintained by a Department of Defense medical treatment facility are neither sought by investigators or military justice practitioners nor acknowledged or released by the medical treatment facility unless and until the production of such mental health records or communications has been ordered by a military judge or a hearing officer described in section 832(b) of title 10, United States Code (article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

SEC. 556. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall make available, electronically through a website of the Department of Defense, to the public all information specified in subsection (c) (subject to such exceptions as may apply under subsection (d)) for all of the proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice specified in subsection (b).

(b) COVERED PROCEEDINGS.—The system established under subsection (a) shall contain information for the following proceedings under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice):

(1) Special and general courts-martial under subchapter IV of such chapter.

(2) Actions by the convening authority under section 860 of such title (article 60).

(3) Reviews conducted by the Courts of Criminal Appeals under section 866 of such title (article 66).

(4) Reviews conducted by the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces under section 867 of such title (article 67).

(c) COVERED INFORMATION.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the following information, either directly or through links to another website, shall be made available through the system established under subsection (a) as soon as the information is reasonably available:

(1) The location of the proceeding and contact information for each base and court jurisdiction, including, when applicable, the name and telephone number of the legal office with jurisdiction over the proceeding.

(2) The calendar of proceedings.

(3) The docket information for the proceeding.

(4) Any motions and documents filed in connection with the proceeding.

(5) The substance of all written rulings and opinions issued in the proceeding, in a text-searchable format.

(6) The authenticated record of the proceeding.

(7) Any other information related to the proceeding that the Secretary of Defense determines to be useful to the public.

(d) PROTECTION OF PRIVACY AND SECURITY.—

(1) REVISION OF MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL.—The Manual for Courts-Martial shall be updated to address privacy and security concerns related to the electronic filing of documents and the public availability of documents made available through the system established under subsection (a). Such guidance must consider, at minimum, the protection of privacy of individuals named in records and status of records under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), section 552a of such title (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act), restricted reporting cases, and laws and guidance related to privilege. Such guidance shall provide to the extent practicable for uniform treatment of privacy and security issues throughout each proceeding specified in subsection (b) and across all branches of the Armed Forces. To the extent that such guidance provide for the redaction of certain categories of information to address privacy and security concerns, such guidance shall provide that a party that wishes to file an otherwise proper document containing such information may file an unredacted document under seal, which shall be retained as part of the proceeding as part of the record, and which, at the discretion of the court and subject to any applicable guidance issued in the Manual for Courts Martial, shall be either in lieu of, or in addition, to, a redacted copy in the public file.

(2) INTERIM GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of Defense may issue interim guidance, and interpretive statements relating to the application of such guidance, which conform to the requirements of paragraph (1) and which shall cease to have effect upon the effective date of the guidance required under paragraph (1). Pending issuance of the guidance required under paragraph (1), any guidance or order of any court, or of the Secretary of Defense, providing for the redaction of certain categories of information in order to address privacy and security concerns arising from electronic filing shall comply with, and be construed in conformity with, the last sentence of paragraph (1).

(e) ELECTRONIC FILINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d) or under paragraph (2), each court-martial and the courts specified in paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b) shall make each document that is filed electronically with the court available to the public through a website of the Department of Defense. To the extent practicable, the court shall convert any document that is filed in paper form to electronic form. To the extent such conversions are made, all such electronic versions of the document shall be made available to the public.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to any filed document that is not otherwise available to the public, such as a document filed under seal.

(f) MAINTENANCE OF DATA.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the information in the system established under subsection (a) is updated regularly and kept reasonably current. Electronic files and docket information for a proceeding closed for more than five years are not required to be made available through the system, except all written opinions with a date of issuance after the date specified in subsection (h) shall remain available to the public through the system.

(g) AUTHORIZATION TO CHARGE FEES.—The Secretary of Defense may prescribe reasonable fees for access to information made available through the system established under subsection (a). These fees may distinguish between classes of persons, and shall provide for exempting persons or classes of persons from the fees, in order to avoid unreasonable burdens and to promote public access to such information. The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe a schedule of reasonable fees for electronic access to information which the Secretary is required to maintain and make available to the public. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit each schedule of fees prescribed under this subsection to the Congress at least 30 days before the schedule of fees becomes effective.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—The information system required by this section shall be available to the public no later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and apply to all proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice specified in subsection (b) that have begun or been completed since the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 557. REVISION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE-TYPE MEMORANDUM 15-003, RELATING TO REGISTERED SEX OFFENDER IDENTIFICATION, NOTIFICATION, AND MONITORING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REVISION REQUIRED; DATABASE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall revise Department of Defense Directive-type Memorandum 15-003, relating to Registered Sex Offender Identification, Notification, and Monitoring in the Department of Defense, and all subsequent directive and guidance to ensure the following:

(1) All provisions of the Department of Defense Directive-type Memorandum 15-003 shall go into effect not later than 180 days after its revision under this section.

(2) The Department of Defense shall create a database (in this section referred to as the ''database'') to track the following sex offenders:

(A) Sex offenders who are active-duty or reserve component members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps or civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

(B) Former active-duty or reserve component members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps who have been convicted of a sex offense under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), if not already covered by subparagraph (A).

(3) For each individual identified in the database pursuant to paragraph (2)(A), the database shall contain the following information:

(A) The name of the sex offender (including any alias used by the individual).

(B) The Social Security number of the sex offender.

(C) A physical description of the sex offender.

(D) A current photograph of the sex offender.

(E) The address of each residence at which the sex offender resides.

(F) The name and address of any place where the sex offender is an employee, including the sex offender's current assignment, duty station, physical place of work, and deployment status, if applicable.

(G) The name and address of any place where the sex offender is a student.

(H) The text of the provision of law defining the criminal offense for which the sex offender is registered in accordance with the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248; 120 Stat. 587) or other Federal, State, or local laws.

(I) The criminal history of the sex offender, including the date of all arrests and convictions; the status of parole, probation, or supervised release; registration status in accordance with the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248; 120 Stat. 587) or other applicable Federal, State, or local laws; and the existence of any outstanding arrest warrants for the sex offender.

(J) Any other information required by Secretary of Defense.

(4) For each individual identified in the database pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), the database shall contain the following information:

(A) The name of the sex offender (including any alias used by the individual).

(B) The Social Security number of the sex offender.

(C) A physical description of the sex offender.

(D) A current photograph of the sex offender.

(E) The last known address of each residence of the sex offender and, if released or about to be released from a military correctional facility, the intended address of residence of the sex offender.

(F) The text of the provision of law defining the criminal offense for which the sex offender is registered in accordance with the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248; 120 Stat. 587) or other Federal, State, or local laws.

(G) The criminal history of the sex offender, including the date of all arrests and convictions; the status of parole, probation, or supervised release; registration status in accordance with the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248; 120 Stat. 587) or other Federal, State, or local laws; and the existence of any outstanding arrest warrants for the sex offender.

(H) Any other information required by Secretary of Defense.

(5) The database shall be available to local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies. In the case of each individual identified in the database pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) who fails to register with a sex offender registry in accordance with the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248; 120 Stat. 587) or other applicable Federal, State, or local laws, the Secretary of Defense shall make available on the Internet, in a manner that is readily accessible to the public, the following information:

(A) The name of the sex offender (including any alias used by the individual).

(B) A physical description of the sex offender.

(C) A most recent photograph of the sex offender.

(D) The last known address of each residence of the sex offender and, if applicable, the intended address of residence of the sex offender.

(E) The criminal offense for which the sex offender is registered in accordance with the

Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248; 120 Stat. 587) or other applicable Federal, State, or local laws.

(F) Notification that the sex offender has failed to register on a sex offender registry in accordance with Federal, State, or local laws.

(G) Any other information required by Secretary of Defense, in accordance with existing laws and regulations.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1631(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12) The number of individuals released from active-duty as a members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps as a result of a conviction of a sex-related offense, including the number who have registered with a local sex offender registry in accordance with local, State, and Federal law and the number who have failed to register with a local sex offender registry in accordance with local, State, and Federal law.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) In this section, the term ''sex offender'' means an individual who is required to be placed on a sexual offender registry by Federal, State, or local laws, including the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248; 120 Stat. 587).

(2) In this section, the term ''sex offense'' means an offense in a category of conduct punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice specified by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 115(a)(8)(C)(i) of Public Law 105–119 (10 U.S.C. 951 note).

SEC. 558. IMPROVED IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGES TO UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

The Secretary of Defense shall examine the Department of Defense and interagency review process for implementing statutory changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice for the purpose of developing options for streamlining such process. The Secretary shall adopt procedures to ensure that legal guidance is published at the same time as statutory changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice are implemented.

Subtitle F—Member Education, Training, and Transition

SEC. 561. AVAILABILITY OF PRESEPARATION COUNSELING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DISCHARGED OR RELEASED AFTER LIMITED ACTIVE DUTY.

Section 1142(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''that member's first 180 days of active duty'' and inserting ''the first 180 continuous days of active duty of the member''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) For purposes of calculating the days of active duty of a member under subparagraph (A), the Secretary concerned shall exclude any day on which—

''(i) the member performed full-time training duty or annual training duty; and

''(ii) the member attended, while in the active military service, a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary concerned.''.

SEC. 562. AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES UNDER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ADDITIONAL TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES.—(1) As part of the program carried out under this section, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, when the Coast Guard is not operating within the Department of the Navy, shall permit a member of the armed forces eligible for assistance under the program to elect to receive additional training in any of the following subjects:

''(A) Preparation for higher education or training.

''(B) Preparation for career or technical training.

''(C) Preparation for entrepreneurship.

''(D) Other training options determined by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, when the Coast Guard is not operating within the Department of the Navy.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, when the Coast Guard is not operating within the Department of the Navy, shall ensure that a member of the armed forces who elects to receive additional training in subjects available under paragraph (1) is able to receive the training.''.

SEC. 563. ENHANCEMENTS TO YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM.

(a) SCOPE AND PURPOSE.—Section 582(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by striking ''combat veteran''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS DEFINED.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'eligible individual' means a member of a reserve component, a member of their family, or a designated representative who the Secretary of Defense determines to be eligible for the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''National Guard and Reserve members and their families'' and inserting ''eligible individuals'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, their families,'' and inserting ''eligible individuals'';

(C) in subsection (d)(2)(C), by striking ''members of the Armed Forces and their families'' and inserting ''eligible individuals'';

(D) in subsection (h), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''members of the Armed Forces and their family members'' and inserting ''eligible individuals''; and

(ii) by striking ''such members and their family members'' and inserting ''such eligible individuals'';

(E) in subsection (j), by striking ''members of the Armed Forces and their families'' and inserting ''eligible individuals''; and

(F) in subsection (k), by striking ''individual members of the Armed Forces and their families'' and inserting ''eligible individuals''.

(c) OFFICE FOR REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.—Section 582(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (1)(B), by striking ''substance abuse and mental health treatment services'' and inserting ''substance abuse, mental health treatment, and other quality of life services''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) GRANTS.—The Office for Reintegration Programs may make grants to conduct data collection, trend analysis, and curriculum development and to prepare reports in support of activities under this section.''.

(d) OPERATION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) ENHANCED FLEXIBILITY.—Subsection (g) of section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) OPERATION OF PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office for Reintegration Programs shall assist State National Guard and Reserve organizations with the development and provision of information, events, and activities to support the health and well-being of eligible individuals before, during, and after periods of activation, mobilization, or deployment.

''(2) FOCUS OF INFORMATION, EVENTS, AND ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) BEFORE ACTIVATION, MOBILIZATION, OR DEPLOYMENT.—Before a period of activation, mobilization, or deployment, the information, events, and activities described in paragraph (1) should focus on preparing eligible individuals and affected communities for the rigors of activation, mobilization, and deployment.

''(B) DURING ACTIVATION, MOBILIZATION, OR DEPLOYMENT.—During such a period, the information, events, and activities described in paragraph (1) should focus on—

''(i) helping eligible individuals cope with the challenges and stress associated with such period;

''(ii) decreasing the isolation of eligible individuals during such period; and

''(iii) preparing eligible individuals for the challenges associated with reintegration.

''(C) AFTER ACTIVATION, MOBILIZATION, OR DEPLOYMENT.—After such a period, but no earlier than 30 days after demobilization, the information, events, and activities described in paragraph (1) should focus on—

''(i) reconnecting the member with their families, friends, and communities;

''(ii) providing information on employment opportunities;

''(iii) helping eligible individuals deal with the challenges of reintegration;

''(iv) ensuring that eligible individuals understand what benefits they are entitled to and what resources are available to help them overcome the challenges of reintegration; and

''(v) providing a forum for addressing negative behaviors related to operational stress and reintegration.

''(3) MEMBER PAY.—Members shall receive appropriate pay for days spent attending such events and activities.

''(4) MINIMUM NUMBER OF EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES.—The State National Guard and Reserve Organizations shall provide to eligible individuals—

''(A) one event or activity before a period of activation, mobilization, or deployment;

''(B) one event or activity during a period of activation, mobilization, or deployment; and

''(C) two events or activities after a period of activation, mobilization, or deployment.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''throughout the entire deployment cycle'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''well-being through the 4 phases'' through the end of the subsection and inserting ''well-being.'';

(ii) in the heading, by striking ''; DEPLOYMENT CYCLE'';

(C) in subsection (d)(2)(C), by striking ''throughout the deployment cycle described in subsection (g)''; and

(D) in the heading of subsection (f), by striking ''STATE DEPLOYMENT CYCLE''.

(e) ADDITIONAL PERMITTED OUTREACH SERVICE.—Section 582(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(16) Stress management and positive coping skills.''.

(f) SUPPORT OF DEPARTMENT-WIDE SUICIDE PREVENTION EFFORTS.—Section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

''(i) SUPPORT OF SUICIDE PREVENTION EFFORTS.—The Office for Reintegration Programs shall assist the Defense Suicide Prevention Office and the Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury to collect and analyze information, suggestions, and best practices from State National Guard and Reserve organizations with suicide prevention and community response programs.''.

(g) NAME CHANGE.—Section 582(d)(1)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by striking ''Substance Abuse and the Mental Health Services Administration'' and inserting ''Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration''.

SEC. 564. APPOINTMENTS TO MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES FROM NOMINATIONS MADE BY DELEGATES IN CONGRESS FROM THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, GUAM, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

(a) UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.—Section 4342(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''Three'' and inserting ''Four'';

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking ''Three'' and inserting ''Four'';

(3) in paragraph (9), by striking ''Two'' and inserting ''Three''; and

(4) in paragraph (10), by striking ''Two'' and inserting ''Three''.

(b) UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.—Section 6954(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''Three'' and inserting ''Four'';

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking ''Three'' and inserting ''Four'';

(3) in paragraph (9), by striking ''Two'' and inserting ''Three''; and

(4) in paragraph (10), by striking ''Two'' and inserting ''Three''.

(c) UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.—Section 9342(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''Three'' and inserting ''Four'';

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking ''Three'' and inserting ''Four'';

(3) in paragraph (9), by striking ''Two'' and inserting ''Three''; and

(4) in paragraph (10), by striking ''Two'' and inserting ''Three''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to the nomination of candidates for appointment to the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy for classes entering these military service academies after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 565. RECOGNITION OF ADDITIONAL INVOLUNTARY MOBILIZATION DUTY AUTHORITIES EXEMPT FROM FIVE-YEAR LIMIT ON REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS OF PERSONS WHO SERVE IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

Section 4312(c)(4)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''12304,'' the following: ''12304a, 12304b,''.

SEC. 566. JOB TRAINING AND POST-SERVICE PLACEMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Section 320 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting ''a subordinate Job Training and Post-Service Placement Executive Committee,'' before ''and such other committees'';

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) JOB TRAINING AND POST-SERVICE PLACEMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—The Job Training and Post-Service Placement Executive Committee described in subsection (b)(2) shall—

''(1) review existing policies, procedures, and practices of the Departments (including the military departments) with respect to job training and post-service placement programs; and

''(2) identify changes to such policies, procedures, and practices to improve job training and post-service placement.''; and

(3) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting '', including with respect to job training and post-service placement'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 567. DIRECT EMPLOYMENT PILOT PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to enhance the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members in the National Guard and Reserves.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The pilot program shall be offered to, and administered by, the adjutants general appointed under section 314 of title 32, United States Code.

(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—As a condition on the provision of funds under this section to a State to support the operation of the pilot program in the State, the State must agree to contribute an amount, derived from non-Federal sources, equal to at least 30 percent of the funds provided by the Secretary of Defense under this section.

(d) DIRECT EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM MODEL.—The pilot program should follow a job placement program model that focuses on working one-on-one with a member of a reserve component to cost-effectively provide job placement services, including services such as identifying unemployed and under employed members, job matching services, resume editing, interview preparation, and post-employment follow up. Development of the pilot program should be informed by State direct employment programs for members of the reserve components, such as the programs conducted in California and South Carolina.

(e) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop outcome measurements to evaluate the success of the pilot program.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the results of the pilot program. The Secretary shall prepare the report in coordination with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(2) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—A report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description and assessment of the effectiveness and achievements of the pilot program, including the number of members of the reserve components hired and the cost-per-placement of participating members.

(B) An assessment of the impact of the pilot program and increased reserve component employment levels on the readiness of members of the reserve components.

(C) Any other matters considered appropriate by the Secretary.

(g) LIMITATION ON TOTAL FISCAL-YEAR OBLIGATIONS.—The total amount obligated by the Secretary of Defense to carry out the pilot program for any fiscal year may not exceed $20,000,000.

(h) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority to carry out the pilot program expires September 30, 2018.

(2) EXTENSION.—Upon the expiration of the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may extend the pilot program for not more than two additional fiscal years.

SEC. 568. PROGRAM REGARDING CIVILIAN CREDENTIALING FOR SKILLS REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTIES.

Section 558 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 2015 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) INCLUSION OF SPECIFIED MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTIES.—The pilot program required by this section shall include at a minimum the following military occupational specialties:

''(1) Army 31B Military Police.

''(2) Navy MA Master-At-Arms.

''(3) Air Force 3P0X1 Security Forces.

''(4) Marine Corps 5811 Military Police.

''(5) Army 11B Infantryman.

''(6) Marine Corps 0311 Rifleman.''.

Subtitle G—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters

SEC. 571. CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO ASSIST LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES THAT BENEFIT DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS WITH SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS OF MILITARY DEPENDENT STUDENTS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities as specified in the funding table in section 4301, $30,000,000 shall be available only for the purpose of providing assistance to local educational agencies under subsection (a) of section 572 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 20 U.S.C. 7703b).

(b) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 8013(9) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7713(9)).

SEC. 572. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ASSIGNED TO SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES.

Section 554(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 1785 note) is amended by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 573. SUPPORT FOR EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND TRANSITION OF MILITARY DEPENDENT STUDENTS.

The Secretary of Defense may make grants to nonprofit organizations that provide services to improve the academic achievement of military dependent students, including those nonprofit organizations whose programs focus on improving the civic responsibility of military dependent students and their understanding of the Federal Government through direct exposure to the operations of the Federal Government.

SEC. 574. STUDY REGARDING FEASIBILITY OF USING DEERS TO TRACK DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WHO ARE ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY EDUCATION STUDENTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense

shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the results of a study regarding the feasibility of using the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS) to maintain records of where students who are dependents of members of the Armed Forces or Department of Defense civilian employees are enrolled in elementary or secondary education, be it private, public, or homeschooled.

SEC. 575. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SUPPORT FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ATTENDING SPECIALIZED CAMPS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) It has been shown that some members of the Armed Forces have a difficult time transitioning back into civilian life due to posttraumatic stress and other behavioral health disorders from traumatic events they experienced during combat.

(2) The children of returning members of the Armed Forces who suffer from post-traumatic stress and other behavioral health disorders often also suffer from severe distress due to the lack of a stable home environment and loss of a strong parental figure for guidance.

(3) The children of members of the Armed Forces who are in severe distress can be helped by being given the opportunity to participate in intensive specialized programs outside of their regular environment with other children who are going through similar situations.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should continue to support dependents of members of the Armed Forces in attending camps offered by nonprofit organizations that are using evidence-based practices to provide support to children grieving the loss of a parent, guardian, or sibling, or who have a parent, guardian, or sibling who suffers from post-traumatic stress or a behavioral health disorder.

Subtitle H—Decorations and Awards

SEC. 581. AUTHORIZATION FOR AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE CROSS FOR ACTS OF EXTRAORDINARY HEROISM DURING THE KOREAN WAR.

Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Army may award the Distinguished-Service Cross under section 3742 of such title to Edward Halcomb who, while serving in Korea as a member of the United States Army in the grade of Private First Class in Company B, 1st Battalion, 29th Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division, distinguished himself by acts of extraordinary heroism from August 20, 1950, to October 19, 1950, during the Korean War.

SEC. 582. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS REGARDING REVOCATION OF COMBAT VALOR AWARDS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1133 the following new section:

''§ 1133a. Limitation on revocation of combat valor awards

''The Secretary of a military department may not revoke a combat valor award awarded to a member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of that Secretary unless the conduct of the member during the period of service during which the distinguished act occurred was not honorable. The Secretary may not consider the characterization of the member's service outside of the actual time period covered by the award.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 57 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1133 the following new item:

''1133a. Limitation on revocation of combat valor awards.''.

SEC. 583. AWARD OF PURPLE HEART TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO WERE VICTIMS OF THE OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA, BOMBING.

Notwithstanding section 571(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3387), the Secretary of the military department concerned shall award the Purple Heart pursuant to section 1129a of title 10, United States Code, to the following members of the Armed Forces who were killed in the bombing that occurred at the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, on April 19, 1995:

(1) Sergeant First Class Lola Renee Bolden, United States Army.

(2) Sergeant Benjamin Laranzo Davis, United States Marine Corps.

(3) Captain Randolph Albert Guzman, United States Marine Corps.

(4) Airman First Class Lakesha Racquel Levy, United States Air Force.

(5) Airman First Class Cartney Jean Mcraven, United States Air Force.

(6) Master Sergeant Victoria Lee Sohn, United States Army.

Subtitle I—Reports and Other Matters

SEC. 591. AUTHORITY FOR UNITED STATES AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY TO CHARGE AND RETAIN TUITION FOR INSTRUCTION OF PERSONS OTHER THAN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL DETAILED FOR INSTRUCTION AT THE INSTITUTE.

(a) INSTITUTE INSTRUCTION OF PERSONS OTHER THAN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL.—Section 9314a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (c), (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as paragraph (4) of subsection (d), as so redesignated; and

(3) by inserting before subsection (d), as so redesignated, the following new subsections:

''(a) MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OTHER THAN THE AIR FORCE WHO ARE DETAILED TO THE INSTITUTE.—(1) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of Homeland Security shall bear the cost of the instruction at the Air Force Institute of Technology that is received by members of the armed forces detailed for that instruction by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Homeland Security, respectively.

''(2) Members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may only be detailed for instruction at the Institute on a space-available basis.

''(3) In the case of an enlisted member of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard detailed to receive instruction at the Institute, the Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the Secretary concerned only for such costs and fees as the Secretary considers appropriate (taking into consideration the admission of enlisted members on a space-available basis).

''(b) FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OTHER THAN AIR FORCE EMPLOYEES WHO ARE DETAILED TO THE INSTITUTE.—(1) The Institute shall charge tuition for the cost of providing instruction at the Institute for any civilian employee of a military department (other than a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force), of another component of the Department of Defense, or of another Federal agency who is detailed to receive instruction at the Institute.

''(2) The cost of any tuition charged an individual under this subsection shall be borne by the department, agency, or component that details the individual for instruction at the Institute.

''(c) NON-DETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to any of the following persons:

''(A) A member of the armed forces not detailed for that instruction by the Secretary concerned.

''(B) A civilian employee of a military department, of another component of the Department of Defense, of another Federal agency, or of a State's National Guard not detailed for that instruction by the Secretary concerned or head of the other Department of Defense component, other Federal agency, or the National Guard.

''(C) A United States citizen who is the recipient of a competitively selected Federal or Department of Defense sponsored scholarship or fellowship with a defense focus in areas of study related to the academic disciplines offered by the Air Force Institute of Technology and which requires a service commitment to the Federal government in exchange for educational financial assistance.

''(3) If a scholarship or fellowship described in paragraph (2)(C) includes a stipend, the Institute may accept the stipend payment from the scholarship or fellowship sponsor and make a direct payment to the individual.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATED TO REDESIGNATION AND OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 9314a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''ADMISSION AUTHORIZED'' and inserting ''DEFENSE INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''paragraph (4)''; and

(C) in paragraph (4), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2), by striking ''ELIGIBLE DEFENSE INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES.—'';

(2) in subsection (f)(1), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(1)'';

(3) in subsection (g)(1), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''under this section'' and inserting ''under subsections (c) and (d)''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''who are detailed to receive instruction at the Institute under subsection (b)''; and

(4) in subsection (h), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by striking ''defense industry employees enrolled under this section'' and inserting ''persons enrolled under this section who are not members of the armed forces or Government civilian employees''.

(c) CONDITIONS ON ADMISSION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRY CIVILIANS.—Subsection (e)(1) of section 9314a of title 10, United States Code, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking ''will be done on a space-available basis and not require an increase in the size of the faculty'' and inserting ''will not require an increase in the permanently authorized size of the faculty''.

(d) STATUTORY REORGANIZATION.—Chapter 901 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by transferring subsections (d) and (f) of section 9314 to the end of section 9314b and redesignating those subsections as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by striking subsection (e) of section 9314.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADINGS.—(A) The heading of section 9314 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 9314. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: degree granting authority''.

(B) The heading of section 9314a of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 9314a. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: reimbursement and tuition; instruction of persons other than Air Force personnel''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 901 of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 9314 and 9314a and inserting the following new items:

''9314. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: degree granting authority.

''9314a. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: reimbursement and tuition; instruction of persons other than Air Force personnel.''.

SEC. 592. HONORING CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS AS VETERANS.

(a) VETERAN STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 107 the following new section:

''§ 107A. Honoring as veterans certain persons who performed service in the reserve components

''Any person who is entitled under chapter 1223 of title 10 to retired pay for nonregular service or, but for age, would be entitled under such chapter to retired pay for nonregular service shall be honored as a veteran but shall not be entitled to any benefit by reason of this section.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 107 the following new item:

''107A. Honoring as veterans certain persons who performed service in the reserve components''.

(b) CLARIFICATION REGARDING BENEFITS.—No person may receive any benefit under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs solely by reason of section 107A of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 593. SUPPORT FOR DESIGNATION OF 2015 AS THE YEAR OF THE MILITARY DIVER.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Military divers are serving and have served in the noble and self-sacrificing profession of military diving in the Armed Forces.

(2) Military divers were created at the turn of the twentieth century, the trademark of diving is the Mark Five Dive Helmet created in 1915.

(3) Military divers perform a dangerous and selfless task often without recognition, risking their lives on behalf of the United States.

(4) The United States will forever be in debt to personnel in the profession of military diving for their bravery and sacrifice in times of peace and war.

(5) People in the United States should express their recognition and gratitude for military divers and the diving profession.

(6) In 1939, when the submarine U.S.S. Squalus sank, Navy divers used an experimental rig to rescue all 33 sailors aboard the vessel who survived the initial sinking, and the divers were awarded the Medal of Honor for their role in the rescue.

(7) In 1941, after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Navy divers raised every battleship that was sunk at Pearl Harbor, to the surface (with the exception of the U.S.S. Arizona, U.S.S. Utah, and the U.S.S. Oklahoma).

(8) The raised ships were repaired and sent back out to fight the Imperial Japanese Navy.

(9) In 1986, when Space Shuttle Challenger exploded, Navy divers recovered the remains and debris.

(10) In 1999, when John F. Kennedy Jr., Carolyn Bessette, and Lauren Bessette died in a plane crash, Navy divers recovered their remains and debris.

(11) In 2003, during the Quecreek Mine Rescue in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, Navy divers treated the recovered miners in Fly Away Recompression Chambers.

(12) 2015 would be an appropriate year to highlight the achievements of the military diver.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings under subsection (a), Congress—

(1) reaffirms its support for the sacrifices made by military divers during the past 100 years;

(2) recognizes the sacrifices of those who have volunteered as military divers for their bravery; and

(3) encourages and supports the Department of Defense to designate 2015 as the Year of the Military Diver to honor those who are serving and have served in the noble and self-sacrificing profession of military diving in the Armed Forces.

SEC. 594. TRANSFER AND ADOPTION OF MILITARY ANIMALS.

(a) AVAILABILITY FOR ADOPTION.—Section 2583(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''may'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting ''shall''.

(b) AUTHORIZED RECIPIENTS.—Subsection (c) of section 2583 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AUTHORIZED RECIPIENTS.—(1) A military animal shall be made available for adoption under this section, in order of recommended priority—

''(A) by former handlers of the animal;

''(B) by law enforcement agencies; and

''(C) by other persons capable of humanely caring for the animal.

''(2) If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that an adoption is justified under subsection (a)(2) under circumstances under which the handler of a military working dog is wounded in action, the dog shall be made available for adoption only by the handler. If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that such an adoption is justified under circumstances under which the handler of a military working dog is killed in action or dies of wounds received in action, the military working dog shall be made available for adoption only by a parent, child, spouse, or sibling of the deceased handler.''.

SEC. 595. COORDINATION WITH NON-GOVERNMENT SUICIDE PREVENTION ORGANIZATIONS AND AGENCIES TO ASSIST IN REDUCING SUICIDES.

(a) POLICY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop a policy to coordinate the efforts of the Department of Defense and non-government suicide prevention organizations regarding—

(A) the use of such non-government organizations to reduce the number of suicides among members of the Armed Forces by comprehensively addressing the needs of members of the Armed Forces who have been identified as being at risk of suicide;

(B) the delineation of the responsibilities within the Department of Defense regarding interaction with such organizations; and

(C) the collection of data regarding the efficacy and cost of coordinating with such organizations; and

(D) the preparation and preservation of any reporting material the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this section.

(2) SELECTION OF ORGANIZATIONS.—The policy required by paragraph (1) shall include a policy on the identification of appropriate non-government organizations by the Secretary of Defense using factors developed by the Secretary. Such factors shall include—

(A) the record of an organization in reducing suicide rates among participants in the programs carried out by the organization;

(B) the familiarity of an organization with the structure, ethos, and environment of the Armed Forces;

(C) the demonstrated experience of an organization in understanding and working with injured and disabled members of the Armed Forces, including those who were injured in combat;

(D) the expertise of an organization in improving the emotional well being, mental clarity, and ability to perform missions of program participants; and

(E) the expertise of an organization in improving the health and fitness of program participants.

(3) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall be authorized to take any necessary measures to prevent suicides by members of the Armed Forces, including by facilitating the access of members of the Armed Forces to successful non-governmental treatment regimen.

(4) CONSULTATION.—In developing the policy under this subsection, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Secretaries of each of the military departments and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(b) SUBMISSION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a copy of the policy developed under this section.

(2) DEADLINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the policy developed under this section is implemented by not later than the date that is 180 days after the submission of the policy under paragraph (1).

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

SEC. 601. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY INCREASE IN RATES OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

Section 403(b)(7)(E) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016''.

SEC. 602. PROHIBITION ON PER DIEM ALLOWANCE REDUCTIONS BASED ON THE DURATION OF TEMPORARY DUTY ASSIGNMENT OR CIVILIAN TRAVEL.

(a) MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.—Section 474(d)(3) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Secretaries concerned shall not alter the amount of the per diem allowance, or the maximum amount of reimbursement, for a locality based on the duration of the temporary duty assignment of a member of the uniformed services in the locality.''.

(b) CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.—Section 5702(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Secretary of the Department of Defense shall not alter the amount of the per diem allowance, or the maximum amount of reimbursement, for a locality based on the duration of the travel of an employee of the Department in the locality.''.

(c) REPEAL OF POLICY AND REGULATIONS.—The policy, and any regulations issued pursuant to such policy, implemented by the Secretary of the Department of Defense on November 1, 2014, with respect to reductions in per diem allowances based on duration of temporary duty assignment or civilian travel shall have no force or effect.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

SEC. 611. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR RESERVE FORCES.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016'':

(1) Section 308b(g), relating to Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus.

(2) Section 308c(i), relating to Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus.

(3) Section 308d(c), relating to special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units.

(4) Section 308g(f)(2), relating to Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service.

(5) Section 308h(e), relating to Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

(6) Section 308i(f), relating to Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

(7) Section 478a(e), relating to reimbursement of travel expenses for inactive-duty training outside of normal commuting distance.

(8) Section 910(g), relating to income replacement payments for reserve component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service.

SEC. 612. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS.

(a) TITLE 10 AUTHORITIES.—The following sections of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016'':

(1) Section 2130a(a)(1), relating to nurse officer candidate accession program.

(2) Section 16302(d), relating to repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve.

(b) TITLE 37 AUTHORITIES.—The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016'':

(1) Section 302c–1(f), relating to accession and retention bonuses for psychologists.

(2) Section 302d(a)(1), relating to accession bonus for registered nurses.

(3) Section 302e(a)(1), relating to incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists.

(4) Section 302g(e), relating to special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties.

(5) Section 302h(a)(1), relating to accession bonus for dental officers.

(6) Section 302j(a), relating to accession bonus for pharmacy officers.

(7) Section 302k(f), relating to accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties.

(8) Section 302l(g), relating to accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

SEC. 613. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF SPECIAL PAY AND BONUS AUTHORITIES FOR NUCLEAR OFFICERS.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016'':

(1) Section 312(f), relating to special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service.

(2) Section 312b(c), relating to nuclear career accession bonus.

(3) Section 312c(d), relating to nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

SEC. 614. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO TITLE 37 CONSOLIDATED SPECIAL PAY, INCENTIVE PAY, AND BONUS AUTHORITIES.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016'':

(1) Section 331(h), relating to general bonus authority for enlisted members.

(2) Section 332(g), relating to general bonus authority for officers.

(3) Section 333(i), relating to special bonus and incentive pay authorities for nuclear officers.

(4) Section 334(i), relating to special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities for officers.

(5) Section 335(k), relating to special bonus and incentive pay authorities for officers in health professions.

(6) Section 336(g), relating to contracting bonus for cadets and midshipmen enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(7) Section 351(h), relating to hazardous duty pay.

(8) Section 352(g), relating to assignment pay or special duty pay.

(9) Section 353(i), relating to skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus.

(10) Section 355(h), relating to retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units.

SEC. 615. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO PAYMENT OF OTHER TITLE 37 BONUSES AND SPECIAL PAYS.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016'':

(1) Section 301b(a), relating to aviation officer retention bonus.

(2) Section 307a(g), relating to assignment incentive pay.

(3) Section 308(g), relating to reenlistment bonus for active members.

(4) Section 309(e), relating to enlistment bonus.

(5) Section 316a(g), relating to incentive pay for members of precommissioning programs pursuing foreign language proficiency.

(6) Section 324(g), relating to accession bonus for new officers in critical skills.

(7) Section 326(g), relating to incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage.

(8) Section 327(h), relating to incentive bonus for transfer between branches of the Armed Forces.

(9) Section 330(f), relating to accession bonus for officer candidates.

SEC. 616. INCREASE IN MAXIMUM ANNUAL AMOUNT OF NUCLEAR OFFICER BONUS PAY.

Section 333(d)(1)(A) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$35,000'' and inserting ''$50,000''.

SEC. 617. MODIFICATION TO SPECIAL AVIATION INCENTIVE PAY AND BONUS AUTHORITIES FOR OFFICERS.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY TO SET REQUIREMENTS FOR AVIATION INCENTIVE PAY ELIGIBILITY.—Section 334(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) INCENTIVE PAY AUTHORIZED; ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary'';

(2) by designating existing paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E), respectively, and moving the margin of such subparagraphs, as so designated, 2 ems to the right; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) OFFICERS NOT CURRENTLY ENGAGED IN FLYING DUTY.—The Secretary concerned may pay aviation incentive pay under this section to an officer who is otherwise qualified for such pay but who is not currently engaged in the performance of operational flying duty or proficiency flying duty if the Secretary determines, under regulations prescribed under section 374 of this title, that payment of aviation incentive pay to that officer is in the best interests of the service.''.

(b) RESTORATION OF AUTHORITY TO PAY AVIATION INCENTIVE PAY TO MEDICAL OFFICERS PERFORMING FLIGHT SURGEON DUTIES.—Section 334(h)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''(except a flight surgeon or other medical officer)''.

(c) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF AVIATION SPECIAL PAYS.—Section 334(c)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$850'' and inserting ''$1,000'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), is amended by striking ''$25,000'' and inserting ''$35,000''.

(d) AUTHORITY TO PAY AVIATION BONUS AND SKILL INCENTIVE PAY SIMULTANEOUSLY TO OFFICERS.—Section 334(f) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''353'' and inserting ''353(a)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''a payment'' and inserting ''a bonus payment''; and

(B) by striking ''353'' and inserting ''353(b)''.

SEC. 618. REPEAL OF OBSOLETE SPECIAL TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCE FOR SURVIVORS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM THE VIETNAM CONFLICT.

(a) REPEAL AND REDESIGNATION.—Section 481f of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO CROSS REFERENCE.—Section 2493(a)(4)(B)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 481f(e)'' and inserting ''section 481f(d)''.

Subtitle C—Modernization of Military Retirement System

SEC. 631. FULL PARTICIPATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES IN THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN.

(a) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 8440e(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(1) the term 'basic pay' means basic pay payable under section 204 of title 37;

''(2) the term 'full TSP member' means a member described in subsection (e)(1);

''(3) the term 'member' has the meaning given the term in section 211 of title 37; and

''(4) the term 'Secretary concerned' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 37.''.

(2) TSP MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—Subsection (e) of section 8440e of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(e) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

''(1) TSP MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned shall make contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund, in accordance with section 8432 of this title (except to the extent the requirements under such section are modified by this subsection), for the benefit of a member—

''(A) who first enters a uniformed service on or after October 1, 2017; or

''(B) who entered a uniformed service before that date, but who makes the election described in section 1409(b)(4) of title 10 to receive Thrift Savings Plan matching contributions under this subsection in exchange for the reduced multipliers described in section 1409(b)(4)(B) of title 10 for purposes of calculating the retired pay of the member.

''(2) MATCHING AMOUNT.—The amount contributed under this subsection by the Secretary concerned with respect to any contribution made by a full TSP member for any pay period shall be equal to such portion of the total

amount of the member's contribution as does not exceed 5 percent of the member's basic pay for the pay period. Such amount contributed under this subsection is instead of, and not in addition to, amounts contributed under section 8432(c)(2) of this title.

''(3) TIMING AND DURATION OF MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary concerned shall make a contribution under this subsection on behalf of a full TSP member for any pay period for the member that—

''(A) begins on or after December 1, 2017; and

''(B) covers any period of service by the member after the member completes two years of service.

''(4) PROTECTIONS FOR SPOUSES AND FORMER SPOUSES.—Section 8435 of this title shall apply to a full TSP member in the same manner as such section is applied to an employee or Member under such section.''.

(b) AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT IN THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN.—Section 8432(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking ''Members'' and inserting ''(ii) Except in the case of a full TSP member (as defined in section 8440e(a) of this title), members'';

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''8440e(a)(1)'' and inserting ''8440e(b)(1)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, if a full TSP member (as defined in section 8440e(a) of this title) has declined automatic enrollment into the Thrift Savings Plan for a year, the full TSP member shall be automatically reenrolled on January 1 of the succeeding year, with contributions under subsection (a) at the default percentage of basic pay.''.

(c) VESTING.—

(1) TWO-YEARS OF SERVICE.—Section 8432(g)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) 2 years of service in the case of a member of the uniformed services.''.

(2) SEPARATION.—Section 8432(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) For purposes of this subsection, a member of the uniformed services shall be considered to have separated from Government employment if the member is discharged or released from service in the uniformed services.''.

(d) THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN DEFAULT INVESTMENT FUND.—Section 8438(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''(A) Consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (B), if an'' and inserting ''If an''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B).

(e) REPEAL OF SEPARATE CONTRIBUTION AGREEMENT AUTHORITY.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 211 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8432b(c)(2)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''(including pursuant to an agreement under section 211(d) of title 37)''.

SEC. 632. MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) REGULAR SERVICE.—Section 1409(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

''(A) REDUCED MULTIPLIER FOR FULL TSP MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), in the case of a member who first becomes a member of the uniformed services on or after October 1, 2017, or a member who makes the election described in subparagraph (B) (referred to as a 'full TSP member')—

''(i) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting '2' for '2½';

''(ii) clause (i) of paragraph (3)(B) shall be applied by substituting '60 percent' for '75 percent'; and

''(iii) clause (ii)(I) of such paragraph shall be applied by substituting '2' for '2½'.

''(B) ELECTION TO PARTICIPATE IN MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Pursuant to subparagraph (C), a member of a uniformed service serving on September 30, 2017, may elect, in exchange for the reduced multipliers described in subparagraph (A) for purposes of calculating the retired pay of the member, to receive Thrift Savings Plan matching contributions pursuant to section 8440e(e) of title 5.

''(C) ELECTION PERIOD.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), a member of a uniformed service may make the election authorized by subparagraph (B) only during the period that begins on January 1, 2018, and ends on December 31, 2018.

''(ii) HARDSHIP EXTENSION.—The Secretary concerned may extend the election period described in clause (i) for a member who experiences a hardship as determined by the Secretary concerned.

''(iii) EFFECT OF BREAK IN SERVICE.—A member of a uniformed service who returns to service after a break in service that occurs during the election period specified in clause (i) shall make the election described in subparagraph (B) within 30 days after the date of the reentry into service of the member.

''(D) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations to implement this paragraph.''.

(b) NON-REGULAR SERVICE.—Section 12739 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

''(1) REDUCED MULTIPLIER FOR FULL TSP MEMBERS.—In the case of a person who first performs reserve component service on or after October 1, 2017, after not having performed regular or reserve component service on or before that date—

''(A) subsection (a)(2) shall be applied by substituting '2 percent' for '2½ percent';

''(B) subparagraph (A) of subsection (c)(2) shall be applied by substituting '60 percent' for '75 percent'; and

''(C) subparagraph (B)(ii) of such subsection shall be applied by substituting '2 percent' for '2½ percent'.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations to implement this subsection.''.

(c) COORDINATING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER RETIREMENT AUTHORITIES.—

(1) DISABILITY, WARRANT OFFICERS, AND DOPMA RETIRED PAY.—

(A) COMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY.—The table in section 1401(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1) in column 2 of formula number 1, by striking ''2½% of years of service credited to him under section 1208'' and inserting ''the retired pay multiplier determined for the member under section 1409 of this title''; and

(ii) in paragraph (1) in column 2 of formula number 2, by striking ''2½% of years of service credited to him under section 1208'' and inserting ''the retired pay multiplier determined for the member under section 1409 of this title''; and

(iii) in column 2 of each of formula number 4 and formula number 5, by striking ''section 1409(a)'' and inserting ''section 1409''.

(B) CLARIFICATION REGARDING MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 1401a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

''(5) ADJUSTMENTS FOR PARTICIPANTS IN MODERNIZED RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), if a member or former member makes the election described in section 1409(b)(4) of this title, the Secretary shall increase the retired pay of such member in accordance with paragraph (2).''.

(2) 15-YEAR CAREER STATUS BONUS.—Section 354 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (f)—

(i) by striking ''If a'' and inserting ''(1) If a''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) If a person who is paid a bonus under this section subsequently makes an election described in section 1409(b)(4) of title 10, the person shall repay any bonus payments received under this section in the same manner as repayments are made under section 373 of this title.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) SUNSET AND CONTINUATION OF PAYMENTS.—(1) A Secretary concerned may not pay a new bonus under this section after September 30, 2017.

''(2) Subject to subsection (f)(2), the Secretary concerned may continue to make payments for bonuses that were awarded under this section on or before the date specified in paragraph (1).''.

(3) APPLICATION TO NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION COMMISSIONED CORPS.—Paragraph (2) of section 245(a) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002 (33 U.S.C. 3045(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) the retired pay multiplier determined under section 1409 of such title for the number of years of service that may be credited to the officer under section 1405 of such title as if the officer's service were service as a member of the Armed Forces.''.

(4) APPLICATION TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.—Section 211(a)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 212(a)(4)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''at the rate of 2 ½ per centum of the basic pay of the highest grade held by him as such officer'' and inserting ''calculated by multiplying the retired pay base determined under section 1406 of title 10, United States Code, by the retired pay multiplier determined under section 1409 of such title for the numbers of years of service credited to the officer under this paragraph''; and

(B) in the matter following subparagraph (B)(iii)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''such pay, and'' and inserting ''such pay,''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''such basic pay.'' and inserting ''such basic pay, and (E) in the case of any officer who makes the election described in section 1409(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, subparagraph (C) shall be applied by substituting '40 per centum' for '50 per centum' each place the term appears.''.

(d) CONFORMING DELAY IN COST-OF-LIVING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DELAY.—The amendments made by section 403(a) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–67; 127 Stat. 1186), as amended by section 10001 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113–76; 128 Stat. 151) and section 2 of Public Law 113–82 (128 Stat. 1009), shall take effect

on October 1, 2017, rather than December 1, 2015.

(2) COVERED MEMBERS.—Subparagraph (G) of section 1401a(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, which shall take effect October 1, 2017, pursuant paragraph (1) and section 403(a) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–67; 127 Stat. 1186), section 10001 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113–76; 128 Stat. 151) and section 2 of Public Law 113–82 (128 Stat. 1009), is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''October 1, 2017''.

(3) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, section 623 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3403) is repealed.

SEC. 633. CONTINUATION PAY FOR FULL TSP MEMBERS WITH 12 YEARS OF SERVICE.

(a) CONTINUATION PAY.—Subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 356. Continuation pay: full TSP members with 12 years of service

''(a) CONTINUATION PAY.—The Secretary concerned shall make a payment of continuation pay to each full TSP member (as defined in section 8440e(a) of title 5) of the uniformed services under the jurisdiction of the Secretary who—

''(1) completes 12 years of service; and

''(2) enters into an agreement with the Secretary to serve for an additional 4 years of obligated service.

''(b) AMOUNT.—The amount of continuation pay payable to a full TSP member under subsection (a) shall be the amount that is equal to—

''(1) in the case of a member of a regular component—

''(A) the monthly basic pay of the member at 12 years of service multiplied by 2.5; plus

''(B) at the discretion of the Secretary concerned, the monthly basic pay of the member at 12 years of service multiplied by such number of months (not to exceed 13 months) as the Secretary concerned shall specify in the agreement of the member under subsection (a); and

''(2) in the case of a member of a reserve component—

''(A) the amount of monthly basic pay to which the member would be entitled at 12 years of service if the member were a member of a regular component multiplied by 0.5; plus

''(B) at the discretion of the Secretary concerned, the amount of monthly basic pay described in subparagraph (A) multiplied by such number of months (not to exceed 6 months) as the Secretary concerned shall specify in the agreement of the member under subsection (a).

''(c) ADDITIONAL DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY.—In addition to the continuation pay required under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may provide pay continuation pay under this subsection to a full TSP member described in subsection (a), and subject to the service agreement referred to in paragraph (2) of such subsection, in an amount determined by the Secretary concerned.

''(d) TIMING OF PAYMENT.—The Secretary concerned shall pay continuation pay under subsection (a) to a full TSP member when the member completes 12 years of service. If the Secretary concerned also provides continuation pay under subsection (c) to the member, that continuation pay shall be provided when the member completes 12 years of service.

''(e) LUMP SUM OR INSTALLMENTS.—A full TSP member may elect to receive continuation pay provided under subsection (a) or (c) in a lump sum or in a series of not more than four payments.

''(f) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—Continuation pay under this section is in addition to any other pay or allowance to which the full TSP member is entitled.

''(g) REPAYMENT.—A full TSP member who receives continuation pay under this section (a) and fails to complete the obligated service required under such subsection shall be subject to the repayment provisions of section 373 of this title.

''(h) REGULATIONS.—Each Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''356. Continuation pay: full TSP members with 12 years of service.''.

SEC. 634. EFFECTIVE DATE AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in section 632(d)(3), the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 2017.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretaries concerned shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing a plan to ensure the full and effective commencement of the implementation of the amendments made by this section on the date specified in subsection (a). The Secretaries concerned, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board shall take appropriate actions to ensure the full and effective implementation of the amendments.

(c) ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The report required by subsection (b) shall contain a draft of such legislation as may be necessary to make any additional technical and conforming changes to titles 10 and 37, United States Code, and other provisions of law that are required or should be made by reason of the amendments made by this subtitle.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

(2) The term ''Secretary concerned'' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 37, United States Code.

Subtitle D—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations

SEC. 641. PRESERVING ASSURED COMMISSARY SUPPLY TO ASIA AND THE PACIFIC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that there are no changes to the second destination transportation policy that currently applies to fresh fruit and vegetable supplies for commissaries in Asia and the Pacific until the Defense Commissary Agency conducts and submits to Congress a comprehensive study on fresh fruit and vegetable supply for the region.

(b) ELEMENTS OF STUDY.—The study required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, for Japan, South Korea, Okinawa, and Guam—

(1) an item-by-item review of the price, quality, and availability of fresh fruits and vegetables under both local sourcing models and second destination models, including an updated market survey of fresh fruits and vegetables in each location;

(2) an item-by-item review of fresh fruits and vegetables to determine the most cost-effective way to supply each item in each location year-round without increasing prices to commissary consumers; and

(3) a comprehensive review of supply models that would lower costs to the Defense Working Capital Fund, DECA, without increasing prices for commissary patrons.

SEC. 642. PROHIBITION ON REPLACEMENT OR CONSOLIDATION OF DEFENSE COMMISSARY AND EXCHANGE SYSTEMS PENDING SUBMISSION OF REQUIRED REPORT ON DEFENSE COMMISSARY SYSTEM.

The Secretary of Defense shall take no action to replace or consolidate the defense commissary and exchange systems, including through the establishment of a new defense resale system, before submission of the report on the defense commissary system required by section 634 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 651. IMPROVEMENT OF FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS OF MEMBERS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should strengthen arrangements with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government and nonprofit organizations in order to improve the financial literacy and preparedness of members of the Armed Forces; and

(2) the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps should provide support for the financial literacy and preparedness training carried out under section 992 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsections (b), (c), and (d).

(b) PROVISION OF FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS TRAINING.—Subsection (a) of section 992 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''CONSUMER EDUCATION'' and inserting ''FINANCIAL LITERACY TRAINING'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking ''education'' in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting ''financial literacy training'';

(3) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) Training under this subsection shall be provided to a member of the armed forces—

''(A) as a component of the initial entry training of the member;

''(B) upon arrival at the first duty station of the member;

''(C) upon arrival at each subsequent duty station, in the case of a member in pay grade E–4 or below or in pay grade O–3 or below;

''(D) on the date of promotion of the member, in the case of a member in pay grade E–5 or below or in pay grade O–4 or below;

''(E) when the member vests in the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) under section 8432(g)(2)(C) of title 5;

''(F) when the member becomes entitled to receive continuation pay under section 356 of title 37, at which time the training shall include, at a minimum, information on options available to the member regarding the use of continuation pay;

''(G) at each major life event during the service of the member, such as—

''(i) marriage;

''(ii) divorce;

''(iii) birth of first child; or

''(iv) disabling sickness or condition;

''(H) during leadership training;

''(I) during pre-deployment training and during post-deployment training;

''(J) at transition points in the service of the member, such as—

''(i) transition from a regular component to a reserve component;

''(ii) separation from service; or

''(iii) retirement; and

''(K) as a component of periodically recurring required training that is provided to the member at a military installation.'';

(4) in paragraph (3), by striking ''paragraph (2)(B)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)(J)''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations setting forth any other events and circumstances (in addition to the events and circumstances described in paragraph (2)) upon which the training required by this subsection will be provided.''.

(c) SURVEY OF MEMBERS' FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS.—Section 992 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) FINANCIAL LITERACY AND PREPAREDNESS SURVEY.—(1) The Director of the Defense Manpower Data Center shall annually include in the status of forces survey a survey of the status of the financial literacy and preparedness of members of the armed forces.

''(2) The results of the annual financial literacy and preparedness survey—

''(A) shall be used by each of the Secretaries concerned as a benchmark to evaluate and update training provided under this section; and

''(B) shall be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.''.

(d) FINANCIAL SERVICES DEFINED.—Subsection (e) of section 992 of title 10, United States Code, as redesignated by subsection (c)(1) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) Health insurance, budget management, Thrift Savings Plan (TSP), retirement lump sum payments (including rollover options and tax consequences), and Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP).''.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 992 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 992. Financial literacy training: financial services''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 50 of such title is amended by striking the item related to section 992 and inserting the following new item:

''992. Financial literacy training: financial services.''.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the military department concerned and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall commence providing financial literacy training under section 992 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, to members of the Armed Forces.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits

SEC. 701. JOINT UNIFORM FORMULARY FOR TRANSITION OF CARE.

(a) JOINT FORMULARY.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly establish a joint uniform formulary for the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense with respect to pharmaceutical agents that are critical for the transition of an individual from receiving treatment furnished by the Secretary of Defense to treatment furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(b) SELECTION.—The Secretaries shall select for inclusion on the joint uniform formulary established under subsection (a) pharmaceutical agents relating to—

(1) the control of pain, sleep disorders, and psychiatric conditions, including post-traumatic stress disorder; and

(2) any other conditions determined appropriate by the Secretaries.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than July 1, 2016, the Secretaries shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the joint uniform formulary established under subsection (a), including a list of the pharmaceutical agents selected for inclusion on the formulary.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(2) The term ''pharmaceutical agent'' has the meaning given that term in section 1074g(g) of title 10, United States Code.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1074g(a)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''With respect to members of the uniformed services, such uniform formulary shall include pharmaceutical agents on the joint uniform formulary established under section 701 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.''.

SEC. 702. ACCESS TO BROAD RANGE OF METHODS OF CONTRACEPTION APPROVED BY THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND MILITARY DEPENDENTS AT MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Commencing not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that every military medical treatment facility has a sufficient stock of a broad range of methods of contraception approved by the Food and Drug Administration to be able to dispense any such method of contraception to any women members of the Armed Forces and female covered beneficiaries who receive care through such facility.

(b) COVERED BENEFICIARY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered beneficiary'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072(5) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 703. ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTIVE METHOD FOR DURATION OF DEPLOYMENT.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that, whenever possible, a female member of the Armed Forces who uses prescription contraception on a long-term basis should be given prior to deployment a sufficient supply of the prescription contraceptive for the duration of the deployment.

SEC. 704. ACCESS TO INFERTILITY TREATMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPENDENTS.

(a) ACCESS.—Pursuant to the findings contained in the report required by section 729 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall provide to members of the Armed Forces and dependents of members of the Armed Forces access to reproductive counseling and treatments for infertility.

(b) CONTINUITY OF SERVICES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that members and dependents are provided continuity of services as appropriate if treatments for infertility are disrupted, including pursuant to a change of duty station.

Subtitle B—Health Care Administration

SEC. 711. UNIFIED MEDICAL COMMAND.

(a) UNIFIED COMBATANT COMMAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 6 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 167a the following new section:

''§ 167b. Unified combatant command for medical operations

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—With the advice and assistance of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, shall establish under section 161 of this title a unified command for medical operations (in this section referred to as the 'unified medical command'). The principal function of the command is to provide medical services to the armed forces and other health care beneficiaries of the Department of Defense as defined in chapter 55 of this title.

''(b) ASSIGNMENT OF FORCES.—In establishing the unified medical command under subsection (a), all active military medical treatment facilities, training organizations, and research entities of the armed forces shall be assigned to such unified command, unless otherwise directed by the Secretary of Defense.

''(c) GRADE OF COMMANDER.—The commander of the unified medical command shall hold the grade of general or, in the case of an officer of the Navy, admiral while serving in that position, without vacating his permanent grade. The commander of such command shall be appointed to that grade by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for service in that position. The commander of such command shall be a member of a health profession described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of section 335(j) of title 37. During the five-year period beginning on the date on which the Secretary establishes the command under subsection (a), the commander of such command shall be exempt from the requirements of section 164(a)(1) of this title.

''(d) SUBORDINATE COMMANDS.—(1) The unified medical command shall have the following subordinate commands:

''(A) A command that includes all fixed military medical treatment facilities, including elements of the Department of Defense that are combined, operated jointly, or otherwise operated in such a manner that a medical facility of the Department of Defense is operating in or with a medical facility of another department or agency of the United States.

''(B) A command that includes all medical training, education, and research and development activities that have previously been unified or combined, including organizations that have been designated as a Department of Defense executive agent.

''(C) The Defense Health Agency.

''(2) The commander of a subordinate command of the unified medical command shall hold the grade of lieutenant general or, in the case of an officer of the Navy, vice admiral while serving in that position, without vacating his permanent grade. The commander of such a subordinate command shall be appointed to that grade by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for service in that position. The commander of such a subordinate command shall also be required to be a surgeon general of one of the military departments.

''(e) AUTHORITY OF COMBATANT COMMANDER.—(1) In addition to the authority prescribed in section 164(c) of this title, the commander of the unified medical command shall be responsible for, and shall have the authority to conduct, all affairs of such command relating to medical operations activities.

''(2) The commander of such command shall be responsible for, and shall have the authority to conduct, the following functions relating to medical operations activities (whether or not relating to the unified medical command):

''(A) Developing programs and doctrine.

''(B) Preparing and submitting to the Secretary of Defense program recommendations and budget proposals for the forces described in subsection (b) and for other forces assigned to the unified medical command.

''(C) Exercising authority, direction, and control over the expenditure of funds—

''(i) for forces assigned to the unified medical command;

''(ii) for the forces described in subsection (b) assigned to unified combatant commands other than the unified medical command to the extent directed by the Secretary of Defense; and

''(iii) for military construction funds of the Defense Health Program.

''(D) Training assigned forces.

''(E) Conducting specialized courses of instruction for commissioned and noncommissioned officers.

''(F) Validating requirements.

''(G) Establishing priorities for requirements.

''(H) Ensuring the interoperability of equipment and forces.

''(I) Monitoring the promotions, assignments, retention, training, and professional military education of medical officers described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of section 335(j) of title 37.

''(3) The commander of such command shall be responsible for the Defense Health Program, including the Defense Health Program Account established under section 1100 of this title.

''(g) REGULATIONS.—In establishing the unified medical command under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations for the activities of the unified medical command.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 167a the following new item:

''167b. Unified combatant command for medical operations.''.

(b) PLAN, NOTIFICATION, AND REPORT.—

(1) PLAN.—Not later than July 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a comprehensive plan to establish the unified medical command authorized under section 167b of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), including any legislative actions the Secretary considers necessary to implement the plan.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees written notification of the time line of the Secretary to establish the unified medical command under such section 167b by not later than the date that is 30 days before establishing such command.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after submitting the notification under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the establishment of the unified medical command.

SEC. 712. LICENSURE OF MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS IN TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that a qualified mental health professional described in subsection (b) is eligible for reimbursement under the TRICARE program as a TRICARE certified mental health counselor.

(b) QUALIFIED MENTAL HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL DESCRIBED.—A qualified mental health care professional described in this subsection is an individual who—

(1) holds a masters degree or doctoral degree in counseling from a mental health counseling program or clinical mental health counseling program that is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs;

(2) is licensed by a State in mental health counseling at the clinical level or, with respect to a State that has a tiered licensing scheme, at the highest level available; and

(3) has passed the National Clinical Mental Health Counseling Examination.

(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN PRACTICING PROFESSIONALS.—During the period preceding January 1, 2027, for purposes of subsection (a), an individual who meets the following criteria is deemed to be a qualified mental health care professional described in subsection (b):

(1) The individual holds a masters degree or doctoral degree in counseling from a program that is accredited by a covered institution.

(2) The individual has been licensed by a State as a mental health counselor for a period of not less than five years.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''covered institution'' means any of the following:

(A) The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC-WASC).

(B) The Higher Learning Commission (HLC).

(C) The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE).

(D) The New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC-CIHE).

(E) The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on Colleges.

(F) The WASC Senior College and University Commission (WASC-SCUC).

(G) The Accrediting Bureau of Health Education Schools (ABHES).

(H) The Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges (ACCSC).

(I) The Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS).

(J) The Distance Education Accreditation Commission (DEAC).

(2) The term ''State'' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and each possession of the United States.

(3) The term ''TRICARE program'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 713. REPORTS ON PROPOSED REALIGNMENTS OF MILITARY MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES.

(a) LIMITATION ON REALIGNMENT.—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1073b the following new section:

''§ 1073c. Reports on proposed realignments of military medical treatment facilities

''(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not restructure or realign a military medical treatment facility until—

''(1) the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a report on such proposed restructuring or realignment; and

''(2) a period of 90 days has elapsed following the date of such submission.

''(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subsection (a)(1) shall include, with respect to the military medical treatment facility covered by the report, the following:

''(1) The average daily inpatient census.

''(2) The average inpatient capacity.

''(3) The top five inpatient admission diagnoses.

''(4) Each medical specialty available.

''(5) The average daily percent of staffing available for each medical specialty.

''(6) The beneficiary population within the catchment area.

''(7) The budgeted funding level.

''(8) Whether the facility has a helipad capable of receiving medical evacuation airlift patients arriving on the primary evacuation aircraft platform for the military installation served.

''(9) A determination of whether the civilian hospital system in which the facility resides, if any, is a Federally-designated underserved medical community and the effect on such community from any reduction in staff or functions or downgrade of the facility.

''(10) If the facility serves a training center—

''(A) a determination of the risk with respect to high-tempo, live-fire military operations, treating battlefield-like injuries, and the potential for a mass casualty event if the facility is downgraded to a clinic or reduced in personnel or capabilities; and

''(B) a description of the extent to which the Secretary, in making such determination, consulted with the appropriate training directorate, training and doctrine command, and forces command of each military department.

''(11) A site assessment by the TRICARE program to assess the network capabilities of TRICARE providers in the local area.

''(12) The inpatient mental health availability.

''(13) The average annual inpatient care directed to civilian medical facilities.

''(14) The civilian capacity by medical specialty in each catchment area.

''(15) The distance in miles to the nearest civilian emergency care department.

''(16) The distance in miles to the closest civilian inpatient hospital, listed by level of care and whether the facility is designated a sole community hospital.

''(17) The availability of ambulance service on the military installation and the distance in miles to the nearest civilian ambulance service, including the average response time to the military installation.

''(18) An estimate of the cost to restructure or realign the military medical treatment facility, including with respect to bed closures and civilian personnel reductions.

''(19) If the military medical treatment facility is restructured or realigned, an estimate of—

''(A) the number of civilian personnel reductions, listed by series;

''(B) the number of local support contracts terminated; and

''(C) the increased cost of purchased care.

''(20) An assessment of the effect of the elimination of health care services at the military medical treatment facility on civilians employed at such facility.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1073b the following new item:

''1073c. Reports on proposed realignments of military medical treatment facilities.''.

SEC. 714. PILOT PROGRAM FOR OPERATION OF NETWORK OF RETAIL PHARMACIES UNDER TRICARE PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense may conduct a pilot program to evaluate whether, in carrying out the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program under section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, operating a network of preferred retail pharmacies will generate cost savings for the Department of Defense.

(b) ELEMENTS OF PILOT PROGRAM.—In conducting the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) incorporate ''best practices'' to enhance patient access from non-TRICARE health plans that are using a preferred retail network of pharmacies along with the mail-order pharmacy program of the plans and preferred pharmacy networks in Medicare Part D;

(2) allow beneficiaries to obtain prescription medication that is available through the

TRICARE pharmacy benefits program, including maintenance medication, through the network of preferred retail pharmacies and the national mail-order pharmacy program under section 1074g(a)(2)(E)(iii) of title 10 United States Code;

(3) allow retail pharmacies participating in the network of preferred retail pharmacies to purchase prescription medication for beneficiaries at rates available to the Federal government pursuant to section 1074g(f) of title 10, United States Code;

(4) ensure that retail pharmacies participating in the network of preferred retail pharmacies shall be comprised of small business pharmacies at a rate no lower than the current TRICARE pharmacy program participation rate;

(5) study the potential, viability, cost efficiency, and health care effectiveness of the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program administering prescription medication through a network of preferred retail pharmacies in addition to the methods available pursuant to section 1074g(a)(2)(E) of title 10, United States Code; and

(6) determine the opportunities for and barriers to coordinating and leveraging the use of a network of preferred retail pharmacies in addition to such methods available pursuant to such section 1074g(a)(2)(E).

(c) SELECTION OF RETAIL PHARMACIES.—The Secretary shall select the retail pharmacies to participate in the preferred network of preferred retail pharmacies pursuant to subsection (a). In making such selection the Secretary may—

(1) require that retail pharmacies opt-in to the network and agree to the reimbursement rates paid by the Secretary;

(2) determine specific criteria for each retail pharmacy to meet or that a certain number of retail pharmacies must meet;

(3) use a competitive process; and

(4) require the preferred pharmacy network to comply with the existing TRICARE retail pharmacy access standards.

(d) SELECTION OF MILITARY COMMUNITIES.—In carrying out the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall select at least one region in which to carry out the pilot program. The Secretary shall ensure that any region selected meets the following criteria:

(1) The region has a certain number or percentage, as determined by the Secretary, of—

(A) members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty;

(B) members of the Armed Forces serving in a reserve component; and

(C) retired members of the Armed Forces.

(2) The number of beneficiaries under paragraph (1) is sufficient to produce statistically significant results.

(3) The region has at least one retail pharmacy that operates at least 10 pharmacy locations in the region.

(4) The region has at least one military installation that has a military medical treatment facility with a pharmacy.

(e) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall develop the pilot program under subsection (a) in consultation with—

(1) the Secretaries of the military departments;

(2) representatives from the military installations within the region selected under subsection (d); and

(3) the TRICARE-managed pharmacy contractor with responsibility for the national pharmacy mail-order program.

(f) DURATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—If the Secretary of Defense carries out the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall commence such pilot program by not later than May 1, 2016, and shall terminate such program on September 30, 2018.

(g) REPORTS.—If the Secretary of Defense carries out the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees reports on the pilot program as follows:

(1) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report containing an implementation plan for the pilot program.

(2) Not later than 90 days after the date on which the pilot program commences, and semi-annually thereafter during the period in which the pilot program is carried out, an interim report on the pilot program.

(3) Not later than 90 days after the date on which the pilot program terminates, a final report describing the results of the pilot program, including any recommendations of the Secretary to expand such program.

Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters

SEC. 721. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR DOD-VA HEALTH CARE SHARING INCENTIVE FUND.

Section 8111(d)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2020''.

SEC. 722. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR JOINT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FACILITY DEMONSTRATION FUND.

Section 1704(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2573), as amended by section 722 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291;128 Stat. 3417), is amended by striking ''September 30, 2016'' and inserting ''September 30, 2017''.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

SEC. 800. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DESIRED TENETS OF THE DEFENSE ACQUISITION SYSTEM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives held a series of hearings in 2013, 2014, and 2015 gathering testimony from key acquisition leaders and experts. It is clear that the acquisition reform efforts of the last 50 years continue to founder because they fail to address the motivational and environmental factors in which they must be implemented. The acquisition system, though frustrating to all, is in one sense in equilibrium. The acquisition system provides enough benefits to proponents and opponents to continue, with only minor changes, despite its shortcomings.

(2) The Armed Forces continue to pursue too many defense acquisitions, chasing too few dollars. Consequently, there remains a vast difference between the budgeting plans of the Department and the reality of the cost of its systems or the services it acquires.

(3) To keep programs alive, the Department develops and Congress accepts fragile acquisition strategies that downplay technical issues and assume only successful outcomes from high-risk efforts. As a result, the Department often ends up with too few weapons, with performance that falls short, that are difficult and costly to maintain, delivered late at too high a cost. Congressional and Department of Defense leadership have limited insight into the services acquired or what services need to be acquired in the future. Furthermore, the conventional acquisition process is not agile enough for today's demands. Finally, the Department of Defense continues to struggle with financial management and auditability, affecting its ability to control costs, ensure basic accountability, anticipate future costs and claims on the budget, and measure performance.

(4) Too often today, all stakeholders in the Department of Defense, Congress, and industry, accept that—

(A) for the acquisition process, success is defined as maximizing technical performance or protecting organizational interests, without regard to funding disruptions and delivery delays of needed capability or services to the warfighter; and

(B) the acquisition process is—

(i) reactive, meaning issues are addressed late and at great cost only after problems are realized;

(ii) plodding, meaning the bureaucratic processes are sclerotic and cumbersome;

(iii) opaque, meaning that limiting information is necessary to protect programs; and

(iv) traditional, meaning that customary approaches and suppliers are preferred over perceived risk of new or unique concepts and vendors.

(5) Today, the United States is at a crossroads, and if changes to the acquisition system are not made soon, the trend of fewer and more costly systems and services that fall short of the needs of the Armed Forces will continue. Congress, the Department of Defense, and industry all have a stake in making positive changes. Each plays a role in contributing to the current system. Each gains benefits from that system, but each is frustrated by it as well.

(6) The acquisition improvement effort of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives proposes a different approach from previous efforts by seeking to improve the environment (i.e., statutes, regulations, processes, and culture) driving acquisition decisions in the Department of Defense, industry, and Congress. The Committee has solicited input from industry and the Department of Defense, as well as others in Congress, and will continue to do so. The Committee recognizes that there are no ''silver bullets'' that can immediately fix the current acquisition system in a holistic and long-standing manner. Therefore, the reform effort will be an ongoing and iterative process that will result in legislation not only this year, but will be embedded in the Committee's annual and regular work.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE TENETS OF AN IMPROVED ACQUISITION SYSTEM.—It is the sense of Congress that all stakeholders in the acquisition system—the Department of Defense, Congress, and industry—should be governed by the following tenets:

(1) SUCCESS.—Success in the acquisition system means the timely delivery of affordable and effective military equipment and services.

(2) PROACTIVE.—The acquisition system should be proactive, meaning—

(A) the system should recognize that development and acquisition problems can occur; and

(B) officials at all levels should be empowered to solve problems and reduce risks by surfacing issues early and honestly and taking action to resolve them.

(3) AGILE.—The acquisition system should be agile, meaning that needed program adjustments to both respond to emerging threats and the rapid pace of technological change and to address development or production issues should be proposed and adjudicated quickly.

(4) TRANSPARENT.—The acquisition system should be transparent, meaning that—

(A) all decision makers should be given useful, relevant, credible, and reliable information when making commitments;

(B) Government and industry communication should be clear and open; and

(C) the Department of Defense should produce auditable financial management statements.

(5) INNOVATIVE.—The acquisition system should be innovative, meaning that barriers should be removed that preclude companies from undertaking defense business or officials from proposing new approaches.

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

SEC. 801. REPORT ON LINKING AND STREAMLINING REQUIREMENTS, ACQUISITION, AND BUDGET PROCESSES WITHIN ARMED FORCES.

(a) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall each submit to the congressional defense committees a report on efforts to link and streamline the requirements, acquisition, and budget processes within the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, respectively.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A specific description of—

(A) the management actions the Chief concerned or the Commandant has taken or plans to take to link and streamline the requirements, acquisition, and budget processes of the Armed Force concerned;

(B) any reorganization or process changes that will link and streamline the requirements, acquisition, and budget processes of the Armed Force concerned; and

(C) any cross-training or professional development initiatives of the Chief concerned or the Commandant.

(2) For each description under paragraph (1)—

(A) the specific timeline associated with implementation;

(B) the anticipated outcomes once implemented; and

(C) how to measure whether or not those outcomes are realized.

(3) Any other matters the Chief concerned or the Commandant considers appropriate.

SEC. 802. REQUIRED REVIEW OF ACQUISITION-RELATED FUNCTIONS OF THE CHIEFS OF STAFF OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall conduct a review of their current individual authorities provided in sections 3033, 5033, 8033, and 5043 of title 10, United States Code, and other relevant statutes and regulations related to defense acquisitions for the purpose of developing such recommendations as the Chief concerned or the Commandant considers necessary to further or advance the role of the Chief concerned or the Commandant in the development of requirements, acquisition processes, and the associated budget practices of the Department of Defense.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall each submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing, at a minimum, the following:

(1) The recommendations developed by the Chief concerned or the Commandant under subsection (a) and other results of the review conducted under such subsection.

(2) The actions the Chief concerned or the Commandant is taking, if any, within the Chief's or Commandant's existing authority to implement such recommendations.

SEC. 803. INDEPENDENT STUDY OF MATTERS RELATED TO BID PROTESTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall enter into a contract with an independent research entity that is a not-for-profit entity or a federally funded research and development center with appropriate expertise and analytical capability to carry out a comprehensive study of factors leading to the filing of bid protests. The study shall examine issues such as the following:

(1) The variable influences on the net benefit (monetary and non-monetary) to contractors either filing a protest or indicating intent to file a protest.

(2) The extent to which protests are filed by incumbent contractors for purposes of extending a contract's period of performance.

(3) The extent to which companies file protests even when those companies do not believe there was an error in the procurement process.

(4) The time it takes agencies to implement corrective actions after a ruling or decision.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the independent entity shall provide to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the study, along with any recommendations it may have.

SEC. 804. PROCUREMENT OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

(a) COMMERCIAL ITEM DETERMINATIONS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 140 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§2380. Commercial item determinations by Department of Defense

''The Secretary of Defense shall—

''(1) establish and maintain a centralized capability with necessary expertise and resources to oversee the making of commercial item determinations for the purposes of procurements by the Department of Defense; and

''(2) provide public access to Department of Defense commercial item determinations for the purposes of procurements by the Department of Defense.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2380. Commercial item determinations by Department of Defense.''.

(b) COMMERCIAL ITEM EXCEPTION TO SUBMISSION OF COST AND PRICING DATA.—Section 2306a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) COMMERCIAL ITEM DETERMINATION.—(A) For purposes of applying the commercial item exception under paragraph (1)(B) to the required submission of certified cost or pricing data, the contracting officer may presume that a prior commercial item determination made by a military department, a Defense Agency, or another component of the Department of Defense shall serve as a determination for subsequent procurements of such item.

''(B) If the contracting officer does not make the presumption described in subparagraph (A) and instead chooses to proceed with a procurement of an item previously determined to be a commercial item using procedures other than the procedures authorized for the procurement of a commercial item, the contracting officer shall request a review of the commercial item determination by the head of the contracting activity.

''(C) Not later than 30 days after receiving a request for review of a commercial item determination under subparagraph (B), the head of a contracting activity shall—

''(i) confirm that the prior determination was appropriate and still applicable; or

''(ii) issue a revised determination with a written explanation of the basis for the revision.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF COMMERCIAL ITEM.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall affect the meaning of the term ''commercial item'' under subsection (a)(5) of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, or any requirement under subsection (c) of such section.

SEC. 805. MODIFICATION TO INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED BY OFFEROR IN PROCUREMENT OF MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEMS AS COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR DETERMINATION.—Subsection (a) of section 2379 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (1)(B), by inserting ''; and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(b) TREATMENT OF SUBSYSTEMS AS COMMERCIAL ITEMS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''only if'' and inserting ''if either'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''that—'' and all that follows through ''the subsystem is a'' and inserting ''that the subsystem is a'';

(B) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B).

(c) TREATMENT OF COMPONENTS AS COMMERCIAL ITEMS.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''title only if'' and inserting ''title if either''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''that—'' and all that follows through ''the component or'' and inserting ''that the component or'';

(B) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (ii).

(d) INFORMATION SUBMITTED.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''submit—'' and all that follows through ''prices paid'' and inserting ''submit prices paid'';

(2) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

SEC. 806. AMENDMENT RELATING TO MULTIYEAR CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.

Paragraph (1) of section 2306b(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) That there is a reasonable expectation that the use of such a contract will result in lower total anticipated costs of carrying out the program than if the program were carried out through annual contracts.''.

SEC. 807. COMPLIANCE WITH INVENTORY OF CONTRACTS FOR SERVICES.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the operation of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended in fiscal year 2016 until—

(1) the ''Department of Defense Compliance Plan for Section 8108(c) of Public Law 112–10'', as contained in a memorandum and enclosure dated November 22, 2011, is implemented;

(2) the implementing direction contained in the ''Enterprise-wide Contractor Manpower Reporting Application'', as contained in a memorandum dated November 28, 2012, from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the (then) Acting Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness is fulfilled; and

(3) the funds made available in March 2014 to establish the Total Force Management Support Office to define business processes for compiling, reviewing, and using the inventory required under section 2330a(c) of title 10, United States Code, have been obligated.

Subtitle B—Workforce Development and Related Matters

SEC. 811. AMENDMENTS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND.

(a) PERMANENT EXTENSION OF FUND.—Section 1705(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''of an amount as follows:'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''of an amount of not less than $500,000,000.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''an amount that is less than'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''an amount that is less than $400,000,000.''.

(b) PERMANENT EXTENSION OF EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY.—Section 1705(g) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2);

(2) by striking ''AUTHORITY.—'' and all that follows through ''For purposes of'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''AUTHORITY.—For purposes of'';

(3) by striking ''(A)'' and inserting ''(1)'';

(4) by striking ''(B)'' and inserting ''(2)''; and

(5) by aligning paragraphs (1) and (2), as designated by paragraphs (3) and (4), so as to be two ems from the left margin.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF ACQUISITION WORKFORCE COVERED.—Section 1705(g) of such title, as amended by subsection (c), is further amended by striking ''acquisition workforce positions'' and inserting ''of positions in the acquisition workforce, as defined in subsection (h),''.

SEC. 812. DUAL-TRACK MILITARY PROFESSIONALS IN OPERATIONAL AND ACQUISITION SPECIALITIES.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR SERVICE CHIEF INVOLVEMENT.—Section 1722a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''military department)'' the following: '', in collaboration with the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps (with respect to the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, respectively),''.

(b) DUAL-TRACK CAREER PATH.—Section 1722a(b) of such title is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''single-track'' before ''career path''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) A dual-track career path that attracts the highest quality officers and enlisted personnel and allows them to gain experience in and receive credit for a primary career in combat arms and a functional secondary career in the acquisition field in order to more closely align the military operational, requirements, and acquisition workforces of each armed force.''.

SEC. 813. PROVISION OF JOINT DUTY ASSIGNMENT CREDIT FOR ACQUISITION DUTY.

Section 668(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) acquisition matters addressed by military personnel and covered under chapter 87 of this title.''.

SEC. 814. REQUIREMENT FOR ACQUISITION SKILLS ASSESSMENT BIENNIAL STRATEGIC WORKFORCE PLAN.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Section 115b(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E);

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) new or expanded critical skills and competencies needed by the existing civilian employee workforce of the Department to address new acquisition process requirements established by law or policy during the four years preceding the year of submission of the plan; and''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 115b of such title is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E) of subsection (b)(1), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by striking ''(C)'' and inserting ''(D)'';

(2) in paragraph (2) of subsection (b), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''(1)(D)'' and inserting ''(1)(E)''; and

(3) in paragraph (2)(A) of each of subsections (c), (d), and (e), by striking ''through (D)'' and inserting ''through (E)''.

SEC. 815. MANDATORY REQUIREMENT FOR TRAINING RELATED TO THE CONDUCT OF MARKET RESEARCH.

(a) MANDATORY MARKET RESEARCH TRAINING.—Section 2377 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) MARKET RESEARCH TRAINING REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide mandatory training for members of the armed forces and employees of the Department of Defense responsible for the conduct of market research required under subsection (c). Such mandatory training shall, at a minimum—

''(1) provide comprehensive information on the subject of market research and the function of market research in the acquisition of commercial items;

''(2) teach best practices for conducting and documenting market research; and

''(3) provide methodologies for establishing standard processes and reports for collecting and sharing market research across the Department.''.

(b) INCORPORATION INTO MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATION TRAINING MANDATE.—The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall ensure that the requirements of section 2377(d) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), are incorporated into the requirements management certification training mandate of the Joint Capabilities Integration Development System.

SEC. 816. INDEPENDENT STUDY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall enter into a contract with an independent research entity described in subsection (b) to carry out a comprehensive study of the strategic planning of the Department of Defense related to the defense acquisition workforce. The study shall provide a comprehensive examination of the Department's efforts to recruit, develop, and retain the acquisition workforce with a specific review of the following:

(1) The implementation of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (including chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code).

(2) The application of the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (as established under section 1705 of title 10, United States Code).

(3) The effectiveness of professional military education programs, including fellowships and exchanges with industry.

(b) INDEPENDENT RESEARCH ENTITY.—The entity described in this subsection is an independent research entity that is a not-for-profit entity or a federally funded research and development center with appropriate expertise and analytical capability.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) TO SECRETARY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the independent research entity shall provide to the Secretary a report containing—

(A) the results of the study required by subsection (a); and

(B) such recommendations to improve the acquisition workforce as the independent research entity considers to be appropriate.

(2) TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit such report, together with any additional views or recommendations of the Secretary, to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 817. EXTENSION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT RELATING TO CERTAIN ACQUISITION PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.

Section 1762(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2020''.

Subtitle C—Weapon Systems Acquisition and Related Matters

SEC. 821. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DESIRED CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE WEAPON SYSTEMS ACQUISITION SYSTEM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) CURRENT SITUATION.—Despite significant and repeated attempts at acquisition reform, the Department of Defense still experiences case after case of expensive weapon system acquisition failures. The Department of Defense has a track record of too many cancellations, schedule slippages, cost over-runs, and failures to deliver timely solutions to the requirements of the Armed Forces. This situation is unacceptable. For example, according to the Final Report of the 2010 Army Acquisition Review, between 1996 and 2010, the Army expended approximately $1 billion to $3 billion annually on two dozen programs that were eventually cancelled. No military service and no type of weapon acquisition has been immune.

(2) PROBLEMS IN ALL PHASES OF ACQUISITIONS.—

(A) Despite detailed weapon acquisition processes and procedures, there is only limited discipline in starting programs. Many programs begin without a solid foundation. They have too many requirements deemed ''critical'', which are driven by too many organizations and individuals. Approved requirements are often set with only a limited understanding of the technical feasibility of achieving them. The resulting compromises of good program management and engineering judgment that allow the programs to proceed are the ''spackle'' of the acquisition system that covers up the risks and enables the system to operate.

(B) As these weapon systems proceed into engineering and manufacturing development, they often encounter development problems leading to cost growth, schedule delay, and performance reductions. Industry and Government officials frequently respond by taking additional development risks to resolve basic performance issues by reducing the time to analyze and assess development results, overlapping key development efforts, and reducing testing. The Department of Defense and Congress disrupt the planned funding of stable programs to find resources for troubled programs or to fund across-the-board spending cuts. Funding instability is the inevitable price that programs pay for survival because funding disruptions actually keep more programs alive.

(C) Finally, these weapons are often rushed into production only to encounter production problems, and are fielded with many unknowns or deficiencies leading to significantly reduced quantities and force structure reductions. The

warfighter faces the challenge of operating weapons with poor reliability, high maintenance demands, reduced performance, and many capability shortfalls.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that, in accordance with the tenets described in section 800, to improve weapon system acquisitions, the Department of Defense, Congress, and industry should develop an acquisition system characterized by highly disciplined program initiation coupled with agile program execution and balanced oversight, as described in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4).

(2) HIGHLY DISCIPLINED PROGRAM INITIATION.—An acquisition system characterized by highly disciplined program initiation means that programs do not begin engineering development until firm requirements are matched to a flexible acquisition strategy structured to develop militarily useful capability that can be delivered in a relevant period of time with available technologies, funding, and management capacity. Such a highly disciplined program initiation includes—

(A) a workforce with smart requirements setters and expert buyers, with the knowledge, skills, and experience to successfully plan for and execute highly complex acquisitions;

(B) requirements that are well-defined, technically feasible, and affordable;

(C) acquisition strategies that are designed to minimize time to market of militarily useful capability, with the program concerned being structured so that—

(i) lower-risk, technically mature capabilities are matched to delivering capability to the warfighter in the near term, while remaining requirements are aligned and resources are programmed to support integration into later increments to meet the requirements of the Armed Forces;

(ii) capabilities are approved for an increment only when their developmental risks have been appropriately reduced; and

(iii) increments are planned to complete engineering and manufacturing development in a reasonable period of time;

(D) a science and technology development enterprise that is responsive to the acquisition process before engineering and manufacturing development begins, and sufficiently resourced to reduce risks and enable programs to make smart decisions without losing critical funds; and

(E) redtape reduction in order to free up program and Department officials to focus on their mission of defining an executable program and understanding and addressing risks.

(3) AGILE PROGRAM EXECUTION.—An acquisition system characterized by agile program execution means a system in which acquisition speed and flexibility to make trade-offs are balanced with the need to achieve desired technical performance. Such agile program execution includes—

(A) program managers and program officials who are expert buyers and negotiators who anticipate problems, negotiate solutions, and are empowered to manage;

(B) a preference for fixed price contracting where appropriate for the size and complexity of the work and for the nature and scope of the capabilities being developed;

(C) program managers who avoid increasing program risk by resisting the addition of new requirements or the reduction of developmental activities;

(D) empowering program managers and senior decisionmakers to make decisions easily in order to move forward with capabilities that mature quickly, cancel those that encounter greater difficulties than expected, and trade-off or reduce requirements to maintain cost and schedule;

(E) enabling program managers to focus on overcoming execution challenges and delivering success rather than concentrating on compliance with reporting, certifications, and other redtape; and

(F) senior decisionmakers who have knowledge of demonstrated performance as programs proceed through development, with robust developmental testing occurring before committing to production for operational use as a basis for decision making.

(4) BALANCED OVERSIGHT.—An acquisition system characterized by balanced oversight means that the focus is on ensuring discipline initiating programs and that appropriate adjustments are made during development, so that programs have the best chance to succeed. Such balanced oversight includes—

(A) involvement by decisionmakers early to ensure that an understanding of trade-offs, risks, and needs are considered, resourced, and validated, and that agreement is reached between the executive and legislative branches;

(B) acceptance by decisionmakers that complex weapon system developments are inherently risky and require expertise and flexibility to manage effectively;

(C) conscious decisions by decisionmakers regarding where to accept risk, while ensuring that risk mitigation plans are resourced (with time, funding, alternatives, and competent government and contractor officials);

(D) measuring and monitoring by decisionmakers of the right factors, such as technology maturation progress and systems engineering during risk reduction, development cost growth during engineering and manufacturing development, and reliability growth during system demonstration;

(E) work by Congress and the Department of Defense, once a program has begun, to resolve issues by considering trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance necessary to best support the warfighter; and

(F) congressional understanding of risks and efforts to mitigate such risks even if they are through non-traditional means or other technological advances.

SEC. 822. ACQUISITION STRATEGY REQUIRED FOR EACH MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM AND MAJOR SYSTEM.

(a) CONSOLIDATION OF REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ACQUISITION STRATEGY.—

(1) NEW TITLE 10 SECTION.—Chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2431 the following new section:

''§ 2431a. Acquisition strategy

''(a) ACQUISITION STRATEGY REQUIRED.—There shall be an acquisition strategy for each major defense acquisition program and each major system approved by a Milestone Decision Authority.

''(b) RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL.—For each acquisition strategy required by subsection (a), the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics is responsible for issuing and maintaining the requirements for—

''(1) the content of the strategy; and

''(2) the review and approval process for the strategy.

''(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—(1) In issuing requirements for the content of an acquisition strategy for a major defense acquisition program or major system, the Under Secretary shall ensure that—

''(A) the strategy clearly describes the proposed business and technical management approach for the program or system, in sufficient detail to allow the Milestone Decision Authority to assess the viability of the proposed approach;

''(B) the strategy contains a clear explanation of how the strategy is designed to be implemented with available resources, such as time, funding, and management capacity; and

''(C) the strategy considers the items listed in paragraph (2).

''(2) Each strategy shall, at a minimum, consider the following:

''(A) An approach that delivers required capability in increments, each depending on available mature technology, and that recognizes up front the need for future capability improvements.

''(B) Acquisition approach, including industrial base considerations in accordance with section 2440 of this title.

''(C) Risk management, including such methods as competitive prototyping at the system, subsystem, or component level, in accordance with section 2431b of this title.

''(D) Business strategy, including measures to ensure competition at the system and subsystem level throughout the life-cycle of the program or system in accordance with section 2337 of this title.

''(E) Contracting strategy, including—

''(i) contract type and how the type selected relates to level of program risk in each acquisition phase;

''(ii) how the plans for the program or system to reduce risk enable the use of fixed-price elements in subsequent contracts and the timing of the use of those fixed price elements;

''(iii) market research; and

''(iv) consideration of small business participation.

''(F) Intellectual property strategy in accordance with section 2320 of this title.

''(G) International involvement, including foreign military sales and cooperative opportunities, in accordance with section 2350a of this title.

''(H) Multi-year procurement in accordance with section 2306b of this title.

''(I) Integration of current intelligence assessments into the acquisition process.

''(J) Requirements related to logistics, maintenance, and sustainment in accordance with sections 2464 and 2466 of this title.

''(d) REVIEW.—(1) Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Milestone Decision Authority shall review and approve, as appropriate, the acquisition strategy for a major defense acquisition program or major system at each of the following times:

''(A) Milestone A approval.

''(B) The decision to release the request for proposals for development of the program or system.

''(C) Milestone B approval.

''(D) Each subsequent milestone.

''(E) Review of any decision to enter into full-rate production.

''(F) When there has been—

''(i) a significant change to the cost of the program or system;

''(ii) a critical change to the cost of the program or system;

''(iii) a significant change to the schedule of the program or system; or

''(iv) a significant change to the performance of the program or system.

''(G) Any other time considered relevant by the Milestone Decision Authority.

''(2) If the Milestone Decision Authority revises an acquisition strategy for a program or system, the Milestone Decision Authority shall provide notice of the revision to the congressional defense committees.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'major defense acquisition program' has the meaning provided in section 2430 of this title.

''(2) The term 'major system' has the meaning provided in section 2302(5) of this title.

''(3) The term 'Milestone A approval' means a decision to enter into technology maturation

and risk reduction pursuant to guidance prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for the management of Department of Defense acquisition programs.

''(4) The term 'Milestone B approval' has the meaning provided in section 2366(e)(7) of this title.

''(5) The term 'Milestone Decision Authority', with respect to a major defense acquisition program or major system, means the official within the Department of Defense designated with the overall responsibility and authority for acquisition decisions for the program or system, including authority to approve entry of the program or system into the next phase of the acquisition process.

''(6) The term 'management capacity', with respect to a major defense acquisition program or major system, means the capacity to manage the program or system through the use of highly qualified organizations and personnel with appropriate experience, knowledge, and skills.

''(7) The term 'significant change to the cost', with respect to a major defense acquisition program or major system, means a significant cost growth threshold, as that term is defined in section 2433(a)(4) of this title.

''(8) The term 'critical change to the cost', with respect to a major defense acquisition program or major system, means a critical cost growth threshold, as that term is defined in section 2433(a)(5) of this title.

''(9) The term 'significant change to the schedule', with respect to a major defense acquisition program or major system, means any schedule delay greater than six months in a reported event.

''(f) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Upon request by the chairman or ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the committee the most recently approved acquisition strategy for a major defense acquisition program or major system. The strategy shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2431 the following new item:

''2431a. Acquisition strategy.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2350a(e) of such title is amended—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''DOCUMENT'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the Under Secretary of Defense for'' and all that follows through ''of the Board'' and inserting ''opportunities for such cooperative research and development shall be addressed in the acquisition strategy for the project''; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''document'' and inserting ''discussion''; and

(II) by striking ''include'' and inserting ''consider'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''A statement indicating whether'' and inserting ''Whether'';

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics''; and

(II) by striking ''of the United States under consideration by the Department of Defense''; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''The recommendation of the Under Secretary'' and inserting ''A recommendation to the Milestone Decision Authority''.

(2) Section 803 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 10 U.S.C. 2430 note) is repealed.

SEC. 823. REVISION TO REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO RISK MANAGEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT OF MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS AND MAJOR SYSTEMS.

(a) RISK MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2431a (as added by section 813) the following new section:

''§2431b. Risk management and mitigation in major defense acquisition programs and major systems

''(a) REQUIREMENT.—(1) There shall be a risk management and mitigation strategy for each major defense acquisition program or major system.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the initial acquisition strategy (required under section 2431a of this title) approved by the Milestone Decision Authority and any subsequent revisions include the following:

''(A) A comprehensive strategy for managing and mitigating risk (including technical, cost, and schedule risk) during each of the following periods:

''(i) The period preceding engineering manufacturing development, or its equivalent.

''(ii) The period preceding initial production.

''(iii) The period preceding full-rate production.

''(B) An identification of the major sources of risk in each of the periods listed in subparagraph (A).

''(3) In the case of a program or system with separate increments of capabilities that require Milestone Decision Authority approval to begin or proceed, paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to each increment.

''(b) STRATEGY TO MANAGE AND MITIGATE RISKS.—(1) The comprehensive strategy to manage and mitigate risk included in the acquisition strategy for purposes of subsection (a)(2)(A) shall identify each individual risk and the risk management and mitigation activities to address each risk. For the mitigation activities identified, the strategy shall note whether they require cost and schedule margins and need to be included in funding requests.

''(2) The strategy shall be comprehensive and, at a minimum, include consideration of risk mitigation techniques such as the following:

''(A) Prototyping (including prototyping at the system, subsystem, or component level and competitive prototyping, where appropriate) and, if prototyping at either the system, subsystem, or component level is not used, an explanation of why it is not appropriate.

''(B) Modeling and simulation, the areas that modeling and simulation will assess, and identification of the need for development of any new modeling and simulation tools in order to support the comprehensive strategy.

''(C) Technology demonstrations and decision points for disciplined transition of planned technologies into programs or the selection of alternative technologies.

''(D) Multiple design approaches.

''(E) Alternative designs, including any designs that meet requirements but do so with reduced performance.

''(F) Phasing of program activities or related technology development efforts in order to address high risk areas as early as feasible.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'major defense acquisition program' and 'major system' have the meanings provided in section 2431a of this title.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2431a, as so added, the following new item:

''2431b. Risk reduction in major defense acquisition programs and major systems.''.

(b) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROVISION.—Section 203 of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (10 U.S.C. 2430 note) is repealed.

SEC. 824. MODIFICATION TO REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DETERMINATION OF CONTRACT TYPE FOR MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS AND MAJOR SYSTEMS.

(a) DETERMINATION OF CONTRACT TYPE.—Section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF GUIDANCE RELATING TO CONTRACT TYPE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the guidance of the Department of Defense relating to major defense acquisition programs, major systems, and major automated information systems includes a requirement that the acquisition strategy required under section 2431a of this title for such a program or system includes—

''(A) a separate identification of the contract type for each acquisition phase of the program or system; and

''(B) a justification of the contract type identified.

''(2) The contract type identified in accordance with paragraph (1)(A) may be—

''(A) a fixed-price type contract (including a fixed-price incentive contract); or

''(B) a cost-type contract (including a cost-plus-incentive-fee contract).

''(3) The guidance referred to in paragraph (1) shall require that the justification for the contract type selected explain—

''(A) how the level of program risk in each acquisition phase relates to the contract type selected;

''(B) how the use of incentives (especially cost incentives) in the contract, if any, supports the program or system objectives during each acquisition phase; and

''(C) how the plans for the program or system to reduce risk enable the use of fixed-price elements in subsequent contracts.

''(4) The guidance shall also specify that the use of contracts with target costs, target profits or fees, and profit or fee adjustment formulas can be an appropriate contract type.''.

(b) REPEAL.—Section 818 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 10 U.S.C. 2306 note) is amended by striking subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e).

SEC. 825. REQUIRED DETERMINATION BEFORE MILESTONE A APPROVAL OR INITIATION OF MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) DETERMINATION RATHER THAN CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Subsection (a) of section 2366a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''CERTIFICATION'' and inserting ''WRITTEN DETERMINATION REQUIRED''; and

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''certifies'' and inserting ''determines, in writing,''.

(b) SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN DETERMINATION TO CONGRESS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—At the request of any of the congressional defense committees, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the committee an explanation of the basis for a determination made under subsection (a) with respect to a major defense acquisition program, together with a copy of the written determination. The explanation shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.''.

(c) REPEAL OF UNUSED DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (2) and (4); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 2366a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2366a. Major defense acquisition programs: determination required before Milestone A approval".

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2366a and inserting the following new item:

''2366a. Major defense acquisition programs: determination required before Milestone A approval.''.

SEC. 826. REQUIRED CERTIFICATION AND DETERMINATION BEFORE MILESTONE B APPROVAL OF MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) DETERMINATION REQUIRED IN ADDITION TO CERTIFICATION.—Subsection (a) of section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''CERTIFICATION'' and inserting ''CERTIFICATION AND DETERMINATION REQUIRED'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by striking ''(3) further certifies that—'' and inserting the following:

''(3) further certifies that the technology in the program has been demonstrated in a relevant environment, as determined by the Milestone Decision Authority on the basis of an independent review and assessment by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, in consultation with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation;

''(4) determines, in writing, that—''.

(b) SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN DETERMINATION TO CONGRESS.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) At the request of any of the congressional defense committees, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the committee an explanation of the basis for a determination made under subsection (a)(4) with respect to a major defense acquisition program, together with a copy of the written determination. The explanation shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.''.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''certification requirement'' and inserting ''certification and determination requirements''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''waiver'' before ''determination'' each place it appears; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''certification components'' both places it appears and inserting ''certification and determination components''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a)'';

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a)''; and

(3) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking ''paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4) of subsection (a)''.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2366b. Major defense acquisition programs: certification and determination required before Milestone B approval".

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2366b and inserting the following new item:

''2366b. Major defense acquisition programs: certification and determination required before Milestone B approval.''.

Subtitle D—Industrial Base Matters

SEC. 831. CODIFICATION AND AMENDMENT OF MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1607; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is transferred to chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, inserted so as to appear after section 2323a, redesignated as section 2323b, and amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

"§ 2323b. Mentor-Protege Program";

(2) by striking ''pilot'' each place such term appears;

(3) by amending subsection (e)(1) to read as follows:

''(1) A developmental program for the protege firm, in such detail as may be reasonable, including—

''(A) factors to assess the protege firm's developmental progress under the program; and

''(B) the anticipated number and type of subcontracts to be awarded to the protege firm.'';

(4) in subsection (g)(2)(B), by striking ''under subsection (l)(2)'';

(5) in subsection (h)(1), by inserting ''(15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.)'' after ''Small Business Act'';

(6) by striking subsection (j) and redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively;

(7) by amending subsection (j) (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

''(j) REGULATIONS.—The regulations implementing the Mentor-Protege Pilot Program established under section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1607; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) as in effect on the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 shall apply to this section. The Secretary of Defense may revise such regulations or prescribe additional regulations necessary to carry out this section. The Department of Defense policy regarding the Mentor-Protege Program shall be published and maintained as an appendix to the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.'';

(8) by striking ''prescribed pursuant to subsection (k)'' each place such term appears and inserting ''described in subsection (j)''; and

(9) in subsection (k) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''means a business concern that meets the requirements of section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)) and the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto'' and inserting ''has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''the severely disabled'' and inserting ''severely disabled individuals''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (G), by inserting ''(15 U.S.C. 632(p))'' after ''Small Business Act''; and

(C) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

''(8) The term 'severely disabled individual' means an individual who is blind (as defined in section 8501 of title 41) or a severely disabled individual (as defined in such section).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2323a the following new item:

''2323b. Mentor-Protege Program.''.

SEC. 832. AMENDMENTS TO DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 15(s) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(s)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraphs:

''(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than the first day of fiscal year 2017, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall implement the plan described in this subsection.

''(5) CERTIFICATION.—The Administrator shall annually provide to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate a certification of the accuracy and completeness of data reported on bundled and consolidated contracts.''.

(b) GAO STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—Not later than the first day of fiscal year 2018, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study on the effectiveness of the plan described in section 15(s) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(s)) that shall assess whether contracts were accurately labeled as bundled or consolidated.

(2) CONTRACTS EVALUATED.—For the purposes of conducting the study described in paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States—

(A) shall evaluate, for work in each of sectors 23, 33, 54, and 56 (as defined by the North American Industry Classification System), not fewer than 100 contracts in each sector;

(B) shall evaluate only those contracts—

(i) awarded by an agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code; and

(ii) that have a Base and Exercised Options Value, an Action Obligation, or a Base and All Options Value (as such terms are defined in the Federal procurement data system described in section 1122(a)(4)(A) of title 41, United States Code, or any successor system); and

(C) shall not evaluate contracts that have used any set aside authority.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after initiating the study required by paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate on the results from such study and, if warranted, any recommendations on how to improve the quality of data reported on bundled and consolidated contracts.

SEC. 833. NOTICE OF CONTRACT CONSOLIDATION FOR ACQUISITION STRATEGIES.

(a) NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR THE SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE OR CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER.—Section 44(c)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657q(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 7 days after making a determination that an acquisition strategy involving a consolidation of contract requirements is necessary and justified under subparagraph (A), the senior procurement executive or Chief Acquisition Officer shall publish a notice on a public website that such determination has been made. Any solicitation for a procurement related to the acquisition strategy may not be published earlier than 7 days after such notice is published. Along with the publication of the solicitation, the senior procurement executive or Chief Acquisition Officer shall publish a justification for the determination,

which shall include the information in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1).''.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR THE HEAD OF A CONTRACTING AGENCY.—Section 15(e)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(e)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) STRATEGY SPECIFICATIONS.—If the head of a contracting agency determines that an acquisition plan for a procurement involves a substantial bundling of contract requirements, the head of a contracting agency shall publish a notice on a public website that such determination has been made not later than 7 days after making such determination. Any solicitation for a procurement related to the acquisition plan may not be published earlier than 7 days after such notice is published. Along with the publication of the solicitation, the head of a contracting agency shall publish a justification for the determination, which shall include following information:

''(A) The specific benefits anticipated to be derived from the bundling of contract requirements and a determination that such benefits justify the bundling.

''(B) An identification of any alternative contracting approaches that would involve a lesser degree of bundling of contract requirements.

''(C) An assessment of—

''(i) the specific impediments to participation by small business concerns as prime contractors that result from the bundling of contract requirements; and

''(ii) the specific actions designed to maximize participation of small business concerns as subcontractors (including suppliers) at various tiers under the contract or contracts that are awarded to meet the requirements.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 44(c)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657q(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''Subject to paragraph (4), the head'' and inserting ''The head''.

SEC. 834. CLARIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTS FOR SERVICES.

(a) PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS.—Section 8(a)(17) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(17)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''any procurement contract'' and all that follows through ''section 15'' and inserting ''any procurement contract, which contract has as its principal purpose the supply of a product to be let pursuant to this subsection or subsection (m), or section 15(a), 31, or 36,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) LIMITATION.—This paragraph shall not apply to a contract that has as its principal purpose the acquisition of services or construction.''.

(b) SUBCONTRACTOR CONTRACTS.—Section 46(a)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657s(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''for supplies from a regular dealer in such supplies'' and inserting ''which is principally for supplies from a regular dealer in such supplies, and which is not a contract principally for services or construction,''.

SEC. 835. REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS OF PRIVATE SECTOR FIRMS.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall enter into a contract with an independent entity with appropriate expertise to conduct a review of Department of Defense regulations and practices related to Government access to and use of intellectual property rights of private sector firms. The contract shall require that in conducting the review, the independent entity shall consult with the National Defense Technology and Industrial Base Council (described in section 2502 of title 10, United States Code).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the findings of the independent entity, along with a description of any actions that the Secretary proposes to revise and clarify laws or that the Secretary may take to revise or clarify regulations related to intellectual property rights.

SEC. 836. REQUIREMENT THAT CERTAIN SHIP COMPONENTS BE MANUFACTURED IN THE NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE.

(a) ADDITIONAL PROCUREMENT LIMITATION.—Section 2534(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) COMPONENTS FOR AUXILIARY SHIPS.—Subject to subsection (k), the following components:

''(A) Auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services.

''(B) Propulsion system components, including engines, reduction gears, and propellers.

''(C) Shipboard cranes.

''(D) Spreaders for shipboard cranes.''.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) IMPLEMENTATION OF AUXILIARY SHIP COMPONENT LIMITATION.—Subsection (a)(6) applies only with respect to contracts awarded by the Secretary of a military department for new construction of an auxiliary ship after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 using funds available for National Defense Sealift Fund programs or Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.''.

SEC. 837. POLICY REGARDING SOLID ROCKET MOTORS USED IN TACTICAL MISSILES.

(a) POLICY.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that every tactical missile program of the Department of Defense that uses solid propellant as the primary propulsion system shall have at least one rocket motor supplier within the national technology and industrial base (as defined in section 2500(1) of title 10, United States Code).

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive subsection (a) in the case of compelling national security reasons.

SEC. 838. FAR COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP FOR ADMINISTRATOR OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ADDITION OF ADMINISTRATOR OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION TO FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATORY COUNCIL.—Section 1302(b)(1) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by striking the period and inserting ''; and'' at the end of subparagraph (D); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such title is amended—

(1) in section 1303(a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''and the Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space,'' and inserting ''the Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration,''; and

(B) by striking ''and the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.),'' and inserting ''the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), and the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.),''; and

(2) in section 1121(d), by striking ''and the General Services Administration'' and inserting ''the General Services Administration, and the Small Business Administration''.

SEC. 839. SURETY BOND REQUIREMENTS AND AMOUNT OF GUARANTEE.

(a) SURETY BOND REQUIREMENTS.—Chapter 93 of subtitle VI of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

''§ 9310. Individual sureties

''If another applicable law or regulation permits the acceptance of a bond from a surety that is not subject to sections 9305 and 9306 and is based on a pledge of assets by the surety, the assets pledged by such surety shall—

''(1) consist of eligible obligations described under section 9303(a); and

''(2) be submitted to the official of the Government required to approve or accept the bond, who shall deposit the assets with a depository described under section 9303(b).''; and

(2) in the table of contents for such chapter, by adding at the end the following:

''9310. Individual sureties.''.

(b) AMOUNT OF SURETY BOND GUARANTEE FROM SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.—Section 411(c)(1) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''70'' and inserting ''90''.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON SURETY BONDS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the following:

(A) All instances during the 10-year period beginning on January 31, 2006, in which a surety bond proposed or issued by a surety in connection with a Federal project was—

(i) rejected by a Federal contracting officer; or

(ii) accepted by a Federal contracting officer, but was later found to have been backed by insufficient collateral or to be otherwise deficient or with respect to which the surety did not perform.

(B) The consequences to the Federal Government, subcontractors, and suppliers of the instances described under subparagraph (A).

(C) The percentages of all Federal contracts that were awarded to new startup businesses (including new startup businesses that are small disadvantaged businesses or disadvantaged business enterprises), small disadvantaged businesses, and disadvantaged business enterprises as prime contractors during—

(i) the 2-year period beginning on January 31, 2014 and ending on January 31, 2016; and

(ii) the 2-year period beginning on January 31, 2016 and ending on January 31, 2018.

(D) An assessment of the impact of the amendments made by this section upon the percentages described in subparagraph (C).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than January 31, 2019, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under paragraph (1).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE.—The term ''disadvantaged business enterprise'' has the meaning given that term under section 26.5 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(B) NEW STARTUP BUSINESS.—The term ''new startup business'' means a business that was formed in the 2-year period ending on the date on which the business bids on a Federal contract that requires giving a surety bond.

(C) SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS.—The term ''small disadvantaged business'' has the meaning given the term ''socially and economically disadvantaged small business concern'' under section 8(a)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(4)).

SEC. 840. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES, BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY SPECIALISTS, AND COMMERCIAL MARKET REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 15(l)(5)(A)(iii) of the

Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(l)(5)(A)(iii)) is amended by striking ''except that'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''except that—

''(I) any person serving in such a position on or before January 3, 2013, may continue to serve in that position for a period of 5 years beginning on such date without the required certification; and

''(II) any person hired for such position after January 3, 2013, may have up to one calendar year from the date of employment to obtain the required certification.''.

(b) BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY SPECIALIST REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY SPECIALISTS.—A Business Opportunity Specialist described under section 7(j)(10)(D) shall have a Level I Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting (or any successor certification) or the equivalent Department of Defense certification, except that—

''(1) a Business Opportunity Specialist who was serving on or before January 3, 2013, may continue to serve as a Business Opportunity Specialist for a period of 5 years beginning on such date without such a certification; and

''(2) any person hired as a Business Opportunity Specialist after January 3, 2013, may have up to one calendar year from the date of employment to obtain the required certification.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(j)(10)(D)(i) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 636(j)(10)(D)(i)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(c) COMMERCIAL MARKET REPRESENTATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633), as amended by section 9 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMERCIAL MARKET REPRESENTATIVES.—A commercial market representative referred to in section 15(q)(3) shall have a Level I Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting (or any successor certification) or the equivalent Department of Defense certification, except that—

''(1) a commercial market representative who was serving on or before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 may continue to serve as a commercial market representative for a period of 5 years beginning on such date without such a certification; and

''(2) any person hired as a commercial market representative after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 may have up to one calendar year from the date of employment to obtain the required certification.''.

SEC. 841. INCLUDING SUBCONTRACTING GOALS IN AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 1633(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2076; 15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended by striking ''assume responsibility for of the agency's success in achieving small business contracting goals and percentages'' and inserting ''assume responsibility for the agency's success in achieving each of the small business prime contracting and subcontracting goals and percentages''.

SEC. 842. MODIFICATIONS TO REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFIED HUBZONE SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS LOCATED IN A BASE CLOSURE AREA.

(a) PERIOD FOR BASE CLOSURE AREAS.—

(1) EXTENSION OF PERIOD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 152(a)(2) of title I of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (15 U.S.C. 632 note) is amended by striking ''for a period of 5 years'' and inserting ''for the later of—

''(A) 8 years from the date of final closure; or

''(B) the date designated by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration that is based on data of the Bureau of the Census obtained from the first decennial census conducted after the date of final closure.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1698(b)(2) of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (15 U.S.C. 632 note) is amended by striking ''5 years'' and inserting ''the later of—

''(A) 8 years; or

''(B) the date designated by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration described in section 152(a)(2)(B) of title I of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (15 U.S.C. 632 note).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) apply to—

(i) a base closure area (as defined in section 3(p)(4)(D) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(4)(D))) that, on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, is treated as a HUBZone described in section 3(p)(1)(E) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(1)(E)) under—

(I) section 152(a)(2) of title I of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (15 U.S.C. 632 note); or

(II) section 1698(b)(2) of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (15 U.S.C. 632 note); and

(ii) a base closure area relating to the closure of a military instillation under the authority described in clauses (i) through (iv) of section 3(p)(4)(D) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(4)(D)) that occurs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ELIGIBLE AREA FOR EMPLOYEE RESIDENCE FOR BASE CLOSURE HUBZONES.—Section 3(p)(5)(A)(i)(I) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(5)(A)(i)(I)) is amended—

(1) in item (aa), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating item (bb) as item (cc); and

(3) by inserting after item (aa) the following new item:

''(bb) pursuant to subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of paragraph (3), that its principal office is located within a base closure area and that not fewer than 35 percent of its employees reside in such base closure area or in another HUBZone; or''.

(c) EXPANSION OF AREA INCLUDED IN BASE AREA CLOSURE DEFINITION.—Section 3(p)(4)(D) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(4)(D)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'';

(2) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iv) as subclauses (I) through (IV), respectively;

(3) in the matter preceding subclause (I), as so redesignated, by striking ''means lands within'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(i) lands within''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(ii) lands within 25 miles of the external boundaries of a military installation described in clause (i), excluding any such lands that are not within a qualified nonmetropolitan county.''.

SEC. 843. JOINT VENTURING AND TEAMING.

(a) JOINT VENTURE OFFERS FOR BUNDLED OR CONSOLIDATED CONTRACTS.—Section 15(e)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(e)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) CONTRACT TEAMING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a solicitation of offers for a bundled or consolidated contract that is issued by the head of an agency, a small business concern that provides for use of a particular team of subcontractors or a joint venture of small business concerns may submit an offer for the performance of the contract.

''(B) EVALUATION OF OFFERS.—The head of the agency shall evaluate an offer described in subparagraph (A) in the same manner as other offers, with due consideration to the capabilities of all of the proposed subcontractors or members of the joint venture as follows:

''(i) TEAMS.—When evaluating an offer of a small business prime contractor that includes a proposed team of small business subcontractors, the head of the agency shall consider the capabilities and past performance of each first tier subcontractor that is part of the team as the capabilities and past performance of the small business prime contractor.

''(ii) JOINT VENTURES.—When evaluating an offer of a joint venture of small business concerns, if the joint venture does not have sufficient capabilities or past performance to be considered for award of a contract opportunity, the head of the agency shall consider the capabilities and past performance of each member of the joint venture as the capabilities past performance of the joint venture.

''(C) STATUS AS A SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—Participation of a small business concern in a team or a joint venture under this paragraph shall not affect the status of that concern as a small business concern for any other purpose.''.

(b) TEAM AND JOINT VENTURES OFFERS FOR MULTIPLE AWARD CONTRACTS.—Section 15(q)(1) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 644(q)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting ''AND JOINT VENTURE'' before ''REQUIREMENTS'';

(2) by striking ''Each Federal agency'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) TEAMS.—When evaluating an offer of a small business prime contractor that includes a proposed team of small business subcontractors for any multiple award contract above the substantial bundling threshold of the Federal agency, the head of the agency shall consider the capabilities and past performance of each first tier subcontractor that is part of the team as the capabilities and past performance of the small business prime contractor.

''(C) JOINT VENTURES.—When evaluating an offer of a joint venture of small business concerns for any multiple award contract above the substantial bundling threshold of the Federal agency, if the joint venture does not have sufficient capabilities or past performance to be considered for award of a contract opportunity, the head of the agency shall consider the capabilities and past performance of each member of the joint venture as the capabilities and past performance of the joint venture.''.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 851. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.

(a) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.—Section 139 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c) The Director shall consider the potential for increases in program cost estimates or delays in schedule estimates in the implementation of policies, procedures, and activities related to operational test and evaluation and shall take appropriate action to ensure that operational test and evaluation activities do not unnecessarily increase program costs or impede program schedules.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 196(c)(1)(A)(ii) of such title is amended by striking ''section 139(i)'' and inserting ''section 139(k)''.

SEC. 852. USE OF RECENT PRICES PAID BY THE GOVERNMENT IN THE DETERMINATION OF PRICE REASONABLENESS.

Section 2306a(b) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 804, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) A contracting officer shall consider evidence provided by an offeror of recent purchase prices paid by the Government for the same or similar commercial items in establishing price reasonableness on a subsequent purchase if the contracting officer is satisfied that the prices previously paid remain a valid reference for comparison after considering the totality of other relevant factors such as the time elapsed since the prior purchase and any differences in the quantities purchased or applicable terms and conditions.''.

SEC. 853. CODIFICATION OF OTHER TRANSACTION AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 10 U.S.C. 2371 note) is transferred to chapter 139 of title 10, United States Code, inserted so as to appear after section 2371a, redesignated as section 2371b, and amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

''§ 2371b. Authority of the Advanced Research Projects Agency to carry out certain prototype projects'';

(2) by striking ''of title 10, United States Code'' each place it appears and inserting ''of this title'';

(3) by striking ''of title 41, United States Code'' each place it appears and inserting ''of title 41'';

(4) by amending subparagraph (B) of subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

''(B) all parties to the transaction other than the Federal Government are innovative small business and nontraditional contractors with unique capabilities relevant to the prototype project.''; and

(5) by striking subsection (i).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2371a the following new item:

''2371b. Authority of the Advanced Research Projects Agency to carry out certain prototype projects.''.

SEC. 854. AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN ACQUISITION THRESHOLDS.

(a) SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION THRESHOLD GENERALLY.—Section 134 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$100,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''.

(b) MICRO-PURCHASE THRESHOLD.—Section 1902(a) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$3,000'' and inserting ''$5,000''.

(c) SPECIAL EMERGENCY PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY.—Section 1903(b)(2) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$750,000''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''$1,000,000'' and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(d) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN RESERVATION.—Section 15(j)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(j)(1)) is amended by striking ''$100,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''.

SEC. 855. REVISION OF METHOD OF ROUNDING WHEN MAKING INFLATION ADJUSTMENT OF ACQUISITION-RELATED DOLLAR THRESHOLDS.

Section 1908(e)(2) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''on the day before the adjustment'' and inserting ''as calculated under paragraph (1)'';

(2) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C); and

(3) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

''(D) not less than $1,000,000, but less than $10,000,000, to the nearest $500,000;

''(E) not less than $10,000,000, but less than $100,000,000, to the nearest $5,000,000;

''(F) not less than $100,000,000, but less than $1,000,000,000, to the nearest $50,000,000; and

''(G) $1,000,000,000 or more, to the nearest $500,000,000.''.

SEC. 856. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR STANDALONE MANPOWER ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 2434 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and a manpower estimate for the program have'' and inserting ''has''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REGULATIONS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2);

(2) by striking ''shall require—'' and all that follows through ''that the independent'' and inserting ''shall require that the independent'';

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and realigning those paragraphs so as to be two ems from the left margin; and

(4) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''and operations and support,'' and inserting ''operations and support, and manpower to operate, maintain, and support the program upon full operational deployment,''; and

(B) by striking ''; and'' at the end and inserting a period.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2434. Independent cost estimates''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 144 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''2434. Independent cost estimates.''.

SEC. 857. EXAMINATION AND GUIDANCE RELATING TO OVERSIGHT AND APPROVAL OF SERVICES CONTRACTS.

Not later than March 1, 2016, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall—

(1) complete an examination of the decision authority related to acquisition of services; and

(2) develop and issue guidance to improve capabilities and processes related to requirements development and source selection for, and oversight and management of, services contracts.

SEC. 858. STREAMLINING OF REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REVISION.—Section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2222. Defense business systems: business process reengineering; enterprise architecture; management

''(a) DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS GENERALLY.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each covered defense business system developed, deployed, and operated by the Department of Defense—

''(1) supports efficient business processes that have been reviewed, and as appropriate revised, through business process reengineering;

''(2) is integrated into a comprehensive defense business enterprise architecture; and

''(3) is managed in a manner that provides visibility into, and traceability of, expenditures for the system.

''(b) ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.—

''(1) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall issue guidance to provide for the coordination of, and decision making for, the planning, programming, and control of investments in covered defense business systems.

''(2) SUPPORTING GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall direct the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Chief Information Officer, and the Chief Management Officer of each of the military departments to issue and maintain supporting guidance, as appropriate, for the guidance of the Secretary issued under paragraph (1).

''(c) GUIDANCE ELEMENTS.—The guidance issued under subsection (b)(1) shall include the following elements:

''(1) Policy to ensure that the business processes of the Department of Defense are continuously reviewed and revised—

''(A) to implement the most streamlined and efficient business processes practicable; and

''(B) to enable the use of commercial off-the-shelf business systems with the fewest changes necessary to accommodate requirements and interfaces that are unique to the Department of Defense.

''(2) A process to establish requirements for covered defense business systems.

''(3) Mechanisms for the planning and control of investments in covered defense business systems, including a process for the collection and review of programming and budgeting information for covered defense business systems.

''(4) Policy requiring the periodic review of covered defense business systems that have been fully deployed, by portfolio, to ensure that investments in such portfolios are appropriate.

''(d) DEFENSE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE.—

''(1) BLUEPRINT.—The Secretary, working through the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, shall develop and maintain a blueprint to guide the development of integrated business processes within the Department of Defense. Such blueprint shall be known as the 'defense business enterprise architecture'.

''(2) PURPOSE.—The defense business enterprise architecture shall be sufficiently defined to effectively guide implementation of interoperable defense business system solutions and shall be consistent with the policies and procedures established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(3) ELEMENTS.—The defense business enterprise architecture shall—

''(A) include policies, procedures, business data standards, business performance measures, and business information requirements that apply uniformly throughout the Department of Defense; and

''(B) enable the Department of Defense to—

''(i) comply with all applicable law, including Federal accounting, financial management, and reporting requirements;

''(ii) routinely produce verifiable, timely, accurate, and reliable business and financial information for management purposes; and

''(iii) integrate budget, accounting, and program information and systems.

''(4) INTEGRATION INTO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ARCHITECTURE.—(A) The defense business enterprise architecture shall be integrated into the information technology enterprise architecture required under subparagraph (B).

''(B) The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense shall develop an information technology enterprise architecture. The architecture shall describe a plan for improving

the information technology and computing infrastructure of the Department of Defense, including for each of the major business processes conducted by the Department of Defense.

''(e) DEFENSE BUSINESS COUNCIL.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT FOR COUNCIL.—The Secretary shall establish a Defense Business Council to provide advice to the Secretary on developing the defense business enterprise architecture, reengineering the Department's business processes, and requirements for defense business systems. The Council shall be chaired by the Deputy Chief Management Officer and the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The membership of the Council shall include the following:

''(A) The Chief Management Officers of the military departments, or their designees.

''(B) The following officials of the Department of Defense, or their designees:

''(i) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics with respect to acquisition, logistics, and installations management processes.

''(ii) The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) with respect to financial management and planning and budgeting processes.

''(iii) The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness with respect to human resources management processes.

''(f) APPROVALS REQUIRED FOR DEVELOPMENT.—

''(1) INITIAL APPROVAL REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall ensure that a covered defense business system program cannot proceed into development (or, if no development is required, into production or fielding) unless the appropriate approval official (as specified in paragraph (2)) approves the program by determining that the covered defense business system concerned—

''(A) supports a business process that has been, or is being as a result of the acquisition program, reengineered to be as streamlined and efficient as practicable consistent with the guidance issued pursuant to subsection (b), including business process mapping;

''(B) is in compliance with the defense business enterprise architecture developed pursuant to subsection (d) or will be in compliance as a result of modifications planned;

''(C) has valid, achievable requirements; and

''(D) is in compliance with the Department's auditability requirements.

''(2) APPROPRIATE OFFICIAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the appropriate approval official with respect to a covered defense business system is the following:

''(A) In the case of a system of a military department, the Chief Management Officer of that military department.

''(B) In the case of a system of a Defense Agency or Defense Field Activity or a system that will support the business process of more than one military department or Defense Agency or Defense Field Activity, the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

''(C) In the case of any system, such official other than the applicable official under subparagraph (A) or (B) as the Secretary designates for such purpose.

''(3) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—For any fiscal year in which funds are expended for development pursuant to a covered defense business system program, the Defense Business Council shall review the system and certify (or decline to certify as the case may be) that it continues to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (1). If the Council determines that certification cannot be granted, the chairman of the Council shall notify the appropriate approval official and the acquisition Milestone Decision Authority for the program and provide a recommendation for corrective action.

''(4) OBLIGATION OF FUNDS IN VIOLATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—The obligation of Department of Defense funds for a covered defense business system program that has not been certified in accordance with paragraph (3) is a violation of section 1341(a)(1)(A) of title 31.

''(g) RESPONSIBILITY OF MILESTONE DECISION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that, as part of the defense acquisition system, the requirements of this section are fully addressed by the Milestone Decision Authority for a covered defense business system program as acquisition process approvals are considered for such system.

''(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 15 of each year from 2016 through 2020, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on activities of the Department of Defense pursuant to this section. Each report shall include the following:

''(1) A description of actions taken and planned with respect to the guidance required by subsection (b) and the defense business enterprise architecture developed pursuant to subsection (d).

''(2) A description of actions taken and planned for the reengineering of business processes by the Defense Business Council established pursuant to subsection (e).

''(3) A summary of covered defense business system funding and covered defense business systems approved pursuant to subsection (f).

''(4) Identification of any covered defense business system program that during the preceding fiscal year was reviewed and not approved pursuant to subsection (f) and the reasons for the lack of approval.

''(5) Identification of any covered defense business system program that during the preceding fiscal year failed to achieve initial operational capability within five years after the date the program received Milestone B approval.

''(6) For any program identified under paragraph (5), a description of the plan to address the issues that caused the failure.

''(7) A discussion of specific improvements in business operations and cost savings resulting from successful covered defense business systems programs.

''(8) A copy of the most recent report of the Chief Management Officer of each military department on implementation of business transformation initiatives by such military department in accordance with section 908 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4569; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note).

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1)(A) DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM.—The term 'defense business system' means an information system that is operated by, for, or on behalf of the Department of Defense, including any of the following:

''(i) A financial system.

''(ii) A financial data feeder system.

''(iii) A contracting system.

''(iv) A logistics system.

''(v) A planning and budgeting system.

''(vi) An installations management system.

''(vii) A human resources management system.

''(viii) A training and readiness system.

''(B) The term does not include—

''(i) a national security system; or

''(ii) an information system used exclusively by and within the defense commissary system or the exchange system or other instrumentality of the Department of Defense conducted for the morale, welfare, and recreation of members of the armed forces using nonappropriated funds.

''(2) COVERED DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM.—The term 'covered defense business system' means a defense business system that is expected to have a total amount of budget authority, over the period of the current future-years defense program submitted to Congress under section 221 of this title, in excess of the threshold established for the use of special simplified acquisition procedures pursuant to section 2304(g)(1)(B) of this title.

''(3) COVERED DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM PROGRAM.—The term 'covered defense business system program' means a defense acquisition program to develop and field a covered defense business system or an increment of a covered defense business system.

''(4) ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE.—The term 'enterprise architecture' has the meaning given that term in section 3601(4) of title 44.

''(5) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term 'information system' has the meaning given that term in section 11101 of title 40.

''(6) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM.—The term 'national security system' has the meaning given that term in section 3542(b)(2) of title 44.

''(7) MILESTONE DECISION AUTHORITY.—The term 'Milestone Decision Authority', with respect to a defense acquisition program, means the individual within the Department of Defense designated with the responsibility to grant milestone approvals for that program.

''(8) BUSINESS PROCESS MAPPING.—The term 'business process mapping' means a procedure in which the steps in a business process are clarified and documented in both written form and in a flow chart.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2222. Defense business systems: business process reengineering; enterprise architecture; management.''.

(b) DEADLINE FOR GUIDANCE.—The guidance required by subsection (b)(1) of section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(1), shall be issued not later than December 31, 2016.

(c) REPEAL.—Section 811 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is repealed.

SEC. 859. CONSIDERATION OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS IN PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEW.

(a) CONSIDERATION.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall ensure that Department of Defense Instruction 5000.02 and other applicable guidance receive full consideration, during preliminary design review for a product, with respect to any strategic materials required for sustainment of the product over the life cycle of the product.

(b) STRATEGIC MATERIALS.—In this section, the term ''strategic materials'' means—

(1) materials critical to national security, as defined in section 187(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code; and

(2) any specialty metal, as defined in section 2533b(l) of such title.

SEC. 860. PROCUREMENT OF PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall use best value tradeoff source selection methods to the maximum extent practicable when procuring an item of personal protective equipment or critical safety items.

(b) PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''personal protective equipment'' includes the following:

(1) Body armor components.

(2) Combat helmets.

(3) Combat protective eyewear.

(4) Environmental and fire resistant clothing.

(5) Footwear.

(6) Organizational clothing and individual equipment.

(7) Other critical safety items as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

SEC. 861. AMENDMENTS CONCERNING DETECTION AND AVOIDANCE OF COUNTERFEIT ELECTRONIC PARTS.

Section 818(c)(2)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by inserting ''electronic'' after ''avoid counterfeit'';

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by inserting ''covered'' after ''provided to the''; and

(B) by inserting ''or were obtained by the covered contractor in accordance with regulations described in paragraph (3)'' after ''Regulation''; and

(3) in clause (iii), by inserting ''discovers the counterfeit electronic parts or suspect counterfeit electronic parts and'' after ''contractor''.

SEC. 862. REVISION TO DUTIES OF THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION AND THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING.

Section 139b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''review and approve or disapprove'' and inserting ''advise in writing the milestone decision authority regarding review and approval of''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''in order to advise relevant technical authorities for such programs on the incorporation of best practices for developmental test from across the Department'' after ''programs''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''review and approve'' and inserting ''advise in writing the milestone decision authority regarding review and approval of''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''in order to advise relevant technical authorities for such programs on the incorporation of best practices for systems engineering from across the Department'' after ''programs''.

SEC. 863. EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE ANNUAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR CONTRACT SERVICES.

Section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1489), as most recently amended by section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3429) is further amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b), by striking ''or 2015'' and inserting ''2015, or 2016'';

(2) in subsection (c)(3), by striking ''and 2015'' and inserting ''2015, and 2016'';

(3) in subsection (d)(4), by striking ''or 2015'' and inserting ''2015, or 2016''; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2016''.

SEC. 864. USE OF LOWEST PRICE, TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PROCUREMENT OF AUDIT OR AUDIT READINESS SERVICES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Given the size and scope of the Department of Defense, the effort to finish and institutionalize auditability is one of the more challenging management tasks that has ever faced the Department.

(2) The acquisition of services by the Department abides by many rules and parameters, one of which is the lowest price, technically acceptable (LPTA) evaluation method.

(3) The Department's audit effort is extremely complicated, requiring personnel and assistance who have the financial management and auditor skills that a non-independent public accounting firm or a non-credentialed firm offering the lowest price may not have.

(4) In order for the Department to meet the September 30, 2017, audit readiness statutory deadline and the March 31, 2019, audit of fiscal year 2018 statutory deadline, it is imperative that the Department not sacrifice contracts with firms who have the proper credentials and expertise to meet these deadlines.

(5) The LPTA evaluation method is appropriate for commercial or non-complex services or supplies where the requirement is clearly definable and the risk of unsuccessful contract performance is minimal. However, audit and audit readiness services are complex and evolving.

(b) REQUIREMENTS BEFORE USING LPTA EVALUATION METHOD.—Before using the lowest price, technically acceptable evaluation method for the procurement of audit or audit readiness services, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) establish the values and metrics for the services being procured, including domain expertise and experience, size and scope of offeror's team, personnel qualifications and certifications, technology, and tools; and

(2) review each offeror's past performance requirements.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

SEC. 901. REDESIGNATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

(a) REDESIGNATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.—

(1) REDESIGNATION OF MILITARY DEPARTMENT.—The military department designated as the Department of the Navy is redesignated as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(2) REDESIGNATION OF SECRETARY AND OTHER STATUTORY OFFICES.—

(A) SECRETARY.—The position of the Secretary of the Navy is redesignated as the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(B) OTHER STATUTORY OFFICES.—The positions of the Under Secretary of the Navy, the four Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, and the General Counsel of the Department of the Navy are redesignated as the Under Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the General Counsel of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, respectively.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF ''MILITARY DEPARTMENT''.—Paragraph (8) of section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(8) The term 'military department' means the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Department of the Air Force.''.

(2) ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT.—The first sentence of section 5011 of such title is amended to read as follows: ''The Department of the Navy and Marine Corps is separately organized under the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps.''.

(3) POSITION OF SECRETARY.—Section 5013(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''There is a Secretary of the Navy'' and inserting ''There is a Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps''.

(4) CHAPTER HEADINGS.—

(A) The heading of chapter 503 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 503—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS''.

(B) The heading of chapter 507 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 507—COMPOSITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS''.

(5) OTHER AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Department of the Navy'' and ''Secretary of the Navy'' each place they appear other than as specified in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) (including in section headings, subsection captions, tables of chapters, and tables of sections) and inserting ''Department of the Navy and Marine Corps'' and ''Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps'', respectively, in each case with the matter inserted to be in the same typeface and typestyle as the matter stricken.

(B)(i) Sections 5013(f), 5014(b)(2), 5016(a), 5017(2), 5032(a), and 5042(a) of such title are amended by striking ''Assistant Secretaries of the Navy'' and inserting ''Assistant Secretaries of the Navy and Marine Corps''.

(ii) The heading of section 5016 of such title, and the item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 503 of such title, are each amended by inserting ''and Marine Corps'' after ''of the Navy'', with the matter inserted in each case to be in the same typeface and typestyle as the matter amended.

(c) OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW AND OTHER REFERENCES.—

(1) TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Department of the Navy'' and ''Secretary of the Navy'' each place they appear and inserting ''Department of the Navy and Marine Corps'' and ''Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps'', respectively.

(2) OTHER REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law other than in title 10 or title 37, United States Code, or in any regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States, to the Department of the Navy shall be considered to be a reference to the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. Any such reference to an office specified in subsection (a)(2) shall be considered to be a reference to that office as redesignated by that section.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 902. CHANGE OF PERIOD FOR CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF REVIEW OF THE UNIFIED COMMAND PLAN.

Section 161(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''two years'' and inserting ''four years''.

SEC. 903. UPDATE OF STATUTORY SPECIFICATION OF FUNCTIONS OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF RELATING TO JOINT FORCE DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.

Section 153(a)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) Advising the Secretary on development of joint command, control, communications, and cyber capability, including integration and interoperability of such capability, through requirements, integrated architectures, data standards, and assessments.''.

SEC. 904. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) As senior United States statesman Dr. Henry Kissinger wrote in testimony submitted to the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 29, 2015, ''The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War.''.

(2) The rise of non-state forces and near peer competitors has introduced destabilizing pressures around the globe.

(3) Advances in information and weapons technology have reduced the time available for the United States to prepare for and respond to crises against both known and unknown threats.

(4) The importance of the maritime domain cannot be overstated. As acknowledged in the

March 2015 Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard maritime strategy, ''A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower'': ''Oceans are the lifeblood of the interconnected global community. . . 90 percent of trade by volume travels across the oceans. Approximately 70 percent of the world's population lives within 100 miles of the coastline.''.

(5) The United States must be prepared to rapidly respond to crises around the world regardless of the nation's fiscal health.

(6) In this global security environment, it is critical that the nation possess a maritime force whose mission and ethos is readiness—a fight tonight force, forward deployed, that can respond immediately to emergent crises across the full range of military operations around the globe either from the sea or home station.

(7) The need for such a force was recognized by the 82nd Congress after the major wars of the twentieth century, when it mandated a core mission for the nation's leanest force—the Marine Corps—to be most ready when the nation is least ready.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, remain the Nation's expeditionary, crisis response force;

(B) the need for such a force with such a capability has never been greater; and

(C) accordingly, in recognition of this need and the wisdom of the 82nd Congress, the 114th Congress reaffirms section 5063 of title 10, United States Code, uniquely charging the United States Marine Corps with this responsibility.

(2) It is further the sense of Congress that the Marine Corps—

(A) shall—

(i) be organized to include not less than three combat divisions and three air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein;

(ii) be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign; and

(iii) provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct;

but these additional duties may not detract from nor interfere with the operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized;

(B) shall develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations that pertain to the tactics, techniques, and equipment used by landing forces; and

(C) is responsible, in accordance with the integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war.

SEC. 905. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR STREAMLINING OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) On July 31, 2013, the then Secretary of Defense stated that the Department would ''reduc[e] the Department's major headquarters budgets by 20 percent. . .Although the 20 percent cut applies to budget dollars, organizations will strive for a goal of 20 percent reductions in government civilians and military personnel.'' The then Secretary further stated that ''these management reforms. . .will reduce the Department's overhead and operating costs by...$10 billion over the next five years.''.

(2) Furthermore, the President's budget request for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 stated that reductions to management headquarters staff and consolidation of duplicative efforts across the Department would result in a savings of $5.3 billion over 5 years—through fiscal year 2019. However, as noted by the Government Accountability Office in a January 2015 report (GAO-15-10), the Department accounted for $5.3 billion as efficiency savings in its budget request, but has not provided specific details on the reductions to management headquarters' staff it plans to make.

(3) In June 2014, the Government Accountability Office found (in GAO-14-439) that the Department did not have an accurate accounting of the resources being devoted to management headquarters to use as a starting point for tracking reductions to such headquarters. In April 2015, the Government Accountability Office reported (in GAO-15-404SP) that focusing reductions on management headquarters budgets and personnel, which tend to be inconsistently defined and often represent a small portion of the overall headquarters, shields much of the resources identified for potential reduction.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense's commitment in July 2013 to a goal of a 20 percent reduction in headquarters budgets and personnel and a goal of $10 billion in cost savings over five years is worthwhile and should be fully implemented;

(2) without a clear baseline for management headquarters, it is difficult to demonstrate and track progress achieving actual savings;

(3) any reduction in personnel should not be implemented as an across-the-board cut, but rather should be strategically designed to retain critical functions, capabilities, and skill sets—including but not limited to depots and the acquisition workforce—and eliminate unnecessary or redundant functions or skill sets that do not benefit or support mission requirements;

(4) functions should be performed at the lowest appropriate organizational level and those organizations should be empowered and held accountable;

(5) duplicative functions at higher level organizations should be eliminated; and

(6) the movement of a function from a management headquarters to a different Department of Defense organization or a lower level organization does not result in an efficiency, since the same budget is still required to perform that function.

(c) REQUIREMENT TO IMPLEMENT 20 PERCENT REDUCTION IN MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS FUNCTIONS.—Section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 111 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) IMPLEMENTATION OF MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS REDUCTION.—The Secretary of Defense shall implement the 20 percent reduction directed by the Secretary in July 2013 in management headquarters budget and personnel by September 30, 2019, for the covered organizations in the National Capital Region (as defined in section 2674(f) of title 10, United States Code). Such reductions shall be strategically designed to retain critical functions, capabilities, and skill sets. Management, functions, programs, or offices shall be moved to the lowest appropriate organizational level. In any report issued pursuant to subsection (d), the Secretary may not claim a cost savings solely based on moving management, functions, programs, or offices from one organization to another.''.

(d) LIMITATION ON WORKING-CAPITAL FUND POSITIONS.—Section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 111 note) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) LIMITATION ON WORKING-CAPITAL FUND POSITIONS.—In implementing the 20 percent reduction referred to in subsection (e), the Secretary of Defense may not reduce the number of Department of Defense civilian employees whose salaries are funded from working-capital funds except in accordance with section 2472 of title 10, United States Code.''.

(e) CHANGE IN DEADLINE FOR REQUIRED PLAN.—Section 904(a) of the such Act is amended by striking ''180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''March 31, 2016''.

(f) ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—Section 904(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph (1):

''(1) An accurate baseline accounting of defense headquarters budgets and personnel as of fiscal year 2014, including what is and is not included as part of management headquarters accounting, and a detailed description of the number of personnel, budgets, functions, capabilities, and skill sets.'';

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting ''actual and'' before ''planned changes'';

(B) by striking ''staffing'' and inserting ''personnel''; and

(C) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', set forth separately by fiscal year, from fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2019'';

(4) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''description of the planned changes'' and inserting ''detailed description of the actual and planned changes''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', set forth separately by fiscal year, from fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2019''; and

(5) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking ''fiscal year 2015, and estimated savings to be achieved for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2024'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2014, and estimated savings to be achieved, along with associated changes or reductions in budget, for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2024''.

(g) ADDITIONAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 904(d) of such Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''March 31, 2016''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''including'' and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting the following: ''and specific detailed information on how the changes, consolidations, or reductions were prioritized and resulted in functions no longer being performed, in the fiscal year covered by such report.'';

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking '', including'' and all that follows through ''management review''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(H) A separate description of—

''(i) the management functions, programs, or offices that were eliminated and how each represents a redundant management or oversight function; and

''(ii) the management, functions, programs, or offices that were moved, and how moving each will result in efficiency.''.

SEC. 906. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND WORKFORCE INCENTIVE SYSTEM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law

111–84) required the Department of Defense to institute a fair, credible, and transparent performance appraisal system, given the name ''New Beginnings,'' for employees, which—

(A) links employee bonuses and other performance-based action to employee performance appraisals;

(B) ensures ongoing performance feedback and dialogue among supervisors, managers, and employees throughout the appraisal period, with timetables for review; and

(C) develops performance assistance plans to give employees formal training, on-the-job training, counseling, mentoring, and other assistance.

(2) The military components and defense agencies of the Department of Defense are currently reviewing the proposed ''New Beginnings'' performance management and workforce incentive system developed in response to section 1113 of Public Law 111–84.

(3) The Department of Defense anticipates it will begin implementation of the ''New Beginnings'' performance management and workforce incentive system in April 2016.

(4) The authority provided in section 1113 of Public Law 111–84 provided the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, flexibilities in promulgating regulations to redesign the procedures which are applied by the Department of Defense in making appointments to positions within the competitive service in order to—

(A) better meet mission needs;

(B) respond to managers' needs and the needs of applicants;

(C) produce high-quality applicants;

(D) support timely decisions;

(E) uphold appointments based on merit system principles; and

(F) promote competitive job offers.

(5) In implementing the ''New Beginnings'' performance management and workforce incentive system, section 113 of Public Law 111–84 requires the Secretary of Defense to comply with veterans' preference requirements.

(6) Among the criteria for the new performance management and workforce incentive system authorized under section 1113 of Public Law 111–84, the Secretary of Defense is required to—

(A) adhere to merit principles;

(B) include a means for ensuring employee involvement (for bargaining unit employees, through their exclusive representatives) in the design and implementation of the performance management and workforce incentive system;

(C) provide for adequate training and retraining for supervisors, managers, and employees in the implementation and operation of the performance management and workforce incentive system;

(D) develop a comprehensive management succession program to provide training to employees to develop managers for the agency and a program to provide training to supervisors on actions, options, and strategies a supervisor may use in administering the performance management and workforce incentive system;

(E) include effective transparency and accountability measures and safeguards to ensure that the management of the performance management and workforce incentive system is fair, credible, and equitable, including appropriate independent reasonableness reviews, internal assessments, and employee surveys;

(F) use the annual strategic workforce plan required by section 115b of title 10; and

(G) ensure that adequate agency resources are allocated for the design, implementation, and administration of the performance management and workforce incentive system.

(7) Section 1113 of Public Law 111–84 also requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a program of training—to be completed by a supervisor every three years—on the actions, options, and strategies a supervisor may use in—

(A) developing and discussing relevant goals and objectives with the employee, communicating and discussing progress relative to performance goals and objectives, and conducting performance appraisals;

(B) mentoring and motivating employees, and improving employee performance and productivity;

(C) fostering a work environment characterized by fairness, respect, equal opportunity, and attention to the quality of the work of employees;

(D) effectively managing employees with unacceptable performance;

(E) addressing reports of a hostile work environment, reprisal, or harassment of or by another supervisor or employee; and

(F) allowing experienced supervisors to mentor new supervisors by sharing knowledge and advice in areas such as communication, critical thinking, responsibility, flexibility, motivating employees, teamwork, leadership, and professional development, and pointing out strengths and areas of development.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should proceed with the collaborative work with employee representatives on the ''New Beginnings'' performance management and workforce incentive system and begin implementation of the new system at the earliest possible date.

SEC. 907. GUIDELINES FOR CONVERSION OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY CIVILIAN OR CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL TO PERFORMANCE BY MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Section 129a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS BY MILITARY PERSONNEL.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no functions performed by civilian personnel or contractors may be converted to performance by military personnel unless—

''(A) there is a direct link between the functions to be performed and a military occupational specialty; and

''(B) the conversion to performance by military personnel is cost effective, based on Department of Defense instruction 7041.04 (or any successor administrative regulation, directive, or policy).

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following functions:

''(A) Functions required by law or regulation to be performed by military personnel.

''(B) Functions related to—

''(i) missions involving operation risks and combatant status under the Law of War;

''(ii) specialized collective and individual training requiring military-unique knowledge and skills based on recent operational experience;

''(iii) independent advice to senior civilian leadership in the Department of Defense requiring military-unique knowledge and skills based on recent operational experience; and

''(iv) command and control arrangements under chapter 47 of this title (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).''.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

SEC. 1001. GENERAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this division for fiscal year 2016 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof). Amounts of authorizations so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this section may not exceed $5,000,000,000.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR TRANSFERS BETWEEN MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS.—A transfer of funds between military personnel authorizations under title IV shall not be counted toward the dollar limitation in paragraph (2).

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) to transfer authorizations—

(1) may only be used to provide authority for items that have a higher priority than the items from which authority is transferred; and

(2) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress.

(c) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—A transfer made from one account to another under the authority of this section shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for the account to which the amount is transferred by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(d) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall promptly notify Congress of each transfer made under subsection (a).

SEC. 1002. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER FUNDS TO THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION TO SUSTAIN NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION AND NAVAL REACTORS.

(a) TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—If the amount authorized to be appropriated for the weapons activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration under section 3101 or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 is less than $8,900,000,000 (the amount projected to be required for such activities in fiscal year 2016 as specified in the report under section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2549)), the Secretary of Defense may transfer, from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 pursuant to this Act, to the Secretary of Energy an amount, not to exceed $150,000,000, to be available only for naval reactors or weapons activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—In the event of a transfer under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify Congress of the transfer, and shall include in such notice the Department of Defense account or accounts from which funds are transferred.

(c) TRANSFER MECHANISM.—Any funds transferred under this section shall be transferred in accordance with established procedures for reprogramming under section 1001 or successor provisions of law.

(d) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORITY.—The transfer authority provided under subsection (a) is in addition to any other transfer authority provided under this Act.

SEC. 1003. ACCOUNTING STANDARDS TO VALUE CERTAIN PROPERTY, PLANT, AND EQUIPMENT ITEMS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN ACCOUNTING STANDARDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall work in coordination with the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board to establish accounting standards to value large and unordinary general property, plant, and equipment items.

(b) DEADLINE.—The accounting standards required by subsection (a) shall be established by not later than September 30, 2017, and be available for use for the full audit on the financial statements of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018, as required by section 1003(a) of

the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 842; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note).

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

SEC. 1011. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (a)(2) of section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 1881), as most recently amended by section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 844), is further amended by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2017''.

(b) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF SUPPORT.—Subsection (e)(2) of such section 1033, as so amended, is further amended by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2017''.

SEC. 1012. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON PLAN CENTRAL AMERICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The stability and security of Central American nations have a direct impact on the stability and security of the United States.

(2) Over the past decade, stability and increased security in the Republic of Colombia has pushed illicit trafficking to Central America bringing increased violence and instability.

(3) Much of Central America has seen spikes in violence and homicides. In fiscal year 2013, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime released its Global Study on Homicide 2013. Four of the top five countries with the highest homicide rates in the world were Central American nations including Honduras, Belize, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

(4) In calendar year 2014, approximately 65,000 unaccompanied alien children from Central America entered the United States through its southwest border. This number of such children who enter the United States during calendar year 2015 is expected to be approximately the same.

(5) The southwest border of the United States continues to be porous to illicit trafficking of narcotics, weapons, cash, and people.

(6) In November 2014, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador announced a Plan for the Alliance for Prosperity of the Northern Triangle. This plan is a comprehensive approach to address the ongoing violence and instability facing these three nations by stimulating economic opportunities, improving public safety and rule of law, and strengthening institutions to increase trust in the state.

(7) The United States Government has stated its support for the Alliance for Prosperity and included in the President's fiscal year 2016 budget request $1,000,000,000 in Department of State funds, to support the strategy for United States engagement in Central America. According to the strategy, this funding will be focused on promoting prosperity and regional economic integration, enhancing security, and promoting improved governance.

(8) None of the President's $1,000,000,000 budget request for the strategy for United States engagement in Central America includes any funding for Department of Defense programs in the region.

(9) The Department of Defense provides training, equipment, education, and interdiction efforts to address security challenges in Central America through detection and monitoring of illicit trafficking, assistance in illicit trafficking interdictions, and building partnership capacities.

(10) The Department of Defense through its roles and missions, is executing a plan to address security challenges in Central America in conjunction with the United States Strategy for Engagement in Central America.

(b) POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to prioritize a Plan Central America to address the threatening levels of violence, instability, illicit trafficking, and transnational organized crime that challenge the sovereignty of Central American nations and security of the United States. In order to address such issues, the Department of Defense shall—

(1) increase the efforts of the Department of Defense as the lead agency to detect and monitor the aerial and maritime illicit trafficking into the United States;

(2) increase the efforts of the Department of Defense to support aerial and maritime illicit trafficking interdiction efforts;

(3) increase the efforts of the Department of Defense to build partnership capacity with partner nations in Central America to confront security challenges through increased training opportunities, education, and exercises;

(4) enforce human rights requirements consistent with section 2249e of title 10, United States Code, and increase the training and education regarding human rights provided in Central American nations; and

(5) support interagency efforts in Central America addressing all levels of instability including development, education, economic, political, and security challenges.

Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

SEC. 1021. RESTRICTIONS ON THE OVERHAUL AND REPAIR OF VESSELS IN FOREIGN SHIPYARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7310(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''In the case'' and inserting ''(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in the case'';

(2) by striking ''during the 15-month'' and all that follows through ''United States)'';

(3) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', other than in the case of voyage repairs''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) The Secretary of the Navy may waive the application of subparagraph (A) to a contract award if the Secretary determines that the waiver is essential to the national security interests of the United States.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the later of the following dates:

(1) The date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

(2) October 1, 2016.

SEC. 1022. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES FOR CERTAIN NAVY MESS OPERATIONS AFLOAT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (b) of section 1014 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4585), as amended by section 1021 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383, 124 Stat. 4348), is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2020''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (a) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''not more that'' and inserting ''not more than''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Naval vessels'' and inserting ''such vessels''.

SEC. 1023. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OR INACTIVATION OF TICONDEROGA CLASS CRUISERS OR DOCK LANDING SHIPS.

(a) LIMITATION ON THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 may be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, inactivate, or place in storage a cruiser or dock landing ship.

(b) CRUISER MODERNIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As provided by section 1026 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3490), the Secretary of the Navy shall begin the modernization of two cruisers during fiscal year 2016 only after the receipt of the materiel required to begin such modernization. Such modernization shall include—

(A) hull, mechanical, and electrical upgrades; and

(B) combat systems modernizations.

(2) DURATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the time period for such modernization shall not exceed two years.

(B) EXTENSION.—If the Secretary of the Navy determines that the scope of the modernization cannot be reasonably completed in two years, the Secretary may extend the time period under subparagraph (A) for an additional six months. If the Secretary issues such an extension, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees notice of the extension and the reasons the Secretary made such determination.

(3) DELAY.—The Secretary of the Navy may delay the modernization required under paragraph (1) if the materiel required to begin the modernization has not been received.

SEC. 1024. LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR REMOVAL OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE CAPABILITIES FROM TICONDEROGA CLASS CRUISERS.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be used to remove ballistic missile defense capabilities from any of the 5 Ticonderoga class cruisers equipped with such capabilities until the Secretary of the Navy certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Navy has—

(1) obtained the ballistic missile capabilities required by the most recent Navy Force Structure Assessment; or

(2) determined to upgrade such cruisers with an equal or improved ballistic missile defense capability.

Subtitle D—Counterterrorism

SEC. 1031. PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE REWARDS THROUGH GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL OF ALLIED FORCES AND CERTAIN OTHER MODIFICATIONS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAM TO PROVIDE REWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 127b(c)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''subparagraphs (B) and (C)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B)''; and

(2) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The section heading for section 127b of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 127b. Department of Defense rewards program''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 127b and inserting the following new item:

''127b. Department of Defense rewards program.''.

SEC. 1032. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF SENSITIVE MILITARY OPERATIONS.

Section 130f of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

SEC. 1033. REPEAL OF SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON OBLIGATION AND EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR COMBATING TERRORISM PROGRAM.

Section 229 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

SEC. 1034. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON CONTACT BETWEEN TERRORISTS AND INDIVIDUALS FORMERLY DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) Section 319(c) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 123 Stat. 1874; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraphs:

''(6) A summary of all contact by any means of communication, including telecommunications, electronic or technical means, in person, written communications, or any other means of communication, regardless of content, between any individual formerly detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any individual known or suspected to be associated with a foreign terrorist group.

''(7) A description of whether any of the contact described in the summary required by paragraph (6) included any information or discussion about hostilities against the United States or its allies or partners.''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to terminate, alter, modify, override, or otherwise affect any reporting of information required under section 319(c) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 123 Stat. 1874; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) prior to the enactment of this section.

SEC. 1035. INCLUSION IN REPORTS TO CONGRESS INFORMATION ABOUT RECIDIVISM OF INDIVIDUALS FORMERLY DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

Section 319(c) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 123 Stat. 1874; 10 U.S.C. 801 note), as amended by section 1034, is further amended by inserting after paragraph (7), as added by such section, the following new paragraphs:

''(8) For each individual described in paragraph (4), the period of time between the date on which the individual was released or transferred from Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and the date on which it is confirmed that the individual is suspected or confirmed of reengaging in terrorist activities.

''(9) The average period of time described in paragraph (8) for all the individuals described in paragraph (4).''.

SEC. 1036. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR THE TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after January 20, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 1037. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT OR MODIFY FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES TO HOUSE DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' has the meaning given that term in section 1039(f)(2).

SEC. 1038. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TRANSFER OR RELEASE INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO COMBAT ZONES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be used, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to a combat zone.

(b) COMBAT ZONE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''combat zone'' means any area designated as a combat zone for purposes of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 112) for which the income of a member of the Armed Forces was excluded during 2014, 2015, or 2016 by reason of the member's service on active duty in such area.

SEC. 1039. REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATIONS RELATING TO THE TRANSFER OF DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND OTHER FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED PRIOR TO TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may not use any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary submits to Congress the certification described in subsection (b) not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a written certification made by the Secretary of Defense that—

(1) the government of the foreign country or the recognized leadership of the foreign entity to which the individual detained at Guantanamo is to be transferred—

(A) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(B) maintains control over each detention facility in which the individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(C) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(D) has taken or agreed to take effective actions to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(E) has taken or agreed to take such actions as the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity; and

(F) has agreed to share with the United States any information that—

(i) is related to the individual or any associates of the individual; and

(ii) could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies; and

(2) includes an assessment, in classified or unclassified form, of the capacity, willingness, and past practices (if applicable) of the foreign country or entity in relation to the Secretary's certifications.

(c) PROHIBITION IN CASES OF PRIOR CONFIRMED RECIDIVISM.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may not use any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual who was detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, at any time after September 11, 2001, who was transferred to such foreign country or entity and subsequently engaged in any terrorist activity.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance).

(d) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability to a detainee transfer of a certification requirement specified in subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1) or the prohibition in subsection (c), if the Secretary certifies the rest of the criteria required by subsection (b) for transfers prohibited by (c) and determines that—

(A) alternative actions will be taken to address the underlying purpose of the requirement or requirements to be waived;

(B) in the case of a waiver of subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the paragraph to be waived have been completely eliminated, but the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate such risks with regard to the individual to be transferred;

(C) in the case of a waiver of subsection (c), the Secretary has considered any confirmed case in which an individual who was transferred to the country subsequently engaged in terrorist activity, and the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate the risk of recidivism with regard to the individual to be transferred; and

(D) the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) REPORTS.—Whenever the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual concerned, the following:

(A) A copy of the determination and the waiver concerned.

(B) A statement of the basis for the determination, including—

(i) an explanation why the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States;

(ii) in the case of a waiver of paragraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), an explanation why it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the paragraph to be waived have been completely eliminated; and

(iii) a classified summary of—

(I) the individual's record of cooperation while in the custody of or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; and

(II) the agreements and mechanisms in place to provide for continuing cooperation.

(C) A summary of the alternative actions to be taken to address the underlying purpose of, and to mitigate the risks addressed in, the paragraph or subsection to be waived.

(D) The assessment required by subsection (b)(2).

(e) RECORD OF COOPERATION.—In assessing the risk that an individual detained at Guantanamo will engage in terrorist activity or other actions that could affect the security of the United States if released for the purpose of making a certification under subsection (b) or a waiver under subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may give favorable consideration to any such individual—

(1) who has substantially cooperated with United States intelligence and law enforcement authorities, pursuant to a pre-trial agreement, while in the custody of or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; and

(2) for whom agreements and effective mechanisms are in place, to the extent relevant and necessary, to provide for continued cooperation with United States intelligence and law enforcement authorities.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(3) The term ''foreign terrorist organization'' means any organization so designated by the Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(g) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—Section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 851; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is repealed.

SEC. 1040. SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO TO QATAR.

(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and House of Representatives all covered correspondence.

(b) COVERED CORRESPONDENCE.—For purposes of this section, the term ''covered correspondence''—

(1) means any correspondence between the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice or any other agency or entity of the United States Government that—

(A) relates to the transfer of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Qatar;

(B) is dated any time between January 1, 2013, and June 1, 2014; and

(C) is in the custody of the Department of Justice or the Department of Defense; and

(2) includes—

(A) all relevant correspondence, including the email exchange described in June 11, 2014, testimony to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by the Secretary of Defense and the General Counsel of the Department of Defense; and

(B) any analysis of—

(i) section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 851; 10 U.S.C. 801 note);

(ii) section 8111 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76; 128 Stat. 131);

(iii) section 1341 of title 31, United States Code (popularly known as ''the Antideficiency Act''); or

(iv) Article II of the Constitution.

(c) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 2016, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the date of the submission of all covered correspondence.

SEC. 1041. SUBMISSION OF UNREDACTED COPIES OF DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE TRANSFER OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO TO QATAR.

(a) UNREDACTED DOCUMENTS REQUIRED.—

(1) FUTURE SUBMISSIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit an unredacted copy of any document submitted to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in response to a request from the Committee dated June 9, 2014, for information regarding the transfer of five individuals from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Qatar.

(2) PRIOR SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives an unredacted copy of any redacted document that was submitted, before the date of the enactment of this Act, in response to a request dated June 9, 2014, for information regarding the transfer of five individuals from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Qatar.

(b) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 2016, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the date of the submission of all documents required to be submitted under subsection (a)(2).

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

SEC. 1051. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF NAVY TO USE NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2218a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''national sea-based deterrence vessels'' and inserting ''a class of twelve national sea-based deterrence vessels, and cross-program coordinated procurement efforts with other nuclear powered vessels'';

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and cross program coordinated procurement efforts with other nuclear powered vessels'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (j) and (l), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsections:

''(f) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO ECONOMIC ORDER QUANTITY CONTRACTS.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may use funds deposited in the Fund to enter into contracts known as 'economic order quantity contracts' with private shipyards and other commercial or government entities to achieve economic efficiencies based on production economies for major components or subsystems. The authority under this subsection extends to the procurement of parts, components, and systems (including weapon systems) common with and required for other nuclear powered vessels under joint economic order quantity contracts.

''(2) A contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose, and that total liability to the Government for termination of any contract entered into shall be limited to the total amount of funding obligated at time of termination.

''(g) AUTHORITY TO BEGIN MANUFACTURING AND FABRICATION EFFORTS PRIOR TO SHIP AUTHORIZATION.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may use funds deposited into the Fund to enter into contracts for advance construction of national sea-based deterrence vessels to support achieving cost savings through workload management, manufacturing efficiencies, or workforce stability, or to phase fabrication activities within shipyard and manage sub-tier manufacturer capacity.

''(2) A contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose, and that total liability to the Government for termination of any contract entered into shall be limited to the total amount of funding obligated at time of termination.

''(h) AUTHORITY TO USE INCREMENTAL FUNDING TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS FOR CERTAIN ITEMS.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may use funds deposited into the Fund to enter into incrementally funded contracts for advance procurement of high value, long lead time items for nuclear powered vessels to better support construction schedules and achieve cost savings through schedule reductions and properly phased installment payments.

''(2) A contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose, and that total liability to the Government for termination of any contract entered into shall be limited to the total amount of funding obligated at time of termination.

''(i) FACILITIES FUNDING.—The Secretary of the Navy may use funds deposited into the Fund to provide incentives for investments in critical infrastructure at nuclear capable shipyards and critical sub-tier vendors. Additionally, the Secretary of the Navy may use such funds for certain cancellation costs in the event of significant changes to the Long Range Shipbuilding Strategy for nuclear powered vessels.'';

(5) by inserting after subsection (j), as redesignated by paragraph (3), the following new subsection:

''(k) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees, by March 1, 2016, and annually through the year 2025, a report on the Fund. Each such report shall identify separately the amount allocated by ship for programs, projects, and activities for construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion. At a minimum, each such report shall include—

''(A) information about the activities carried out using funds deposited into the Fund during the fiscal year covered by the report, including the status of class design and construction efforts, including programmatic schedules, procurement schedules, and funding requirements.

''(B) a plan detailing forecasted obligations and expenditures for construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion of vessels by ship for the fiscal year following the fiscal year during which the report is submitted; and

''(C) the identification of the stable need and design for items, together with a description of any savings associated with the authorities provided in subsections (e) and (f), as documented in cost estimates.

''(2) The Secretary of the Navy shall provide to the congressional defense committees notice in writing at least 30 days before executing any significant deviation to the annual plan required under paragraph (1)(B).''; and

(6) in subsection (m), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) The term 'advance construction' means shipyard manufacturing and fabrication activities (including sub-tier manufacturing of major components or subsystems).''.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN UNOBLIGATED FUNDS FOR TRANSFER.—Section 1022(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3487) is amended by striking ''for the Navy for the Ohio Replacement Program'' and inserting ''to the Department of Defense''.

SEC. 1052. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXCESS PROPERTY PROGRAM.

(a) WEBSITE REQUIRED.—Section 2576a of title 10, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE WEBSITE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency, shall create and maintain a publicly available Internet website that provides information on the property transferred under this section and the recipients of such property.

''(2) The contents of the Internet website required under paragraph (1) shall include all unclassified information pertaining to the request, transfer, denial, and repossession of controlled property under this section, including—

''(A) a current inventory of all controlled property transferred to law enforcement agencies under this section, listed by recipient, that includes the recipient's location, by county and State, and the year of the transfer;

''(B) all outstanding requests for transfers of controlled property under this section; and

''(C) information provided by the law enforcement agencies requesting transfers referred to in subparagraph (B).

''(3) The Secretary may not authorize the transfer of any property under this section to a Federal or State agency to which property has been transferred previously unless the agency submits to the Secretary for publication on the Internet website required under paragraph (1) each of the following:

''(A) A description of any controlled property transferred to the agency under this section, which shall be submitted by not later than 30 days after the date on which the agency takes possession of the property.

''(B) An annual report on the use of any controlled property so transferred to the agency, including a description of the context in which the property was used.

''(4) The Secretary may not authorize the transfer of any property under this section to a Federal or State agency until 30 days after a request for the transfer has been published on the Internet website required under paragraph (1).''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(5) in the case of property that is controlled property, the recipient submits to the Secretary written notice of the intent of the recipient to apply for the controlled property, including authorization of such application by the entity charged with legal oversight of the recipient agency; and

''(6) the recipient agency is located in a State with a State coordinator for the program under this section who—

''(A) has law enforcement experience and is employed by a law enforcement agency or entity with oversight of law enforcement functions;

''(B) serves as the custodian of controlled property transferred to recipients located in that State; and

''(C) has the authority to non-concur with proposed uses of such property.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF CONTROLLED PROPERTY.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) CONTROLLED PROPERTY.—In this section, the term 'controlled property' means any item assigned a demilitarization code of B, C, D, E, F, G, or Q under Department of Defense Manual 4160.21-M, 'Defense Materiel Disposition Manual', or any successor document.''.

(d) EXAMINATION OF TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the Defense Logistics Agency shall enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an assessment of the Department of Defense excess property program under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this section. Such assessment shall include an evaluation of the policies and controls governing the determination of the suitability of recipients of controlled property transferred under the program, including specific recommendations relating to the training that law enforcement agencies that receive such property should receive, at no cost to the Department of Defense, to ensure end-user proficiency in the use, maintenance, and sustainment of such property.

(e) ONE-YEAR MANDATORY USE POLICY ASSESSMENT.—The Director of the Defense Logistics Agency shall enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center for the conduct of an assessment of the Department of Defense excess property program under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, to determine if the requirement that all controlled property transferred under the program be used within one year of being transferred is achieving its intended effect. Such assessment shall also include recommendations on process improvement, including legislative proposals.

(f) COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an assessment of the Department of Defense excess property program under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code. Such assessment shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the transfer of controlled property under the program, including the manner in which the property was used in community law enforcement and the effectiveness of the Internet website required under subsection (e) of section 2576a, as added by subsection (a), in providing transparency to the public; and

(2) a determination of whether the transfer of property under the program enhances the ability of law enforcement agencies to carry out counter-drug and counter-terrorism activities in accordance with the purposes of the program as set forth in section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 1053. LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF CERTAIN AH–64 APACHE HELICOPTERS FROM ARMY NATIONAL GUARD TO REGULAR ARMY AND RELATED PERSONNEL LEVELS.

Section 1712(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended by striking ''before March 31, 2016'' and inserting ''before the later of March 31, 2016, or the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the congressional defense committees receive the report of the Commission under section 1703(c)''.

SEC. 1054. SPACE AVAILABLE TRAVEL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL MORALE LEAVE BY CERTAIN SPOUSES AND CHILDREN OF DEPLOYED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

The Secretary of Defense shall revise the Air Transportation Eligibility Regulation, DOD 4515.13-R, to authorize space-available travel for environmental morale leave by unaccompanied spouses and dependent children of members of the Armed Forces who are deployed for at least 30 consecutive days under priority category IV. The Secretary shall also update any other instructions, directives, or internal policies necessary to facilitate such revision.

SEC. 1055. INFORMATION-RELATED AND STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES ENGAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program or multiple pilot programs under which the Secretary assesses information-related and strategic communications capabilities to support the tactical, operational, and strategic requirements of the geographic and functional combatant commanders, including the urgent and emergent operational needs and the operational and theater security cooperation plans of such combatant commanders, to further United States national security objectives and strategic communications requirements.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Any pilot program carried out under subsection (a) shall include each of the following elements:

(1) Clearly defined goals and end-state objectives for the pilot program, including the traceability of such goals and objectives to the tactical, operational, or strategic requirements of the combatant commanders.

(2) A process for measuring the performance and effectiveness of the pilot program.

(3) A demonstration of a technology capability or concept to support the tactical, operational, or strategic needs of the combatant commanders.

(4) Supporting activities and coordinating elements with joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational partners.

(c) GOVERNANCE.—The Secretary shall create a governance structure for executing any pilot program carried out under subsection (a) that allows for centralized oversight and planning of the program with program execution decentralized to the combatant commands. The Secretary shall provide a written charter for such a governance structure by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary decides to carry out such a pilot program.

(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—By not later than 14 days after the date on which the Secretary decides to carry out a pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees written notice of the decision. Such notice shall include the scope of activities, funding required, sponsoring combatant commander, anticipated participants, and expected duration of the pilot program.

(e) TERMINATION.—The authority to carry out a pilot program under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2022.

SEC. 1056. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF HELICOPTER SEA COMBAT SQUADRON 84 AND 85 AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITIONS.—Except as provided by subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Navy may be obligated or expended to—

(1) retire, prepare to retire, transfer, or place in storage any Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron 84 (HSC 84) or Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron 85 (HSC-85) aircraft; or

(2) make any changes to manning levels with respect to any HSC-84 or HSC-85 aircraft squadron.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of the Navy may waive subsection (a), if the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary has—

(1) conducted a cost-benefit analysis identifying savings to Department of the Navy regarding decommissioning or deactivation of an HSC-84 or HSC-85 squadron;

(2) identified a replacement capability to meet all operational requirements, including special operational-peculiar requirements of the combatant commands, currently being met by the HSC-84 or HSC-85 squadrons and aircraft to be retired, transferred, or placed in storage; and

(3) deployed such capability.

SEC. 1057. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN LANDMINES.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided under subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the destruction of anti-personnel landmines of the United States (as defined in the announcement of the President on September 23, 2014) until—

(1) the Secretary of Defense publishes a comprehensive study on—

(A) the tactical and operational effects of a ban on such landmines; and

(B) the current state of research into operational alternatives to such landmines;

(2) such alternatives are specifically authorized by law and provided appropriations;

(3) such alternatives are fully deployed;

(4) members of the Armed Forces of the United States and allies of the United States are trained in the use of such alternatives; and

(5) the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the replacement of such landmines by such alternatives will not endanger members of the Armed Forces of the United States or allies of the United States or pose any operational challenges and that adequate stockpiles and manufacturing capacity exists to meet the needs of the Armed Forces of the United States and allies of the United States in current deployments and anticipated contingencies.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR SAFETY.—The limitation under subsection (a) shall not apply to any anti-personnel land mine that the Secretary certifies has become unsafe or poses a safety risk if not demilitarized or destroyed.

SEC. 1058. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR MODIFYING COMMAND AND CONTROL OF UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 may be obligated or expended to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command operational and administrative control of Navy forces assigned to the Pacific Fleet. The command and control relationships in effect on October 1, 2004, shall remain in effect unless a change to such relationships is specifically authorized by a law.

SEC. 1059. PROHIBITION ON THE CLOSURE OF UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States military presence in the Republic of Cuba began in 1898, and United States military basing began in Cuba in 1903.

(2) In 1934, the United States and Cuba entered into the Treaty Between the United States of America and Cuba signed at Washington, D.C. on May 29, 1934. Under Article III, the treaty stipulates the perpetual lease agreement between the United States and Cuba for the 45 square miles of land encompassing Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(3) On March 12, 2015, Commander of United States Southern Command, General John Kelly, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, highlighting, ''Its [Naval Station Guantanamo Bay] airfield and port facilities are indispensable to the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, and State's operational and contingency plans. . . As the only permanent U.S. military base in Latin America and the Caribbean, its location provides persistent U.S. presence and immediate access to the region, as well as supporting a layered defense to secure the air and maritime approaches to the United States''.

(4) Former Commander of United States Southern Command, retired Admiral James Stavridis, recently stated ''Guantanamo Bay Naval Station has immense strategic value above and beyond its reputation as a detention facility. It is the logistic, planning, surveillance and basing linchpin for the U.S. Fourth Fleet, crucial to the military for disaster relief, humanitarian work, medical diplomacy, and counternarcotics, all key missions for the U.S. Navy in Latin America and the Caribbean. The U.S. should do all in its power to maintain its legal control over the base''.

(5) In testimony in front of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in 2012, then-Commander of United States Southern Command, General Douglas Fraser, stated, ''Absent a detention facility and even following the eventual demise of the Castro regime, the strategic capability provided by the U.S. Naval Station Guantanamo Bay remains essential for executing national priorities throughout the Caribbean, Latin America, and South America''.

(6) As part of ''normalizing'' relations with the government of Cuba, announced in December 2014, ongoing negotiations are occurring to determine the diplomatic framework between the governments of the United States and Cuba.

(7) In January 2015, soon after negotiations began between the United States and Cuba, Cuban President Raul Castro demanded the return of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Cuba.

(8) In February 2015, Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs Roberta Jacobson, in testimony in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, stated that the return of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is ''not on the table in these conversations'', referencing current diplomatic negotiations. Later in her testimony Assistant Secretary Jacobson pointed out, referring to the possible closure of the Naval Station, that she is not a ''high enough ranking person to know. . .whether it could be in the future''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the strategic, logistic, and postural significance of United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is vital to the security of the United States; and

(2) the United States must not relinquish control of Guantanamo Bay to the Republic of Cuba.

(c) PROHIBITION.—United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, may not be closed or abandoned, and the President shall ensure that the obligations of the United States under Article III of the Treaty Between the United States of America and Cuba signed at Washington, D.C. on May 29, 1934 are met, including the payment of the annual lease sum to the government of Cuba, unless otherwise specifically provided—

(1) by law;

(2) in a treaty that is ratified with the advice and consent of the Senate; or

(3) by a modification of the Treaty Between the United States of America and Cuba signed at Washington, D.C. on May 29, 1934, that is ratified with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commander of United States Southern Command shall submit to appropriate committees of Congress, a report setting forth a military assessment of the strategic implications of United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include each of the following:

(A) An historical analysis of the use and significance of the basing at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(B) A description of the personnel, resources, and base operations based out of United States, Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(C) An assessment of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in support of the National Security Strategy, the National Defense Strategy, and the National Military Strategy.

(D) An assessment of missions and military requirements that United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, currently supports.

(E) A description of the uses of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba by other United States Government agencies.

(F) Any other related matter at the discretion of the Commander.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

Subtitle F—Studies and Reports

SEC. 1061. PROVISION OF DEFENSE PLANNING GUIDANCE AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING GUIDANCE INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 113(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) At the time of the budget submission by the President for a fiscal year, the Secretary of

Defense shall include in the budget materials submitted to Congress for that year summaries of the guidance developed under paragraphs (1) and (2), as well as summaries of any plans developed in accordance with the guidance developed under paragraph (2). Such summaries shall be sufficient to allow the congressional defense committees to evaluate fully the requirements for military forces, acquisition programs, and operation and maintenance funding in the President's annual budget request for the Department of Defense.''.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding the requirement under paragraph (3) of section 113(g) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), that the Secretary of Defense submit summaries under that paragraph at the time of the President's annual budget submission, by not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing—

(1) summaries of the guidance developed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (g) of section 113 of title 10, United States Code; and

(2) summaries of any plans developed in accordance with the guidance developed under paragraph (2) of such subsection.

(c) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS PENDING REPORT.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for the office of the Secretary of Defense, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended before the date that is 15 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report described in subsection (b).

SEC. 1062. MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN REPORTS SUBMITTED BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) REPORT ON NNSA BUDGET REQUESTS.—Section 3255(a)(2) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2455) is amended by inserting before '', the Comptroller General'' the following: ''in an even-numbered year, and not later than 150 days after the date on which the Administrator submits such materials in an odd-numbered year''.

(b) REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT.—Section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2713), as amended by section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2193), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''a series of three reviews, as described in subsections (b), (c), and (d),'' and inserting ''reviews as described in subsections (b) and (c)'';

(2) by striking subsection (d); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

SEC. 1063. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GEOGRAPHICALLY DISTRIBUTED FORCE LAYDOWN IN THE AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY OF UNITED STATES PACIFIC COMMAND.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commander of the United States Pacific Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on Department of Defense plans for implementing the geographically distributed force laydown in the area of responsibility of United States Pacific Command.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the force laydown.

(2) A discussion of how the force laydown affects the operational and contingency plans in the area of responsibility of United States Pacific Command, including a discussion on how timeliness, availability of forces, and risk in meeting the military objectives contained in those plans are affected.

(3) A discussion of the specific support asset requirements derived from the force laydown, including logistical sustainment, pre-positioned stocks, sea and air lift, command and control, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

(4) A discussion of the specific infrastructure and military construction requirements derived from the force laydown.

(5) A discussion on how Department of Defense plans to meet the requirements identified in paragraphs (3) and (4), including the ability of United States Transportation Command, the United States Combat Logistics Force, and the Armed Forces to meet those requirements.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1064. INDEPENDENT STUDY OF NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY FORMULATION PROCESS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall enter into a contract with an independent research entity described in subsection (c) to carry out a comprehensive study of the role of the Department of Defense and its process for the formulation of national security strategy.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The study required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Case studies of the role of the Department of Defense and its process for the formulation of previous national security strategies in place throughout the history of the United States, including an examination of the development and execution of previous strategies, as well as the factors that contributed to the development and execution of successful previous strategies with specific emphasis on—

(A) the frequency of strategy updates;

(B) the synchronization of timelines and content among different strategies;

(C) the prioritization of objectives;

(D) the assignment of roles and responsibilities among relevent agencies;

(E) the links between strategy and resourcing;

(F) the implementation of strategy within the planning documents of relevant agencies; and

(G) the value of a competition of ideas.

(2) A complete review and analysis of the current national security strategy formulation process, as it relates to the Department of Defense, including an analysis of the following:

(A) All major Government products and documents of national security strategy relevant to the Department of Defense and how they fit together, including—

(i) the National Military Strategy prepared by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under section 153(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code;

(ii) the most recent quadrennial defense review conducted by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 118 of title 10, United States Code;

(iii) the national security strategy report required under section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043); and

(iv) any other relevant national security strategy products and documents.

(B) The time periods during which the products and documents covered by subparagraph (A) are prepared and published, and how they fit together.

(C) The interaction between the White House and the agencies that develop such products and documents and formulate strategy.

(D) All the current entities in the Federal Government that contribute to the national security strategy formulation process and how they fit together.

(c) INDEPENDENT RESEARCH ENTITY.—The entity described in this subsection is an independent research entity that is a not-for-profit entity or a federally funded research and development center with appropriate expertise and analytical capability.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the independent research entity shall provide to the Secretary a report on the results of the study. Not later than 30 days after receipt of the report, the Secretary shall submit such report, together with any additional views or recommendations of the Secretary, to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 1065. STUDY AND REPORT ON ROLE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE IN FORMULATION OF LONG-TERM STRATEGY.

The Secretary of Defense shall direct the Office of Net Assessment to conduct a study on the role of the Department of Defense in the formulation of long-term strategy. Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the study, which shall include—

(1) historical lessons learned, and recommendations for both the executive and legislative branch on how to create an entity or entities, programs or projects, or supporting efforts or activities to study and formulate suggestions for Department of Defense long-term strategy across the combination of military, economic, scientific, technological, geopolitical, resources, international relations, and other relevant areas of study related to the role of the Department of Defense in national security.

(2) key recommendations for alternative or candidate courses of action for establishing such an entity or entities, programs or projects, or supporting efforts or activities within or outside of the Government, including identification of areas or components of the Government most suited to the formulation of Department of Defense long-term strategy, or identification of new offices, organizational units, or supporting efforts within or outside of the Government focused on the development of long-term strategies for the Department; and

(3) an analysis of the efforts of the Department of Defense to cultivate long-term strategists within and outside of the Department and the Government, including an examination of options of best methods to improve and support the development, training, and education of strategic thinkers within and outside of the Department and the Government.

SEC. 1066. REPORT ON POTENTIAL THREATS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCES CENTRAL COMMAND AND UNITED STATES FIFTH FLEET IN BAHRAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the threat posed to members of the Armed Forces of the United States Naval Forces Central Command and the United States Fifth Fleet from Naval Support Activity Bahrain and their family members should an increase in violent clashes in Bahrain make their presence in that nation untenable.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the current security situation in Bahrain, marked by escalating violence between security forces and protesters, and the potential impact increased instability could have on—

(A) the physical safety and security of United States personnel and their families living in Bahrain, both inside and outside the confines of military installations;

(B) the freedom of movement of United States personnel and their families living in Bahrain; and

(C) the future operations of Naval Support Activity in Bahrain as it relates to ongoing regional missions.

(2) Safety measures and contingency planning to protect Navy personnel in the event of such an increase in instability, including an analysis of viable alternative locations for both the United States Naval Forces Central Command and the United States Fifth Fleet.

Subtitle G—Repeal or Revision of National Defense Reporting Requirements

SEC. 1071. REPEAL OR REVISION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO MILITARY PERSONNEL ISSUES.

(a) REPORTS ON HEALTH PROTECTION QUALITY AND HEALTH ASSESSMENT DATA.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 1073b of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1073b.

(b) REPORT ON VOTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS EFFECTIVENESS AND COMPLIANCE.—Section 1566(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1)'' after the subsection heading; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3).

(c) REPORT ON AVIATION OFFICER RETENTION BONUSES.—Section 301b(i) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1)'' after the subsection heading; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

(d) REPORT ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY INCENTIVE PAY.—Section 316a of title 37, United States Code, as amended by section 615(5) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

(e) REPORT ON USE OF WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS.—Section 553 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 4346 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(f) REPORT ON INCREASE IN JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS UNITS.—Subsection (e) of section 548 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4466) is repealed.

(g) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM.—

(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 582(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(2) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 597 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is repealed.

(h) REPORT ON STANDARDS OF FACILITIES.—Section 1648 of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(i) REPORT ON INSPECTIONS OF FACILITIES.—Section 1662 of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) REQUIRED INSPECTIONS OF FACILITIES.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

(j) REPORT ON INSPECTIONS OF OTHER FACILITIES.—Section 3307 of the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 110–28; 10 U.S.C. 1073 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(k) REPORT ON LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY ASSISTANCE RELATED TO DOD ACTIVITIES.—Section 574 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 20 U.S.C. 7703b note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

SEC. 1072. REPEAL OR REVISION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO READINESS.

(a) BIANNUAL REPORTS ON ALLOCATION OF FUNDS WITHIN OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE BUDGET SUBACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking section 228.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by striking the item relating to section 228.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES.—Section 7431 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c).

(c) ANNUAL REPORT ON ARMY NATIONAL GUARD COMBAT READINESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1013 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking section 10542.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by striking the item relating to section 10542.

(d) INSIDER THREAT DETECTION BUDGET SUBMISSION.—Section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(e) PRICE TREND ANALYSIS.—Section 892 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 2306a) is repealed.

(f) REPORT ON AUTHORITY FOR AIRLIFT TRANSPORTATION AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RATES FOR NON-DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FEDERAL CARGOES.—Section 351 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2262) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(g) BIENNIAL REPORT ON PROCUREMENT OF MILITARY WORKING DOGS.—Section 358 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(h) REPORT ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY.—Section 958 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 297) is repealed.

(i) REPORT ON ARSENAL SUPPORT PROGRAM INITIATIVE.—Section 343 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398; 10 U.S.C. 4551 note) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(j) GAO REVIEW OF CONTRACTOR-OPERATED CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPLY STORES PROGRAM.—Section 345 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–26; 112 Stat. 1978) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(k) QUARTERLY REPORT ON END STRENGTH.—Section 8104 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (Division C of Public Law 113–76) is repealed.

(l) QUARTERLY REPORT ON END STRENGTH.—Section 8105 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (Division C of Public Law 113–6) is repealed.

(m) REPORT ON DAVID L. BOREN NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION ACT OF 1991.—Section 806 of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (title VIII of Public Law 102-183; 50 U.S.C. 1906) is repealed.

SEC. 1073. REPEAL OR REVISION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO NAVAL VESSELS AND MERCHANT MARINE.

(a) REPORT ON NAMING OF NAVAL VESSELS.—Section 7292 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d).

(b) REPORT ON TRANSFER OF VESSELS STRICKEN FROM NAVAL VESSEL REGISTER.—Section 7306 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

(c) REPORTS ON MISSION MODULES OF LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP.—Section 126 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1657) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) DESIGNATION REQUIRED.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

(d) REPORT ON ASSESSMENTS OF FIRST SHIP OF A SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM.—Section 124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 7291 note) is repealed.

(e) REPORT ON COST ESTIMATE OF CVN–79.—Section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2104), as most recently amended by section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), is amended by striking subsection (f).

(f) ANNUAL REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ELIMINATION OF REPORT AND REVISION OF REMAINING REQUIREMENT.—Section 50111 of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 50111. Submission of annual MARAD authorization request

''(a) SUBMISSION OF LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the Maritime Administration authorization request for that fiscal year.

''(b) MARITIME ADMINISTRATION REQUEST DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'Maritime Administration authorization request' means a proposal for legislation that, for a fiscal year—

''(1) recommends authorizations of appropriations for the Maritime Administration for that fiscal year, including with respect to matters described in subsection 109(j) of title 49 or authorized in subtitle V of this title; and

''(2) addresses any other matter with respect to the Maritime Administration that the Secretary determines is appropriate.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 501 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 50111 and inserting the following new item:

''50111. Submission of annual MARAD authorization request.''.

(g) DISCRETIONARY REPORTS NO LONGER NEEDED.—The Secretary of the Navy is not required to submit to the congressional defense committees—

(1) a report, or updates to such a report, on open architecture as described in Senate Report 110–077; or

(2) a monthly report on Ford class aircraft carriers not otherwise required by law.

SEC. 1074. REPEAL OR REVISION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO NUCLEAR, PROLIFERATION, AND RELATED MATTERS.

(a) REPORT ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS COUNCIL.—Section 179 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (g).

(b) REPORT ON PROLIFERATION SECURITY INITIATIVE.—Section 1821(b) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 2911) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1) IN GENERAL.—''; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3).

(c) BRIEFINGS ON DIALOGUE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND RUSSIAN FEDERATION ON NUCLEAR ARMS.—Section 1282 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 22 U.S.C. 5951 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR WHOLE-OF-GOVERNMENT VISION PRESCRIBED IN THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY.—Section 1072 of the National Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 50 U.S.C. 3043 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

SEC. 1075. REPEAL OR REVISION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) REPORT ON MISSILE DEFENSE EXECUTIVE BOARD ACTIVITIES.—Section 232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1339) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(b) REPORT ON GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE PROGRAM.—Section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1340) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 1076. REPEAL OR REVISION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO ACQUISITION.

(a) REPORT ON FOREIGN PURCHASES.—Section 8305 of title 41, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) REPORT ON COST ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES.—Section 2334 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

(c) REPORT ON PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS AND ROOT CAUSE ANALYSES.—Section 2438 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 1077. REPEAL OR REVISION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.

(a) REPORT ON PILOT PROGRAM FOR EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PERSONNEL.—Section 1110 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2493) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (i);

(2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (i); and

(3) in subsection (i), as so redesignated, by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) any employee whose assignment is allowed to continue by virtue of paragraph (1) shall be taken into account for purposes of the numerical limitation under subsection (h).''.

(b) REPORT ON EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL.—Section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2139) is amended by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 1078. REPEAL OR REVISION OF MISCELLANEOUS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORT ON REWARDS FOR COMBATING TERRORISM.—Section 127b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

(b) REPORT ON TECHNOLOGICAL MATURITY AND INTEGRATION RISK OF CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 138(b)(8) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking ''shall—'' and all that follows through ''assess the technological maturity'' and inserting ''shall periodically review and assess the technological maturity''; and

(3) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period.

(c) REPORT ON SYSTEMS ENGINEERING.—Section 139b(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''or (2)'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''systems engineering master plans and'';

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking '', systems engineering master plans,'';

(D) in subparagraph (C); by striking ''systems engineering, development planning,'' and inserting ''development planning''; and

(E) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (F);

(4) by transferring subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) to the end of paragraph (2), as so redesignated, and redesignating those subparagraphs as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(5) by striking paragraph (4).

(d) REPORT ON REGIONAL DEFENSE COUNTERTERRORISM FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 2249c of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c).

(e) REPORT ON DARPA.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 2352 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 2352.

(f) REPORT ON AIRLIFT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1654) is repealed.

(g) REPORT ON IN-KIND PAYMENTS.—Section 2805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2149) is repealed.

(h) REPORT ON AIRBORNE SIGNALS INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE CAPABILITIES.—Section 112(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4153) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(i) REPORTS ON STATUS OF NAVY NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORKS PROGRAM.—Section 1034 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4593) is repealed.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

SEC. 1081. TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The heading of section 153(a)(5) is amended to read as follows: ''JOINT FORCE DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 21 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 429 the following new item:

''430. Tactical exploitation of national capabilities executive agent.''.

(3) Section 2679, as transferred, redesignated, and amended by section 351 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3346), is amended in subsection (a)(1) by striking ''with'' before '', on a sole source''.

(4) Section 2687a(d)(2) is amended by inserting ''fair market'' before ''value''.

(5) Section 2926, as added and amended by section 901(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3464), is amended in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) by striking ''for Installations, Energy,'' each place it appears and inserting ''for Energy, Installations,''.

(6) Section 9314a(b) is amended by striking ''only so long at'' and inserting ''only so long as''.

(b) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.—Effective as of December 19, 2014, and as if included therein as enacted, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 351(b)(1) (128 Stat. 3346) is amended by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ''; and''.

(2) Section 901(g)(1)(F) (128 Stat. 3465) is amended by inserting ''paragraph (4) of'' before ''subsection (b) of section 2926''.

(3) Section 1072(a)(2) (128 Stat. 3516) is amended by inserting ''in the table of sections'' before ''at the beginning of''.

(4) Section 1079(a)(1) (128 Stat. 3521) is amended by striking ''section 12102 of title 42, United States Code'' and inserting ''section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)''.

(5) Section 1104(b)(2) (128 Stat. 3526) is amended by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A)''.

(6) Section 1208 (128 Stat. 3541) is amended by striking ''of Fiscal Year'' each place it appears and inserting ''for Fiscal Year''.

(7) Section 2803(a) (128 Stat. 3696) is amended in paragraph (2) of the subsection (f) being added by the amendment to be made by that section by inserting ''section'' before ''1105 of title 31''.

(8) Section 2832(c)(3) (128 Stat. 3704) is amended by striking ''United State Code'' and inserting ''United States Code''.

(9) Section 3006(i) (128 Stat. 3744) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Section 8'' and inserting ''Section 18''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''S1/2 N1/2 SE'' and inserting ''S1/2 N1/2 SE1/4''.

(10) Section 3023 (128 Stat. 3762) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, in the matter being added by subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting ''has been waived,'' after ''expired,''; and

(ii) by striking ''the permit or lease required'' and inserting ''the allotment management plan, permit, or lease required'';

(C) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, in the matter being added as subsection (h)(1)—

(i) by striking ''a grazing permit or lease'' in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of such subsection and inserting ''an allotment management plan or grazing permit or lease'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A) of such subsection, by striking ''permit or lease'' and inserting ''allotment management plan, permit, or lease''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(i) of such subsection, by striking ''lease or permit'' and inserting ''allotment management plan, permit, or lease''; and

(D) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

''(1) in subsection (a), by striking 'by the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to lands within National Forests in the sixteen contiguous Western States' and inserting 'on National Forest System land by the Secretary of Agriculture (notwithstanding, for purposes of this section, the definition in section 103(p))';''.

(11) Section 3024 (16 U.S.C. 6214; 128 Stat. 3764) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''report using National Median Price values''; and

(B) in subsection (f)(3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''by regulation establish criteria pursuant to which the annual fee determined in accordance with this section may be suspended or reduced temporarily'' and inserting ''provide for suspension or reduction temporarily of the annual fee determined in accordance with this section''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''by regulation''.

(c) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.—Section 943(d)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4578) by striking the second period at the end of the first sentence.

(d) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005.—Section 1208(f)(2) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375; 118 Stat. 2086), as amended by section 1202(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 363) and section 1202(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat 2512), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating the paragraphs (1) through (8) added by section 1202(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat 2512) as subparagraphs (A) through (H), respectively; and

(2) by moving the margins of such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, two ems to the right.

(e) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AMENDMENTS MADE BY THIS ACT.—For purposes of applying amendments made by provisions of this Act other than this section, the amendments made by this section shall be treated as having been enacted immediately before any such amendments by other provisions of this Act.

SEC. 1082. EXECUTIVE AGENT FOR THE OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT OF ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATORY CONTROL MEASURES.

(a) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following new section:

''§ 430a. Executive agent for management and oversight of alternative compensatory control measures

''(a) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate a senior official from among the personnel of the Department of Defense to act as the Department of Defense executive agent for the management and oversight of alternative compensatory control measures.

''(b) ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe the roles, responsibilities, and authorities of the executive agent designated under subsection (a). Such roles, responsibilities, and authorities shall include the development of an annual management and oversight plan for Department-wide accountability and reporting to the congressional defense committees.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''430a. Executive agent for management and oversight of alternative compensatory control measures.''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the close of each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the oversight and management of alternative compensatory control measures. Each such report shall include—

(1) the annual management and oversight plan required under section 430a(b) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a);

(2) a discussion of the scope and number of alternative compensatory control measures in effect; and

(3) any other matters the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate.

SEC. 1083. NAVY SUPPORT OF OCEAN RESEARCH ADVISORY PANEL.

Section 7903 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c).

SEC. 1084. LEVEL OF READINESS OF CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET CARRIERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Airlift Policy states that ''[t]he national defense airlift objective is to ensure that military and civil airlift resources will be able to meet defense mobilization and deployment requirements in support of US defense and foreign policies.''.

(2) The National Airlift Policy also emphasizes the need for ''dialogue and cooperation with our national aviation industry,'' and it states that ''[i]t is of particular importance that the aviation industry be apprised by the Department of Defense of long-term requirements for airlift in support of national defense.''.

(3) The National Airlift Policy emphasizes the importance of both military and civil airlift resources and their interdependence in the fulfillment of the national defense airlift objective, and it states that the ''Department of Defense shall establish appropriate levels for peacetime cargo airlift augmentation in order to promote the effectiveness of Civil Reserve Air Fleet and provide training within the military airlift system.''.

(4) Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers continue to be an important component of the military airlift system in support of United States defense and foreign policies.

(b) LEVEL OF READINESS OF CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET CARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 931 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 9517. Level of readiness of Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers

''(a) POLICY.—The Civil Reserve Air Fleet program is an important component of the military airlift system in support of United States defense and foreign policies, and it is the policy of the United States to maintain the readiness and interoperability of Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers by providing appropriate levels of peacetime airlift augmentation to maintain networks and infrastructure, exercise the system, and interface effectively within the military airlift system.

''(b) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—On the day the President submits the budget for a fiscal year to Congress, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report that sets forth, for each fiscal year during the period covered by the current future-years defense program under section 221 of this title, each of the following, expressed separately for passenger and cargo airlift services:

''(1) The results (including analytical and justification materials) of an assessment, conducted in consultation with the Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers, of the level of commercial airlift augmentation necessary to maintain the readiness and interoperability of such carriers, maintain networks and infrastructure, exercise the system, and facilitate the regular interfacing between such carriers and the military airlift system, which shall include—

''(A) a projection of the number of block hours necessary to achieve such levels of commercial airlift augmentation;

''(B) a strategic plan for achieving such level of commercial airlift augmentation; and

''(C) an explanation of any deviation from the previous fiscal year's assessment of the projected number of block hours under subparagraph (A).

''(2) A comparison (including analytical and justification materials and explanations of any deviations) of the forecasted number of block hours for each fiscal year of the period covered by the report with the projected number of block hours under paragraph (1)(A) for each such fiscal year.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'budget' has the meaning given that term in section 231(f) of this title.

''(2) The term 'defense budget materials' has the meaning given that term in section 231(f) of this title.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''9517. Level of Readiness of Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers.''.

(3) DEFINITION OF CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET PROGRAM.—Section 9511 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12) The term 'Civil Reserve Air Fleet program' means the program developed by the Department of Defense through which the Department of Defense augments its airlift capability by use of civil aircraft.''.

SEC. 1085. AUTHORIZATION OF TRANSFER OF SURPLUS FIREARMS TO CORPORATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE AND FIREARMS SAFETY .

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 40728 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) AUTHORIZED TRANSFERS.—The Secretary may transfer to the corporation, in accordance with the procedure prescribed in this subchapter, surplus firearms and spare parts and related accessories for those firearms that on the date of the enactment of this subsection are under the control of the Secretary and are excess to the requirements of the Department of the Army, and such material as may be recovered by the Secretary pursuant to section 40728A(a) of this title. The Secretary shall determine a reasonable schedule for the transfer of these excess firearms.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such title is further amended—

(1) in section 40278A—

(A) by striking ''rifles'' each place it appears and inserting ''surplus firearms''; and

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 40731(a)'' and inserting ''section 40732(a)'';

(2) in section 40729(a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''described in section 40728(a) of this title'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''firearms described in section 40728(a) of this title'' and inserting ''surplus firearms''; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''caliber .30 and caliber .22 rimfire rifles'' and inserting ''firearms''; and

(3) in section 40732—

(A) by striking ''caliber .22 rimfire and caliber .30 surplus rifles'' both places it appears and inserting ''surplus firearms''; and

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''is over 18 years of age'' and inserting ''is legally of age''.

SEC. 1086. MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSFERRING AIRCRAFT WITHIN THE AIR FORCE INVENTORY.

(a) MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—Section 345 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 8062 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''Before making an aircraft transfer described in subsection (c), the Secretary of the Air Force shall ensure that a written agreement regarding such transfer has been entered into between the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Director of the Air National Guard or the Chief of Air Force Reserve.''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''depot'';

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) SUBMITTAL OF AGREEMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND CONGRESS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may not take any action to transfer an aircraft until the Secretary ensures that the Air Force has complied with applicable Department of Defense regulations and, for a transfer described in subsection (c)(1), until the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees an agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (a) regarding the transfer of the aircraft.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(c) COVERED AIRCRAFT TRANSFERS.—

''(1) COVERED TRANSFERS.—An aircraft transfer described in this subsection is the transfer (other than as specified in paragraph (2)) from a reserve component of the Air Force to the regular component of the Air Force of—

''(A) the permanent assignment of an aircraft that terminates a reserve component's equitable interest in the aircraft; or

''(B) possession of an aircraft for a period in excess of 90 days.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to the following:

''(A) A routine temporary transfer of possession of an aircraft from a reserve component that is made solely for the benefit of the reserve component for the purpose of maintenance, upgrade, conversion, modification, or testing and evaluation.

''(B) A routine permanent transfer of assignment of an aircraft that terminates a reserve component's equitable interest in the aircraft if notice of the transfer has previously been provided to the congressional defense committees and the transfer has been approved by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to Department of Defense regulations.

''(C) A transfer described in paragraph (1)(A) when there is a reciprocal permanent assignment of an aircraft from the regular component of the Air Force to the reserve component that does not degrade the capability of, or reduce the total number of, aircraft assigned to the reserve component.

''(d) RETURN OF AIRCRAFT AFTER ROUTINE TEMPORARY TRANSFER.—In the case of an aircraft transferred from a reserve component of the Air Force to the regular component of the Air Force for which an agreement under subsection (a) is not required by reason of subsection (c)(2)(A), possession of the aircraft shall be transferred back to the reserve component upon completion of the work described in subsection (c)(2)(A).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a)(7) of such section is amended by striking ''Commander of the Air Force Reserve Command'' and inserting ''Chief of Air Force Reserve''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO DELETE REFERENCES TO AIRCRAFT OWNERSHIP.—Subsection (a) of such section is further amended by striking ''the ownership of'' in paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(C), and (3).

SEC. 1087. REESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION TO ASSESS THE THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES FROM ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE ATTACK.

(a) REESTABLISHMENT.—The commission established pursuant to title XIV of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1654A-345), and reestablished pursuant to section 1052 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 50 U.S.C. 2301 note), known as the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack, is hereby reestablished.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission as reestablished shall have the same membership as the Commission had as of the date of the submission of the report of the Commission pursuant to section 1403(a) of such Act, as amended by such section 1052. Service on the Commission is voluntary, and Commissioners may elect to terminate their service on the Commission. If a Commissioner is unwilling or unable to serve on the Commission, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall appoint a new member to fill that vacancy.

(c) COMMISSION CHARTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Commission charter'' means title XIV of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1654A-345 et seq.), as amended by section 1052 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 50 U.S.C. 2301 note) and section 1073 of the John Warner National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2403).

(d) EXPANDED PURPOSE.—Section 1401(b) of the Commission charter (114 Stat. 1654A-345) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', from non-nuclear EMP weapons, from natural EMP generated by geomagnetic storms, and from proposed uses in the military doctrines of potential adversaries of using EMP weapons in combination with other attack vectors.''.

(e) DUTIES OF COMMISSION.—Section 1402 of the Commission charter (114 Stat. 1654A-346) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1402. DUTIES OF COMMISSION.

''The Commission shall assess the following:

''(1) The vulnerability of electric-dependent military systems in the United States to a manmade or natural EMP event, giving special attention to the progress made by the Department of Defense, other Government departments and agencies of the United States, and entities of the private sector in taking steps to protect such systems from such an event.

''(2) The evolving current and future threat from state and non-state actors of a manmade EMP attack employing nuclear or non-nuclear weapons.

''(3) New technologies, operational procedures, and contingency planning that can protect electronics and electric-dependent military systems from a manmade or natural EMP event.

''(4) Among the States, if State grids are islanded for protection against manmade or natural EMP, which States should receive highest priority for protecting critical defense assets and for maximizing survival of the national population.''.

(f) REPORT.—Section 1403 of the Commission charter (114 Stat. 1654A-345) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2007'' and inserting ''June 30, 2017''.

(g) TERMINATION.—Section 1049 of the Commission charter (114 Stat. 1654A-348) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', as amended by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016''.

SEC. 1088. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STRATEGY FOR COUNTERING UNCONVENTIONAL WARFARE.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the President and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall develop a strategy for the Department of Defense to counter unconventional warfare threats posed by adversarial state and non-state actors.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) An articulation of the activities that constitute unconventional warfare being waged upon the United States and allies.

(2) A clarification of the roles and responsibilities of the Department of Defense in providing indications and warning of, and protection against, acts of unconventional warfare.

(3) The current status of authorities and command structures related to countering unconventional warfare.

(4) An articulation of the goals and objectives of the Department of Defense with respect to countering unconventional warfare threats.

(5) An articulation of related or required interagency capabilities and whole-of-Government activities required by the Department of Defense to support a counter-unconventional warfare strategy.

(6) Recommendations for improving the counter-unconventional warfare capabilities, authorities, and command structures of the Department of Defense.

(7) Recommendations for improving interagency coordination and support mechanisms with respect to countering unconventional warfare threats.

(8) Recommendations for the establishment of joint doctrine to support counter-unconventional warfare capabilities within the Department of Defense.

(9) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff determine necessary.

(c) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees the strategy required by subsection (a). The strategy shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITION OF UNCONVENTIONAL WARFARE.—In this section, the term ''unconventional warfare'' means activities conducted to enable a resistance movement or insurgency to coerce, disrupt, or overthrow a government or occupying power by operating through or with an underground, auxiliary, or guerrilla force in a denied area.

SEC. 1089. MINE COUNTERMEASURES MASTER PLAN.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the same time the budget is submitted to Congress for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a mine countermeasures (hereinafter in this section referred to as ''MCM'') master plan. Each such plan shall include each of the following:

(A) An evaluation of the capabilities, capacities, requirements, and readiness levels of the defensive capabilities of the Navy for MCM, including an assessment of the dedicated MCM force as well as the capabilities of ships, aircraft, and submarines that are not yet dedicated to MCM but could be modified to carry mine warfare capabilities.

(B) An evaluation of the ability of units to properly command and control air and surface MCM forces from fleet level down through to element level and to provide necessary operational and tactical control and awareness of such forces to facilitate mission accomplishment and defense.

(C) An assessment of technologies having promising potential for use for improving mine warfare and of programs for transitioning such technologies from the testing and evaluation phases to procurement.

(D) A fiscal plan to support the master plan through the Future Years Defense Plan.

(E) A plan for inspection of each asset with mine warfare responsibilities, requirements, and capabilities, which shall include proposed methods to ensure the material readiness of each asset and the training level of the force, a general summary, and readiness trends.

(2) FORM OF SUBMISSION.—Each plan submitted under paragraph (1)(E) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex addressing the capability and capacity to meet operational plans and contingency requirements.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the recommendations of the Secretary regarding the force structure and ensuring the operational effectiveness of the surface mine warfare force through 2025 based on current capabilities and capacity, replacement schedules, and service life extensions or retirement schedules. Such report shall include an assessment of the MCM vessels, including the decommissioned MCM-1 and MCM-2 ships and the potential of such ships for reserve operating status.

SEC. 1090. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION AND BRIEFING REQUIREMENT ON ORDERED EVACUATIONS OF UNITED STATES EMBASSIES AND CONSULATES INVOLVING THE USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall provide joint notification to the appropriate congressional committees as soon as practicable after the initiation of an ordered evacuation of a United States embassy or consulate involving the use of United States Armed Forces.

(b) BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall provide a joint briefing to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 15 days after the initiation of an ordered evacuation of a United States embassy or consulate involving the use of the United States Armed Forces.

(c) ELEMENTS.—Each notification under subsection (a) and briefing under subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) An overview of the ordered evacuation.

(2) The status of all personnel assigned to the embassy or consulate, including United States citizens and locally-employed staff.

(3) The status of the embassy or consulate, including whether the embassy or consulate was secured and all classified or otherwise sensitive material destroyed upon departure.

(4) An overview of the manner and location from which the Department of State will continue to conduct the duties and responsibilities of the embassy or consulate.

(5) A description of the disposition of United States Government property and whether such property was destroyed, disabled, abandoned or otherwise left behind, or remains in the possession of United States Government personnel.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State determine to be relevant.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1091. DETERMINATION AND DISCLOSURE OF TRANSPORTATION COSTS INCURRED BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRIPS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DETERMINATION AND DISCLOSURE OF COSTS BY SECRETARY.—In the case of a trip taken by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives or Senate in carrying out official duties outside the United States for which the Department of Defense provides transportation, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) determine the cost of the transportation provided with respect to the Member, officer, or employee;

(2) not later than 10 days after completion of the trip involved, provide a written statement of the cost—

(A) to the Member, officer, or employee involved, and

(B) to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives (in the case of a trip taken by a Member, officer, or employee of the House) or the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate (in the case of a trip taken by a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate); and

(3) upon providing a written statement under paragraph (2), make the statement available for viewing on the Secretary's official public website until the expiration of the 4-year period which begins on the final day of the trip involved.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—This section does not apply with respect to any trip the sole purpose of which is to visit one or more United States military installations or to visit United States military personnel in a war zone (or both).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MEMBER.—The term ''Member'', with respect to the House of Representatives, includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

(2) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to trips taken on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that this section does not apply with respect to any trip which began prior to such date.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

SEC. 1101. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO GRANT ALLOWANCES, BENEFITS, AND GRATUITIES TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL ON OFFICIAL DUTY IN A COMBAT ZONE.

Paragraph (2) of section 1603(a) of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234; 120 Stat. 443), as added by section 1102 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4616) and as most recently amended by section 1102 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3525), is further amended by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2017''.

SEC. 1102. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCES AND BENEFITS FOR DEFENSE CLANDESTINE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Section 1603 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCES AND BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE DEFENSE CLANDESTINE SERVICE.—In addition to the authority to provide compensation under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may provide an employee in a defense intelligence position who is assigned to the Defense Clandestine Service allowances and benefits under paragraph (1) of section 9904 of title 5 without regard to the limitations in that section—

''(1) that the employee be assigned to activities outside the United States; or

''(2) that the activities to which the employee is assigned be in support of Department of Defense activities abroad.''.

SEC. 1103. EXTENSION OF RATE OF OVERTIME PAY FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY EMPLOYEES PERFORMING WORK ABOARD OR DOCKSIDE IN SUPPORT OF THE NUCLEAR-POWERED AIRCRAFT CARRIER FORWARD DEPLOYED IN JAPAN.

Section 5542(a)(6)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2017''.

SEC. 1104. MODIFICATION TO TEMPORARY AUTHORITIES FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING FACILITIES.

Section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 888) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(4) NONCOMPETITIVE CONVERSION TO PERMANENT APPOINTMENT.—With respect to any student appointed by the director of an STRL under paragraph (3) to an indefinite or term appointment, upon graduation from the applicable institution of higher education (as defined in such paragraph), the director may noncompetitively convert such student to a permanent appointment within the STRL without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code (other than sections 3303 and 3328 of such title), provided the student meets all eligibility and Office of Personnel Management qualification requirements for the position.'';

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''3 percent'' and inserting ''6 percent'';

(3) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''1 percent'' and inserting ''3 percent''; and

(4) in subsection (f)(2), by striking ''1 percent'' and inserting ''2 percent''.

SEC. 1105. PREFERENCE ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES APPOINTED TO COMPETITIVE SERVICE; CLARIFICATION OF APPEAL RIGHTS.

(a) PREFERENCE ELIGIBILITY.—Section 2108 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (G)(iii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by inserting the following after subparagraph (H):

''(I) an individual who is a member of a reserve component of the armed forces:

''(i) who has—

''(I) successfully completed officer candidate training or entry level and skill training; and

''(II) incurred, or is performing, an initial period of obligated service in a reserve component of the armed forces of not less than 6 consecutive years; or

''(ii) who has completed at least 10 years of service in a reserve component of the armed forces in each of which the individual was credited with at least 50 points under section 12732 of title 10 toward the computation of years of service under section 12732 of title 10 for purposes of eligibility for retired pay under chapter 1223 of title 10; and

''(J) an individual who is—

''(i) retired from service in a reserve component of the armed forces; and

''(ii) eligible for, but has not yet commenced receipt of, retired pay for non-regular service under chapter 1223 of title 10;'';

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end and inserting ''or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the individual is a retiree described in paragraph (3)(J);'';

(3) in paragraph (5) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) 'entry level and skill training' has the meaning given that term in section 3301(2) of title 38; and

''(7) 'reserve component of the armed forces' means a reserve component specified in section 101(27) of title 38.''.

(b) TIERED HIRING PREFERENCE FOR MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Section 3309 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) a preference eligible under subparagraph (A), (B), or (J) of section 2108(3) of this title-5 points;

''(3) a preference eligible under section 2108(3)(I)(ii) of this title-4 points; and

''(4) a preference eligible under section 2108(3)(I)(i) of this title-3 points.''.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF APPEAL RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3330a of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by inserting '', including a preference eligible appointed pursuant to section 7401 of title 38 or otherwise employed by the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs,'' after ''A preference eligible''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting '', including a complaint so filed by a preference eligible appointed pursuant to section 7401 of title 38 or otherwise employed by the Veterans Health Administration,'' after ''If the Secretary of Labor is unable to resolve a complaint under subsection (a)''.

(2) COORDINATION RULE.—Section 3330a of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) If any part of this section is deemed to be inconsistent with any provision of chapter 74 of title 38, this section shall be deemed to supersede, override or otherwise modify such provision of chapter 74 of title 38.''.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

SEC. 1201. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF LOGISTICAL SUPPORT FOR COALITION FORCES SUPPORTING CERTAIN UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS.

Section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 394), as most recently amended by section 1223(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3548), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''fiscal year 2015'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2016'';

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''during the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''during the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 31, 2016''; and

(3) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016''.

SEC. 1202. STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION.

(a) STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall develop a strategic framework for Department of Defense security cooperation to guide prioritization of resources and activities.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The strategic framework required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Discussion of the strategic goals of Department of Defense security cooperation programs, and the extent to which these programs complement Department of State security assistance programs to achieve United States Government goals globally, regionally, and, if appropriate, within specific programs.

(B) Identification of the primary objectives, priorities, and desired end-states of Department of Defense security cooperation programs.

(C) Identification of challenges to achieving the primary objectives, priorities, and desired end-states identified under subparagraph (B), including—

(i) constraints on Department of Defense resources, authorities, and personnel;

(ii) partner nation variables, such as political will, absorptive capacity, corruption, and instability risk;

(iii) constraints or limitations due to bureaucratic impediments, interagency processes, or congressional requirements;

(iv) validation of requirements; and

(v) assessment, monitoring, and evaluation.

(D) A methodology for assessing the effectiveness of Department of Defense security cooperation programs in making progress toward achieving the primary objectives, priorities, and desired end-states identified under subparagraph (B), including an identification of key benchmarks for such progress and the implications of failing to achieve such primary objectives, priorities, and desired end-states.

(E) An analysis of overlap, duplication, or gaps among Department of Defense security cooperation authorities and how these authorities complement or overlap with Department of State security assistance authorities.

(F) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategic framework required by subsection (a).

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1203. MODIFICATION AND TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 897; 32 U.S.C. 107 note) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: ''to support the national interests and security cooperation goals and objectives of the United States, including applicable policy and guidelines for United States security sector assistance''.

(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting ''that is not'' after ''an activity that the Secretary of Defense determines is a matter''.

(c) PROCEDURES.—Such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (i) as subsections (d) through (j), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall—

''(A) establish, maintain, and update as appropriate a list of core competencies to support each program established under subsection (a), collectively and for each State and territory, and shall submit for approval to the Secretary of Defense the list of core competencies and additional information needed to make use of such core competencies; and

''(B) designate a director for each State and territory who shall be responsible for the conduct of activities under a program established under subsection (a) for such State or territory and reporting on activities under the program.

''(2) MILITARY-TO-CIVILIAN CORE COMPETENCIES.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may conduct an activity under a program established under subsection (a) relating to military-to-civilian core competencies.''.

(d) NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUND.—Subsection (e) of such section (as redesignated) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUND.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary of Defense shall establish on the books of the Department of Defense a National Guard State Partnership Program Fund.

''(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary is not required to establish a Fund under clause (i) if, not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in subsection (h)(1)) that in the opinion of the Secretary such a Fund should be established on the books of the Department of the Treasury.

''(B) CRITERIA.—In administering the Fund established under subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall, to the extent the Secretary determines it to be appropriate, provide for the following amounts to be credited to the Fund:

''(i) Amounts authorized and appropriated to carry out the program under this section.

''(ii) Amounts that the Secretary of Defense transfers, in such amounts as provided in appropriations Acts, to the Fund from amounts authorized and appropriated to the Department of Defense, including amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard.

''(C) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL BUDGET.—The President shall include the Fund established under subparagraph (A)(i) or such a Fund established on the books of the Department of the Treasury in the budget that the President submits to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code for each fiscal year in which the authority under subsection (a) is in effect.''.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f) of such section (as redesignated) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by inserting ''or other government organizations'' after ''and security forces'';

(2) in clause (iv), by adding at the end before the period the following: ''and country'';

(3) in clause (v), by striking ''training'' and inserting ''activities''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) An assessment of the extent to which the activities conducted during the previous year met the objectives described in clause (v).

''(vii) The list of core competencies required by subsection (c)(1) and any update to any changes to the list of core competencies required by subsection (c)(1).''.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (h) of such section (as redesignated) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) the congressional defense committees; and

''(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as amended) the following:

''(2) CORE COMPETENCIES.—The term ''core competencies'' means military-to-military and military-to-civilian skills and capabilities of the National Guard, consistent with the roles and missions of the Armed Forces as established by the Secretary of Defense.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

''(5) TERRITORY.—The term 'territory' means the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.''.

(g) TERMINATION.—Section 1205(i) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 899; 32 U.S.C. 107 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2016'' and inserting ''September 30, 2018''.

SEC. 1204. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR NONRECIPROCAL EXCHANGES OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Section 1207(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2514; 10 U.S.C. 168 note), as amended by section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1980), is further amended by striking ''September 30, 2016'' and inserting ''December 31, 2017''.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan and Pakistan

SEC. 1211. COMMANDERS' EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) ONE-YEAR EXTENSION.—Section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1619), as most recently amended by section 1221 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3546), is further amended by striking ''fiscal year 2015'' each place it appears and inserting ''fiscal year 2016''.

(b) FUNDS AVAILABLE DURING FISCAL YEAR 2016.—Subsection (a) of such section, as so amended, is further amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$5,000,000''.

SEC. 1212. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN COALITION NATIONS FOR SUPPORT PROVIDED TO UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (a) of section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 393), as most recently amended by section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3547), is further amended by striking ''fiscal year 2015'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2016''.

(b) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS AVAILABLE.—Subsection (d)(1) of such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking ''during fiscal year 2015 may not exceed $1,200,000,000'' and inserting ''during fiscal year 2016 may not exceed $1,260,000,000''; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking ''fiscal year 2015'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2016''.

(c) EXTENSION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENT RELATING TO REIMBURSEMENT OF PAKISTAN FOR SUPPORT PROVIDED BY PAKISTAN.—Section 1232(b)(6) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (122 Stat. 393), as most recently amended by section 1222(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (128 Stat. 3548), is further amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2016''.

(d) EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON REIMBURSEMENT OF PAKISTAN PENDING CERTIFICATION ON PAKISTAN.—Section 1227(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2001), as most recently amended by section 1222(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (128 Stat. 3548), is further amended by striking ''fiscal year 2015'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2016''.

(e) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON REIMBURSEMENT OF PAKISTAN PENDING CERTIFICATION ON PAKISTAN.—Of the total amount of reimbursements and support authorized for Pakistan during fiscal year 2016 pursuant to the third sentence of section 1233(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (as amended by subsection (b)(2)), $400,000,000 shall not be eligible for the waiver under section 1227(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (126 Stat. 2001) unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(1) Pakistan continues to conduct military operations in North Waziristan to disrupt the safe haven and freedom of movement of the Haqqani Network in Pakistan;

(2) Pakistan has prevented the Haqqani Network from using North Waziristan as a safe haven; and

(3) the Government of Pakistan actively coordinates with the Government of Afghanistan to restrict the movement of militants, such as the Haqqani Network, along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border.

SEC. 1213. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UNITED STATES POLICY AND STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States continues to have vital national security interests in ensuring that Afghanistan is a stable, sovereign country;

(2) President Ashraf Ghani of Afghanistan should be applauded for his leadership and commitment to ensuring that Afghanistan remains stable, secure, and a friend of the United States;

(3) the decision by the President of the United States to maintain 9,800 United States troops in Afghanistan through all of 2015 to train, advise, and assist and conduct counterterrorism missions in Afghanistan is the appropriate approach, is consistent with United States national security interests, and should be supported by Congress;

(4) the President should withdraw United States troops only on a pace that is consistent with the ability of the Afghan National Security Forces to sustain itself and secure Afghanistan and should review maintaining the United States advisory mission in Afghanistan beyond 2016;

(5) the United States should provide monetary and advisory support for the 352,000 Afghan National Security Forces personnel and 30,000 Afghan Local Police, including intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support, through 2018;

(6) the Afghan National Security Forces should have the independent capability to prevent groups such as al-Qaeda, the Haqqani Network, the Quetta Shura Taliban, and other terrorist and insurgent groups from being able to conduct de-stabilizing attacks and military operations inside Afghanistan or against the United States and its allies and holding or governing territory; and

(7) the United States should continue to vigorously conduct counterterrorism operations in Afghanistan beyond 2016, including against the Haqqani Network, to preserve the vital national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 1214. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES PRODUCED IN COUNTRIES ALONG A MAJOR ROUTE OF SUPPLY TO AFGHANISTAN.

Section 801(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2399), as most recently amended by section 832 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 814), is further amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016''.

SEC. 1215. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER DEFENSE ARTICLES AND PROVIDE DEFENSE SERVICES TO THE MILITARY AND SECURITY FORCES OF AFGHANISTAN.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (h) of section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1992), as amended by section 1231 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3556), is further amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016''.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Subsection (f)(1) of such section, as so amended, is further amended by striking ''March 31, 2016'' and inserting ''March 31, 2017''.

(c) EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Subsection (i)(2) of such section, as so amended, is further amended by striking ''and 2015'' each place it appears and inserting '', 2015, and 2016''.

SEC. 1216. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHAN TRANSLATORS, INTERPRETERS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE AIDS.

It is the sense of Congress that it is in the interest of the United States to continue to assist Afghan partners, and their immediate families, who have served as translators or interpreters and those who have performed sensitive and trusted activities for United States forces.

Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Syria and Iraq

SEC. 1221. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO SUPPORT OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF SECURITY COOPERATION IN IRAQ.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (f)(1) of section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), as most recently amended by section 1237 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3562), is further amended by striking ''fiscal year 2015'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2016''.

(b) AMOUNT AVAILABLE.—Such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''fiscal year 2015'' and all that follows and inserting ''fiscal year 2016 may not exceed $143,000,000.''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''fiscal year 2015'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2016''.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq. The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of how the programs of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq, in conjunction with other United States programs, such as Foreign Military Financing program and the Foreign Military Sales program, will address the capability gaps of the Iraqi Security Forces and coordinate activities to provide for

the training and equipping of the Iraqi Security Forces.

(2) A description of constraints, if any, caused by the operational environment in Iraq on the ability of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq to carry out its mission.

SEC. 1222. COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY FOR THE MIDDLE EAST AND TO COUNTER ISLAMIC EXTREMISM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated, ''The global security environment is as uncertain as I have seen in my 40 years of service.''.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, stated: ''Sunni violent extremists are gaining momentum and the number of Sunni violent extremist groups, members, and safe havens is greater than at any other point in history.''.

(3) In testimony to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, Lieutenant General Michael Flynn, former Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency stated, ''. . .whether it be the number of violent Islamist groups, the territory which they control, the scale and scope of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and associated movements, the number of terrorist attacks they perpetrate, the numbers of causalities they inflict, their broad expansion and use of the internet, or just their sheer barbarism; I can draw no other conclusion than to say that the threat of Islamic extremism has reached an unacceptable level and that it is growing.''.

(4) In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, stated the following:

(A) ''When the final counting is done, 2014 will have been the most lethal year for global terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled . . . about half of all attacks, as well as fatalities, in 2014 occurred in just three countries: Iraq, Pakistan and Afghanistan . . . the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) conducted more attacks than any other terrorist group in the first nine months of 2014.''.

(B) ''Since the conflict began, more than 20,000 Sunni foreign fighters have traveled to Syria from more than 90 countries to fight the Assad regime . . . of that number, at least 13,600 have extremist ties.''.

(C) ''More than 3,400 Western fighters have gone to Syria and Iraq. Hundreds have returned home to Europe.''.

(D) ''About 180 Americans or so have been involved in various stages of travel to Syria . . . and some number have come back.''.

(E) ''ISIL, al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), and, most recently, al-Shabaab are calling on their supporters to conduct lone-wolf attacks against the United States and other Western countries. Of the 13 attacks in the West since last May, 12 were conducted by individual extremists.''.

(5) AQAP continues to be one of al-Qaeda's most capable affiliates, has the intent and capability to attack the United States and its allies, and attempted attacks inside the United States on December 25, 2009, and October 27, 2010.

(6) Iran has been a Department of State-designated state sponsor of terrorism since January 19, 1984, and continues to sponsor and support terrorism throughout the Middle East region and around the world.

(7) In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Jack Keane (retired), stated, ''Is it possible to . . . claim that the United States policy and strategy is working or that al-Qaeda is on the run? It is unmistakable that our policies have failed . . . And the unequivocal explanation is U.S. policy has focused on disengaging from the Middle East.''.

(8) In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, former commander of United States Central Command, General James Mattis (retired), stated, ''We have lived too long in a strategy-free mode . . . America needs a refreshed national strategy . . . And our Nation's strategy demands a comprehensive approach.''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Islamic extremism is growing in the Middle East and elsewhere;

(2) Iran continues to be a leading state sponsor of terrorism in the Middle East and across the globe and continues to actively work against United States interests;

(3) the threat of terrorist attacks in the United States and threats against United States interests have increased due to the growth of Islamic extremism, the proliferation of terrorist groups across the world, and the instability in the Middle East in countries such as Libya, Yemen, Iraq, and Syria;

(4) the approach of Building Partnership Capacity (BPC) and conducting limited counterterrorism operations has had some positive effects in some locations, but has not prevented the proliferation and violence of terrorist groups or instability in the Middle East;

(5) the United States should articulate, develop, and implement an effective strategy to work with its allies and partners to defeat Islamic extremist groups that threaten the interests of the Unites States and its allies;

(6) support for United States allies and partners in the Middle East is a critical component of the effort to prevent the spread of Islamic extremism;

(7) other actors, such as Russia, China, and Iran are trying to work against United States interests in the Middle East;

(8) the United States should take a greater leadership role in fighting Islamic extremism and supporting stability in the Middle East to include coordinating actions of United States allies and partners in the region;

(9) the United States plays a vital leadership role in coordinating the activities of the United States and its allies and partners and should seek opportunities to expand such cooperation to contribute to greater stability in the Middle East;

(10) the United States should continue to take steps to prevent the spread of malign Iranian influence in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and the region;

(11) the United States remains an indispensable actor in the Middle East, and the President should ensure that United States Armed Forces remain forward postured in the region to deter adversaries, fight threats to the United States and its interests, and support United States allies and partners in the region.

(c) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 15, 2016, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to the specified congressional committees a comprehensive strategy for the Middle East and to counter Islamic extremism.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed description of the objectives and end state for the United States in the Middle East and with respect to Islamic extremism.

(B) A description of the roles and responsibilities of the Department of State in such strategy.

(C) A description of the roles and responsibilities of the Department of Defense in such strategy.

(D) A detailed description of actions to prevent the weakening and failing of states in the Middle East.

(E) A detailed description of actions to counter Islamic extremism, including Islamic ideology, strategy, and tactics globally.

(F) A detailed definition of those states and non-state actors the United States will address to counter Islamic extremism.

(G) A detailed description of actions to establish a coalition to carry out the strategy.

(3) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In the section, the term ''specified congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1223. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO COUNTER THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT.

(a) QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT.—Subsection (d) of section 1236 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3561) is amended by striking ''30 days'' and inserting ''90 days''.

(b) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this Act for Overseas Contingency Operations in title XV for fiscal year 2016, there are authorized to be appropriated $715,000,000 to carry out such section.

(c) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Subsection (j)(1)(B) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''the following:'' and all that follows through ''Any provision of law'' and inserting ''any provision of law''; and

(2) by striking clause (ii).

(d) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ASSISTANCE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.—Such section, as so amended, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ASSISTANCE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.—

''(1) ASSESSMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the extent to which the Government of Iraq is meeting the conditions described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) CONDITIONS.—The conditions described in this subparagraph are that the Government of Iraq—

''(i) is addressing the grievances of ethnic and sectarian minorities;

''(ii) is increasing political inclusiveness;

''(iii) is conducting efforts sufficient to reduce support for the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and improve stability in Iraq;

''(iv) is legislating the Iraqi Sunni National Guard;

''(v) is ensuring that minorities are represented in adequate numbers, trained, and equipped in government security organizations;

''(vi) is ending support to Shia militias and stopping abuses of elements of the Iraqi population by such militias;

''(vii) is ensuring that supplies, equipment, and weaponry supplied by the United States are appropriately distributed to security forces with a national security mission in Iraq, including the Kurdish Peshmerga, Sunni tribal security forces with a national security mission, and the Iraqi Sunni National Guard;

''(viii) is releasing prisoners from ethnic or sectarian minorities who have been arrested and held without trial or to charge and try such prisoners in a fair, transparent, and prompt manner; and

''(ix) is taking such other actions as the Secretaries consider appropriate.

''(C) UPDATE.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State may submit an update of

the assessment required under subparagraph (A) to the extent necessary.

''(D) SUBMISSION.—The assessment required under subparagraph (A) and the update of the assessment authorized under subparagraph (C) may be submitted as part of the quarterly report required under subsection (d).

''(2) RESTRICTION ON DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ.—If the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State do not submit the assessment required by paragraph (1) or if the Secretaries submit the assessment required by paragraph (1) but the assessment indicates that the Government of Iraq has not substantially achieved the conditions contained in the assessment, the Secretaries shall withhold the provision of assistance pursuant to subsection (a) directly to the Government of Iraq for fiscal year 2016 until such time as the Secretaries submit an update of the assessment that indicates that the Government of Iraq has substantially achieved the conditions contained in the assessment.

''(3) DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN COVERED GROUPS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section for fiscal year 2016, not less than 25 percent of such funds shall be obligated and expended for assistance directly to the groups described in subparagraph (E) (of which not less than 12.5 percent of such funds shall be obligated and expended for assistance directly to the group described in clause (i) of such subparagraph).

''(B) ADDITIONAL DIRECT ASSISTANCE.—If the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State withhold the provision of assistance pursuant to subsection (a) directly to the Government of Iraq for fiscal year 2016 in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Secretaries shall obligate and expend not less than an additional 60 percent of all unobligated funds authorized to be appropriated under this section for fiscal year 2016 for assistance directly to the groups described in subparagraph (E).

''(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT INAPPLICABLE.—The cost-sharing requirement of subsection (k) shall not apply with respect to funds that are obligated or expended for assistance directly to the groups described in subparagraph (E).

''(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the groups described in subparagraph (E) shall each be deemed to be a country for purposes of meeting the eligibility requirements of section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753) and chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2311 et seq.).

''(E) COVERED GROUPS.—The groups described in this subparagraph are—

''(i) the Kurdish Peshmerga;

''(ii) Sunni tribal security forces with a national security mission; and

''(iii) the Iraqi Sunni National Guard.''.

SEC. 1224. REPORT ON UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES DEPLOYED IN SUPPORT OF OPERATION INHERENT RESOLVE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it should continue to be a top priority to provide United States Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation Inherent Resolve with the necessary force protection and combat search and rescue support;

(2) United States military personnel who are tasked with the mission of providing combat search and rescue support, casualty evacuation, and medical support for Operation Inherent Resolve should not be counted as part of any limitation on the number of United States ground forces for Operation Inherent Resolve;

(3) military assets required to support United States Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation Inherent Resolve should be staged as forward as possible and as proximate to such United States Armed Forces as practicable given the operating environment and also should not be subject to any limitation on the number of United States ground forces for Operation Inherent Resolve; and

(4) the President, the Secretary of Defense, and military commanders on the ground in support of Operation Inherent Resolve should continuously evaluate the force protection and combat search and rescue support requirements, and the associated measures that are being taken to support such requirements, in order to ensure that such requirements and associated measures are sufficient given the operating environment and optimally postured.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on United States Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation Inherent Resolve.

(c) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report shall include the following:

(1) The total number of members of the United States Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation Inherent Resolve for the most recent month for which data is available, delineated by service, component, country, and military task.

(2) The total number of members of the United States Armed Forces conducting force protection and combat search and rescue, delineated by country, location in such country, and capability.

(3) An estimate for the three-month period following the date on which the report is submitted of the total number of members of the United States Armed Forces expected to be deployed in support of Operation Inherent Resolve, delineated by service, component, country, and military task.

(4) A description of the authorities and limitations on the number of United States Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation Inherent Resolve.

(5) A description of military functions that are and are not subject to the authorities and limitations described in paragraph (3).

(6) Any changes to the authorities and limitations described in paragraph (3) and the rationale for such changes.

(7) Any changes to United States policy and authorities for United States Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation Inherent Resolve.

(8) Any other matters that the Secretary of Defense determines to be necessary.

(d) SUNSET.—The requirement to submit reports under this section shall terminate on the date on which Operation Inherent Resolve terminates or the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs earlier.

SEC. 1225. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO THE VETTED SYRIAN OPPOSITION.

Section 1209 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3541) is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this Act for Overseas Contingency Operations in title XV for fiscal year 2016, there are authorized to be appropriated $531,500,000 to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 1226. ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF JORDAN FOR BORDER SECURITY OPERATIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may provide assistance on a reimbursement basis to the Government of Jordan for purposes of supporting and enhancing efforts of the armed forces of Jordan to sustain security along the border of Jordan with Syria and Iraq.

(2) FREQUENCY.—Assistance may be provided under this subsection on a quarterly basis.

(b) FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this Act for ''Assistance for the Border Security of Jordan'' in title XV for fiscal year 2016, there are authorized to be appropriated $300,000,000 to carry out this section.

(2) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may not enter into any contractual obligation to provide assistance under the authority in subsection (a).

(c) NOTICE BEFORE EXERCISE.—Not later than 15 days before providing assistance under the authority in subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report setting forth a full description of the assistance to be provided, including the amount of assistance to be provided, and the timeline for the provision of such assistance.

(d) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In the section, the term ''specified congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(e) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—No assistance may be provided under the authority in subsection (a) after December 31, 2016.

SEC. 1227. REPORT ON EFFORTS OF TURKEY TO FIGHT TERRORISM.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the following:

(1) Turkey's bilateral and multilateral efforts to combat the flow of foreign fighters through its country into Syria.

(2) Turkey's relationship with Hamas, including its harboring of leaders of Hamas.

(3) The efforts of Turkey to fight terrorism, including Turkey's military and humanitarian role in the anti-ISIS coalition.

Subtitle D—Matters Relating to Iran

SEC. 1231. EXTENSION OF ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY POWER OF IRAN.

(a) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Subsection (b) of section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2544), as amended by section 1232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 920), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) An assessment of transfers to Iran of military equipment, technology, and training from non-Iranian sources.''.

(b) TERMINATION.—Subsection (d) of such section, as amended by section 1277 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3592), is further amended by striking ''December 31, 2016'' and inserting ''December 31, 2025''.

SEC. 1232. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM AND ITS MALIGN MILITARY ACTIVITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The understanding announced on April 2, 2015, between the countries of the P5+1 (the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China) and Iran on a Comprehensive Joint Plan of Action (CJPOA) provides sanctions relief in exchange for constraints on Iran's nuclear program for a limited period of time.

(2) Iran continues to develop ballistic missiles in violation of United Nations Security Council

Resolutions 1747 (2007) and 1929 (2010), has developed medium-range ballistic missiles to target Israel and other United States allies, is working towards an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) capability and the CJPOA places no limitations on Iran's ballistic and cruise missile development efforts.

(3) The Secretary of State has designated Iran as a state-sponsor of terrorism since 1984 and for the past decade has characterized Iran as the ''most active state sponsor of terrorism'' in the world.

(4) Iran continues to support Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Bashar al-Assad regime in Syria, Shia militias in Iraq, Hamas in Gaza, the Houthi rebels in Yemen, and other terrorist organizations and extremists globally.

(5) Iran continues to conduct malign military activities across the Middle East and around the globe, which has and will continue to destabilize the region. As the Commander of United States Central Command testified to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on March 3, 2015, ''the leaders in the region. . . are also equally concerned about Iran's ability to mine the Straits, Iran's cyber capabilities, Iran's. . . ballistic missile capability, as well as the activity of their Quds forces... And so whether we get a deal or don't get a deal, I think they will still share those concerns.''.

(6) Iran's destabilizing activities throughout the region pose a threat to United States interests, the interests of United States allies in the region, and international security.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Iran's illicit pursuit, development, or acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability and its malign military activities overall constitute a grave threat to regional stability and the national security interests of the United States and its allies and partners;

(2) Iran continues to expand its malign activities in the Middle East and globally, which may well increase under a CJPOA;

(3) sanctions relief under the CJPOA will provide Iran the ability to increase funding for its ballistic missile development programs, acquisition of destabilizing types and amounts of conventional weapons, support for terrorism, and other malign activities throughout the Middle East and globally;

(4) United States bilateral and multilateral sanctions against Iran, once relieved, will be extremely difficult to reconstitute in response to Iranian violations of its international obligations;

(5) Iran would be an internationally-approved nuclear-threshold state under the framework of the CJPOA, which will likely lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons across the Middle East;

(6) Congress should review and assess all elements of any agreement entered into between the countries of the P5+1 and Iran and it should approve or disapprove of any sanctions relief that results from such an agreement;

(7) the United States must continue to support the defense of allies and partners in the region, including Israel, strengthening ballistic missile defense capabilities, and increasing security assistance;

(8) Congress supports efforts to reach a peaceful, diplomatic solution to permanently and verifiably end Iran's pursuit, development, and acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability, and it reaffirms that it is United States policy that Iran will not be allowed to develop a nuclear weapons capability and that all instruments of United States power must be considered to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon; and

(9) Congress reaffirms the rights of United States allies to exercise their legitimate right to self-defense against the Government of Iran.

SEC. 1233. REPORT ON MILITARY POSTURE REQUIRED IN THE MIDDLE EAST TO DETER IRAN FROM DEVELOPING A NUCLEAR WEAPON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report regarding the military posture required in the Middle East to deter Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include a discussion of the military forces, bases and capabilities required to—

(1) maintain a military option of preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon;

(2) counter Iran's military activities; and

(3) protect the United States military and other interests in the region.

Subtitle E—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation

SEC. 1241. NOTIFICATIONS AND UPDATES RELATING TO TESTING, PRODUCTION, DEPLOYMENT, AND SALE OR TRANSFER TO OTHER STATES OR NON-STATE ACTORS OF THE CLUB-K CRUISE MISSILE SYSTEM BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) NOTIFICATIONS.—

(1) REGARDING TESTING, PRODUCTION, DEPLOYMENT, AND SALE OR TRANSFER.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress quarterly notifications on the testing, production, deployment, and sale or transfer to other states or non-state actors of the Club-K cruise missile system by the Russian Federation.

(2) UPON DEPLOYMENT OR SALE OR TRANSFER.—Not later than seven days after the Secretary determines that there is reasonable grounds to believe that the Russian Federation has deployed or sold or transferred to other states or non-state actors the Club-K cruise missile system, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a notification of such determination.

(3) FORM.—A notification required under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(b) QUARTERLY UPDATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress not less than quarterly updates on the coordination of allied responses to the deployment or sale or transfer to other states or non-state actors of the Club-K cruise missile system by the Russian Federation.

(2) FORM.—The update required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(c) STRATEGY.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall develop a strategy to detect, defend against, and defeat the Club-K cruise missile system, including opportunities for allied contributions to such efforts based on consultations with such allies.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the strategy developed under paragraph (1).

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(e) SUNSET.—The provisions of this section shall not be in effect on and after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1242. NOTIFICATIONS OF DEPLOYMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS BY RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO TERRITORY OF UKRAINIAN REPUBLIC.

(a) NOTIFICATIONS.—

(1) REGARDING POSSIBLE DEPLOYMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees quarterly notifications on the status of the Russian Federation conducting exercises with, planning or preparing to deploy, or deploying covered weapons systems onto the territory of the Ukranian Republic.

(2) UPON DEPLOYMENT.—Not later than seven days after the Secretary determines that there is reasonable grounds to believe that the Russian Federation has deployed covered weapons systems onto the territory of the Ukranian Republic, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notification of such determination.

(3) FORM.—A notification required under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(b) STRATEGY.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall develop a strategy to respond to the military threat posed by the Russian Federation deploying covered weapons systems onto the territory of the Ukranian Republic, including opportunities for allied cooperation in developing such responses based on consultation with such allies.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than June 30, 2016, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall submit to the congressional defense committees the following:

(A) The strategy developed under paragraph (1).

(B) The views of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the strategy developed under paragraph (1), if any.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED WEAPONS SYSTEMS.—The term ''covered weapons systems'' means weapons systems that can perform both conventional and nuclear missions, nuclear weapon delivery systems, and nuclear warheads.

(d) SUNSET.—The provisions of this section shall not be in effect on and after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1243. NON-COMPLIANCE BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION WITH ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE INF TREATY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Department of State, on July 31, 2014, released the Annual Report on the ''Adherence to and Compliance With Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments'' which included the finding that, ''The United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty not to possess, produce, or flight-test a ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) with a range capability of 500 km to 5,500 km, or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles.''.

(2) According to the testimony of senior officials of the Department of State, the Russian Federation is not complying with numerous treaties and agreements, including the INF Treaty, the Open Skies Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Vienna Document, the Budapest Memorandum, the Istanbul Commitments, the Presidential Nuclear Initiatives, the Missile

Technology Control Regime, and the Russian Federation has recently withdrawn from the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE).

(3) The Commander of U.S. European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, General Philip Breedlove, USAF, stated that ''[a] weapon capability that violates the I.N.F., that is introduced into the greater European land mass is absolutely a tool that will have to be dealt with . . . I would not judge how the alliance will choose to react, but I would say they will have to consider what to do about it, [i]t can't go unanswered.''.

(4) General Breedlove has further stated that '' we need to first and foremost signal that we cannot accept this change and that, if this change is continued, that we will have to change the cost calculus for Russia in order to help them to find their way to a less bellicose position.''.

(5) General Martin Dempsey, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff testified that, ''I think we have to make it very clear that things like their compliance with the INF treaty that there will be political, diplomatic and potentially military costs in terms of the way we posture ourselves and the way we plan and work with our allies to address those provocations. . .It concerns me greatly. I certainly would counsel them not to roll back the clock.''.

(6) The Secretary of Defense, Ashton B. Carter, testified that, ''On the military side, we have begun to consider . . . what our options are, because the INF treaty is a treaty, meaning that it's a two-way street. We accepted constraints in return for constraints of the then Soviet Union. It is a two-way street, and we need to remind them that it's a two-way street, meaning that we, without an INF treaty, can take action also that we both decided years ago was best for neither of us to take.''.

(7) The Department of Defense has been considering a range of military options to respond to the Russian Federation's violation of the INF Treaty and these options would ''aim to negate any advantage Russia might gain from deploying an INF-prohibited system, and all of these would be designed to make us more secure'', and these options ''fall into three broad categories: active defenses to counter intermediate-range ground-launched cruise missiles; counterforce capabilities to prevent intermediate-range ground-launched cruise missile attacks; and countervailing strike capabilities to enhance U.S. or allied forces.''.

(8) President Barack Obama stated in Prague in 2009 that, ''Rules must be binding. Violations must be punished. Words must mean something.''.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Russian Federation should return to compliance with the INF Treaty;

(2) the continuing violation of the INF Treaty by the Russian Federation threatens the viability of the INF Treaty;

(3) the United States has reportedly been undertaking diplomatic efforts to address with the Russia Federation its violations of the INF Treaty since 2013, and the Russian Federation has failed to respond to these efforts in any meaningful way;

(4) not only should the Russian Federation end its cheating with respect to the INF Treaty, but also its illegal occupation of the sovereign territory of another nation, its plans for stationing nuclear weapons on that nation's territory, and its cheating and violation of as many as eight of its 12 arms control obligations and agreements; and

(5) there are several United States military requirements that would be addressed by the development and deployment of systems currently prohibited by the INF Treaty.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF RUSSIAN VIOLATIONS OF INF TREATY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notification of—

(A) whether the Russian Federation has flight-tested, deployed, or possesses a military system that has achieved an initial operating capability of a covered missile system; and

(B) whether the Russian Federation has begun steps to return to full compliance with the INF Treaty, including by agreeing to inspections and verification measures necessary to achieve high confidence that any covered missile system will be eliminated, as required by the INF Treaty upon its entry into force.

(2) DEADLINE.—The notification required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not later than 30 days after the date on which the Russian Federation meets any of the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(3) FORM.—The notification required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(d) NOTIFICATION OF COORDINATION WITH ALLIES REGARDING INF TREATY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment, and every 120-day period thereafter for a period of 5 years, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notification on the status and content of updates provided to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and allies of the United States in East Asia, on the Russian Federation's flight testing, operating capability and deployment of a covered missile system, including updates on the status and a description of efforts with such allies to develop collective responses, including economic and military responses, to the Russian Federation's arms control violations, including violations of the INF Treaty.

(2) FORM.—The notification required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(e) MILITARY RESPONSE OPTIONS TO RUSSIAN FEDERATION VIOLATION OF THE TREATY ON INTERMEDIATE RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF CAPABILITIES.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the President determines that the Russian Federation has not begun steps to return to full compliance with the INF Treaty, including by agreeing to inspections and verification measures necessary to achieve high confidence that any covered missile system will be eliminated, as required by the INF Treaty upon its entry into force, the President shall begin developing the following military capabilities:

(A) Counterforce capabilities to prevent intermediate-range ground-launched ballistic missile and cruise missile attacks, including capabilities that may be acquired from allies.

(B) Countervailing strike capabilities to enhance the Armed Forces of the United States or allies of the United States, including capabilities that may be acquired from allies.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RECOMMENDED CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary of Defense may use funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4201, to carry out the development of capabilities pursuant to paragraph (1) that are recommended by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to meet military requirements and current capability gaps. In making such a selection, the Chairman shall give priority to such capabilities that the Chairman determines could be tested and fielded most expediently, with the most priority given to capabilities that the Chairman determines could be fielded in two years.

(3) REPORTS ON DEVELOPMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—During each 180-day period beginning on the date on which funds are first obligated to develop capabilities under paragraph (2), the Chairman shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on such capabilities, including the costs of development (and estimated total costs of each system if pursued to deployment) and the timeline for development flight testing and deployment.

(B) SUNSET.—The provisions of subparagraph (A) shall not be in effect on and after the date on which the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the INF Treaty is no longer in force or the Russian Federation has fully returned to compliance with its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(4) REPORT ON DEPLOYMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the following:

(A) Potential deployment locations of the military capabilities described in paragraph (1) in East Asia and Eastern Europe, including any potential basing agreements that may be required to facilitate such deployments.

(B) Any required safety and security measures, estimates of potential costs of deployments described in subparagraph (A) and an assessment of whether or not such deployments in Eastern Europe may require a decision of the North Atlantic Council.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(A) The congressional defense committees.

(B) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(C) The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) COVERED MISSILE SYSTEM.—The term ''covered missile system'' means ground-launched ballistic missiles or ground-launched cruise missiles with a flight-tested range of between 500 and 5500 kilometers.

(3) INF TREATY.—The term ''INF Treaty'' means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington, December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

SEC. 1244. MODIFICATION OF NOTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL TO MODIFY OR INTRODUCE NEW AIRCRAFT OR SENSORS FOR FLIGHT BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION UNDER OPEN SKIES TREATY.

Section 1242(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3563) is amended—

(1) by striking ''30 days'' and inserting ''90 days''; and

(2) by striking ''and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff'' and inserting '', the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the commander of each relevant combatant command''.

SEC. 1245. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUPPORT FOR ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are highly valued allies of the United States, and they have repeatedly demonstrated their commitment to advancing our mutual interests as well as those of the NATO Alliance.

(2) Operation Atlantic Resolve is a series of exercises and coordinating efforts meant to demonstrate the United States' commitment to the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and the United States-Baltic partnership's shared goal of peace and stability in the region. Built upon the common values of peace, stability and prosperity, Operation Atlantic Resolve strengthens communication and understanding, and is an important effort to deter Russian aggression against the Baltic States.

(3) As part of Operation Atlantic Resolve, the European Reassurance Initiative undertakes exercises, training, and rotational presence necessary to reassure and integrate our Baltic State allies into a common defense framework.

(4) All three Baltic States contributed to the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, sending disproportionate numbers of troops and operating with few caveats. They also continue to engage in the Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) reaffirms its support for the principle of collective defense as enshrined in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty for our NATO allies, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

(2) supports the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and inviolability of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as well as their internationally recognized borders, and expresses concerns over increasingly aggressive military maneuvering by Russia near their borders and airspace;

(3) expresses concerns over increasingly aggressive military maneuvering by the Russian Federation near Baltic state borders and airspace, and condemns reported subversive and destabilizing activities by the Russian Federation within the Baltic states; and

(4) encourages the Administration to further enhance defense cooperation efforts with Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and supports the efforts of their Governments to provide for the defense of their people and sovereign territory.

SEC. 1246. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUPPORT FOR GEORGIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Georgia is a valued friend of the United States and has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to advancing the mutual interests of both countries, including the deployment of Georgian forces as part of the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan and the Multi-National Force in Iraq.

(2) The European Reassurance Initiative builds the partnership capacity of Georgia so it can work more closely with the United States and NATO, as well as provide for their own defense.

(3) In addition to the European Reassurance Initiative, Georgia's participation in the NATO initiative Partnership for Peace is paramount to interoperability with the United States and NATO, and establishing a more peaceful environment in the region.

(4) Despite the heavy and painful losses suffered during the ISAF, as a NATO partner Georgia is engaged in the Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan with the second largest contingent on the ground.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) reaffirms United States support for Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally-recognized borders, and does not recognize the Abkhazia and South Ossetia regions, currently occupied by Russia, as independent; and

(2) supports continued cooperation between the United States and Georgia and the efforts of the Government of Georgia to provide for the defense of its people and sovereign territory.

Subtitle F—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region

SEC. 1251. SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF ALLIED MILITARY ENGAGEMENT IN THE PACIFIC THEATER.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings

(1) September 2, 2015, marks the 70th anniversary of the end of Allied military engagement in the Pacific theater, also marking the end of the Second World War.

(2) The United States entered the Second World War in December 1941, following the Empire of Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, and over the next four years Americans participated in what was arguably the greatest national endeavor in the Nation's history.

(3) The casualty toll of Americans in the Pacific theater during the Second World War was approximately 92,904 killed, 208,333 wounded, and tens of thousands missing in action and prisoners of war, with civilians and military forces of the Allied Powers suffering equally devastating tolls.

(4) American military forces displayed extraordinary courage and suffered significant casualties in battles across the Pacific theater, including in the Battle of the Philippine Sea, the Battle of Leyte Gulf, the Philippines Campaign, the Battle of Iwo Jima, and the Battle of Okinawa.

(5) Japanese military forces and the Japanese civilian population also suffered staggering losses.

(6) On August 15, 1945, Emperor Hirohito of Japan announced the unconditional surrender of Japan's military forces, made formal on September 2, 1945, aboard the U.S.S. Missouri in Tokyo Bay, Japan, thus ending the most devastating war in human history.

(7) Japan is now a free and prosperous democracy; a valued ally with shared values and mutual interests based on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law, who serves as a cornerstone for peace and security in the region and for whom the United States seeks to further enhance security, economic, and diplomatic ties.

(8) The bravery and sacrifice of the members of the United States Armed Forces and the military forces of the Allied Powers who served valiantly to rescue the Pacific nations from tyranny and aggression should be always remembered.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) recognizes the 70th anniversary of the end of Allied military engagement in the Pacific theater, and also marking the end of Second World War;

(2) joins with a grateful nation in expressing respect and appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Pacific theater during the Second World War;

(3) remembers and honors those Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice and gave their lives for their country during the campaigns in the Pacific theater during the Second World War; and

(4) preserves and applies the lessons learned from the history of the Second World War in the Pacific theater and recognizes the close alliance between the United States and Japan, codified in the 1960 Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan, that continues to be enhanced to maintain peace and prosperity in the region.

SEC. 1252. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CONSOLIDATION OF UNITED STATES MILITARY FACILITIES IN OKINAWA, JAPAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The defense alliance between the United States and Japan remains important and strong.

(2) Progress continues to be made in the United States and Japan to fulfill the April 27, 2012, agreement of the United States-Japan Security Consultative Committee that modified the United States-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation, originally codified on May 1, 2006, including the Governor of Okinawa signing the landfill permit for Henoko construction on December 27, 2013, and the elimination of restrictions on Government of Japan contributions for the realignment of Marine Corps forces in the Asia-Pacific region by section 2821 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291).

(3) The Government of Japan has made significant and unprecedented direct financial contributions of more than $3,000,000,000 to the Support for United States Relocation to Guam Account pursuant to section 2350k of title 10, United States Code, for the relocation of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa to Guam and the relocation of certain training from Okinawa to the Marianas region, of which nearly $1,000,000,000 has already been received from the Government of Japan, and a significant amount of these funds has already been obligated and expended to support the relocation of Marine Corps forces on Guam.

(4) It is important to return formerly used United States military property in Okinawa to the local government.

(5) Consolidation of United States facilities and the return of formerly used United States military property in Okinawa will be implemented as soon as possible, while ensuring operational capability, including training capability, throughout the consolidation process.

(6) Under the April 27, 2012, agreement referred to in paragraph (2), the United States is authorized to establish Marine Air-Ground Task Forces at additional locations in the Asia-Pacific region, including Guam, Hawaii, and Australia, which will enhance their readiness posture through flexibility and speed to respond to regional threats and maintain regional peace, stability, and security.

(7) Even though realignment of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa to Guam is ''de-linked'' from progress on the construction of the Futenma Replacement Facility in Henoko, there must be continued progress on Guam and Okinawa to meet the agreement.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Henoko location for the Futenma Replacement Facility—

(1) has been studied and analyzed for several decades, reaffirmed by both the United States and Japan on several occasions, including the 2010 Futenma Replacement Facility Bilateral Experts study and the independent assessment required by section 346 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1373); and

(2) remains the only option for the Futenma Replacement Facility.

SEC. 1253. STRATEGY TO PROMOTE UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) STRATEGY.—The President shall develop an overall strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. Such strategy shall be informed by the following:

(1) The national security strategy of the United States for 2015 set forth in the national security strategy report required under section 108(a)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 5043(a)(3)), as such strategy relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(2) The strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region as contained in the report required by section 1251(a)

of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

(3) The integrated, multi-year planning and budget strategy for a rebalancing of United States policy in Asia submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7043(a) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76)).

(b) PRESIDENTIAL POLICY DIRECTIVE.—The President shall issue a Presidential Policy Directive to relevant Federal departments and agencies that contains the strategy developed under subsection (a) and includes implementing guidance to such departments and agencies.

(c) RELATION TO AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS AND ANNUAL BUDGET.—

(1) AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS.—In identifying agency priority goals under section 1120(b) of title 31, United States Code, for each relevant Federal department and agency, the head of such department or agency, or as otherwise determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall take into consideration the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

(2) ANNUAL BUDGET.—The President, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall ensure that the annual budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, includes a separate section that clearly highlights programs and projects that are being funded in the annual budget that relate to the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

SEC. 1254. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCE WITH JAPAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States highly values its alliance with the Government of Japan as a cornerstone of peace and security in the region, based on shared values of democracy, the rule of law, free and open markets, and respect for human rights in order to promote peace, security, stability, and economic prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region;

(2) the United States welcomes Japan's decision to contribute more proactively to regional and global peace and security;

(3) the United States supports recent changes in Japanese defense policy, including the adoption of collective self-defense and the new bilateral Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation which were approved on April 27, 2015, and will promote a more balanced and effective alliance to meet the emerging security challenges of this century;

(4) the United States and Japan should continue to improve joint interoperability and collaborate on developing future capabilities with which to maintain regional stability in an increasingly uncertain security environment;

(5) the United States and Japan should continue efforts to strengthen regional multilateral institutions that promote economic and security cooperation based on internationally accepted rules and norms;

(6) the United States acknowledges that the Senkaku Islands are under the administration of Japan and opposes any unilateral actions that would seek to undermine such administration and remains committed under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security to respond to any armed attack in the territories under the administration of Japan; and

(7) the United States reaffirms its commitment to the Government of Japan under Article V of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security that ''[e]ach Party recognizes that an armed attack against either Party in the territories under the administration of Japan would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional provisions and processes''.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

SEC. 1261. NON-CONVENTIONAL ASSISTED RECOVERY CAPABILITIES.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (h) of section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4579), as most recently amended by section 1261 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3579), is further amended by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2017''.

(b) REVISION TO ANNUAL LIMITATION ON FUNDS.—Subsection (a) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''Upon'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon'';

(2) by striking ''an amount'' and all that follows through ''may be'' and inserting ''amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) ANNUAL LIMIT.—The total amount made available for support of non-conventional assisted recovery activities under this subsection in any fiscal year may not exceed $25,000,000.''.

SEC. 1262. AMENDMENT TO THE ANNUAL REPORT UNDER ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT.

Subsection (e) of section 403 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2593a) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 15 of each year described in paragraph (2), the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a detailed assessment, consistent with the provision of classified information and intelligence sources and methods, of the adherence of other nations to obligations undertaken in all arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements or commitments to which the United States is a party, including information of cases in which any such nation has behaved inconsistently with respect to its obligations undertaken in such agreements or commitments.

''(2) COVERED YEAR.—A year described in this paragraph is a year in which the President fails to submit the report required by subsection (a) by not later than April 15 of such year.

''(3) FORM.—The report required by this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.''.

SEC. 1263. PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR NATO SPECIAL OPERATIONS HEADQUARTERS.

Section 1244(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2541), as most recently amended by section 1272 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2023), is further amended by striking ''for each of fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015 pursuant to section 301'' and inserting ''for any fiscal year''.

SEC. 1264. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION TO CONDUCT ACTIVITIES TO ENHANCE THE CAPABILITY OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO RESPOND TO INCIDENTS INVOLVING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

Section 1204(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 897; 10 U.S.C. 401 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2020''.

SEC. 1265. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE, FOR ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not more than 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for arms control implementation (PE 0305145F) may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the following:

(1) A description of any meetings of the Open Skies Consultative Commission during the prior year.

(2) A description of any agreements entered into during such meetings of the Open Skies Consultative Commission.

(3) A description of any future year proposals for modifications to the aircraft or sensors of any State Party to the Open Skies Treaty that will be subject to the Open Skies Treaty.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) OPEN SKIES TREATY.—The term ''Open Skies Treaty'' means the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

SEC. 1266. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR SUPPORT OF SPECIAL OPERATIONS TO COMBAT TERRORISM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375; 118 Stat. 2086), as most recently amended by section 1208(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3541), is further amended by striking ''$75,000,000'' and inserting ''$100,000,000''.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Subsection (f)(1) of such section 1208, as most recently amended by section 1202(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2512), is further amended by striking ''120 days'' and inserting ''30 days and not later than 180 days''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to each fiscal year that begins on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 1267. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL DEFENSE COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) Tunnels have been used for centuries around the world as a means of avoiding detection or circumventing defenses.

(B) Tunnels can be used for criminal purposes, such as smuggling drugs, weapons, or humans, or for terrorist or military purposes, such as launching surprise attacks or detonating explosives underneath infrastructure.

(C) Tunnels have been a growing threat on the southern border of the United States for more than 11 years, and the Department of Homeland Security has been working to address this threat.

(D) The conflict in Gaza in 2014 showed that terrorists are now actively using tunnels as a means of attack, and news reports indicate that tunnels are being used in Syria as well.

(E) Terrorist organizations are quick to adopt successful tactics, and it is only a matter of time before other terrorist organizations begin using tunnels.

(F) The facilities of the United States, and those of the allies of the United States, could be under threat very quickly if tunnel threats continue to proliferate.

(G) Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad are United States-designated terrorist organizations.

(H) Designated Palestinian terrorist organizations have killed hundreds of Israelis and dozens of Americans in rocket attacks and suicide bombings.

(I) Hamas has used underground tunnels to Israel and Egypt to smuggle weapons, money, and supplies into Gaza and to send members of Hamas out of Gaza for training and to bring trainers in to Gaza to teach Hamas how to manufacture rockets and build better tunnels. Tunnels in Gaza have also been used as underground rocket launching sites, weapons caches, bunkers, transportation networks and command and control centers.

(J) In 2006, Hamas kidnapped Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit through a tunnel and held him for five years.

(K) The Israel Defense Forces discovered 32 tunnels during the conflict with Hamas in the summer of 2014, 14 of which crossed into Israel.

(L) Hamas intentionally uses civilians as human shields by placing its underground tunnel network in densely populated areas and schools, hospitals, and mosques.

(M) Hamas's placement of explosive material in its vast network of tunnels in Gaza has caused civilian casualties through secondary and tertiary explosions.

(N) While the unemployment rate in Gaza is at 38 percent, it is estimated that Hamas spends $3,000,000 per tunnel.

(O) United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said he was ''shocked by the tunnels used for the infiltration of terrorists''.

(P) Hamas has claimed to be rebuilding tunnels in Gaza after the war with Israel in the summer of 2014.

(Q) Hezbollah has used underground tunnels in southern Lebanon to move Hezbollah fighters and to launch attacks.

(R) The Palestinian Islamic Jihad claims to be digging new tunnels on the Gaza border. Israel has a right to defend itself from the violence of Palestinian terrorist groups, including the violence that is facilitated through terrorist tunnel networks.

(S) The United States is working cooperatively with the Government of Israel to develop technologies to detect and neutralize tunnels penetrating the territory of Israel.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) it is in the best interests of the United States to develop technology to detect and counter tunnels, and the best way to do this is to partner with other affected countries; and

(B) Israel is facing serious threats posed by tunnels and should be the first partner of the United States in addressing this significant challenge.

(b) ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL TO ESTABLISH AN ANTI-TUNNELING DEFENSE SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President, upon request of the Government of Israel, is authorized to carry out research, development, and test activities on a joint basis with Israel to establish an anti-tunneling defense system to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels into and directed at the territory of Israel.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section may be obligated or expended to carry out subsection (a) until the President certifies to Congress the following:

(A) The President has finalized a memorandum of understanding or other formal agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the system described in paragraph (1).

(B) The understanding or agreement—

(i) requires sharing of costs of projects, including the cost of claims and in-kind support, between the United States and Israel on an equitable basis unless the President determines, on a case-by-case basis, the Government of Israel is unable to contribute on an equitable basis;

(ii) requires the designation of payment of non-recurring engineering costs in connection with the establishment of a capacity for co-production in the United States;

(iii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to any intellectual property developed under the cooperative research and development projects; and

(iv) requires the United States Government to receive quarterly reports on expenditure of funds by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(3) ASSISTANCE.—The President, upon request of the Government of Israel, is authorized to provide assistance to Israel for the procurement, maintenance, and sustainment of an anti-tunneling system described in paragraph (1).

(c) ASSISTANCE TO OTHER ALLIES TO ESTABLISH AN ANTI-TUNNELING DEFENSE SYSTEM.—In addition to the memorandum of understanding or other formal agreement described in subsection (b), the President is authorized to seek to enter into a similar memorandum of understanding or other formal agreement with any other ally of the United States upon request of the government of such ally.

(d) DESIGNATION OF LEAD DEVELOPMENT AGENCY.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall designate a military department or other element of the Department of Defense to carry out subsections (b) and (c) as the lead agency of the Federal Government for developing technology to detect and counter tunnels.

(e) REPORTING.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—The President shall submit to Congress a report that contains a copy of the memorandum of understanding or other formal agreement between the United States and Israel as described in subsection (b)(2)(A) or similar agreement described in subsection (c).

(2) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The President shall submit to Congress a quarterly report that contains a copy of the most-recent quarterly report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (b)(2)(B)(iv).

(3) COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(A) Instances of tunnels being used to attack installations of the United States or allies of the United States.

(B) Trends or developments in tunnel attacks throughout the world.

(C) Key technologies used and challenges faced by potential adversaries of the United States with respect to using tunnels.

(D) The capabilities of the Department of Defense for defending fixed or forward locations from tunnel attacks.

(E) Partnerships entered into with allies of the United States under this section, and potential opportunities for increased partnerships with other allies with respect to researching tunnel detection technologies and the opportunities for co-development or co-production.

(F) The plans, including with respect to funding, of the Secretary for countering threats posed by tunnels.

SEC. 1268. EFFORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO PREVENT AND RESPOND TO GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE GLOBALLY.

(a) FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) Gender-based violence reaches every corner of the world, affecting millions of people ever year and one in three women in her lifetime. This epidemic not only undermines the safety, dignity, and human rights of the individual, family and community, it affects public health, economic stability, and security of nations, which in turn has a direct impact upon United States foreign policy, defense interests, democracy, governance, and peace-building efforts.

(B) With one of the largest international footprints in the United States government, the Department of Defense is an integral part of combating the epidemic of gender-based violence, especially in conflict regions.

(C) Section 7061 of the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 directed the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to develop and submit to Congress a multi-year strategy to prevent and respond to gender-based violence.

(D) Executive Order 13623 of August 10, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 49345) established the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, which required the Department of Defense to participate in an Interagency Working Group co-chaired by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to implement the Strategy.

(E) The Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (H.R. 3979, Public Law 113-291), encouraged the Department of Defense to support the continued implementation of the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally and to participate in the Interagency Working Group.

(F) Executive Order 13623 requires within 3 years of August 12, 2012, that the Interagency Working Group shall complete a final evaluation of the Strategy and within 180 days of completing its final evaluation, the Interagency Working Group shall update or revise the Strategy to take into account the information learned and the progress made during and through the implementation of the Strategy.

(2) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is in the national security interest of the United States to—

(A) prevent gender-based violence which will promote regional and global stability and advance sustainable peace and security;

(B) have a multi-year strategy in place that will effectively prevent and respond to gender-based violence globally; and

(C) ensure that existing laws and regulations relating to the Department of Defense are fully implemented to prevent gender-based violence globally.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO CONTINUE IMPLEMENTATION OF A UNITED STATES GLOBAL STRATEGY ON GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND RESPONSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Department of Defense—

(1) continues to implement the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, as appropriate; and

(2) pursuant to the intent laid out in Executive Order 13623, continues to participate in any Interagency Working Group described in subsection (a)(1)(D) or in interagency collaborative efforts to develop or update a United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, as appropriate

(c) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GENDER-BASED TRAINING.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to—

(1) provide training for the United States Armed Forces, Department of Defense personnel, and contractors and military observers on preventing and responding to violence against women and girls globally in conflict, post-conflict, and humanitarian relief settings; and

(2) utilize the Department of Defense's operational capabilities to train professional foreign military, police forces, and judicial officials on preventing and responding to violence against women and girls globally.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report on efforts to prevent and respond to gender-based violence globally made under a United States strategy.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) describe the efforts of the Department of Defense in the Interagency Working Group described in subsection (a)(1)(D) to implement the international gender-based violence prevention and response strategy, funding allocations, programming, and associated outcomes; and

(B) provide an assessment of human and financial resources necessary to fulfill the purposes and duties of such strategy.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be made publicly accessible in a timely manner.

(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''specified congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

SEC. 1301. SPECIFICATION OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2016 COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS DEFINED.—In this title, the term ''fiscal year 2016 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds'' means the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 and made available by the funding table in section 4301 for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program established under section 1321 of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (50 U.S.C. 3711).

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 and made available by the funding table in section 4301 for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program shall be available for obligation for fiscal years 2016, 2017, and 2018.

SEC. 1302. FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.

Of the $358,496,000 authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 in section 301 and made available by the funding table in section 4301 for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program established under section 1321 of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (50 U.S.C. 3711), the following amounts may be obligated for the purposes specified:

(1) For strategic offensive arms elimination, $1,289,000.

(2) For chemical weapons destruction, $942,000.

(3) For global nuclear security, $20,555,000.

(4) For cooperative biological engagement, $264,618,000.

(5) For proliferation prevention, $38,945,000.

(6) For threat reduction engagement, $2,827,000.

(7) For activities designated as Other Assessments/Administrative Costs, $29,320,000.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Military Programs

SEC. 1401. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1402. NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the National Defense Sealift Fund, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1403. CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

(b) USE.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) are authorized for—

(1) the destruction of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521); and

(2) the destruction of chemical warfare materiel of the United States that is not covered by section 1412 of such Act.

SEC. 1404. DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE-WIDE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1405. DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1406. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the funding table in section 4501, for use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense in providing for the health of eligible beneficiaries.

SEC. 1407. NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile

SEC. 1411. EXTENSION OF DATE FOR COMPLETION OF DESTRUCTION OF EXISTING STOCKPILE OF LETHAL CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS.

Section 1412(b)(3) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–145; 50 U.S.C. 1521) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2017'' and inserting ''December 31, 2023''.

Subtitle C—Working-Capital Funds

SEC. 1421. LIMITATION ON FURLOUGH OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EMPLOYEES PAID THROUGH WORKING-CAPITAL FUNDS.

Section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(s) FURLOUGH OF EMPLOYEES.—(1) Except as provided under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department may not furlough any employee of the Department of Defense whose salary is funded by a working-capital fund unless the Secretary determines that—

''(A) the working-capital fund is insolvent; or

''(B) there are insufficient funds in the working-capital fund to pay the labor costs of the employee.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department may waive the restriction under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines such a waiver is in the interest of the national security of the United States.

''(3) In this subsection, the term 'furlough' means the placement, for nondisciplinary reasons, of an employee in a temporary status in which the employee has no duties and is not paid, but does not include administrative leave or an excused absence.''.

SEC. 1422. WORKING-CAPITAL FUND RESERVE ACCOUNT FOR PETROLEUM MARKET PRICE FLUCTUATIONS.

Section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 1421, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(t) MARKET FLUCTUATION ACCOUNT.—(1) From amounts available for Working Capital Fund, Defense, the Secretary shall reserve up to $1,000,000,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, for petroleum market price fluctuations. Such amounts may only be disbursed if the Secretary determines such a disbursement is necessary to absorb volatile market changes in fuel prices without affecting the standard price charged for fuel.

''(2) A budget request for the anticipated costs of fuel may not take into account the availability of funds reserved under paragraph (1).''.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 1431. AUTHORITY FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO JOINT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FACILITY DEMONSTRATION FUND FOR CAPTAIN JAMES A. LOVELL HEALTH CARE CENTER, ILLINOIS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for section 1406 and available for the Defense Health Program for operation and maintenance, $120,387,000 may be transferred by the Secretary of Defense to the Joint Department of Defense–Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund established by subsection (a)(1) of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2571). For purposes of subsection (a)(2) of such section 1704, any funds so transferred shall be treated as amounts authorized and appropriated specifically for the purpose of such a transfer.

(b) USE OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.—For the purposes of subsection (b) of such section 1704, facility operations for which funds transferred under subsection (a) may be used are operations of the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility under an operational agreement covered by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4500).

SEC. 1432. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund the sum of $64,300,000 for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 1501. PURPOSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The purpose of this subtitle is to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 to provide additional funds—

(1) for overseas contingency operations being carried out by the Armed Forces; and

(2) pursuant to section 1504, for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4303.

(b) SUPPORT OF BASE BUDGET REQUIREMENTS; TREATMENT.—Funds identified in subsection (a)(2) are being authorized to be appropriated in support of base budget requirements as requested by the President for fiscal year 2016 pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall apportion the funds identified in such subsection to the Department of Defense without restriction, limitation, or constraint on the execution of such funds in support of base requirements, including any restriction, limitation, or constraint imposed by, or described in, the document entitled ''Criteria for War/Overseas Contingency Operations Funding Requests'' transmitted by the Director to the Department of Defense on September 9, 2010, or any successor or related guidance.

SEC. 1502. PROCUREMENT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for procurement accounts for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities, as specified in the funding table in section 4102.

SEC. 1503. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the funding table in section 4202.

SEC. 1504. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in—

(1) the funding table in section 4302, or

(2) the funding table in section 4303.

SEC. 1505. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for military personnel, as specified in the funding table in section 4402.

SEC. 1506. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1507. DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE-WIDE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1508. DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1509. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

Subtitle B—Financial Matters

SEC. 1521. TREATMENT AS ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.

The amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 1522. SPECIAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this title for fiscal year 2016 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof).

(2) EFFECT OF TRANSFER.—Amounts of authorizations transferred under this subsection shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—The total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this subsection may not exceed $3,500,000,000.

(4) EXCEPTION.—In the case of the authorization of appropriations contained in section 1504 that is provided for the purpose specified in section 1501(2), the transfer authority provided under section 1001, rather than the transfer authority provided by this subsection, shall apply to any transfer of amounts of such authorization.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Transfers under this section shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as transfers under section 1001.

(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—The transfer authority provided by this section is in addition to the transfer authority provided under section 1001.

Subtitle C—European Reassurance Initiative and Related Matters

SEC. 1531. STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In February 2015, Lieutenant General James Clapper (retired), Director of National Intelligence, testified to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that ''Russian dominance over the former Soviet space is Russia's highest foreign policy goal''.

(2) Russia, under the direction of President Vladimir Putin, has demonstrated its intent to expand its sphere of influence beyond its borders and limit Western influence in the region.

(3) The Russian military is aggressively postured on the Ukrainian boarder and continues its buildup of military personnel and material. These aggressive and unwarranted actions serve to intimidate, with a show of force, the Ukrainian people as well as the other nations in the region including Georgia, the Baltic States, and the Balkan States.

(4) In December 2014, Congress enacted the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–272), which gives the President the authority to expand assistance to Ukraine, increase economic sanctions on Russia, and provide equipment to counter offensive weapons.

(5) In February 2015, the Atlantic Council, the Brookings Institute, and the Chicago Council on Global Affairs published a report entitled ''Preserving Ukraine's Independence, Resisting Russian Aggression: What the United States and NATO Must Do'' advocating for increased United States assistance to Ukraine with nonlethal and lethal defensive equipment.

(6) Despite Russia signing the February 2015 Minsk Agreement, it has continued to violate the terms of the agreement, as noted by Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, Victoria Nuland, at the German Marshall Fund Brussels Forum in March 2015: ''We've seen month on month, more lethal weaponry of a higher caliber...poured into Ukraine by the separatist Russian allies...the number one thing is for Russia to stop sending arms over the border so we can have real politics.''.

(7) The military of the Russian Federation continues to increase their show of force globally, including frequent international military flights, frequent snap exercises of thousands of Russian troops, increased global naval presence, and the threat of the use of nuclear weapons in defense of the annexation of Crimea in March 2014.

(8) The Government of the Russian Federation continues to exert and increase undue influence on the free will of sovereign nations and people with intimidation tactics, covert operations, cyber warfare, and other unconventional methods.

(9) In testimony to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in February 2015, Commander of European Command, General Philip Breedlove, United States Air Force, stated that ''Russia has employed 'hybrid warfare'...to illegally seize Crimea, foment separatist fever in several sovereign nations, and maintain frozen conflicts within its so-called 'sphere of influence' or 'near abroad' ''.

(10) The use of unconventional methods of warfare by Russia presents challenges to the United States and its partners and allies in addressing the threat.

(11) An enhanced United States military presence and readiness posture and the provision of security assistance in Europe are key elements to deterring further Russian aggression and reassuring United States allies and partners.

(12) In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), Congress authorized and appropriated $1 billion for the European Reassurance Initiative, which supports Operation Atlantic Resolve of the United States Armed Forces.

(13) The European Reassurance Initiative expands United States military presence in Europe, through—

(A) bolstered and continual United States military presence;

(B) bilateral and multilateral exercises with partners and allies;

(C) improved infrastructure;

(D) increased prepositioning of United States equipment throughout Europe; and

(E) building partnership capacity for allies and partners.

(14) The European Reassurance Initiative has served as a valuable tool in strengthening the partnerships with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as well as partnerships with non-member allies in the region.

(15) As a result of the NATO 2014 Summit in Wales, NATO has initiated a Readiness Action Plan to increase partner nation funding and resourcing to combat Russian aggression. NATO's efforts with the Readiness Action Plan and United States investment in regional security through the European Reassurance Initiative will serve to continue and reinforce the

strength and fortitude of the alliance against nefarious actors.

(16) The President's Budget Request for fiscal year 2016 includes $789.3 million to continue the European Reassurance Initiative focus on increased United States military troop rotations in support of Operation Atlantic Resolve, maintaining and further expanding increasing regional exercises, and building partnership capacity.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to continue and expand its efforts in Europe to reassure United States allies and partners and deter further aggression and intimidation by the Russian Government, in order to enhance security and stability in the region. This policy shall include—

(1) continued use of conventional methods, including increased United States military presence in Europe, exercises and training with allies and partners, increasing infrastructure, prepositioning of United States military equipment in Europe, and building partnership capacity;

(2) increased emphasis on countering unconventional warfare methods in areas such as cyber warfare, economic warfare, information operations, and intelligence operations, including increased efforts in the development of strategy, operational concepts, capabilities, and technologies; and

(3) increased security assistance to allies and partners in Europe, including the provision of both non-lethal equipment and lethal equipment of a defensive nature to Ukraine.

SEC. 1532. ASSISTANCE AND SUSTAINMENT TO THE MILITARY AND NATIONAL SECURITY FORCES OF UKRAINE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, lethal weapons of a defensive nature, logistics support, supplies and services, and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine, through September 30, 2016, to assist the government of Ukraine for the following purposes:

(1) Securing its sovereign territory against foreign aggressors.

(2) Protecting and defending the Ukrainian people from attacks posed by Russian-backed separatists.

(3) Promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict.

(b) NOTICE BEFORE PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, not more than 10 percent of such funds may be obligated or expended until not later than 15 days after the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report in unclassified form with a classified annex as appropriate that contains a description of the plan for providing such assistance, including a description of the types of training and equipment to be provided, the estimated number and role of United States Armed Forces personnel involved, the potential or actual locations of any training, and any other relevant details.

(c) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 105 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the report required in subsection (b), and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the activities carried out under this section. Such report shall include a description of the following:

(1) Updates or changes to the plan required under subsection (b).

(2) A description of the forces provided with training, equipment, or other assistance under this section during the preceding 90-day period.

(3) A description of the equipment provided under this section during the preceding 90-day period, including a detailed breakout of any lethal assistance provided.

(4) A statement of the amount of funds expended during the preceding 90-day period.

(d) VETTING.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that all assistance provided under this section is carried out in full accordance with the provisions of section 2249e of title 10, United States Code.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(f) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by this title for overseas contingency operations, $200,000,000 shall be available to carry out this section.

(g) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including in-kind contributions, from foreign governments, to provide assistance authorized under subsection (a). Any funds so accepted by the Secretary may be credited to the account from which funds are made available to provide assistance authorized under subsection (a) and may remain available to provide assistance authorized under subsection (a) until September 30, 2016.

(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations in which hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(i) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Assistance provided under the authority of subsection (a) shall be subject to the non-transfer and end-use provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.).

Subtitle D—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters

SEC. 1541. CONTINUATION OF EXISTING LIMITATION ON USE OF AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund for fiscal year 2016 shall be subject to the conditions contained in subsections (b) through (g) of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 428), as amended by section 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4424).

(b) PROMOTION OF RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF WOMEN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this Act for fiscal year 2016 for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, there are authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 to be used for the recruitment and retention of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces, including modification of facilities of the Ministry of the Interior and Ministry of Defense to accommodate female service members and police.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to modify the distribution of funds for programs and activities supported using the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, but rather shall ensure attention to recruitment and retention of women within each program and activity.

(c) INVENTORY AND PLAN REQUIRED.—

(1) INVENTORY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall submit to the specified congressional committees an inventory of the facilities and services of the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of the Interior that are lacking in adequate resources for Afghan female service members and police, including resources relating to training, improvement to buildings, transportation, security equipment, and new construction.

(2) PLAN.—Not later than 60 days after the submission of the inventory required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall submit to the specified committees a plan to address the shortcomings of those facilities and services that the Secretaries consider to be most significant. In developing the plan, the Secretaries shall, to the extent possible, utilize amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b) to promote the recruitment and retention of Afghan female service members and police. The Secretaries shall also identify any additional funding shortcomings that would be required to fully address the identified shortcomings of those facilities and services.

(3) UPDATES.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall submit to the specified congressional committees updates to the inventory required under paragraph (1) and plan required under paragraph (2) at the same time the President submits the budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year each year through fiscal year 2020.

(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''specified congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1542. JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND.

(a) USE AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 1514 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2439), as in effect before the amendments made by section 1503 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4649), but as modified by section 1533(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3615), shall apply to the funds made available for fiscal year 2016—

(1) to the Department of Defense for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund; or

(2) to the Director of the successor defense agency to the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization.

(b) EXTENSION OF INTERDICTION OF IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE PRECURSOR CHEMICALS AUTHORITY.—Section 1532(c)(4) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2057), as most recently amended by section 1533(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3616), is amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016''.

(c) REPEAL OF TIMELINE REQUIREMENT FOR CONSOLIDATION OF FUNDING SOURCES FOR RAPID ACQUISITION ORGANIZATIONS.—Paragraph (3) of section 1533(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3615) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) PLAN IMPLEMENTATION.—The plan required by this subsection shall include a timeline for implementation of the consolidation and alignment decisions contained in the plan.''.

(d) REPEAL OF PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Subsection (d) of section 1533 of the

National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3616) is repealed.

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 1533(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3615) is amended by striking ''as amended by subsection (b)'' and inserting ''as modified by subsection (b)''.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Subtitle A—Space Activities

SEC. 1601. MAJOR FORCE PROGRAM AND BUDGET FOR NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) National security space capabilities are a key element of the national defense of the United States.

(2) Because of increasing foreign threats, the national security space advantage of the United States is facing the most challenging environment it has ever faced.

(3) To modernize and fully address the growing threat to the national security space advantage of the United States, further action is necessary to strengthen national security space leadership, management, and organization.

(4) Congress and independent expert commissions have previously stated the importance of establishing a major force program for space with separate authorities, as one of the elements to strengthen national security space.

(b) BUDGET MATTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 239. National security space programs: major force program and budget assessment

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF MAJOR FORCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a unified major force program for national security space programs pursuant to section 222(b) of this title to prioritize national security space activities in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Defense and national security.

''(b) BUDGET ASSESSMENT.—(1) The Secretary shall include with the defense budget materials for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020 a report on the budget for national security space programs of the Department of Defense.

''(2) Each report on the budget for national security space programs of the Department of Defense under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) An overview of the budget, including—

''(i) a comparison between that budget, the previous budget, the most recent and prior future-years defense program submitted to Congress under section 221 of this title, and the amounts appropriated for such programs during the previous fiscal year; and

''(ii) the specific identification, as a budgetary line item, for the funding under such programs.

''(B) An assessment of the budget, including significant changes, priorities, challenges, and risks.

''(C) Any additional matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(3) Each report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'budget', with respect to a fiscal year, means the budget for that fiscal year that is submitted to Congress by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31.

''(2) The term 'defense budget materials', with respect to a fiscal year, means the materials submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Defense in support of the budget for that fiscal year.''.

(2) PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to carry out the unified major force program designation required by section 239(a) of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), including any recommendations for legislative action the Secretary determines appropriate.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter 9 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 238 the following new item:

''239. National security space programs: major force program and budget assessment.''.

SEC. 1602. MODIFICATION TO DEVELOPMENT OF SPACE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY.

Section 2272 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2272. Space science and technology strategy: coordination

''The Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall jointly develop and implement a space science and technology strategy and shall review and, as appropriate, revise the strategy biennially. Functions of the Secretary under this section shall be carried out jointly by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and the official of the Department of Defense designated as the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space.''.

SEC. 1603. ROCKET PROPULSION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) STREAMLINED ACQUISITION.—Section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) STREAMLINED ACQUISITION.—In developing the rocket propulsion system required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

''(1) use a streamlined acquisition approach, including tailored documentation and review processes, that enables the effective, efficient, and expedient transition from the use of non-allied space launch engines to a domestic alternative for national security space launches; and

''(2) prior to establishing such acquisition approach, establish well-defined requirements with a clear acquisition strategy.''.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the rocket propulsion system required by section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), the Secretary of Defense may obligate or expend such funds only for the development of such system, and the necessary interfaces to the launch vehicle, to replace non-allied space launch engines by 2019 as required by such section.

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate (and make available to any other congressional defense committee) a briefing on the streamlined acquisition approach, requirements, and acquisition strategy required under subsection (c) of section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), as inserted by subsection (a).

SEC. 1604. MODIFICATION TO PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH RUSSIAN SUPPLIERS OF ROCKET ENGINES FOR THE EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

Section 1608 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3626; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1608. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH RUSSIAN SUPPLIERS OF ROCKET ENGINES FOR THE EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

''(a) PROHIBITIONS.—

''(1) AWARD OR RENEWAL OF CONTRACT.—Except as provided by subsections (b) and (c), beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense may not award or renew a contract for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities under the evolved expendable launch vehicle program if such contract carries out such space launch activities using rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation.

''(2) MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACT.—Except as provided by subsection (b), beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary may not modify the contract specified in subsection (c)(1)(A) if such modification increases the number of cores procured under such contract to a total of more than 35.

''(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive one or both of the prohibitions under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) with respect to a contract for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days before the waiver takes effect, that—

''(1) the waiver is necessary for the national security interests of the United States; and

''(2) the space launch services and capabilities covered by the contract could not be obtained at a fair and reasonable price without the use of rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation.

''(c) EXCEPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to either—

''(A) the placement of orders or the exercise of options under the contract numbered FA8811–13–C–0003 and awarded on December 18, 2013; or

''(B) subject to paragraph (2), a contract awarded for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities that includes the use of rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation if, prior to February 1, 2014, the contractor had fully paid for such rocket engines or had entered into a contract to procure such rocket engines.

''(2) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary may not award or renew a contract for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities described in paragraph (1)(B) unless the Secretary, upon the advice of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, certifies to the congressional defense committees that the offeror has provided to the Secretary sufficient documentation to conclusively demonstrate that the offeror meets the requirements of such paragraph.''.

SEC. 1605. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY REGARDING PURCHASE OF GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM USER EQUIPMENT.

Section 913 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (10 U.S.C. 2281 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may not delegate the authority to make a waiver under subsection (c) to an official below the level of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.''.

SEC. 1606. ACQUISITION STRATEGY FOR EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of the Air Force needs to develop an updated phased acquisition strategy and contracting plan for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program;

(2) beyond the contractual requirements as of the date of the enactment of this Act, in recognition of the emerging competitive environment, the acquisition strategy and contracting plan should eliminate the currently structured evolved expendable launch vehicle launch capability arrangement;

(3) in further recognition of the emerging competitive environment, the Secretary should acquire launch services in a manner consistent with a full and open competition;

(4) the Secretary should be consistent and fair with evolved expendable launch vehicle providers regarding the requirement for certified cost and pricing data, selection of contract types, and the appropriate audits to protect the taxpayer; and

(5) the Secretary should—

(A) consider various contracting approaches, including launch capability arrangements with multiple certified providers, to meet the objectives identified in the acquisition strategy developed under subsection (d); and

(B) continue to provide the necessary stability in budgeting and acquisition of capabilities as well as the flexibility to the Federal Government to appropriately manage the launch manifest in case of delays in the delivery of satellites or other changes to mission requirements.

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ARRANGEMENT.—

(1) DISCONTINUATION.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall discontinue the evolved expendable launch vehicle launch capability arrangement, as structured as of the date of the enactment of this Act, by the later of—

(A) the date on which the Secretary determines that the obligations of the contracts relating to such arrangement, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, have been met; or

(B) December 31, 2020.

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive paragraph (1) if the Secretary—

(A) determines that such waiver is necessary for the national security interests of the United States;

(B) notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver; and

(C) a period of 90 days has elapsed following the date of such notification.

(c) CONSISTENT STANDARDS.—In accordance with section 2306a of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary shall—

(1) apply consistent and appropriate standards to certified evolved expendable launch vehicle providers with respect to certified cost and pricing data; and

(2) conduct the appropriate audits.

(d) ACQUISITION STRATEGY.—In accordance with subsections (b) and (c) and section 2273 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary shall develop and carry out a ten-year phased acquisition strategy, including near and long term, for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

(e) ELEMENTS.—The acquisition strategy under subsection (d) for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program shall establish a contracting plan for such program that uses competitive procedures (as defined in section 2302 of title 10, United States Code) and ensures that a contract awarded for launch services, capability, or infrastructure—

(1) provides the necessary—

(A) stability in budgeting and acquisition of capabilities; and

(B) flexibility to the Federal Government; and

(2) specifically takes into account the effect of—

(A) all contracts entered into by the Federal Government with, and any assistance provided by the Federal Government to, certified evolved expendable launch vehicle providers, including the evolved expendable launch vehicle launch capability;

(B) the requirements of the Department of Defense, including with respect to launch capabilities and pricing data, that are met by such providers;

(C) the cost of integrating a satellite onto a launch vehicle; and

(D) any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

(f) COMPETITION.—In awarding any contract for launch services in a national security space mission pursuant to a competitive acquisition, the evaluation shall account for the value of the evolved expendable launch vehicle launch capability arrangement per contract line item numbers in the bid price of the offeror as appropriate per launch.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report on the acquisition strategy developed under subsection (d).

SEC. 1607. PROCUREMENT OF WIDEBAND SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) ACQUISITION AGENT.—Except as provided by subsection (b)(1), not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall designate a single senior official of the Department of Defense to procure wideband satellite communications necessary to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense for such communications, including with respect to military and commercial satellite communications.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), an official described in paragraph (2) may carry out the procurement of commercial wideband satellite communications if the official determines that such procurement is required to meet an urgent need.

(2) OFFICIAL DESCRIBED.—An official described in this paragraph is any of the following:

(A) A Secretary of a military department.

(B) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

(C) The Chief Information Office of the Department of Defense.

(D) A commander of a combatant command.

(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than March 1, 2017, and each year thereafter through 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on procurement carried out under paragraph (1) during the year prior to the submission of the report, including—

(A) a brief description of the urgent need fulfilled by each such procurement;

(B) the date and length of the contract of each such procurement; and

(C) the value of each such contract.

(c) PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the Secretary to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense for satellite communications, including with respect to—

(1) the roles and responsibilities of officials of the Department; and

(2) carrying out subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 1608. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR WEATHER SATELLITE FOLLOW-ON SYSTEM.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for the weather satellite follow-on system may be obligated or expended until the date on which—

(1) the Secretary of Defense provides to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the plan developed under subsection (b); and

(2) the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff certifies to the congressional defense committees that such plan will—

(A) meet the requirements of the Department of Defense for cloud characterization and theater weather imagery; and

(B) not negatively affect the commanders of the combatant commands.

(b) PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall develop a plan to address the requirements of the Department of Defense for cloud characterization and theater weather imagery.

SEC. 1609. MODIFICATION OF PILOT PROGRAM FOR ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL SATELLITE COMMUNICATION SERVICES.

Section 1605 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''may develop'' and all that follows through ''funds by the Secretary'' and inserting ''shall develop and carry out a pilot program''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) METHODS.—In carrying out the pilot program under paragraph (1), the Secretary may use a variety of methods authorized by law to effectively and efficiently acquire commercial satellite communications services, including by carrying out multiple pathfinder activities under the pilot program.''; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''REPORTS.—'' and inserting ''REPORTS AND BRIEFINGS.—'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''90 days'' and inserting ''270 days'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''; or'' and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) a description of the appropriate metrics established by the Secretary to meet the goals of the pilot program.'';

(C) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) At the same time as the President submits to Congress the budget pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020, the Secretary shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the pilot program.''.

(E) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C))—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''expanding the use of working capital funds to effectively and efficiently acquire'' and inserting ''the pilot program and whether the pilot program effectively and efficiently acquires''; and

(ii) subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''working capital funds as described in subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''the pilot program''.

SEC. 1610. PROHIBITION ON RELIANCE ON CHINA AND RUSSIA FOR SPACE-BASED WEATHER DATA.

(a) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Department of Defense does not rely on, or in the future plan to rely on, space-based weather data provided by the Government of China, the Government of Russia, or an entity owned or controlled by the Government of China or the Government of Russia for national security purposes.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a certification that the Secretary is in compliance with the prohibition under subsection (a).

SEC. 1611. EVALUATION OF EXPLOITATION OF SPACE-BASED INFRARED SYSTEM AGAINST ADDITIONAL THREATS.

(a) EVALUATION.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall conduct an evaluation of the space-based infrared system to detect, track, and target, or to develop the capability to detect, track and target, the full range of threats to the United States, deployed members of the Armed Forces, and the allies of the United States.

(b) SUBMISSION.—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Under Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate the evaluation under subsection (a).

SEC. 1612. PLAN ON FULL INTEGRATION AND EXPLOITATION OF OVERHEAD PERSISTENT INFRARED CAPABILITY.

(a) PLAN.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command and the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan for the integration of overhead persistent infrared capabilities to support the missions specified in subsection (b)(1).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan under subsection (a) shall—

(1) ensure that all overhead persistent infrared capabilities of the United States, including such capabilities that are planned to be developed, are integrated to allow for such capabilities to be exploited to support the requirements of the missions of the Department of Defense relating to—

(A) battle damage assessment;

(B) battlespace assessment;

(C) technical intelligence;

(D) strategic missile warning;

(E) tactical missile warning;

(F) missile defense tracking, fire control, and kill assessment; and

(G) collection of weather data; and

(2) establish clear benchmarks by which to establish acquisition plans, manning, and budget requirements.

(c) ANNUAL DETERMINATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall include, together with, or not later than 30 days after, the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the budget of the Department of Defense for a fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code), a written determination of how the plan under subsection (a) is being implemented.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 1613. OPTIONS FOR RAPID SPACE RECONSTITUTION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Strategic Command has identified needs to rapidly reconstitute or replenish critical space capabilities;

(2) in accordance with section 915 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 826), the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space is currently conducting a study and developing a plan regarding responsive launch in accordance with warfighter requirements; and

(3) rapid launch should avoid the creation of new Department of Defense-owned and operated infrastructure.

(b) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall evaluate options for the use of current assets of the Department of Defense for the purpose of rapid reconstitution of critical space-based warfighter enabling capabilities.

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than March 31, 2016, the Secretary shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the evaluation conducted under subsection (b), including development timelines, a test plan, and technology readiness levels of key systems and technologies.

SEC. 1614. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SPACE DEFENSE.

It is the sense of Congress that, as outlined in the National Space Policy of 2010, the United States should employ a variety of measures to help assure the use of space for all responsible parties, and, consistent with the inherent right of self-defense, deter others from interference and attack, defend the space systems of the United States and contribute to the defense of allied space systems, and, if deterrence fails, defeat efforts to attack them.

SEC. 1615. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS IN SPACE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Missile Defense Agency has run a successful space sensor program with the space tracking and surveillance system.

(2) The Missile Defense Agency is now executing a promising and ground-breaking space sensor system called space-based kill assessment.

(3) The future missile defense architecture will require significantly improved sensors in space to provide tracking, discrimination, and more.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that a robust multi-mission space sensor network will be vital to ensuring a strong missile defense system.

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities

SEC. 1621. EXECUTIVE AGENT FOR OPEN-SOURCE INTELLIGENCE TOOLS.

(a) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—Subchapter I of chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 1082, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 430b. Executive agent for open-source intelligence tools

''(a) DESIGNATION.—Not later than April 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall designate a senior official of the Department of Defense to serve as the executive agent for the Department for open-source intelligence tools.

''(b) ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND AUTHORITIES.— (1) Not later than July 1, 2016, in accordance with Directive 5101.1, the Secretary shall prescribe the roles, responsibilities, and authorities of the executive agent designated under subsection (a).

''(2) The roles and responsibilities of the executive agent designated under subsection (a) shall include the following:

''(A) Developing and maintaining a comprehensive list of open-source intelligence tools and technical standards.

''(B) Establishing priorities for the integration of open-source intelligence tools into the intelligence enterprise, and other command and control systems as needed.

''(C) Certifying all open-source intelligence tools with respect to compliance with the standards required by the framework and guidance for the Intelligence Community Information Technology Enterprise, the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise, and the Joint Information Environment.

''(E) Performing such other assessments or analyses as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(c) SUPPORT WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—In accordance with Directive 5101.1, the Secretary shall ensure that the military departments, Defense Agencies, and other components of the Department of Defense provide the executive agent designated under subsection (a) with the appropriate support and resources needed to perform the roles, responsibilities, and authorities of the executive agent.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'Directive 5101.1' means Department of Defense Directive 5101.1, or any successor directive relating to the responsibilities of an executive agent of the Department of Defense.

''(2) The term 'executive agent' has the meaning given the term 'DoD Executive Agent' in Directive 5101.1.

''(3) The term 'open-source intelligence tools' means tools regarding relevant information derived from the systematic collection, processing, and analysis of publicly available information in response to known or anticipated intelligence requirements.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 430a, as added by section 1082, the following new item:

''430b. Executive agent for open-source intelligence tools.''.

SEC. 1622. WAIVER AND CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO FACILITIES FOR INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION OR FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS ABROAD.

(a) ADDITION OF CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 2682(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The Secretary of Defense''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Not later than 48 hours after using the waiver authority under paragraph (1) for any facility for intelligence collection conducted under the authorities of the Department of Defense or special operations activity, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives written notification of the use of the authority, including the justification for the waiver and the estimated cost of the project for which the waiver applies.''.

(b) CODIFICATION OF SUNSET PROVISION.—

(1) CODIFICATION.—Section 2682(c) of title 10, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after paragraph (2), as added by subsection (a)(2), the following new paragraph:

''(3) The waiver authority provided by paragraph (1) expires December 31, 2017.''.

(2) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Subsection (b) of section 926 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1541; 10 U.S.C. 2682 note) is repealed.

SEC. 1623. PROHIBITION ON NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to execute—

(1) the separation of the National Intelligence Program budget from the Department of Defense budget;

(2) the consolidation of the National Intelligence Program budget within the Department of Defense budget; or

(3) the establishment of a new appropriations account or appropriations account structure for the National Intelligence Program budget.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM.—The term ''National Intelligence Program'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

(2) NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM BUDGET.—The term ''National Intelligence Program budget'' means the portions of the Department of Defense budget designated as part of the National Intelligence Program.

SEC. 1624. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEM OF THE ARMY.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, for the distributed common ground system of the Army, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of the Army—

(1) conducts a review of the program planning for the distributed common ground system of the Army; and

(2) submits to the appropriate congressional committees the report under subsection (b)(1).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the review of the distributed common ground system of the Army conducted under subsection (a)(1).

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A review of the segmentation of the distributed common ground system program of the Army into discrete software components with the associated requirements of each component.

(B) Identification of each component of Increment 2 of the distributed common ground system of the Army for which commercial software exists that is capable of fulfilling most or all of the system requirements for each such component.

(C) A cost analysis of each such commercial software that compares performance with projected cost.

(D) Validation of the degree to which commercial software solutions are compliant with the standards required by the framework and guidance for the Intelligence Community Information Technology Enterprise, the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise, and the Joint Information Environment.

(E) Identification of each component of Increment 2 of the distributed common ground system of the Army that the Secretary determines may be acquired through competitive means.

(F) An acquisition plan that prioritizes the acquisition of commercial software components, including a data integration layer, in time to meet the projected deployment schedule for Increment 2 of the distributed common ground system of the Army.

(G) A review of the timetable for the distributed common ground system program of the Army in order to determine whether there is a practical, executable acquisition strategy, including the use of operational capability demonstrations, that could lead to an initial operating capability of Increment 2 of the distributed common ground system of the Army prior to fiscal year 2017.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 1625. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, for the United States Special Operations Command for the distributed common ground system, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command—

(1) conducts a review of the program planning for the elements of the distributed common ground system special operations forces program, including the initiative known as ''DCGS-Lite''; and

(2) submits to the appropriate congressional committees the report under subsection (b)(1).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commander shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the review of the distributed common ground system conducted under subsection (a)(1).

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A review of the segmentation of the distributed common ground system special operations forces program into discrete software components with the associated requirements of each component.

(B) Identification of each component of the distributed common ground system special operations forces program for which commercial software exists that is capable of fulfilling most or all of the system requirements for each such component.

(C) A cost analysis of each such commercial software that compares performance with projected cost.

(D) Validation of the degree to which commercial software solutions are compliant with the standards required by the framework and guidance for the Intelligence Community Information Technology Enterprise, the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise, and the Joint Information Environment.

(E) Identification of each component of the distributed common ground system special operations forces program that the Commander determines may be acquired through competitive means.

(F) An assessment of the extent to which elements of the distributed common ground system special operations forces program could be modified to increase commercial acquisition opportunities.

(G) An acquisition plan that uses commercial software components in order to lead to initial operating capability prior to fiscal year 2017.

SEC. 1626. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended for such Office until the Secretary of Defense identifies the intelligence gaps and establishes the written policy required by section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 828).

SEC. 1627. CLARIFICATION OF ANNUAL BRIEFING ON THE INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMBATANT COMMANDS.

Paragraph (1)(A) of section 1626 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3635) is amended by striking ''each of the'' and inserting ''the United States Special Operations Command and each of the other''.

SEC. 1628. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE NEEDS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees a report on how the Director ensures that the National Intelligence Program budgets for the elements of the intelligence community that are within the Department of Defense are adequate to satisfy the national intelligence needs of the Department as required under section 102A(p) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(p)). Such report shall include a description of how the Director incorporates the needs of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commanders of the unified and specified commands into the metrics used to evaluate the performance of the elements of the intelligence community that are within the Department of Defense in conducting intelligence activities funded under the National Intelligence Program.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''congressional intelligence committees'', ''intelligence community'', and ''National Intelligence Program'' have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

SEC. 1629. REPORT ON MANAGEMENT OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ELEMENTS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the management of science and technology research and development programs and foreign materiel exploitation programs of Defense intelligence elements.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the management of each Defense intelligence element that is responsible for work relating to the programs described in subsection (a), including with respect to the policies, procedures, and organizational structures of such element relating to the management and coordination of such work across such elements.

(2) Recommendations to improve the coordination and organization of such elements.

(3) Identification of options for realigning such elements within the Department of Defense to better meet the needs of the Department and reduce unnecessary overhead.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The term ''Defense intelligence element'' has the meaning given that term in section 429(e) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 1630. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF INTELLIGENCE INPUT TO THE DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROCESS.

(a) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a comprehensive review of the processes and procedures for the integration of intelligence into the defense acquisition process, consistent with the provision of classified information, and intelligence sources and methods.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The review required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify processes and procedures for the integration of intelligence into the decision process, including with respect to the staffing and training of Defense intelligence personnel assigned to program offices, for the acquisition of weapon systems from initial requirements through the milestones process and upon final delivery; and

(2) include a review of processes and procedures for—

(A) the integration of intelligence on foreign capabilities into the acquisition process from initial requirement through deployment;

(B) identifying opportunities for weapons systems to collect intelligence, without regard to whether that is the primary mission of such systems, and the plans for exploiting the collection of such intelligence; and

(C) assessing the requirements weapon systems will place on the Defense Intelligence Enterprise once the weapons systems are deployed.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, a report containing the results of the review required by subsection (a).

Subtitle C—Cyberspace-Related Matters

SEC. 1641. CODIFICATION AND ADDITION OF LIABILITY PROTECTIONS RELATING TO REPORTING ON CYBER INCIDENTS OR PENETRATIONS OF NETWORKS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS OF CERTAIN CONTRACTORS.

(a) CODIFICATION AND AMENDMENT.—Section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1889; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) is transferred to chapter 19 of title 10, United States Code, inserted so as to appear after section 392, redesignated as section 393, and amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

''§ 393. Reporting on penetrations of networks and information systems of certain contractors''; and

(2) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection (d):

''(d) PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY OF CLEARED DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.—(1) No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any cleared defense contractor, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for compliance with this section that is conducted in accordance with the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a).

''(2)(A) Nothing in this section shall be construed—

''(i) to require dismissal of a cause of action against a cleared defense contractor that has engaged in willful misconduct in the course of complying with the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a); or

''(ii) to undermine or limit the availability of otherwise applicable common law or statutory defenses.

''(B) In any action claiming that paragraph (1) does not apply due to willful misconduct described in subparagraph (A), the plaintiff shall have the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence the willful misconduct by each cleared defense contractor subject to such claim and that such willful misconduct proximately caused injury to the plaintiff.

''(C) In this subsection, the term 'willful misconduct' means an act or omission that is taken—

''(i) intentionally to achieve a wrongful purpose;

''(ii) knowingly without legal or factual justification; and

''(iii) in disregard of a known or obvious risk that is so great as to make it highly probable that the harm will outweigh the benefit.''.

(b) ADDITION OF LIABILITY PROTECTIONS FOR REPORTING ON CYBER INCIDENTS.—Section 391 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY OF OPERATIONALLY CRITICAL CONTRACTORS.—(1) No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any operationally critical contractor, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for compliance with this section that is conducted in accordance with procedures established pursuant to subsection (b).

''(2)(A) Nothing in this section shall be construed—

''(i) to require dismissal of a cause of action against an operationally critical contractor that has engaged in willful misconduct in the course of complying with the procedures established pursuant to subsection (b); or

''(ii) to undermine or limit the availability of otherwise applicable common law or statutory defenses.

''(B) In any action claiming that paragraph (1) does not apply due to willful misconduct described in subparagraph (A), the plaintiff shall have the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence the willful misconduct by each operationally critical contractor subject to such claim and that such willful misconduct proximately caused injury to the plaintiff.

''(C) In this subsection, the term 'willful misconduct' means an act or omission that is taken—

''(i) intentionally to achieve a wrongful purpose;

''(ii) knowingly without legal or factual justification; and

''(iii) in disregard of a known or obvious risk that is so great as to make it highly probable that the harm will outweigh the benefit.''.

(c) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 391 of title 10, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a) by striking ''with section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 2224 note)'' and inserting ''and section 393 of this title''.

(2) The table of sections for chapter 19 of such title is amended—

(A) by amending the item relating to section 391 to read as follows:

''391. Reporting on cyber incidents with respect to networks and information systems of operationally critical contractors and certain other contractors.''; and

(B) by inserting at the end the following new item:

''393. Reporting on penetrations of networks and information systems of certain contractors.''.

Subtitle D—Nuclear Forces

SEC. 1651. ORGANIZATION OF NUCLEAR DETERRENCE FUNCTIONS OF THE AIR FORCE.

(a) OVERSIGHT OF NUCLEAR DETERRENCE MISSION.—Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force shall be responsible for overseeing the safety, security, reliability, effectiveness, and credibility of the nuclear deterrence mission of the Air Force.

(b) DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Chief of Staff shall designate a Deputy Chief of Staff to carry out the following duties:

(1) Provide direction, guidance, integration, and advocacy regarding the nuclear deterrence mission of the Air Force.

(2) Conduct monitoring and oversight activities regarding the safety, security, reliability, effectiveness, and credibility of the nuclear deterrence mission of the Air Force.

(3) Conduct periodic comprehensive assessments of all aspects of the nuclear deterrence mission of the Air Force and provide such assessments to the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

(c) ROLE OF MAJOR COMMAND.—

(1) CONSOLIDATION.—Not later than March 30, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall consolidate, to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate, under a major command commanded by a single general officer the responsibility, authority, accountability, and resources for carrying out the nuclear deterrence mission of the Air Force.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—The major command described in paragraph (1) shall be responsible, to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate, for carrying out all elements and activities relating to the nuclear deterrence mission of the Air Force. Such elements include nuclear weapons, nuclear weapon delivery systems, and the nuclear command, control, and communication system. Such activities include the following:

(A) Planning and execution of modernization programs.

(B) Procurement and acquisition.

(C) Research, development, test, and evaluation.

(D) Sustainment.

(E) Operations.

(F) Training.

(G) Safety and security.

(H) Research, education, and applied science relating to nuclear deterrence and assurance.

(I) Such other functions of the nuclear deterrence mission as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the plans of the Secretary and the resources required to implement this section.

SEC. 1652. ASSESSMENT OF THREATS TO NATIONAL LEADERSHIP COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM.

Section 171a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h), as subsections (g), (h), and (i), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

''(f) COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS ON CERTAIN THREATS.—The Council shall collect and assess (consistent with the provision of classified information, and intelligence sources and methods) all reports and assessments otherwise conducted by the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) regarding foreign threats, including cyber threats, to the command, control, and communications system for the national leadership of the United States and the vulnerabilities of such system to such threats.''; and

(3) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) An assessment of the threats and vulnerabilities described in the reports and assessments collected under subsection (f) during the period covered by the report, including any plans to address such threats and vulnerabilities.''.

SEC. 1653. PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PARTS OF INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE FUZES.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 1502(a) of title 31, United States Code, of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 101 and available for Missile Procurement, Air Force as specified in the funding table in section 4101, $13,700,000 shall be available for the procurement of covered parts pursuant to contracts entered into under section 1645(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

(b) COVERED PARTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered parts'' means commercially available off the-shelf items as defined in section 104 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 1654. ANNUAL BRIEFING ON THE COSTS OF FORWARD-DEPLOYING NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN EUROPE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the costs of forward-deploying nuclear weapons in Europe.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each briefing required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(1) The contributions of the United States, including with respect to sustainment (operations and maintenance) and manpower, to support forward-deployed nuclear weapons in Europe, during the fiscal year following the date of the briefing and the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted to Congress under section 221 of title 10, United States Code, for that fiscal year.

(2) Recent or planned contributions of the United States for security enhancements relating to such forward-deployed nuclear weapons.

(3) Any other contributions, including burden-share costs by the United States, for other security enhancements and upgrades relating to such forward-deployed nuclear weapons, including infrastructure upgrades at weapons storage sites in Europe.

SEC. 1655. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPORTANCE OF COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND UNITED KINGDOM ON NUCLEAR ISSUES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) cooperation and collaboration under the 1958 Mutual Defense Agreement and the 1963 Polaris Sales Agreement are fundamental elements of the security of the United States and the United Kingdom as well as international stability;

(2) the recent renewal of the Mutual Defense Agreement and the continued work under the Polaris Sales Agreement underscore the enduring and long-term value of the agreements to both countries; and

(3) the vital efforts performed under the purview of both the Mutual Defense Agreement and the Polaris Sales Agreement are critical to sustaining and enhancing the capabilities and knowledge base of both countries regarding nuclear deterrence, nuclear nonproliferation and counterproliferation, and naval nuclear propulsion.

SEC. 1656. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ORGANIZATION OF NAVY FOR NUCLEAR DETERRENCE MISSION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the nuclear deterrent of the United States is a vital national security priority.

(2) Nuclear weapons require special consideration because of the political and military importance of the weapons, the destructive power of the weapons, and the potential consequences of an accident or unauthorized act involving the weapons.

(3) The assured safety, security, and control of nuclear weapons and related systems are of paramount importance.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Navy has repeatedly demonstrated the commitment and prioritization of the Navy to the nuclear deterrence mission of the Navy;

(2) the emphasis of the Navy on ensuring a safe, secure, reliable, and credible sea-based nuclear deterrent force has been matched by an equal emphasis on ensuring the assured safety, security, and control of nuclear weapons and related systems ashore; and

(3) the Navy is commended for the actions the Navy has taken subsequent to the 2014 Nuclear Enterprise Review to ensure continued focus on the nuclear deterrent mission by all ranks within the Navy, including the clarification and assignment of specific responsibilities and authorities within the Navy contained in OPNAV Instruction 8120.1 and SECNAV Instruction 8120.1B.

Subtitle E—Missile Defense Programs

SEC. 1661. PROHIBITIONS ON PROVIDING CERTAIN MISSILE DEFENSE INFORMATION TO RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 130g. Prohibitions on providing certain missile defense information to Russian Federation

''(a) CERTAIN 'HIT-TO-KILL' TECHNOLOGY AND TELEMETRY DATA.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year for the Department of Defense may be used to provide the Russian Federation with 'hit-to-kill' technology and telemetry data for missile defense interceptors or target vehicles.

''(b) OTHER SENSITIVE MISSILE DEFENSE INFORMATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year for the Department of Defense may be used to provide the Russian Federation with—

''(1) information relating to velocity at burnout of missile defense interceptors or targets of the United States; or

''(2) classified or otherwise controlled missile defense information.

''(c) ONE-TIME WAIVER.—The President, without delegation, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) or (b) once if—

''(1) such one-time waiver is used only to provide, in a single instance, the Russian Federation with information regarding ballistic missile early warning; and

''(2) the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, and the Commander of the United States European Command, jointly certify to the President and the congressional defense committees that the provision of such information pursuant to such waiver is required because of a failure of the early warning system of the Russian Federation.

''(d) SUNSET.—The prohibitions in subsection (a) and (b) shall expire on January 1, 2031.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 130f the following new item:

''130g. Prohibitions on providing certain missile defense information to Russian Federation.''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 1246 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 923), as amended by section 1243 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3568), is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(1) in the heading, by striking ''**AND LIMITATIONS**'' *and all that follows through* ''**FEDERATION**''.

SEC. 1662. PROHIBITION ON INTEGRATION OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF CHINA INTO MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF UNITED STATES.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to integrate a missile defense system of the People's Republic of China into any missile defense system of the United States.

SEC. 1663. PROHIBITION ON INTEGRATION OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION INTO MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF UNITED STATES AND NATO.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2031 for the Department of Defense or for contributions of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization may be obligated or expended to integrate a missile defense system of the Russian Federation into any missile defense system of the United States or NATO.

SEC. 1664. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR LONG-RANGE DISCRIMINATING RADAR.

(a) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the long-range discriminating radar will be a critically important addition to the ballistic missile defense system;

(2) such radar will offer needed capability to respond to emerging ballistic missile threats involving countermeasures and decoys; and

(3) the Department of Defense should take all appropriate steps to ensure that such radar is operational in 2020.

(b) LIMITATION.—No funds authorized to be appropriated may be obligated or expended for military construction for the long-range discriminating radar (other than for planning and design) until—

(1) the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation submits to the congressional defense committees the cost assessment conducted under subsection (c)(1);

(2) the Commander of the United States Strategic Command and the Commander of the United States Northern Command jointly certify to the congressional defense committees that the site for the long-range discriminating radar proposed by the Director of the Missile Defense Agency—

(A) best supports missile defense and space situational awareness; and

(B) based on the cost assessment conducted under subsection (c)(1), is the most cost-effective option; and

(3) a period of 60 days elapses following the date of such certification.

(c) COST ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall conduct a cost assessment providing the costs of the complete ground-based radar and other sensor configurations required to provide the same or comparable missile defense tracking and discrimination data as the long-range discriminating radar sites under consideration by the Director of the Missile Defense Agency.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, and the Commander of the United States Northern Command the cost assessment conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 1665. LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PATRIOT LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE CAPABILITY OF THE ARMY.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided by subsection (c), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for any program described in subsection (b) may be obligated or expended unless—

(1) the Secretary of the Army certifies to the congressional defense committees that the analysis of alternatives regarding the Patriot lower tier air and missile defense capability of the Army has been submitted to such committees;

(2) a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary makes the certification under paragraph (1); and

(3) the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics certifies to such committees that such obligation or expenditure of funds on such programs is consistent with the findings of the analysis of alternatives described in paragraph (1) to modernize the Patriot lower tier air and missile defense capability of the Army.

(b) PROGRAM DESCRIBED.—A program described in this subsection are the following components and capabilities of the Patriot air and missile defense system:

(1) Radar capability development, radar improvements, the digital sidelobe canceller, or the radar digital processor of the lower tier air and missile defense program of the Army.

(2) The enhanced launcher electronic system.

(c) WAIVER.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics may waive the limitations in subsection (a) if the Under Secretary—

(1) determines that such waiver—

(A) is caused by the delay of the analysis of alternatives described in paragraph (1) of such subsection; and

(B) is necessary to avoid an unacceptable risk to mission performance;

(2) notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver; and

(3) pursuant to such waiver, obligates or expends funds only in amounts necessary to avoid such unacceptable risk to mission performance.

SEC. 1666. INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY OF AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE CAPABILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) INTEROPERABILITY OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, acting through the Missile Defense Executive Board, shall ensure the interoperability and integration of the covered air and missile defense capabilities of the United States with such capabilities of allies of the United States, including by carrying out operational testing.

(b) ANNUAL DEMONSTRATION.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Secretary of the Army shall jointly ensure that not less than one intercept or flight test is carried out each year that demonstrates the interoperability and integration of the covered air and missile defense capability of the United States.

(2) WAIVER.—The Director and the Secretary may waive the requirement in paragraph (1) with respect to an intercept or flight test carried out during the year covered by the waiver if the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics—

(A) determines that such waiver is necessary for such year; and

(B) submits to the congressional defense committees notification of such waiver, including an explanation for how such waiver will not negatively affect demonstrating the interoperability and integration of the covered air and missile defense capability of the United States.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ''covered air and missile defense capabilities'' means Patriot air and missile defense batteries and associated interceptors and systems, Aegis ships and associated ballistic missile interceptors (including Aegis Ashore capability), AN/TPY–2 radars, and terminal high altitude area defense batteries and interceptors.

SEC. 1667. INTEGRATION OF ALLIED MISSILE DEFENSE CAPABILITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each covered commander shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff an assessment on opportunities for the integration and interoperability of covered air and missile defense capabilities of the United States with such capabilities of allies of the United States located in the area of responsibility of the commander, particularly with respect to such allies who acquired such capabilities through foreign military sales by the United States. Each assessment shall include an assessment of the key technology, security, command and control, and policy requirements necessary to achieve such an integrated and interoperable air and missile defense capability in a manner that ensures burden sharing and furthers the force multiplication goals of the United States.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a covered commander submits to the Secretary and the Chairman an assessment under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing such assessment, without change.

(b) INTEGRATION, INTEROPERABILITY, AND COMMAND-AND-CONTROL.—The Secretary and the Chairman, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Naval Operations, shall carry out the planning, risk assessments, policy development, and concepts of operations necessary for each covered commander to ensure that the integration, interoperability, and command-and-control of air and missile defense capabilities described in subsection (a)(1) occur by not later than December 31, 2017.

(c) QUARTERLY BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each 90-day period thereafter through December 31, 2017, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall jointly provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing that describes the progress made by the Secretary, the Chairman, and the covered commanders with respect to carrying out subsection (b), including an identification of each required action that has not been taken as of the date of the report.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''covered air and missile defense capabilities'' means Patriot air and missile defense batteries and associated interceptors and systems, Aegis ships and associated ballistic missile interceptors (including Aegis Ashore capability), AN/TPY–2 radars, and terminal high altitude area defense batteries and interceptors.

(2) The term ''covered commander'' means the following:

(A) The Commander of the United States European Command.

(B) The Commander of the United States Central Command.

(C) The Commander of the United States Pacific Command.

SEC. 1668. MISSILE DEFENSE CAPABILITY IN EUROPE.

(a) AEGIS ASHORE SITES.—

(1) POLAND.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that the Aegis Ashore site to be deployed in the Republic of Poland has anti-air warfare capability upon such site achieving full operating capability.

(2) ROMANIA.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall develop and implement a plan to provide anti-air warfare capability to the Aegis Ashore site deployed in the Republic of Romania by not later than December 31, 2018.

(3) EVALUATION OF CERTAIN MISSILES.—The Secretary shall evaluate the feasibility, benefit, and cost of using the evolved sea sparrow missile or the standard missile 2 in providing the anti-air warfare capability described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) CAPABILITIES IN EUROPEAN COMMAND AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY.—

(1) ROTATIONAL DEPLOYMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that a terminal high altitude area defense battery is available for rotational deployment to the area of responsibility of the United States European Command unless the Secretary notifies the congressional defense committees that such battery is needed in the area of responsibility of another combatant command.

(2) PRE-POSITIONING SITES.—The Secretary of Defense shall examine potential sites in the area of responsibility of the United States European Command to pre-position a terminal high altitude area defense battery.

(3) STUDIES.—

(A) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct studies to evaluate—

(i) not fewer than three sites in the area of responsibility of the United States European Command for the deployment of a terminal high altitude area defense battery in the event that the deployment of such a battery is determined to be necessary; and

(ii) not fewer than three sites in such area for the deployment of a Patriot air and missile defense battery in the event that such a deployment is determined to be necessary.

(B) In evaluating sites under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall determine which sites are best for defending—

(i) the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(ii) the member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(4) AGREEMENTS.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that a deployment described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (3)(A) is necessary and the appropriate host nation requests such a deployment, the President shall seek to enter into the necessary agreements with the host nation to carry out such deployment.

SEC. 1669. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR IRON DOME SHORT-RANGE ROCKET DEFENSE SYSTEM.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 101 for procurement, Defense-wide, and available for the Missile Defense Agency, not more than $41,400,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure radars for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system as specified in the funding table in section 4101, including for co-production of such radars in the United States by industry of the United States.

(b) CONDITIONS.—

(1) AGREEMENT.—Funds described in subsection (a) to produce the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense program shall be available subject to the terms, conditions, and co-production targets specified for fiscal year 2015 in the ''Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement,'' signed on March 5, 2014. In negotiations by the Missile Defense Agency and the Missile Defense Organization of the Government of Israel regarding such production, the goal of the United States is to maximize opportunities for co-production of the radars described subsection (a) in the United States by industry of the United States.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days prior to the initial obligation of funds described in subsection (a), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) a certification that the agreement specified in paragraph (1) is being implemented as provided in such agreement; and

(B) an assessment detailing any risks relating to the implementation of such agreement.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 1670. ISRAELI COOPERATIVE MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM CO-DEVELOPMENT AND POTENTIAL CO-PRODUCTION.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 101 for procurement, Defense-wide, and available for the Missile Defense Agency, as specified in the funding table in section 4101—

(A) not more than $150,000,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the David's Sling weapon system; and

(B) not more than $15,000,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the Arrow 3 upper tier development program.

(2) PROCUREMENT AND CO-PRODUCTION.—The use of funds under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be carried out only with respect to procurement activities; and

(B) include the co-production of parts and components in the United States by United States industry.

(b) CONDITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency may not carry out subparagraphs (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) unless—

(1) the Director and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics jointly certify to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) the knowledge points and production readiness agreements of the research, development, test, and evaluation agreements for the David's Sling weapon system or the Arrow 3 upper tier development program, respectively, have been successfully completed;

(B) such subparagraphs shall be carried out with the Government of Israel matching funds in an amount equal to the amount of funds provided by the United States; and

(C) the United States and the Government of Israel have entered into a bilateral agreement that—

(i) establishes the terms of co-production of parts and components described in subsection (a)(2) pursuant to the teaming agreements previously entered into regarding the co-development of such weapon system and development program in a manner that minimizes non-recurring engineering and facilitization expenses;

(ii) establishes complete transparency on the requirement of Israel for the number of interceptors and batteries of such weapon system and development program that will be procured;

(iii) allows the Director and Under Secretary to establish technical milestones for co-production and procurement of the such weapon system and development program; and

(iv) establishes joint approval processes for third-party sales of such weapon system and development program; and

(2) a period of 90 days has elapsed following the date of such certification.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 1671. DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF MULTIPLE-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE FOR MISSILE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES HOMELAND.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the ballistic missile defense of the United States homeland is the highest priority of the Missile Defense Agency;

(2) the Missile Defense Agency is appropriately prioritizing the design, development, and deployment of the redesigned kill vehicle; and

(3) the multiple-object kill vehicle is critical to the future of the ballistic missile defense of the United States homeland.

(b) MULTIPLE-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall develop a highly reliable multiple-object kill vehicle for the ground-based midcourse defense system using best acquisition practices.

(2) DEPLOYMENT.—The Director shall—

(A) conduct rigorous flight testing of the multiple-object kill vehicle developed under paragraph (1) by not later than 2020; and

(B) recognizing the primacy of developing the redesigned kill vehicle, produce and deploy the multiple-object kill vehicle as early as practicable after the date on which the Director carries out paragraph (1).

(c) CAPABILITIES AND CRITERIA.—The Director shall ensure that the multiple-object kill vehicle developed under subsection (b)(1) meets, at a minimum, the following capabilities and criteria:

(1) Vehicle-to-vehicle communications.

(2) Vehicle-to-ground communications.

(3) Kill assessment capability.

(4) The ability to counter advanced counter measures, decoys and penetration aids.

(5) Produceability and manufacturability.

(6) Use of technology involving high technology readiness levels.

(7) Options to be integrated onto other missile defense interceptor vehicles other than the ground-based interceptors of the ground-based midcourse defense system.

(d) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—The management of the multiple-object kill vehicle program under subsection (b) shall report directly to the Deputy Director of the Missile Defense Agency.

(e) REPORT ON FUNDING PROFILE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the funding profile of the multiple-object kill vehicle program under subsection (b).

SEC. 1672. BOOST PHASE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) prioritize technology investments in the Department of Defense to support efforts by the Missile Defense Agency to develop and field a boost phase defense system by fiscal year 2022;

(2) ensure that development and fielding of a boost phase missile defense layer to the ballistic missile defense system supports multiple war fighter missile defense requirements, including, specifically, protection of the United States homeland and allies of the United States against ballistic missiles, particularly in the boost phase;

(3) continue development and fielding of high-energy lasers and high-power microwave systems as part of a layered architecture to defend ships and theater bases against air and cruise missile strikes; and

(4) encourage collaboration among the military departments and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency with respect to high energy laser efforts carried out in support of the Missile Defense Agency.

(b) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF BOOST PHASE MISSILE DEFENSE.—

(1) SENIOR LEVEL ADVISORY GROUP.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall establish a senior level advisory group (consisting of individuals with expertise in industry, science, and Department of Defense program management) to recommend to the Director promising technologies, including such technologies recommended by industry, that the Director can evaluate for use as a boost phase missile defense layer.

(2) BRIEFING.—Not later than May 1, 2016, the Director shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on—

(A) the recommendations of the senior level advisory group under paragraph (1);

(B) a plan for developing one or more programs of record for boost phase missile defense systems; and

(C) the views of the Director regarding such recommendations and plan.

SEC. 1673. EAST COAST HOMEPORT OF SEA-BASED X-BAND RADAR.

(a) HOMEPORT.—Subject to subsection (b), not later than December 31, 2020, the Secretary of the Navy shall—

(1) reassign the homeport of the sea-based X-band radar to a homeport on the East Coast of the United States; and

(2) ensure that such vessel has an at-sea capability of not less than 120 days per year.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary may not carry out subsection (a) until the date on which the Director of the Missile Defense Agency certifies to the congressional defense committees that Hawaii will have adequate missile defense coverage prior to the reassignment of the homeport of the sea-based X-band radar as described in such subsection.

(c) REQUIRED STUDIES AND EVALUATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall commence any siting studies, environmental impact assessments or statements, homeport agreements for sea-based X-band radar support, evaluations of any needed pier modifications, and evaluations of any communications capabilities or other requirements to carry out the homeport reassignment under subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 1674. PLAN FOR MEDIUM RANGE BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR ALTERNATIVES FOR ENHANCED DEFENSE OF HAWAII.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) expanding persistent midcourse and terminal ballistic missile defense system discrimination capability is critically important to the defense of the Nation;

(2) such discrimination capability is needed to respond to emerging ballistic missile threats involving countermeasures and decoys; and

(3) the Department of Defense should take all appropriate steps to ensure Hawaii has adequate missile defense coverage.

(b) EVALUATION AND PLAN.—

(1) EVALUATION.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall conduct an evaluation of potential options for fielding medium range ballistic missile defense sensor alternatives for the defense of Hawaii, including—

(A) the use of the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense Test Complex land-based system at the Pacific Missile Range Facility in Hawaii;

(B) the use of existing sensor assets in the region; and

(C) other options the Director determines appropriate.

(2) SUBMITTAL OF PLAN.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the congressional

defense committees a plan for the missile defense of Hawaii, which shall include—

(A) a summary of the findings of the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1);

(B) estimated acquisition and operating costs for each sensor option; and

(C) a timeline for deployment of the sensor.

SEC. 1675. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF NON-TERRESTRIAL MISSILE DEFENSE LAYER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall commence the concept definition, design, research, development, and engineering evaluation of a space-based ballistic missile intercept and defeat layer to the ballistic missile defense system that—

(1) shall provide increased access to ballistic missile targets, independent of adversary country size and threat trajectory;

(2) may provide a boost-phase layer for missile defense; and

(3) may provide additional defensive options against direct ascent anti-satellite weapons and hypersonic glide vehicles and maneuvering reentry vehicles.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The activities carried out under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum the following:

(1) Initiate formal steps for potential integration into the architecture of the ballistic missile defense system.

(2) Mature planning for early proof of concept component demonstrations.

(3) Draft operation concepts in the context of a multi-layer architecture.

(4) Identification of proof of concept vendor sources for demo components and subassemblies.

(5) The development of a multiyear technology and risk reduction investment plan.

(6) Commence development of proof of concept master program phasing schedule.

(7) Identification of proof of concept long lead items.

(8) Mature options for an acquisition strategy.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(1) the findings of the concept development required by subsection (a);

(2) a plan for developing one or more programs of record for a non-terrestrial missile defense layer; and

(3) the views of the Director regarding such findings and plan.

(d) BRIEFING.—Not later the March 31, 2016, the Director shall provide to the congressional defense committees an interim briefing on the plan described in subsection (c)(2).

SEC. 1676. AEGIS ASHORE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT.

(a) EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Army, shall evaluate the role, feasibility, cost, and cost benefit of additional Aegis Ashore sites and upgrades to current ballistic missile defense system sensors to offset capacity demands on current Aegis ships, Aegis Ashore sites, and Patriot and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense capability and to meet the requirements of the combatant commanders.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall—

(A) review the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1); and

(B) submit to the congressional defense committees such evaluation and the results of such review.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF FMS OBSTACLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Secretary of State shall jointly identify any obstacles to foreign military sales of Aegis Ashore or co-financing of additional Aegis Ashore sites. Such evaluation shall include, with appropriate coordination with other agencies and departments of the Federal Government as appropriate, the feasibility of host nation manning or dual manning with the United States and such host nation.

(2) SUBMISSION.—

(A) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall provide to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate an interim briefing on the identification of obstacles under paragraph (1).

(B) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall submit to such committees a report on such identification.

(c) NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall seek to enter into host nation agreements for Aegis Ashore sites and co-financing and co-development opportunities as appropriate if the sites meet the requirements of the combatant commanders.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the congressional defense, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate the status of efforts to seek to enter into agreements described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 1677. BRIEFINGS ON PROCUREMENT AND PLANNING OF LEFT-OF-LAUNCH CAPABILITY.

(a) BRIEFING ON CURRENT CAPABILITY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the military requirement for left-of-launch capability and any current gaps in meeting such requirement.

(b) BRIEFING ON JOINT REVIEW AND PLAN TO DEVELOP AND PROCURE CAPABILITIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall jointly provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the plan of the Secretary and the Director to develop and procure the left-of-launch capabilities as described in the briefing under subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016''.

SEC. 2002. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

(a) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER THREE YEARS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), all authorizations contained in titles XXI through XXVII and title XXIX for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor) shall expire on the later of—

(1) October 1, 2018; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before the later of—

(1) October 1, 2018; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for fiscal year 2019 for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

SEC. 2003. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Titles XXI through XXVII and title XXIX shall take effect on the later of—

(1) October 1, 2015; or

(2) the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Inside the United States

State	*Installation or Location*	*Amount*
Alaska	*Fort Greely*	*$7,800,000*
California	*Concord*	*$98,000,000*
Colorado	*Fort Carson*	*$5,800,000*
Georgia	*Fort Gordon*	*$90,000,000*
New York	*Fort Drum*	*$19,000,000*
	United States Military Academy	*$70,000,000*
Oklahoma	*Fort Sill*	*$69,400,000*

Army: Inside the United States—*Continued*

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Texas	Corpus Christi	$85,000,000
Virginia	Fort Lee	$33,000,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military construction projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out the military construction project for the installation outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Army: Outside the United States

Country	Installation	Amount
Germany	Grafenwoehr	$51,000,000

SEC. 2102. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition and supporting facilities) at the installations or locations, in the number of units, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Army: Family Housing

State/Country	Installation	Units	Amount
Florida	Camp Rudder	Family Housing New Construction	$8,000,000
Illinois	Rock Island	Family Housing New Construction	$20,000,000
Korea	Camp Walker	Family Housing New Construction	$61,000,000

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed $7,195,000.

SEC. 2103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $3,500,000.

SEC. 2104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2101 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2105. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2119) for the United States Military Academy, New York, for construction of a Cadet barracks building at the installation, the Secretary of the Army may install mechanical equipment and distribution lines sufficient to provide chilled water for air conditioning the nine existing historical Cadet barracks which are being renovated through the Cadet Barracks Upgrade Program.

SEC. 2106. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101 of that Act (125 Stat. 1661) and extended by section 2107 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3673), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) as follows:

Army: Extension of 2012 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Georgia	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	$5,100,000
	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	$25,000,000
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	Road and Infrastructure Improvements	$25,000,000

SEC. 2107. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101 of that Act (126 Stat. 2119), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later:

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Army: Extension of 2013 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
District of Columbia	Fort McNair	Vehicle Storage Building, Installation	$7,191,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Complex	$12,184,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	Aerial Gunnery Range	$41,945,000
Texas	JB San Antonio	Barracks	$20,971,000
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	Secure Admin/Operations Facility	$93,876,000
Italy	Camp Ederle	Barracks	$35,952,000
Japan	Sagami	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	$17,976,000

SEC. 2108. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2016 PROJECTS.

(a) BRUSSELS.—The Secretary of the Army may carry out a military construction project to construct a multi-sport athletic field and track and perimeter road and fencing and acquire approximately 5 acres of land adjacent to the existing Sterrebeek Dependent School site to allow relocation of Army functions to the site in support of the European Infrastructure Consolidation effort, in the amount of $6,000,000.

(b) RHINE ORDNANCE BARRACKS.—

(1) PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of the Army may carry out a military construction project to construct a vehicle bridge and traffic circle to facilitate traffic flow to and from the Medical Center at Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany, in the amount of $12,400,000.

(2) USE OF HOST-NATION PAYMENT-IN-KIND FUNDS.—The Secretary may use available host-nation payment-in-kind funding for the project described in paragraph (1).

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Inside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Arizona	Yuma	$50,635,000
California	Camp Pendleton	$44,540,000
	Coronado	$4,856,000
	Lemoore	$71,830,000
	Point Mugu	$22,427,000
	San Diego	$37,366,000
	Twentynine Palms	$9,160,000
Florida	Jacksonville	$16,751,000
	Mayport	$16,159,000
	Pensacola	$18,347,000
	Whiting Field	$10,421,000
Georgia	Albany	$7,851,000
	Kings Bay	$8,099,000
	Townsend	$48,279,000
Guam	Joint Region Marianas	$181,768,000
Hawaii	Barking Sands	$30,623,000
	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	$14,881,000
	Kaneohe Bay	$106,618,000
Maryland	Patuxent River	$40,935,000
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	$54,849,000
	Cherry Point	$34,426,000
	New River	$8,230,000
South Carolina	Parris Island	$27,075,000
Virginia	Dam Neck	$23,066,000
	Norfolk	$126,677,000
	Portsmouth	$45,513,000
	Quantico	$58,199,000
Washington	Bangor	$34,177,000
	Bremerton	$22,680,000
	Indian Island	$4,472,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military construction projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Japan	Camp Butler	$11,697,000

***Navy: Outside the United States**—Continued*

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
	Iwakuni	*$17,923,000*
	Kadena AB	*$23,310,000*
	Yokosuka	*$13,846,000*

SEC. 2202. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition and supporting facilities) at the installation or location, in the number of units, and in the amount set forth in the following table:

Navy: Family Housing

State	Installation	Units	Amount
Virginia	*Wallops Island*	*Family Housing New Construction*	*$438,000*

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed $4,588,000.

SEC. 2203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $11,515,000.

SEC. 2204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy, as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2201 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2205. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2201 of that Act (125 Stat. 1666) and extended by section 2208 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3678), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Navy: Extension of 2012 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
California	*Camp Pendleton*	*Infantry Squad Defense Range*	*$29,187,000*
Florida	*Jacksonville*	*P-8A Hangar Upgrades*	*$6,085,00*
Georgia	*Kings Bay*	*Crab Island Security Enclave*	*$52,913,000*

SEC. 2206. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2201 of that Act (126 Stat. 2122), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Navy: Extension of 2013 Project Authorizations

State/Country	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
California	*Camp Pendleton*	*Comm. Information Systems Ops Complex*	*$78,897,000*
	Coronado	*Bachelor Quarters*	*$76,063,000*
	Twentynine Palms	*Land Expansion Phase 2*	*$47,270,000*
Greece	*Souda Bay*	*Intermodal Access Road*	*$4,630,000*
South Carolina	*Beaufort*	*Recycling/Hazardous Waste Facility*	*$3,743,000*
Virginia	*Quantico*	*Infrastructure—Widen Russell Road*	*$14,826,000*
Worldwide Unspecified	*Various Worldwide Locations*	*BAMS Operational Facilities*	*$34,048,000*

SEC. 2207. TOWNSEND BOMBING RANGE EXPANSION, PHASE 2.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—With respect to the authorization contained in section 2201(a) for expansion of Townsend Bombing Range to support Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, Georgia, the Secretary of the Navy may convey, without consideration, to McIntosh County and Long County, Georgia (in this section referred to as the ''County''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two fire and emergency response stations to be constructed as part of the land acquisition.

(b) USE OF CONVEYED PROPERTY.—

(1) PROVISION OF SECONDARY FIRE AND EMERGENCY SUPPORT.—As a condition for the construction and conveyance under subsection (a) of the fire and emergency response stations, each County shall enter into a mutual support agreement with the Secretary of the Navy to provide secondary fire and emergency support for the Townsend Bombing Range. Each County shall agree to equip, staff, and operate the fire and emergency response station conveyed to that County in accordance with the terms of the agreement.

(2) SUBSEQUENT PAYMENT OF CONSIDERATION.—If the Secretary of the Navy determines that a fire and emergency response station conveyed to a County under subsection (a) is ever put to a primary use other than as a fire and emergency response station, that County shall pay, at the election of the Secretary, an amount equal to the then current fair market value of the fire and emergency response station, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL AND ZONING REQUIREMENTS.—Each County shall be responsible for

meeting any environmental requirements associated with the County-owned land, including any permits, or other local zoning processes, in preparation for the construction of the fire and emergency response station on the land.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

(e) CONVEYANCE AGREEMENT.—The conveyance of real property under subsection (a) shall be accomplished using a quit claim deed or other legal instrument and upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy and the County, including such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Alaska	Eielson Air Force Base	$71,400,000
Arizona	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	$16,900,000
	Luke Air Force Base	$56,700,000
Colorado	Air Force Academy	$10,000,000
Florida	Cape Canaveral Air Force Station	$21,000,000
	Eglin Air Force Base	$8,700,000
	Hurlburt Field	$14,200,000
Guam	Joint Region Marianas	$50,800,000
Hawaii	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	$46,000,000
Kansas	McConnell Air Force Base	$4,300,000
Missouri	Whiteman Air Force Base	$29,500,000
Montana	Malstrom Air Force Base	$19,700,000
Nebraska	Offutt Air Force Base	$21,000,000
Nevada	Nellis Air Force Base	$68,950,000
New Mexico	Cannon Air Force Base	$7,800,000
	Holloman Air Force Base	$3,000,000
	Kirtland Air Force Base	$12,800,000
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	$17,100,000
Oklahoma	Altus Air Force Base	$28,400,000
	Tinker Air Force Base	$49,900,000
South Dakota	Ellsworth Air Force Base	$23,000,000
Texas	Joint Base San Antonio	$106,000,000
Utah	Hill Air Force Base	$38,400,000
Wyoming	F.E. Warren Air Force Base	$95,000,000
CONUS Classified	Classified Location	$77,130,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military construction projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out the military construction projects for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Greenland	Thule Air Base	$41,965,000
Japan	Kadena Air Base	$3,000,000
	Yokota Air Base	$8,461,000
United Kingdom	Croughton Royal Air Force	$130,615,000

SEC. 2302. FAMILY HOUSING.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed $9,849,000.

SEC. 2303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $150,649,000.

SEC. 2304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force, as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2301 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2305. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2010 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2636) for Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, for construction of a ground control tower at the installation, the Secretary of the Air Force may install communications cabling.

SEC. 2306. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 993) for Royal Air Force Lakenheath, United Kingdom, for construction of a Guardian Angel Operations Facility at the installation, the Secretary of the Air Force may construct the facility at an unspecified location within the United States European Command's area of responsibility.

(b) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENT.—Before the Secretary of the Air Force commences construction of the Guardian Angel Operations Facility at an alternative location, as authorized by subsection (a)—

(1) the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing a description of the project, including the rational for selection of the project location; and

(2) a period of 14 days has expired following the date on which the report is received by the committees or, if over sooner, a period of 7 days has expired following the date on which a copy of the report is provided in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 2307. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3679) for McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, for construction of a KC-46A Alter Composite Maintenance Shop at the installation, the Secretary of the Air Force may construct a 696 square meter (7,500 square foot) facility consistent with Air Force guidelines for composite maintenance shops.

SEC. 2308. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2301 of that Act (125 Stat. 1670) and extended by section 2305 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3680), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Air Force: Extension of 2012 Project Authorization

Country	Installation	Project	Amount
Italy	Sigonella Naval Air Station	UAS SATCOM Relay Pads and Facility	$15,000,000

SEC. 2309. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2301 of that Act (126 Stat. 2126), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Air Force: Extension of 2013 Project Authorization

Country	Installation	Project	Amount
Portugal	Lajes Field	Sanitary Sewer Lift/Pump Station	$2,000,000

SEC. 2310. LIMITATION ON PROJECT AUTHORIZATION TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2016 PROJECT.

(a) PROJECT CONDITIONED ON SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—No amounts may be expended for the construction of the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex Consolidation, Phase 2, at Royal Air Force Croughton, United Kingdom, as authorized by section 2301(b) until the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, submits a report to the congressional defense committees that provides—

(1) a summary of the alternatives considered to support continuity of operations of critical communications and intelligence capabilities located at, and to be consolidated to, Royal Air Force Croughton, United Kingdom; and

(2) a list of critical communications and intelligence capabilities that were considered under continuity of operations planning.

(b) LIMITATION ON RELATED REALIGNMENT ACTIONS.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, no additional action to realign forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, shall be taken until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of Defense has determined, based on an analysis of operational requirements, that Lajes Air Force Base is not an optimal location for the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex, or any of the critical communications or intelligence capabilities considered pursuant to subsection (a)(2). The certification shall include a discussion of the basis for the Secretary's determination.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Alabama	Fort Rucker	$46,787,000
	Maxwell Air Force Base	$32,968,000
Arizona	Fort Huachuca	$3,884,000
California	Camp Pendleton	$10,181,000
	Fresno Yosemite International Airport	$10,700,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	$8,243,000
Delaware	Dover Air Force Base	$21,600,000
Florida	Hurlburt Field	$17,989,000
	MacDill Air Force Base	$39,142,000
Georgia	Moody Air Force Base	$10,900,000
Hawaii	Kaneohe Bay	$122,071,000
	Schofield Barracks	$107,563,000
Kentucky	Fort Campbell	$12,553,000
	Fort Knox	$23,279,000
Maryland	Fort Meade	$722,817,000
Nevada	Nellis Air Force Base	$39,900,000
New Mexico	Cannon Air Force Base	$45,111,000
New York	United States Military Academy	$55,778,000
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	$69,006,000

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States—*Continued*

State	Installation or Location	Amount
	Fort Bragg	*$185,674,000*
Ohio	*Wright-Patterson Air Force Base*	*$6,623,000*
Oregon	*Klamath Falls International Airport*	*$2,500,000*
Pennsylvania	*Philadelphia*	*$49,700,000*
South Carolina	*Fort Jackson*	*$26,157,000*
Texas	*Joint Base San Antonio*	*$61,776,000*
Virginia	*Arlington National Cemetery*	*$30,000,000*
	Fort Belvoir	*$9,500,000*
	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	*$28,000,000*
	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek-Story	*$23,916,000*

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for military construction projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Germany	*Garmisch*	*$14,676,000*
	Grafenwoehr	*$38,138,000*
	Spangdahlem Air Base	*$39,571,000*
	Stuttgart-Patch Barracks	*$49,413,000*
Japan	*Kadena Air Base*	*$37,485,000*
Spain	*Rota*	*$13,737,000*

SEC. 2402. AUTHORIZED ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for energy conservation projects as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy conservation projects under chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, in the amount set forth in the table:

Energy Conservation Projects: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
California	*Edwards AFB*	*$4,550,000*
	Fort Hunter Liggett	*$22,000,000*
Colorado	*Schriever AFB*	*$4,400,000*
District of Columbia	*NSA Washington/Naval Research Lab*	*$10,990,000*
Hawaii	*Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam*	*$13,780,000*
	MCRC Kaneohe Bay	*$5,740,000*
Idaho	*Mountain Home AFB*	*$9,122,000*
Montana	*Malstrom AFB*	*$4,260,000*
Virginia	*Pentagon/Arlington*	*$4,528,000*
Washington	*Joint Base Lewis-McChord*	*$14,770,000*

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for energy conservation projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy conservation projects under chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Energy Conservation Projects: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
American Samoa	*Wake Island*	*$5,331,000*
Bahamas	*Ascencion Aux Airfield St Helena*	*$5,500,000*
Guam	*Naval Base Guam*	*$5,330,000*
Japan	*CFA Yokoska*	*$13,940,000*

(c) LIMITATION ON SET-ASIDE OF FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION PROGRAM FUNDS FOR ENERGY PROJECTS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriation in Section 301 for operation and maintenance and made available for facilities restoration and modernization may not be set-aside for the exclusive purpose of funding energy projects on military installations. Installation energy projects must compete in the normal process of determining installation requirements.

SEC. 2403. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for military construction, land acquisition,

and military family housing functions of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2401 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2404. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization in the table in section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1672), as amended by section 2404(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1632), for Fort Meade, Maryland, for construction of the High Performance Computing Center at the installation, the Secretary of Defense may construct a generator plant capable of producing up to 60 megawatts of back-up electrical power in support of the 60 megawatt technical load.

SEC. 2405. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2401 of that Act (125 Stat. 1672) and extended by section 2405 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3685), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Defense Agencies: Extension of 2012 Project Authorizations

State	Installation	Project	Amount
California	Naval Base Coronado	SOF Support Activity Operations Facility	$38,800,000
Virginia	Pentagon Reservation	Heliport Control Tower and Fire Station	$6,457,000
		Pedestrian Plaza	$2,285,000

SEC. 2406. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2401(a) of that Act (126 Stat. 2127), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Defense Agencies: Extension of 2013 Project Authorizations

State	Installation	Project	Amount
California	Navel Base Coronado	SOF Support Activity Operations Facility	$9,327,000
Colorado	Pikes Peak	High Altitude Medical Research Center	$3,600,000
Hawaii	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	SOF SDVT-1 Waterfront	$22,384,000
Pennsylvania	Def Distribution Depot New Cumberland	Replace Reservoir	$4,300,000

SEC. 2407. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

(a) MODIFICATION.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 995), for Fort Knox, Kentucky, for construction of an Ambulatory Care Center at the installation, the Secretary of Defense may construct a 102,000-square foot medical clinic at the installation in the amount of $80,000,000 using appropriations available for the project pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403 of such Act (127 Stat. 998).

(b) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 985), the authorization set forth in subsection (a) shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 2501. AUTHORIZED NATO CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the sum of the amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in section 2502 and the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

SEC. 2502. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program authorized by section 2501 as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 2601. AUTHORIZED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Army National Guard locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army National Guard

State	Location	Amount
Connecticut	Camp Hartell	$11,000,000
Florida	Palm Coast	$18,000,000
Illinois	Sparta	$1,900,000
Kansas	Salina	$6,700,000
Maryland	Easton	$13,800,000
Nevada	Reno	$8,000,000
Ohio	Camp Ravenna	$3,300,000
Oregon	Salem	$16,500,000
Pennsylvania	Fort Indiantown Gap	$16,000,000
Vermont	North Hyde Park	$7,900,000

***Army National Guard**—Continued*

State	Location	Amount
Virginia	*Richmond*	*$29,000,000*

SEC. 2602. AUTHORIZED ARMY RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Army Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army Reserve

State	Location	Amount
California	*Miramar*	*$24,000,000*
Florida	*MacDill Air Force Base*	*$55,000,000*
New York	*Orangeburg*	*$4,200,000*
Pennsylvania	*Conneaut Lake*	*$5,000,000*

SEC. 2603. AUTHORIZED NAVY RESERVE AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve

State	Location	Amount
Nevada	*Fallon*	*$11,480,000*
New York	*Brooklyn*	*$2,479,000*
Virginia	*Dam Neck*	*$18,443,000*

SEC. 2604. AUTHORIZED AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Air National Guard locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air National Guard

State	Location	Amount
Alabama	*Dannelly Field*	*$7,600,000*
California	*Moffett Field*	*$6,500,000*
Colorado	*Buckley Air Force Base*	*$5,100,000*
Georgia	*Savannah/Hilton Head International Airport*	*$9,000,000*
Iowa	*Des Moines Municipal Airport*	*$6,700,000*
Kansas	*Smokey Hill Range*	*$2,900,000*
Louisiana	*New Orleans*	*$10,000,000*
Maine	*Bangor International Airport*	*$7,200,000*
New Hampshire	*Pease International Trade Port*	*$2,800,000*
New Jersey	*Atlantic City International Airport*	*$10,200,000*
New York	*Niagara Falls International Airport*	*$7,700,000*
North Carolina	*Charlotte/Douglas International Airport*	*$9,000,000*
North Dakota	*Hector International Airport*	*$7,300,000*
Oklahoma	*Will Rogers World Airport*	*$7,600,000*
Oregon	*Klamath Falls International Airport*	*$7,200,000*
West Virginia	*Yeager Airport*	*$3,900,000*

SEC. 2605. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Air Force Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force Reserve

State	Location	Amount
California	March Air Force Base	$4,600,000
Florida	Patrick Air Force Base	$3,400,000
Ohio	Youngstown	$9,400,000
Texas	Joint Base San Antonio	$9,900,000

SEC. 2606. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under sections 2601 through 2605 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 2611. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECT.

(a) MODIFICATION.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2135) for Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, for construction of an Army Reserve Center at that location, the Secretary of the Army may construct a new facility in the vicinity of Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland.

(b) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorization set forth in subsection (a) shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

SEC. 2612. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2602 of that Act (125 Stat. 1678), and extended by section 2611 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3690), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Extension of 2012 Army Reserve Project Authorizations

State	Location	Project	Amount
Kansas	Kansas City	Army Reserve Center	$13,000,000
Massachusetts	Attleboro	Army Reserve Center	$22,000,000

SEC. 2613. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2118), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in sections 2601, 2602, and 2603 of that Act (126 Stat. 2134, 2135) shall remain in effect until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is a follows:

Extension of 2013 National Guard and Reserve Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Arizona	Yuma	Reserve Training Facility	$5,379,000
California	Tustin	Army Reserve Center	$27,000,000
Iowa	Fort Des Moines	Joint Reserve Center	$19,162,000
Louisiana	New Orleans	Transient Quarters	$7,187,000
New York	Camp Smith (Stormville)	Combined Support Maintenance Shop Phase 1	$24,000,000

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 2701. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES FUNDED THROUGH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for base realignment and closure activities, including real property acquisition and military construction projects, as authorized by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and funded through the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 2906 of such Act (as amended by section 2711 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2140)), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2702. PROHIBITION ON CONDUCTING ADDITIONAL BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE (BRAC) ROUND.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

SEC. 2801. REVISION OF CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION THRESHOLDS FOR RESERVE FACILITY EXPENDITURES AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO REFLECT CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION THRESHOLDS FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR PROJECTS.

Section 18233a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''in an amount in excess of $750,000'' and inserting ''in excess of the amount specified in section 2805(b)(1) of this title''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by striking ''section 2811(e) of this title) that costs less than $7,500,000'' and inserting ''subsection (e) of section 2811 of this title) that costs less than the amount specified in subsection (d) of such section''.

SEC. 2802. AUTHORITY FOR ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM KUWAIT FOR CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR PROJECTS MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND KUWAIT MILITARY FORCES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subchapter II of chapter 138 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2350n. Authority to accept and use contributions for construction, maintenance, and repair projects mutually beneficial to the Department of Defense and Kuwait military forces

''(a) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT AND USE CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may accept cash contributions from the government of Kuwait for the purpose of paying costs in

connection with construction (including military construction not otherwise authorized by law), maintenance, and repair projects in Kuwait that are mutually beneficial to the Department of Defense and Kuwait military forces.

''(b) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY.—Contributions accepted under subsection (a) shall be deposited in an account established in the Treasury and shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, in such amounts as may be provided in advance in appropriation Acts, until expended for a purpose specified in subsection (a).

''(c) DETERMINATION OF MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL.—A construction, maintenance, or repair project is mutually beneficial for purposes of subsection (a) if—

''(1) the project is in support of a bilateral United States and Kuwait defense cooperation agreement; or

''(2) the Secretary of Defense determines, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, that the United States may derive a benefit from the project, including—

''(A) access to and use of facilities of Kuwait military forces;

''(B) ability or capacity for future posture; and

''(C) increased interoperability between United States armed forces and Kuwait military forces.

''(d) LIMITATION ON ANNUAL OBLIGATIONS.—The maximum amount that the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may obligate in any fiscal year under this section is $50,000,000.

''(e) NOTICE AND WAIT.—When a decision is made to carry out a construction, maintenance, or repair project using contributions accepted under subsection (a) and the estimated cost of the project will exceed the thresholds prescribed by section 2805 of this title, the Secretary of Defense shall notify in writing the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of that decision, of the justification for the project, and of the estimated cost of the project. The project may then be carried out only after the end of the 21-day period beginning on the date the notification is received by the committees or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.

''(f) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to carry out construction, maintenance, and repair projects under this section expires on September 30, 2020.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of chapter 138 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2350n. Authority to accept and use contributions for construction, maintenance, and repair projects mutually beneficial to the Department of Defense and Kuwait military forces.''.

SEC. 2803. DEFENSE LABORATORY MODERNIZATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out, using amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, such military construction projects as are authorized in a Military Construction Authorization Act at—

(1) any Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratory (as designated by section 1105(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note); and

(2) Department of Defense Federally Funded Research and Development Centers that function primarily as research laboratories located on a military installation on facilities owned by the Government.

(b) SCOPE OF PROJECT AUTHORITY.—Authority provided by law to carry out a military construction project under this section includes authority for—

(1) surveys, site preparation, and advanced planning and design;

(2) acquisition, conversion, rehabilitation, and installation of facilities;

(3) acquisition and installation of equipment and appurtenances integral to the project; acquisition and installation of supporting facilities (including utilities) and appurtenances incident to the project; and

(4) planning, supervision, administration, and overhead expenses incident to the project.

(c) SUBMISSION OF PROJECT REQUESTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall include military construction projects proposed to be carried out under this section in the budget justification documents for the Department of Defense submitted to Congress in connection with the budget for a fiscal year submitted under 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(d) PROJECTS DESCRIBED.—The authority provided by this section shall be used for military construction projects that—

(1) will support research and development activities at laboratories described in subsection (a)(1) of more than one military department or Defense Agency and centers described in subsection (a)(2);

(2) will establish facilities that will have significant potential for use by entities outside the Department of Defense, including universities, industrial partners, and other Federal agencies; and

(3) are endorsed for funding by more than one military department or Defense Agency.

(e) FUNDING LIMITATION.—The maximum amount that may be obligated in any fiscal year under the authority provided by this section is $150,000,000.

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided by this section shall terminate on October 1, 2020.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

SEC. 2811. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONDITIONAL GIFTS OF REAL PROPERTY ON BEHALF OF MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES.

Section 2601 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesigning subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

''(e) ACCEPTANCE OF REAL PROPERTY GIFTS; NAMING RIGHTS.—(1) The Secretary concerned may accept a gift under subsection (a) or (b) consisting of the provision, acquisition, enhancement, or construction of real property offered to the United States Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, or the Coast Guard Academy even though the gift will be subject to the condition that the real property, or a portion thereof, bear a specified name.

''(2) A gift may not be accepted under paragraph (1) if—

''(A) the acceptance of the gift or the imposition of the naming-rights condition would reflect unfavorably upon the United States, as provided in subsection (d)(2); or

''(B) the real property to be subject to the condition, or portion thereof, has been named by an act of Congress.

''(3) The Secretaries concerned shall issue uniform regulations governing the circumstances under which gifts conditioned on naming rights may be accepted, appropriate naming conventions, and suitable display standards.''.

SEC. 2812. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT IN CONNECTION WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MAJOR LAND ACQUISITIONS.

Section 2664(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''No military department'';

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following new paragraph:

''(2) If the real property acquisition is a major land acquisition inside a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any territory or possession of the United States, the Secretary concerned shall consult with the chief executive officer of the State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or the territory or possession in which the land is located to determine options for completing the real property acquisition.'';

(3) by striking ''The foregoing limitation'' and inserting the following:

''(3) The limitations imposed by paragraphs (1) and (2)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) In this subsection, the term 'major land acquisition' means any land acquisition not covered by the authority to acquire low-cost interests in land under section 2663(c) of this title.''.

SEC. 2813. ADDITIONAL MASTER PLAN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO MAIN OPERATING BASES, FORWARD OPERATING SITES, AND COOPERATIVE SECURITY LOCATIONS OF CENTRAL COMMAND AND AFRICA COMMAND AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY.

Section 2687a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) In the case of each report under paragraph (1) submitted during fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the report also shall address or include the following with respect to each main operating base, forward operating site, or cooperative security location within the Area of Responsibility of the Central Command or Africa Command:

''(A) The strategic goal and operational requirements supported by the base, site, or location, and the basis for any infrastructure improvements to the base, site, or location.

''(B) The estimated steady-state population of the base, site, or location, including the number of military personnel, Department of Defense civilian personnel, and non-Department of Defense personnel, including contractors.

''(C) A prioritized list of all anticipated near-term, mid-term, and long-term infrastructure projects for the base, site, or location, an estimated total cost to complete each project, and expected start and completion dates.

''(D) A discussion of the medical services and support services, including capacities of commissaries, exchanges, or other support services, necessary to support the steady-state population of the base, site, or location, including any necessary investments in facilities to provide these services.

''(E) Current estimated costs, including United States appropriated funds and host-nation contributions, addressing all costs associated with constructing, sustaining, repairing, or modernizing the infrastructure necessary to support the United States military posture at the base, site, or location.

''(F) A long-term funding plan for the base, site, or location, identifying the military department or Defense Agency to be responsible for providing funding for the base, site, or location and the sources of funds for construction of new facilities, sustainment and restoration of existing facilities, and operations and maintenance costs.

''(G) A summary of the terms of agreements with the host nation, including access agreements, status-of-forces agreements, or other implementing agreements, and their specific terms (such as timeframe and cost) and limitations on United States presence and operations.

''(H) A comparison and explanation of any changes made from the report submitted in the previous year regarding the items required by the preceding subparagraphs.''.

SEC. 2814. FORCE-STRUCTURE PLAN AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE NECESSARY TO SUPPORT THE FORCE STRUCTURE.

(a) PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF FORCE-STRUCTURE PLANS AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVENTORY.—As part of the budget justification documents submitted to Congress in support of the budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2017, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress the following:

(1) A force-structure plan for each of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps based on an assessment by the Secretary of the probable threats to United States national security during the 20-year period beginning with fiscal year 2017, and the end-strength levels and major military force units (including land force divisions, carrier and other major combatant vessels, air wings, and other comparable units) authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

(2) A comprehensive inventory of military installations world-wide for each military department, with specifications of the number and type of facilities in the active and reserve forces of each military department.

(b) RELATIONSHIP OF PLANS AND INVENTORY.—Using the force-structure plans and infrastructure inventory prepared under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall prepare (and include as part of the submission of such plans and inventory) the following:

(1) A description of the infrastructure necessary to support the force structure described in each force-structure plan.

(2) A discussion of categories of excess infrastructure and infrastructure capacity, and the Secretary's objective for the reduction of such excess capacity.

(3) An assessment of the value of retaining certain excess infrastructure to accommodate contingency, mobilization, or surge requirements.

(c) SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the level of necessary versus excess infrastructure under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall consider the following:

(1) The anticipated continuing need for and availability of military installations outside the United States, taking into account current restrictions on the use of military installations outside the United States and the potential for future prohibitions or restrictions on the use of such military installations.

(2) Any efficiencies that may be gained from joint tenancy by more than one branch of the Armed Forces at a military installation or the reorganization or association of two or more military installations as a single military installation.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL EVALUATION.—

(1) EVALUATION REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare an evaluation of the force-structure plans and infrastructure inventory prepared under subsection (a), including an evaluation of the accuracy and analytical sufficiency of the plans and inventory.

(2) SUBMISSION.—The Comptroller General shall submit the evaluation to Congress not later than 60 days after the date on which the force-structure plans and infrastructure inventory are submitted to Congress.

Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment

SEC. 2821. RESTRICTION ON DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE IN CONNECTION WITH REALIGNMENT OF MARINE CORPS FORCES IN ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) RESTRICTION.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that any grant, cooperative agreement, transfer of funds to another Federal agency, or supplement of funds available under Federal programs administered by agencies other than the Department of Defense will result in the development (including repair, replacement, renovation, conversion, improvement, expansion, acquisition, or construction) of public infrastructure on Guam, the Secretary of Defense may not carry out such grant, transfer, cooperative agreement, or supplemental funding unless such grant, transfer, cooperative agreement, or supplemental funding will be used—

(1) to carry out a public infrastructure project—

(A) that was included in the report prepared by the Secretary of Defense under section 2822(d)(2) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1017); and

(B) for which amounts have been appropriated or made available to be expended by the Department of Defense before the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) to perform planning and design work in connection with a public infrastructure project described in paragraph (1).

(b) PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''public infrastructure'' means any utility, method of transportation, item of equipment, or facility under the control of a public entity or State or local government that is used by, or constructed for the benefit of, the general public.

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED LAW.—Subsection (b) of section 2821 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3701) is repealed.

SEC. 2822. ANNUAL REPORT ON GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD REALIGNMENT OF MARINE CORPS FORCES IN ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than the date of the submission of the budget of the President for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that specifies each of the following:

(1) The total amount contributed by the Government of Japan during the most recently concluded Japanese fiscal year under section 2350k of title 10, United States Code, for deposit in the Support for United States Relocation to Guam Account.

(2) The anticipated contributions to be made by the Government of Japan under such section during the current and next Japanese fiscal years.

(3) The projects carried out on Guam or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands during the previous fiscal year using amounts in the Support for United States Relocation to Guam Account.

(4) The anticipated projects that will be carried out on Guam or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands during the fiscal year covered by the budget submission using amounts in such Account.

(b) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 2824 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110–417; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is repealed.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

SEC. 2831. LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORITY, MARE ISLAND ARMY RESERVE CENTER, VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA.

(a) EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Army may carry out a real property exchange with Touro University California (in this section referred to as the ''University''), under which the Secretary will convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 3.42 acres of the former Mare Island Naval Shipyard on Azuar Drive in the City of Vallejo, California, and administered by the Secretary as part of the 63rd Regional Support Command, for the purpose of permitting the University to use the parcel for educational and administrative purposes.

(b) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY CONDITIONAL.—The conveyance authority provided by subsection (a) shall take effect only if the real property exchange process initiated by the Secretary of the Army in a notice of availability (DACW05-8-15-512) issued on January 28, 2015, and involving the real property described in subsection (a) is terminated unsuccessfully.

(c) CONVEYANCE PROCESS.—The Secretary shall carry out the real property exchange authorized by subsection (a) using the authority available to the Secretary under section 18240 of title 10, United States Code.

(d) FACILITIES TO BE ACQUIRED.—In exchange for the conveyance of the real property under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army shall acquire, consistent with subsections (c) and (d) of section 18240 of title 10, United States Code, a facility, or addition to an existing facility, needed to rectify the parking shortage for the Mare Island Army Reserve Center.

(e) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall require the University to cover costs (except costs for environmental remediation of the property) to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation related to the conveyance, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the University in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the University.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance or, if the period of availability for obligations for that appropriation has expired, to the appropriations or fund that is currently available to the Secretary for the same purpose. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(f) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) and acquired under subsection (d) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 2832. LAND EXCHANGE, NAVY OUTLYING LANDING FIELD, NAVAL AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD, FLORIDA.

(a) LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') may convey to Escambia County, Florida (in this section referred to as the ''County''), all right, title, and interest of the

United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, containing Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 in Escambia County associated with Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Milton, Florida.

(b) LAND TO BE ACQUIRED.—In exchange for the property described in subsection (a), the County shall convey to the Secretary of the Navy land and improvements thereon in Santa Rosa County, Florida, that is acceptable to the Secretary and suitable for use as a Navy outlying landing field to replace Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8.

(c) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Navy shall require the County to fund costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the land exchange under this section, including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, other administrative costs related to the land exchange, and all costs associated with relocation of activities and facilities from Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 to the replacement location. If amounts are collected from the County in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the land exchange, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the County.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the land exchange. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

(e) CONVEYANCE AGREEMENT.—The exchange of real property under this section shall be accomplished using a quit claim deed or other legal instrument and upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy and the County, including such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2833. RELEASE OF PROPERTY INTERESTS RETAINED IN CONNECTION WITH LAND CONVEYANCE, FORT BLISS MILITARY RESERVATION, TEXAS.

(a) RELEASE OF RETAINED INTERESTS.—With respect to a parcel of real property in El Paso, Texas, consisting of approximately 20 acres and conveyed by deed for National Guard and military purposes by the United States to the State of Texas pursuant to section 708 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1972 (Public Law 92–145; 85 Stat. 412), the Secretary of the Army may release the rights reserved by the United States under subsections (d) and (e)(2) of such section and the reversionary interest retained by the United States under subsection (e)(1) of such section. The release of such rights and retained interests with respect to any portion of that parcel shall not be construed to alter the rights or interests retained by the United States with respect to the remainder of the real property conveyed to the State under such section.

(b) CONDITION OF RELEASE.—The release authorized by subsection (a) of rights and retained interests shall be subject to the condition that—

(1) the State of Texas sell the parcel of real property covered by the release for fair market value; and

(2) all proceeds from the sale shall be used to fund improvements or repairs for National Guard and military purposes on the remainder of the property conveyed under section 708 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1972 (Public Law 92–145; 85 Stat. 412) and retained by the State.

(c) INSTRUMENT OF RELEASE AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The Secretary of the Army may execute and file in the appropriate office a deed of release, amended deed, or other appropriate instrument reflecting the release of rights and retained interests under subsection (a). The exact acreage and legal description of the property for which rights and retained interests are released under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army.

(d) PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army may require the State of Texas to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the release of retained interests under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs related to environmental documentation, and other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts paid to the Secretary in advance exceed the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the State.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received under paragraph (1) as reimbursement for costs incurred by the Secretary to carry out the release of retained interests under subsection (a) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the release of retained interests. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the release of retained interests under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, to include necessary munitions response actions by the State of Texas in accordance with subsection (e)(3) of section 708 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1972 (Public Law 92–145; 85 Stat. 412).

Subtitle E—Military Land Withdrawals

SEC. 2841. WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF PUBLIC LAND, NAVAL AIR WEAPONS STATION CHINA LAKE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF ADDITIONAL PUBLIC LAND.—Section 2971(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1044) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The public land'' and inserting the following:

''(1) INITIAL WITHDRAWAL.—The public land''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) ADDITIONAL WITHDRAWAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the public land (including interests in land) referred to in subsection (a) also includes the approximately 21,060 acres of public land in San Bernardino County, California, identified as 'Proposed Navy Land' on the map entitled 'Proposed Navy Withdrawal', dated March 10, 2015, and filed in accordance with section 2912.

''(B) EXCLUDED LANDS.—The withdrawal area referred to in subparagraph (A) specifically excludes section 36, township 29 south, range 43 east, San Bernardino meridian.

''(C) EXISTING RIGHTS AND ACCESS.—The withdrawal and reservation of public land pursuant to subparagraph (A) is subject to valid existing rights. The Secretary of the Navy shall ensure that the owners of the excluded private land identified in subparagraph (B) continue to have reasonable access to such land.''.

(b) PERMANENT WITHDRAWAL OR TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Section 2979 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1044) is amended by striking ''on March 31, 2039.'' and inserting the following: ''only as follows:

''(1) If the Secretary of the Navy makes an election to terminate the withdrawal and reservation of the public land.

''(2) If the Secretary of the Interior, upon request by the Secretary of the Navy, transfers administrative jurisdiction over the public land to the Secretary of the Navy. A transfer under this paragraph may consist of a portion of the land, in which case the termination of the withdrawal and reservation applies only with respect to the land so transferred.''.

SEC. 2842. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT WITHDRAWN MILITARY LANDS EFFICIENCY AND SAVINGS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF TERMINATION DATE AND AUTHORIZATION FOR TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Subsection (a) of section 3015 of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 892) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) PERMANENT WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION; EFFECT OF TRANSFER ON WITHDRAWAL.—The withdrawal and reservation of lands by section 3011 shall terminate only as follows:

''(1) Upon an election by the Secretary of the military department concerned to relinquish any or all of the land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011.

''(2) Upon a transfer by the Secretary of the Interior, under section 3016 and upon request by the Secretary of the military department concerned, of administrative jurisdiction over the land to the Secretary of the military department concerned. Such a transfer may consist of a portion of the land, in which case the termination of the withdrawal and reservation applies only with respect to the land so transferred.''.

(b) TRANSFER PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT AND USE OF LANDS.—The Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106–65) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 3022 and 3023 as sections 3027 and 3028, respectively; and

(2) by striking sections 3016 through 3021 and inserting the following new sections:

''SEC. 3016. TRANSFER PROCESS.

''(a) TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Interior shall, upon the request of the Secretary concerned, transfer to the Secretary concerned administrative jurisdiction over the land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011, or a portion of the land as the Secretary concerned may request.

''(b) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS.—The transfer of administrative jurisdiction under subsection (a) shall be subject to any valid existing rights.

''(c) TIME FOR CONVEYANCE.—The transfer of administrative jurisdiction under subsection (a) shall occur pursuant to a schedule agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary concerned.

''(d) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

''(1) PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a legal description of the public land to be transferred under subsection (a).

''(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall file with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives—

''(A) a copy of the legal description prepared under paragraph (1); and

''(B) the map referred to in subsection (a).

''(3) AVAILABILITY FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION.—Copies of the legal description and map filed under paragraph (2) shall be available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of—

''(A) the Bureau of Land Management;

''(B) the commanding officer of the installation; and

''(C) the Secretary concerned.

''(4) FORCE OF LAW.—The legal description and map filed under paragraph (2) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct clerical and typographical errors in the legal description or map.

''(5) REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS.—Any transfer entered into pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made without reimbursement, except that the Secretary concerned shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for any costs incurred by the Secretary of the Interior to prepare the legal description and map under this subsection.

''SEC. 3017. ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSFERRED LAND.

''(a) TREATMENT AND USE OF TRANSFERRED LAND.—Upon the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of land under section 3016—

''(1) the land shall be treated as property (as defined in section 102(9) of title 40, United States Code) under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned; and

''(2) the Secretary concerned shall administer the land for military purposes.

''(b) WITHDRAWAL OF MINERAL ESTATE.—Subject to valid existing rights, land for which the administrative jurisdiction is transferred under section 3016 is withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, the mineral leasing laws, and the geothermal leasing laws, for as long as the land is under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned.

''(c) INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than one year after the transfer of land under section 3016, the Secretary concerned, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall prepare an integrated natural resources management plan pursuant to the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) for the transferred land.

''(d) RELATION TO GENERAL PROVISIONS.—Sections 3018 through 3026 do not apply to lands transferred under section 3016 or to the management of such land.

''(e) TRANSFERS BETWEEN ARMED FORCES.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed as limiting the authority to transfer administrative jurisdiction over the land transferred under section 3016 to another armed force pursuant to section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, and the provisions of this section shall continue to apply to any such lands.

''SEC. 3018. GENERAL APPLICABILITY; DEFINITIONS.

''(a) APPLICABILITY.—Sections 3014 through 3028 apply to the lands withdrawn and reserved by section 3011 except—

''(1) to the B-16 Range referred to in section 3011(a)(3)(A), for which only section 3019 applies;

''(2) to the 'Shoal Site' referred to in section 3011(a)(3)(B), for which sections 3014 through 3028 apply only to the surface estate;

''(3) to the 'Pahute Mesa' area referred to in section 3011(b)(2); and

''(4) to the Desert National Wildlife Refuge referred to in section 3011(b)(5)—

''(A) except for section 3024(b); and

''(B) for which sections 3014 through 3028 shall only apply to the authorities and responsibilities of the Secretary of the Air Force under section 3011(b)(5).

''(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subtitle assigns management of real property under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned to the Secretary of the Interior.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this subtitle:

''(1) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

''(2) MANAGE; MANAGEMENT.—

''(A) INCLUSIONS.—The terms 'manage' and 'management' include the authority to exercise jurisdiction, custody, and control over the lands withdrawn and reserved by section 3011.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—Such terms do not include authority for disposal of the lands withdrawn and reserved by section 3011.

''(3) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term 'Secretary concerned' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

''SEC. 3019. ACCESS RESTRICTIONS.

''(a) AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE RESTRICTIONS.—If the Secretary concerned determines that military operations, public safety, or national security require the closure to the public of any road, trail, or other portion of land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011, the Secretary may take such action as the Secretary determines to be necessary to implement and maintain the closure.

''(b) LIMITATION.—Any closure under subsection (a) shall be limited to the minimum area and duration that the Secretary concerned determines are required for the purposes of the closure.

''(c) CONSULTATION REQUIRED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), before a closure is implemented under this section, the Secretary concerned shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior.

''(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—Subject to paragraph (3), if a closure proposed under this section may affect access to or use of sacred sites or resources considered to be important by an Indian tribe, the Secretary concerned shall consult, at the earliest practicable date, with the affected Indian tribe.

''(3) LIMITATION.—No consultation shall be required under paragraph (1) or (2)—

''(A) if the closure is provided for in an integrated natural resources management plan, an installation cultural resources management plan, or a land use management plan; or

''(B) in the case of an emergency, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

''(d) NOTICE.—Immediately preceding and during any closure implemented under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall post appropriate warning notices and take other appropriate actions to notify the public of the closure.

''SEC. 3020. CHANGES IN USE.

''(a) OTHER USES AUTHORIZED.—In addition to the purposes described in section 3011, the Secretary concerned may authorize the use of land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011 for defense-related purposes.

''(b) NOTICE TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned shall promptly notify the Secretary of the Interior if the land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011 is used for additional defense-related purposes.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A notification under paragraph (1) shall specify—

''(A) each additional use;

''(B) the planned duration of each additional use; and

''(C) the extent to which each additional use would require that additional or more stringent conditions or restrictions be imposed on otherwise-permitted nondefense-related uses of the withdrawn and reserved land or portions of withdrawn and reserved land.

''SEC. 3021. BRUSH AND RANGE FIRE PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION.

''(a) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with any applicable land management plan, the Secretary concerned shall take necessary precautions to prevent, and actions to suppress, brush and range fires occurring as a result of military activities on the land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011, including fires that occur on other land that spread from the withdrawn and reserved land.

''(b) COOPERATION OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the Secretary concerned, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide assistance in the suppression of fires under subsection (a). The Secretary concerned shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for the costs incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in providing such assistance.

''(2) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 2215 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary concerned may transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, in advance, funds to be used to reimburse the costs of the Department of the Interior in providing assistance under this subsection.

''SEC. 3022. ONGOING DECONTAMINATION.

''(a) PROGRAM OF DECONTAMINATION REQUIRED.—During the period of a withdrawal and reservation of land by section 3011, the Secretary concerned shall maintain, to the extent funds are available to carry out this subsection, a program of decontamination of contamination caused by defense-related uses on the withdrawn land. The decontamination program shall be carried out consistent with applicable Federal and State law.

''(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the annual report required by section 2711 of title 10, United States Code, a description of decontamination activities conducted under subsection (a).

''SEC. 3023. WATER RIGHTS.

''(a) NO RESERVATION OF WATER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this subtitle—

''(1) establishes a reservation in favor of the United States with respect to any water or water right on the land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011; or

''(2) authorizes the appropriation of water on the land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011, except in accordance with applicable State law.

''(b) EFFECT ON PREVIOUSLY ACQUIRED OR RESERVED WATER RIGHTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section affects any water rights acquired or reserved by the United States before October 5, 1999, on the land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011.

''(2) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The Secretary concerned may exercise any water rights described in paragraph (1).

''SEC. 3024. HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2671 of title 10, United States Code, shall apply to all hunting, fishing, and trapping on the land—

''(1) that is withdrawn and reserved by section 3011; and

''(2) for which management of the land has been assigned to the Secretary concerned.

''(b) DESERT NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.—Hunting, fishing, and trapping within the Desert National Wildlife Refuge shall be conducted in accordance with the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the Recreation Use of Wildlife Areas Act of 1969 (16 U.S.C. 460k et seq.), and other laws applicable to the National Wildlife Refuge System.

''SEC. 3025. RELINQUISHMENT.

''(a) NOTICE OF INTENTION TO RELINQUISH.—If, during the period of withdrawal and reservation made by section 3011, the Secretary concerned decides to relinquish any or all of the

land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011, the Secretary concerned shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior notice of the intention to relinquish the land.

''(b) DETERMINATION OF CONTAMINATION.—The Secretary concerned shall include in the notice submitted under subsection (a) a written determination concerning whether and to what extent the land that is to be relinquished is contaminated with explosive materials or toxic or hazardous substances.

''(c) PUBLIC NOTICE.—The Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register the notice of intention to relinquish the land under this section, including the determination concerning the contaminated state of the land.

''(d) DECONTAMINATION OF LAND TO BE RELINQUISHED.—

''(1) DECONTAMINATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary concerned shall decontaminate land subject to a notice of intention under subsection (a) to the extent that funds are appropriated for that purpose, if—

''(A) the land subject to the notice of intention is contaminated, as determined by the Secretary concerned; and

''(B) the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary concerned, determines that—

''(i) decontamination is practicable and economically feasible, after taking into consideration the potential future use and value of the contaminated land; and

''(ii) on decontamination of the land, the land could be opened to operation of some or all of the public land laws, including the mining laws, the mineral leasing laws, and the geothermal leasing laws.

''(2) ALTERNATIVES TO RELINQUISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to accept the land proposed for relinquishment under subsection (a), if—

''(A) the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Secretary concerned, determines that—

''(i) decontamination of the land is not practicable or economically feasible; or

''(ii) the land cannot be decontaminated sufficiently to be opened to operation of some or all of the public land laws; or

''(B) sufficient funds are not appropriated for the decontamination of the land.

''(3) STATUS OF CONTAMINATED LAND PROPOSED TO BE RELINQUISHED.—If, because of the contaminated state of the land, the Secretary of the Interior declines to accept land withdrawn and reserved by section 3011 that has been proposed for relinquishment—

''(A) the Secretary concerned shall take appropriate steps to warn the public of—

''(i) the contaminated state of the land; and

''(ii) any risks associated with entry onto the land;

''(B) the Secretary concerned shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior and Congress a report describing—

''(i) the status of the land; and

''(ii) any actions taken under this paragraph.

''(e) REVOCATION AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of the Interior determines that it is in the public interest to accept the land proposed for relinquishment under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior may order the revocation of a withdrawal and reservation made by section 3011.

''(2) REVOCATION ORDER.—To carry out a revocation under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a revocation order that—

''(A) terminates the withdrawal and reservation;

''(B) constitutes official acceptance of the land by the Secretary of the Interior; and

''(C) specifies the date on which the land will be opened to the operation of some or all of the public land laws, including the mining laws, the mineral leasing laws, and the geothermal leasing laws.

''(f) ACCEPTANCE BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section requires the Secretary of the Interior to accept the land proposed for relinquishment if the Secretary determines that the land is not suitable for return to the public domain.

''(2) NOTICE.—If the Secretary makes a determination that the land is not suitable for return to the public domain, the Secretary shall provide notice of the determination to Congress.

''SEC. 3026. EFFECT OF TERMINATION OF MILITARY USE.

''(a) NOTICE AND EFFECT.—Upon a determination by the Secretary concerned that there is no longer a military need for all or portions of the land for which administrative jurisdiction was transferred under section 3016, the Secretary concerned shall notify the Secretary of the Interior of such determination. Subject to subsections (b), (c), and (d), the Secretary concerned shall transfer administrative jurisdiction over the land subject to such a notice back to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

''(b) CONTAMINATION.—Before transmitting a notice under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall prepare a written determination concerning whether and to what extent the land to be transferred is contaminated with explosive materials or toxic or hazardous substances. A copy of the determination shall be transmitted with the notice. Copies of the notice and the determination shall be published in the Federal Register.

''(c) DECONTAMINATION.—The Secretary concerned shall decontaminate any contaminated land that is the subject of a notice under subsection (a) if—

''(1) the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary concerned, determines that—

''(A) decontamination is practicable and economically feasible (taking into consideration the potential future use and value of the land); and

''(B) upon decontamination, the land could be opened to operation of some or all of the public land laws, including the mining laws; and

''(2) funds are appropriated for such decontamination.

''(d) NO REQUIRED ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary of the Interior is not required to accept land proposed for transfer under subsection (a) if the Secretary of the Interior is unable to make the determinations under subsection (c)(1) or if Congress does not appropriate a sufficient amount of funds for the decontamination of the land.

''(e) ALTERNATIVE DISPOSAL.—If the Secretary of the Interior declines to accept land proposed for transfer under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall dispose of the land in accordance with property disposal procedures established by law.''.

(c) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3014 of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 890) is amended by striking subsections (b), (d), and (f).

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 885) is amended by striking the items relating to sections 3016 through 3023 and inserting the following new items:

''Sec. 3016. Transfer process.
''Sec. 3017. Administration of transferred land.
''Sec. 3018. General applicability; definitions.
''Sec. 3019. Access restrictions.
''Sec. 3020. Changes in use.
''Sec. 3021. Brush and range fire prevention and suppression.
''Sec. 3022. Ongoing decontamination.
''Sec. 3023. Water rights.
''Sec. 3024. Hunting, fishing, and trapping.
''Sec. 3025. Relinquishment.
''Sec. 3026. Effect of termination of military use.
''Sec. 3027. Use of mineral materials.
''Sec. 3028. Immunity of United States.''.

Subtitle F—Military Memorials, Monuments, and Museums

SEC. 2851. RENAMING SITE OF THE DAYTON AVIATION HERITAGE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, OHIO.

Section 101(b)(5) of the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 (16 U.S.C. 410ww(b)(5)) is amended by striking ''Aviation Center'' and inserting ''National Museum''.

SEC. 2852. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMEMORATIVE WORK IN HONOR OF BRIGADIER GENERAL FRANCIS MARION.

Notwithstanding section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, the authority provided by section 331 of the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–229; 122 Stat. 781; 40 U.S.C. 8903 note) shall continue to apply through May 8, 2018.

SEC. 2853. AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT.

(a) CRITERIA AND REGULATIONS RELATING TO NATIONAL REGISTER, NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS, AND WORLD HERITAGE LIST.—Section 302103 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) notifying the Committee on Natural Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate if the property is owned by the Federal Government when the property is being considered for inclusion on the National Register, for designation as a National Historic Landmark, or for nomination to the World Heritage List.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Section 302107 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) to allow for expedited removal of Federal property listed on the National Register of Historic Places if the managing agency of that Federal property submits to the Secretary a written request to remove the Federal property from the National Register of Historic Places for reasons of national security, such as any impact the inclusion or designation would have on use of the property for military training or readiness purposes.''.

(c) OBJECTION TO INCLUSION OR DESIGNATION FOR REASONS OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—Chapter 3021 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 302109. Objection to inclusion or designation for reasons of national security

''If the head of the agency managing any Federal property objects to such inclusion or designation for reasons of national security, such as any impact the inclusion or designation would have on use of the property for military training or readiness purposes, that Federal property shall be neither included on the National Register nor designated as a National

Historic Landmark until the objection is withdrawn''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3021 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''302109. Objection to inclusion or designation for reasons of national security.''.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

SEC. 2861. MODIFICATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GUIDANCE ON USE OF AIRFIELD PAVEMENT MARKINGS.

The Secretary of Defense shall require such modifications of Unified Facilities Guide Specifications for pavement markings (UFGS 32 17 23.00 20 Pavement Markings, UFGS 32 17 24.00 10 Pavement Markings), Air Force Engineering Technical Letter ETL 97-18 (Guide Specification for Airfield and Roadway Marking), and any other Department of Defense guidance on airfield pavement markings as may be necessary to permit the use of Type III category of retro-reflective beads to reflectorize airfield markings. The Secretary shall develop appropriate policy to ensure that the determination of the category of retro-reflective beads used on an airfield is determined on an installation-by-installation basis, taking into consideration local conditions and the life-cycle maintenance costs of the pavement markings.

SEC. 2862. PROTECTION AND RECOVERY OF GREATER SAGE GROUSE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''Federal resource management plan'' means—

(A) a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management for public lands pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); or

(B) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for National Forest System lands pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(2) The term ''Greater Sage Grouse'' means a sage grouse of the species Centrocercus urophasianus.

(3) The term ''State management plan'' means a State-approved plan for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage Grouse.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is—

(1) to facilitate implementation of State management plans over a period of multiple, consecutive sage grouse life cycles; and

(2) to demonstrate the efficacy of the State management plans for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage Grouse.

(c) ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973 FINDINGS.—

(1) DELAY REQUIRED.—Any finding by the Secretary of the Interior under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)) with respect to the Greater Sage Grouse made during the period beginning on September 30, 2015, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall have no force or effect in law or in equity, and the Secretary of the Interior may not make any such finding during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2025.

(2) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—The delay imposed by paragraph (1) is, and shall remain, effective without regard to any other statute, regulation, court order, legal settlement, or any other provision of law or in equity.

(3) EFFECT ON CONSERVATION STATUS.—Until the date specified in paragraph (1), the conservation status of the Greater Sage Grouse shall remain warranted for listing under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but precluded by higher-priority listing actions pursuant to clause (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)).

(d) COORDINATION OF FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND STATE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—In order to foster coordination between a State management plan and Federal resource management plans that affect the Greater Sage Grouse, upon notification by the Governor of a State with a State management plan, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may not amend or otherwise modify any Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in the State in a manner inconsistent with the State management plan for a period, to be specified by the Governor in the notification, of at least five years beginning on the date of the notification.

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECT.—In the case of any State that provides notification under paragraph (1), if any amendment or modification of a Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in the State was issued during the one-year period preceding the date of the notification and the amendment or modification altered management of the Greater Sage Grouse or its habitat, implementation and operation of the amendment or modification shall be stayed to the extent that the amendment or modification is inconsistent with the State management plan. The Federal resource management plan, as in effect immediately before the amendment or modification, shall apply instead with respect to management of the Greater Sage Grouse and its habitat, to the extent consistent with the State management plan.

(3) DETERMINATION OF INCONSISTENCY.—Any disagreement regarding whether an amendment or other modification of a Federal resource management plan is inconsistent with a State management plan shall be resolved by the Governor of the affected State.

(e) RELATION TO NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—With regard to any Federal action consistent with a State management plan, any findings, analyses, or conclusions regarding the Greater Sage Grouse or its habitat under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) shall not have a preclusive effect on the approval or implementation of the Federal action in that State.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter through 2021, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the Secretaries' implementation and effectiveness of systems to monitor the status of Greater Sage Grouse on Federal lands under their jurisdiction.

(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation, this section, including determinations made under subsection (d)(3), shall not be subject to judicial review.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2901. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT.

The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out the military construction project for the installation outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Army: Outside the United States

Country	*Installation*	*Amount*
Cuba	*Guantanamo Bay*	*$76,000,000*

SEC. 2902. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out the military construction projects for the installations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Outside the United States

Country	*Installation*	*Amount*
Bahrain	*Bahrain Island*	*$37,700,000*
	Bahrain Island	*$52,091,000*
Italy	*Sigonella*	*$62,302,000*
	Sigonella	*$40,641,000*
Poland	*Redzikowo*	*$51,270,000*

SEC. 2903. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out the military construction projects for the installations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Outside the United States

Country	Installation	Amount
Niger	Agadez	$50,000,000
Oman	Al Mussanah	$25,000,000

SEC. 2904. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out the military construction projects for the installations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agency: Outside the United States

Installation	Defense Agency	Amount
Djibouti	Camp Lemonnier	$43,700,000
Poland	Redzikowo	$169,153,000

SEC. 2905. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2015, for the military construction projects outside the United States authorized by this title as specified in the funding table in section 4602.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

SEC. 3101. NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016 for the activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF NEW PLANT PROJECTS.—From funds referred to in subsection (a) that are available for carrying out plant projects, the Secretary of Energy may carry out new plant projects for the National Nuclear Security Administration as follows:

Project 16–D–621, Substation Replacement at TA–3, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $25,000,000.

SEC. 3102. DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016 for defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

SEC. 3103. OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016 for other defense activities in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 3111. AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS OF NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT PERSONNEL LEVELS.—Subsection (a) of section 3241A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2016''; and

(B) by striking ''1,690'' and inserting ''1,350''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2017''; and

(B) by striking ''1,690'' and inserting ''1,350''.

(b) COUNTING RULE FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS.—Subsection (b)(3) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) Employees appointed under section 3241.''.

(c) CERTAIN CONTRACTING AND TECHNICAL POSITIONS.—Section 3241 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2441) is amended by striking ''600'' and inserting ''450''.

(d) BUDGET INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such section 3241A is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

''(e) BUDGET DISPLAY.—In the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of each budget submitted by the President to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Administrator shall include information regarding the number of employees of the Office of the Administrator, including the number of employees who are described in each of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of subsection (b)(3).''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3251(b)(2) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 3251(b)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking '' testing, and'' and inserting ''testing,''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and the information regarding employees of the Administration required by section 3241A(e)''.

SEC. 3112. FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL LEVELS.

Section 3241A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441a), as amended by section 3111, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(g) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL LEVELS.—

''(1) TOTAL NUMBER.—The total number of full-time equivalent contractor employees working under a service support contract of the Administration may not exceed the number that is 30 percent of the number of employees of the Office of the Administrator authorized under subsection (a)(1).

''(2) EXCESS.—The Administrator may not exceed the total number of full-time equivalent contractor employees authorized under paragraph (1) unless, during each fiscal year in which such total number of contractor employees exceeds such authorized number, the Administrator submits to the congressional defense committees a report justifying such excess.

''(g) ANNUAL REPORT.—Together with each budget submitted by the President to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Administrator shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the following information as of the date of the report:

''(1) The number of full-time equivalent employees of the Office of the Administrator, as counted under subsection (a).

''(2) The number of service support contracts of the Administration.

''(3) The number of full-time equivalent contractor employees working under each contract identified under paragraph (2).

''(4) The number of full-time equivalent contractor employees described in paragraph (2) that have been employed under such a contract for a period greater than two years.''.

SEC. 3113. IMPROVEMENT TO ACCOUNTABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY EMPLOYEES AND PROJECTS.

(a) NOTIFICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 3245. NOTIFICATION OF EMPLOYEE PRACTICES AFFECTING NATIONAL SECURITY.

''(a) ANNUAL NOTIFICATION.—At or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly notify the appropriate congressional committees of—

''(1) the number of covered employees whose security clearance was revoked during the year prior to the year in which the notification is made; and

''(2) for each employee counted under paragraph (1), the length of time such employee has been employed at the Department or the Administration, respectively, since such revocation.

''(b) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Whenever the Secretary or the Administrator terminates the employment of a covered employee or removes and reassigns a covered employee for cause, the Secretary or the Administrator, as the case may be, shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such termination or reassignment by not later than 30 days after the date of such termination or reassignment.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the congressional defense committees; and

''(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

''(2) The term 'covered employee' means—

''(A) an employee of the Administration; or

''(B) an employee of an element of the Department of Energy (other than the Administration) involved in nuclear security.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents at the beginning of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3244 the following new items:

''Sec. 3245. Notification of employee practices affecting national security.''.

(3) ONE-TIME CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate written certification that the Secretary and the Administrator possess the authorities needed to terminate the employment of an employee for cause relating to improper program management (as defined in section 3246(c) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act, as added by subsection (b)(1)).

(b) LIMITATION ON BONUSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such subtitle, as amended by subsection (a)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 3246. LIMITATION ON BONUSES.

''(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary or the Administrator may not pay to a covered employee a bonus during the one-year period beginning on the date on which the Secretary or the Administrator determines that the covered employee committed improper program management.

''(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary or the Administrator may waive the limitation in subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis if—

''(1) the Secretary or the Administrator notifies the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver; and

''(2) a period of 60 days elapses following such notification.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the congressional defense committees; and

''(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

''(2) The term 'bonus' means a bonus or award paid under title 5, United States Code, including under chapters 45 or 53 of such title, or any other provision of law.

''(3) The term 'covered employee' has the meaning given that term in section 3245.

''(4) The term 'covered project' means—

''(A) a construction project of the Administration that is not covered under section 4703(d) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2743(d));

''(D) a life extension program;

''(E) a defense nuclear nonproliferation project or program; or

''(F) an activity of the Office of the Administrator.

''(5) The term 'improper program management' means actions relating to the management of a covered project that significantly—

''(A) delays the project;

''(B) reduce the scope of the project;

''(C) increase the cost of the project; or

''(D) undermines health, safety, or security.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents at the beginning of such Act, as amended by subsection (a), is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3245 the following new items:

''Sec. 3246. Limitation on bonuses.''.

(c) IMPROVEMENT TO PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XLVII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 4715. COMPLETION OF PROJECTS ON TIME, ON BUDGET, WITHIN PLANNED SCOPE, AND WHILE PROTECTING HEALTH, SAFETY, AND SECURITY.

''(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Administrator should use all contractual remedies available to the Administrator, including through the withholding of all award fees, in cases in which the Administrator determines that a contractor of a covered project is responsible for significantly—

''(1) delaying the project;

''(2) reducing the scope of the project;

''(3) increasing the cost of the project; or

''(4) undermines health, safety, or security.

''(b) ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS.—In addition to the requirements under section 4713, at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Administrator shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that each covered project is being carried out on time, on budget, within the planned scope of the project, and while protecting health, safety, and security.

''(c) NOTIFICATIONS OF DEFICIENCIES.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Administrator makes each certification under subsection (b), the Administrator shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the following:

''(1) Any covered project for which the Administrator could not make such a certification.

''(2) Except as provided by paragraph (3), with respect to a covered project for which the Administrator could not make such a certification by reason of the actions of a contractor that the Administrator determines significantly delayed the project, reduced the scope of the project, increased the cost of the project, or undermined health, safety, or security—

''(A) an explanation as to whether termination of contract for the project is an appropriate remedy;

''(B) a description of the terms of the contract regarding award fees and performance; and

''(C) a description of how the Administrator plans to exercise contractual options.

''(3) In the case of a covered project described in paragraph (2) for which the Administrator is not able to submit the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of such paragraph by reason of a contract enforcement action, a notification of such contract enforcement action and the date on which the Administrator plans to submit the information described in such subparagraphs.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the congressional defense committees; and

''(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

''(2) The term 'covered project' means—

''(A) a construction project of the Administration that is not covered under section 4703(d);

''(B) a life extension program;

''(C) a defense nuclear nonproliferation project or program; or

''(D) an activity of the Office of the Administrator.''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4714 the following new item:

''Sec. 4715. Completion of projects on time, on budget, within planned scope, and while protecting health, safety, and security.''.

SEC. 3114. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES FOR COMPETITION OF MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTS.

(a) ELEMENTS OF REPORTS.—Subsection (b) of section 3121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2175), as amended by section 3124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1062), is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

''(5) the factors considered and processes used by the Administrator to determine—

''(A) whether to compete or extend the contract; and

''(B) which activities at the facility should be covered under the contract rather than under a different contract;

''(6) with respect to the matters included under paragraphs (1) through (5), a detailed description of the analyses conducted by the Administrator to reach the conclusions presented in the report, including any assumptions, limitations, and uncertainties relating to such conclusions; and''.

(b) FISCAL YEARS COVERED.—Subsection (d) of such section 3121 is amended by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2019''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Such section 3121 is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''or (d)(2)''; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(C) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking ''subsections (a) and (d)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) in the past decade, competition of the management and operating contracts for the national security laboratories has resulted in significant increases in fees paid to the contractors—funding that otherwise could be used to support program and mission activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration;

(2) competition of the management and operating contracts of the nuclear security enterprise is an important mechanism to help realize cost savings, seek efficiencies, improve performance, and hold contractors accountable;

(3) when the Administrator for Nuclear Security considers it appropriate to achieve these goals, the Administrator should conduct competition of these contracts while recognizing the unique nature of federally funded research and development centers; and

(4) the Administrator should ensure that fixed fees and performance-based fees contained in management and operating contracts are as low as possible to maintain a focus on national service while attracting high-quality contractors and achieving the goals of the competition.

SEC. 3115. NUCLEAR WEAPON DESIGN RESPONSIVENESS PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a modern and responsive nuclear weapons infrastructure is only one component of a nuclear posture that is agile, flexible, and responsive to change; and

(2) to ensure the nuclear deterrent of the United States remains safe, secure, reliable, credible, and responsive, the United States must

continually exercise all capabilities required to conceptualize, study, design, develop, engineer, certify, produce, and deploy nuclear weapons.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XLII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 4220. NUCLEAR WEAPON DESIGN RESPONSIVENESS PROGRAM.

''(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to sustain, enhance, and continually exercise all capabilities required to conceptualize, study, design, develop, engineer, certify, produce, and deploy nuclear weapons to ensure the nuclear deterrent of the United States remains safe, secure, reliable, credible, and responsive.

''(b) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator and in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall carry out a program, along with the stockpile stewardship program under section 4201 and the stockpile management program under section 4204, to sustain, enhance, and continually exercise all capabilities required to conceptualize, study, design, develop, engineer, certify, produce, and deploy nuclear weapons.

''(c) OBJECTIVES.—The program under subsection (b) shall have the following objectives:

''(1) Correct deficiencies in, identify, sustain, enhance, and continually exercise all capabilities required to carry out all phases of the joint nuclear weapons life cycle process, with respect to both the nuclear security enterprise and relevant elements of the Department of Defense.

''(2) Identify, enhance, and transfer knowledge, skills, and direct experience with respect to all phases of the joint nuclear weapons life cycle process from one generation of nuclear weapon designers and engineers to the following generation.

''(3) Identify, sustain, and enhance the capabilities, infrastructure, tools, and technologies required for all phases of the joint nuclear weapons life cycle process.

''(4) Periodically demonstrate nuclear weapon design responsiveness throughout the range of capabilities required, including prototypes, flight testing, and development of plans for certification without the need for nuclear explosive testing.

''(5) Continually exercise processes for the integration and coordination of all relevant elements and processes of the Administration and the Department of Defense required to ensure nuclear weapon design responsiveness.

''(d) JOINT NUCLEAR WEAPONS LIFE CYCLE PROCESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'joint nuclear weapons life cycle process' means the process developed and maintained by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy for the development, production, maintenance, and retirement of nuclear weapons.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4219 the following new item:

''Sec. 4220. Nuclear weapon design responsiveness program.''.

(c) INCLUSION IN STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN.—Section 4203 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2523) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''design responsiveness,'' after ''stockpile management,'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraphs (4) the following new paragraph (5):

''(5) A summary of the status, plans, and budgets for carrying out the nuclear weapons design responsiveness program under section 4220.'';

(3) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''stewardship and management'' and inserting ''stewardship, stockpile management, and design responsiveness'';

(B) in subparagraph (K), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in subparagraph (L), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(M) the status, plans, activities, budgets, and schedules for carrying out the nuclear weapons design responsiveness program under section 4220; and

''(N) for each of the five fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the report is submitted, an identification of the funds needed to carry out the program required under section 4220.''; and

(4) in subsection (e)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) whether the plan supports the nuclear weapons design responsiveness program under section 4220 in a manner that meets the objectives of such program and an identification of any improvements that may be made to the plan to better carry out such program.''.

(d) REPORT BY STRATCOM.—Section 4205(e)(4) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2525(e)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) the views of the Commander on the nuclear weapons design responsiveness program under section 4220, the activities conducted under such program, and any suggestions to improve such program.''.

SEC. 3116. DISPOSITION OF WEAPONS-USABLE PLUTONIUM.

(a) MIXED OXIDE FUEL FABRICATION FACILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Using funds described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Energy shall carry out construction and project support activities relating to the MOX facility.

(2) FUNDS DESCRIBED.—The funds described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the National Nuclear Security Administration for the MOX facility for construction and project support activities.

(B) Funds authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year prior to fiscal year 2016 for the National Nuclear Security Administration for the MOX facility for construction and project support activities that are unobligated as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) UPDATED PERFORMANCE BASELINE.—The Secretary shall include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Energy budget (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) for fiscal year 2017 an updated performance baseline for construction and project support activities relating to the MOX facility conducted in accordance with Department of Energy Order 413.3B.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''MOX facility'' means the mixed-oxide fuel fabrication facility at the Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina.

(2) The term ''project support activities'' means activities that support the design, long-lead equipment procurement, and site preparation of the MOX facility.

SEC. 3117. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR FIXED SITE RADIOLOGICAL PORTAL MONITORS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 or any fiscal year thereafter for the National Nuclear Security Administration may be obligated or expended for the research and development, installation, or sustainment of fixed site radiological portal monitors or equipment for use in foreign countries.

(b) MOBILE RADIOLOGICAL INSPECTION EQUIPMENT.—The prohibition in subsection (a) may not be construed to apply to mobile radiological inspection equipment.

SEC. 3118. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PROVISION OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION ASSISTANCE TO RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities may be obligated or expended to enter into a contract with, or otherwise provide assistance to, the Russian Federation.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Energy, without delegation, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if the Secretary—

(1) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing—

(A) notification that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(B) justification for such a waiver; and

(2) a period of 15 days elapses following the date on which the Secretary submits such report.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3119. LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATION OF PRODUCTION OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES BY FOREIGN COUNTRY WITH NUCLEAR NAVAL PROPULSION PROGRAM.

Section 57 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2077), as amended by section 3118, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''f.(1) The Secretary may not make an authorization under subsection b.(2) with respect to a foreign country with a nuclear naval propulsion program unless—

''(A) the Director of National Intelligence and the Chief of Naval Operations jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the risks of diversion, and the likely consequences of such diversion, of the technology and material covered by such authorization;

''(B) following the date on which such assessment is submitted, the Administrator for Nuclear Security certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

''(i) there is sufficient diversion control as part of such transfer; and

''(ii) such transfer presents a minimal risk of diversion of such technology to a military program that would degrade the technical advantage of the United States; and

''(C) a period of 90 days has elapsed following the date of such certification.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the following:

''(A) The congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code).

''(B) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

''(C) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.''.

SEC. 3120. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided by subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for defense nuclear nonproliferation for nonproliferation or arms control verification or monitoring technologies may be obligated or expended to develop such technologies beyond technology readiness level 5 unless, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy submits to the appropriate congressional committees the following:

(1) Written certification that such technologies are being developed to fulfill the rights or obligations of the United States under—

(A) a current arms control or nonproliferation treaty or agreement requiring verification or monitoring that has entered into force with respect to the United States; or

(B) an arms control or nonproliferation treaty or agreement that—

(i) will require verification or monitoring; and

(iii) the Secretary expects will enter into force with respect to the United States during the two-year period beginning on the date of the certification.

(2) With respect to each technology developed beyond technology readiness level 5 pursuant to this subsection—

(A) an identification of the amount of such funds made available for fiscal year 2016 for defense nuclear nonproliferation that will be used for such development; and

(B) how such development helps to fulfill the rights or obligations of the United States as described in subparagraphs (A) or (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if—

(1) the Secretary—

(A) determines that the waiver is necessary in the national security interests of the United States; and

(B) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a written certification of such determination; and

(2) a period of 15 days elapses following the date on which the Secretary submits such certification.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) The term ''technology readiness level 5'' has the meaning given that term in the Department of Energy Guide 413.3-4A titled ''Technology Readiness Assessment Guide'' and approved on September 15, 2011.

SEC. 3121. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT.

(a) LIMITATION ON MAXIMUM AMOUNT FOR DISMANTLEMENT.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 for the National Nuclear Security Administration, not more than $50,000,000 may be obligated or expended in each such fiscal year to carry out the nuclear weapons dismantlement and disposition activities of the Administration.

(b) LIMITATION ON UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraph (2) and subsection (d), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 for the National Nuclear Security Administration may be obligated or expended to dismantle a nuclear weapon of the United States.

(2) AUTHORIZED DISMANTLEMENT.—The limitation in paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a nuclear weapon of the United States that meets at least one of the following criteria:

(A) The nuclear weapon was retired on or before September 30, 2008.

(B) The Administrator for Nuclear Security certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that the components of the nuclear weapon are directly required for the purposes of a current life extension program.

(C) The President certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that the nuclear weapon is being dismantled pursuant to a nuclear arms reduction treaty or similar international agreement that—

(i) has entered into force after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) was approved—

(I) with the advice and consent of the Senate pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(II) by an Act of Congress, as described in section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573(b)).

(c) LIMITATION ON UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT OF CERTAIN CRUISE MISSILE WARHEADS.—Except as provided by subsection (d), and notwithstanding subsection (b)(2), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 for the National Nuclear Security Administration may be obligated or expended to dismantle or dispose a W84 nuclear weapon.

(d) EXCEPTION.—The limitations in subsection (b) and (c) shall not apply to activities necessary to conduct maintenance or surveillance of the nuclear weapons stockpile or activities to ensure the safety or reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

SEC. 3122. USE OF BEST PRACTICES FOR CAPITAL ASSET PROJECTS AND NUCLEAR WEAPON LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAMS.

(a) ANALYSES OF ALTERNATIVES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Administrator for Nuclear Security, shall ensure that analyses of alternatives are conducted (including through contractors, as appropriate) in accordance with best practices for capital asset projects and life extension programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration and capital asset projects relating to defense environmental management.

(b) COST ESTIMATES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, shall develop cost estimates in accordance with cost estimating best practices for capital asset projects and life extension programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration and capital asset projects relating to defense environmental management.

(c) REVISIONS TO DEPARTMENTAL PROJECT MANAGEMENT ORDER AND NUCLEAR WEAPON LIFE EXTENSION REQUIREMENTS.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, but not later than two years after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall revise—

(1) the capital asset project management order of the Department of Energy to require the use of best practices for preparing cost estimates and for conducting analyses of alternatives for National Nuclear Security Administration and defense environmental management capital asset projects; and

(2) the nuclear weapon life extension program procedures of the Department to require the use of use of best practices for preparing cost estimates and conducting analyses of alternatives for National Nuclear Security Administration life extension programs.

Subtitle C—Plans and Reports

SEC. 3131. ROOT CAUSE ANALYSES FOR CERTAIN COST OVERRUNS.

Section 4713(c) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2753) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting ''AND ROOT CAUSE ANALYSES'' after ''PROJECTS'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'';

(3) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following paragraph:

''(3) submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the root cause or causes of the growth in the total cost of the project, including the contribution of any shortcomings in cost, schedule, or performance of the program, including the role, if any, of—

''(A) unrealistic performance expectations;

''(B) unrealistic baseline estimates for cost or schedule;

''(C) immature technologies or excessive manufacturing or integration risk;

''(D) unanticipated design, engineering, manufacturing, or technology integration issues arising during program performance;

''(E) changes in procurement quantities;

''(F) inadequate program funding or funding instability;

''(G) poor performance by personnel of the Federal Government or contractor personnel responsible for program management; or

''(H) any other matters.''.

SEC. 3132. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN ANNUAL REPORTS ON NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION.

Section 3122(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1710) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2020''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''world,'' the following: ''including an identification of such uranium that is obligated by the United States,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) A list, by country and site, reflecting the total amount of separated plutonium around the world, including an identification of such plutonium that is obligated by the United States, and an assessment of the vulnerability of the plutonium to theft or diversion.''.

SEC. 3133. GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF NUCLEAR SECURITY ENTERPRISE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) correcting the longstanding problems with the governance and management of the nuclear security enterprise will require robust, personal, and long-term engagement by the President, the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator for Nuclear Security, and leaders from the appropriate congressional committees;

(2) recent and past studies of the governance and management of the nuclear security enterprise have provided a list of reasonable, practical, and actionable steps that the Secretary and the Administrator should take to make the nuclear security enterprise more efficient and more effective; and

(3) lasting and effective change to the nuclear security enterprise will require personal engagement by senior leaders, a clear plan, and mechanisms for ensuring follow-through and accountability.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION ACTION TEAM.—

(A) The Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly establish a team of senior officials from the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration to develop and carry out an implementation plan to reform the governance and management of the nuclear security enterprise to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the nuclear security enterprise. Such plan shall be developed and implemented in accordance with the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2401 et seq.), the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), and any other provision of law.

(B) The team established under paragraph (1) shall be co-chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Energy and the Administrator.

(C) In developing and carrying out the implementation plan, the team shall consult with the implementation assessment panel established under subsection (c)(1).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The implementation plan developed under paragraph (1)(A) shall address all recommendations contained in the covered study (except such recommendations that require legislative action to carry out) by identifying specific actions, milestones, timelines, and responsible personnel to implement such plan.

(3) SUBMISSION.—Not later than January 30, 2016, the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees the implementation plan developed under paragraph (1)(A).

(c) IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT PANEL.—

(1) AGREEMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall seek to enter into a joint agreement with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Public Administration to establish a panel of external, independent experts to evaluate the implementation plan developed under subsection (b)(1)(A) and the implementation of such plan.

(2) DUTIES.—The panel established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) provide guidance to the Secretary and the Administrator with respect to the implementation plan developed under subsection (b)(1)(A), including how such plan compares or contrasts with the covered study;

(B) track the implementation of such plan; and

(C) assess the effectiveness of such plan.

(3) REPORTS.—

(A) Not later than March 1, 2016, the panel established under paragraph (1) shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary, and the Administrator an initial assessment of the implementation plan developed under subsection (b)(1)(A), including with respect to the completeness of the plan, how the plan aligns with the intent and recommendations made by the covered study, and the prospects for success for the plan.

(B) Beginning August 1, 2016, and semiannually thereafter until September 30, 2018, the panel established under paragraph (1) shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary, and the Administrator a report on the efforts of the Secretary and the Administrator to implement the implementation plan developed under subsection (b)(1)(A).

(C) Not later than September 30, 2018, the panel established under paragraph (1) shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary, and the Administrator a final report on the efforts of the Secretary and the Administrator to implement the implementation plan developed under subsection (b)(1)(A), including an assessment of the effectiveness of the reform efforts under such plan and whether further action is needed.

(4) COOPERATION.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall provide to the panel established under paragraph (1) full and timely access to all information, personnel, and systems of the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration that the panel determines necessary to carry out this subsection.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''nuclear security enterprise'' has the meaning given that term in section 4002(6) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501).

(2) The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(5) The term ''covered study'' means the following:

(A) The final report of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise established by section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2208).

(B) Any other study not conducted by the Secretary or the Administrator that the Secretary determines appropriate for purposes of this section.

(e) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any action—

(1) in contravention of section 3220 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2410); or

(2) that would undermine or weaken health, safety, or security.

SEC. 3134. ASSESSMENTS ON NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION RISKS AND NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION OPPORTUNITIES.

(a) REPORTS.—Not later than March 1, 2016, and each year thereafter through 2020, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report, consistent with the provision of classified information and intelligence sources and methods, containing—

(1) an assessment and prioritization of international nuclear proliferation risks and nuclear nonproliferation opportunities; and

(2) an assessment of the effectiveness of various means and programs for addressing such risks and opportunities.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(3) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 3135. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF LABORATORY-DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator for Nuclear Security shall seek to enter into a contract with the JASON Defense Advisory Panel to conduct a review of the laboratory-directed research and development programs authorized under section 4811 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2791). Such review shall include assessments of the following:

(A) Whether and how such programs support the mission of the National Nuclear Security Administration, including whether such programs are carried out pursuant to the requirements of section 4812(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2792(a)) or other similar requirements established by the Secretary of Energy or the Administrator.

(B) Whether the science conducted under such programs underpin the advancement of scientific understanding necessary for nuclear weapons, nuclear nonproliferation, and naval nuclear propulsion programs.

(C) Whether the science conducted under such programs help attract and retain highly qualified technical personnel.

(D) The scientific and programmatic opportunities and challenges in such programs, including recent significant accomplishments and failures of such programs.

(E) How projects are selected for funding under such programs.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than November 1, 2016, the Administrator shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the review of the JASON Defense Advisory Panel conducted under paragraph (1).

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL BRIEFING.—Not later than November 1, 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the following:

(1) How funding limits for laboratory-directed research and development programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration compare to funding limits for other laboratories of the Department of Energy and laboratories and federally funded research and development centers of the Department of Defense.

(2) How many personnel are supported by laboratory-directed research and development programs, including—

(A) how many personnel receive 50 percent or more of their funding from such programs; and

(B) how many personnel devote more than 50 percent of their time to such programs for more than three years.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 3141. TRANSFER, DECONTAMINATION, AND DECOMMISSIONING OF NONOPERATIONAL FACILITIES.

(a) PLAN.—The Secretary of Energy shall establish and carry out a plan under which the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall transfer to the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management the responsibility for decontaminating and decommissioning facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration that the Secretary of Energy determines—

(1) are nonoperational as of the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) meet the requirements of the Office of Environmental Management for such transfer.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a schedule for transferring the facilities as described in such subsection by not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) a prioritized list and schedule for decontaminating and decommissioning such facilities, including how such priority and schedule is treated in light of the other facility disposition priorities of the Office of Environmental Management; and

(3) a description of the estimated life cycle costs for all such facilities and how such information is factored into the prioritized list and schedule under paragraph (2).

(c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than February 15, 2016, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives the plan under subsection (a), including any additional views of the Secretary regarding such plan.

SEC. 3142. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF ADVANCED NAVAL NUCLEAR FUEL SYSTEM BASED ON LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for defense nuclear nonproliferation for material management and minimization, not more than $5,000,000 shall be made available to the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors for initial planning and early research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium, as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

(b) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) DETERMINATION.—At the same time that the President submits to Congress the budget for fiscal year 2017 under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees the determination of the Secretaries as to whether the United States should continue to pursue research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium.

(2) BUDGET REQUEST.—If the Secretaries determine under paragraph (1) that research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium should continue, the Secretaries shall ensure that the budget described in such paragraph includes amounts for defense nuclear nonproliferation for material management and minimization necessary to carry out the plan under subsection (c).

(c) PLAN.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the submission of the determination under subsection (b)(1), the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium to meet military requirements. Such plan shall include the following:

(1) Timelines.

(2) Costs (including an analysis of the cost of such research and development as compared to the cost of maintaining current naval nuclear reactor technology).

(3) Milestones, including an identification of decision points in which the Deputy Administrator shall determine whether further research and development of a low-enriched uranium naval nuclear fuel system is warranted.

(4) Identification of any benefits or risks for nuclear nonproliferation of such research and development and eventual deployment.

(5) Identification of any military benefits or risks of such research and development and eventual deployment.

(6) A discussion of potential security cost savings from using low-enriched uranium in future naval nuclear fuels, including for transporting and using low-enriched uranium fuel, and how such cost savings relate to the cost of fuel fabrication.

(7) The distinguishment between requirements for aircraft carriers from submarines.

(8) Any other matters the Deputy Administrator determines appropriate.

(d) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—If the Secretaries determine under subsection (b)(1) that research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium should continue, not later than 60 days after the date on which the Deputy Administrator submits the plan under subsection (c), the Deputy Administrator shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation regarding such research and development, including with respect to how funding for such research and development will be requested for the ''Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'' account for material management and minimization and provided to the ''Naval Reactors'' account to carry out the program.

SEC. 3143. PLUTONIUM PIT PRODUCTION CAPACITY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the requirement to create a modern, responsive nuclear infrastructure that includes the capability and capacity to produce, at minimum, 50 to 80 pits per year, is a national security priority;

(2) delaying creation of a modern, responsive nuclear infrastructure until the 2030s is an unacceptable risk to the nuclear deterrent and the national security of the United States; and

(3) timelines for creating certain capacities for production of plutonium pits and other nuclear weapons components must be driven by the requirement to hedge against technical and geopolitical risk and not solely by the needs of life extension programs.

(b) BRIEFING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council established under section 179 of title 10, United States Code, in consultation with the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the annual plutonium pit production capacity of the nuclear security enterprise (as defined in section 4002(6) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501)).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The briefing under paragraph (1) shall describe the following:

(A) The pit production capacity requirement, including the numbers of pits produced that are needed for nuclear weapons life extension programs.

(B) The annual pit production requirement, including the numbers of pits produced, to support a responsive nuclear weapons infrastructure to hedge against technical and geopolitical risk.

SEC. 3144. ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES FOR MOBILE GUARDIAN TRANSPORTER PROGRAM.

(a) SUBMISSION OF ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall submit to the congressional defense committees the analysis of alternatives conducted by the Administrator for the mobile guardian transporter program.

(b) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an independent assessment of the analysis of alternatives for the mobile guardian transporter program.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The assessment under paragraph (1) of the analysis of alternatives for the mobile guardian transporter program shall include an assessment of the following:

(A) The engineering, operations, logistics, cost, cost-benefit, policy, threat, safety, security, and risk analysis used to inform the analysis of alternatives.

(B) The options considered by the analysis of alternatives and whether such options represent a comprehensive set of options.

(C) The constraints and assumptions used to frame and bound the analysis of alternatives.

(3) SUBMISSION.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Administrator shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing—

(A) the assessment conducted by the federally funded research and development center under paragraph (1), without change; and

(B) any views of the Administrator regarding such assessment or the mobile guardian transporter program.

(c) IDENTIFICATION IN BUDGET MATERIALS.—The Secretary of Energy shall include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Energy budget (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) for any fiscal year in which the mobile guardian transporter program is carried out a separate, dedicated program element for such program.

SEC. 3145. DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGY ON RISKS TO NONPROLIFERATION CAUSED BY ADDITIVE MANUFACTURING.

(a) STRATEGY.—The President shall develop and pursue a strategy to address the risks to the goals and policies of the United States regarding nuclear nonproliferation that are caused by the increased use of additive manufacture technology (commonly referred to as ''3D printing''), including such technology that does not originate in the United States.

(b) BRIEFINGS.—Not later than March 31, 2016, and each 120-day period thereafter through January 1, 2019, the President shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the strategy developed under subsection (a).

(c) PURSUIT OF STRATEGY.—The President shall pursue the strategy developed under subsection (a) at the Nuclear Security Summit in Chicago in 2016.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(3) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SEC. 3201. AUTHORIZATION.

There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 $29,150,000 for the operation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board under chapter 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286 et seq.).

SEC. 3202. ADMINISTRATION OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD.

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO BOARD MEMBERS.—Section 311(c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''paragraph (5)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (5), (6), and (7)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) In carrying out paragraph (5)(B), the Chairman may not withhold from any member of the Board any information that is made available to the Chairman regarding the Board's functions, powers, and mission (including with respect to the management and evaluation of employees of the Board).''.

(b) SENIOR EMPLOYEES.—

(1) APPOINTMENT AND REMOVAL.— Such section 311(c), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7)(A) The Chairman, subject to the approval of the Board, shall appoint the senior employees described in subparagraph (C).

''(B) The Chairman, subject to the approval of the Board, may remove a senior employee described in subparagraph (C).

''(C) The senior employees described in this subparagraph are the following senior employees of the Board:

''(i) The senior employee responsible for budgetary and general administration matters.

''(ii) The general counsel.

''(iii) The senior employee responsible for technical matters.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 313(b)(1)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2286b(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''hire'' and inserting ''in accordance with section 311(c)(7), hire''.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

SEC. 3401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AMOUNT.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy $17,500,000 for fiscal year 2016 for the purpose of carrying out activities under chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the naval petroleum reserves.

(b) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3501. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY ASPECTS OF THE MERCHANT MARINE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016, to be available without fiscal year limitation if so provided in appropriations Acts, for the use of the Department of Transportation for Maritime Administration programs associated with maintaining national security aspects of the merchant marine, as follows:

(1) For expenses necessary for operations of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, $96,028,000, of which—

(A) $71,306,000 shall remain available until expended for Academy operations;

(B) $24,722,000 shall remain available until expended for capital asset management at the Academy.

(2) For expenses necessary to support the State maritime academies, $34,550,000, of which—

(A) $2,400,000 shall remain available until expended for student incentive payments;

(B) $3,000,000 shall remain available until expended for direct payments to such academies;

(C) $1,800,000 shall remain available until expended for training ship fuel assistance payments;

(D) $22,000,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of State maritime academy training vessels;

(E) $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the National Security Multi-Mission Vessel Design; and

(F) $350,000 shall remain available until expended for improving the monitoring of graduates' service obligation.

(3) For expenses necessary to support Maritime Administration operations and programs, $54,059,000.

(4) For expenses necessary to dispose of vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, $8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(5) For expenses to maintain and preserve a United States-flag merchant marine to serve the national security needs of the United States under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code, $186,000,000.

(6) For the cost (as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5)) of loan guarantees under the program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, $3,135,000, of which $3,135,000 shall remain available until expended for administrative expenses of the program.

SEC. 3502. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MARITIME SECURITY FLEET PROGRAM.

It is the sense of Congress that dedicated and enhanced support is necessary to stabilize and preserve the Maritime Security Fleet program, a program that provides the Department of Defense with on-demand access to world class, economical commercial sealift capacity, assures a United States-flag presence in international commerce, supports a pool of qualified United States merchant mariners needed to crew United States-flag vessels during times of war or national emergency, and serves as a critical component of our national security infrastructure.

SEC. 3503. UPDATE OF REFERENCES TO THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION REGARDING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND VESSEL OPERATORS.

Sections 3305 and 3306(n) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''Secretary of Commerce'' each place that it appears and inserting ''Secretary of Transportation''.

SEC. 3504. RELIANCE ON CLASSIFICATION SOCIETY CERTIFICATION FOR PURPOSES OF ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTIFICATE OF INSPECTION.

Section 53102(e)(3)(A) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

SEC. 4001. AUTHORIZATION OF AMOUNTS IN FUNDING TABLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever a funding table in this division specifies a dollar amount authorized for a project, program, or activity, the obligation and expenditure of the specified dollar amount for the project, program, or activity is hereby authorized, subject to the availability of appropriations.

(b) MERIT-BASED DECISIONS.—A decision to commit, obligate, or expend funds with or to a specific entity on the basis of a dollar amount authorized pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, or on competitive procedures; and

(2) comply with other applicable provisions of law.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO TRANSFER AND PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY.—An amount specified in the funding tables in this division may be transferred or reprogrammed under a transfer or reprogramming authority provided by another provision of this Act or by other law. The transfer or reprogramming of an amount specified in such funding tables shall not count against a ceiling on such transfers or reprogrammings under section 1001 or section 1522 of this Act or any other provision of law, unless such transfer or reprogramming would move funds between appropriation accounts.

(d) APPLICABILITY TO CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—This section applies to any classified annex that accompanies this Act.

(e) ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.—No oral or written communication concerning any amount specified in the funding tables in this division shall supersede the requirements of this section.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	FIXED WING		
002	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	879	879
004	MQ–1 UAV	260,436	277,436
	Extended Range Modifications		[17,000]
	ROTARY		
006	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	187,177	187,177
007	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	1,168,461	1,168,461
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	209,930	209,930
011	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	1,435,945	1,563,945
	Additional 8 rotorcraft for Army National Guard		[128,000]
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	127,079	127,079
013	UH–60 BLACK HAWK A AND L MODELS	46,641	55,441
	Additional 8 rotorcraft for Army National Guard		[8,800]
014	CH–47 HELICOPTER	1,024,587	1,024,587
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	99,344	99,344
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
016	MQ–1 PAYLOAD (MIP)	97,543	97,543
019	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)	95,725	95,725
020	AH–64 MODS	116,153	116,153
021	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	86,330	86,330
022	GRCS SEMA MODS (MIP)	4,019	4,019
023	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP)	16,302	16,302
024	EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP)	13,669	13,669
025	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	16,166	16,166
026	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	13,793	13,793
028	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN	112,807	112,807
029	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE	82,904	82,904
030	GATM ROLLUP	33,890	33,890
031	RQ–7 UAV MODS	81,444	81,444
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS		
032	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	56,215	56,215
033	SURVIVABILITY CM	8,917	8,917
034	CMWS	78,348	104,348
	Apache Survivability Enhancements—Army Unfunded Requirement		[26,000]
	OTHER SUPPORT		
035	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,937	6,937
036	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	64,867	64,867
037	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	44,085	44,085
038	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	94,545	94,545
039	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	1,207	1,207
040	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	3,012	3,012
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**5,689,357**	**5,869,157**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM		
001	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD)	115,075	115,075
002	MSE MISSILE	414,946	414,946
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM		
003	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	27,975	27,975
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	27,738	27,738
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS		
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	77,163	168,163
	Program increase to support Unfunded Requirements		[91,000]
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	87,525	87,525
008	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	251,060	251,060
009	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	17,428	17,428
	MODIFICATIONS		
011	PATRIOT MODS	241,883	241,883
012	ATACMS MODS	30,119	15,119
	Early to need		[–15,000]
013	GMLRS MOD	18,221	18,221
014	STINGER MODS	2,216	2,216
015	AVENGER MODS	6,171	6,171
016	ITAS/TOW MODS	19,576	19,576
017	MLRS MODS	35,970	35,970
018	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS	3,148	3,148
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
019	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	33,778	33,778
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
020	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	3,717	3,717
021	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)	1,544	1,544
022	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	4,704	4,704
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**1,419,957**	**1,495,957**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
001	STRYKER VEHICLE	181,245	181,245
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
002	STRYKER (MOD)	74,085	118,585
	Lethality Upgrades		[44,500]
003	STRYKER UPGRADE	305,743	305,743
005	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)	225,042	225,042
006	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	60,079	60,079
007	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	273,850	273,850
008	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	123,629	195,629
	Additional Vehicles – Army Unfunded Requirement		[72,000]
009	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)	2,461	2,461
010	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	2,975	2,975
011	M88 FOV MODS	14,878	14,878
012	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	33,455	33,455
013	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	367,939	407,939
	Program Increase		[40,000]
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
015	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	6,479	6,479
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		
016	MORTAR SYSTEMS	4,991	4,991
017	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	26,294	26,294
018	PRECISION SNIPER RIFLE	1,984	0
	Army request – schedule delay		[–1,984]
019	COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM	1,488	0
	Army request – schedule delay		[–1,488]
020	CARBINE	34,460	34,460
021	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	8,367	8,367
022	HANDGUN	5,417	0
	Army request – early to need and schedule delay		[–5,417]
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH		
023	MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS	2,777	2,777
024	M777 MODS	10,070	10,070
025	M4 CARBINE MODS	27,566	27,566
026	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS	44,004	44,004
027	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS	1,190	1,190
028	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS	1,424	1,424
029	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS	2,431	980
	Army request – schedule delay		[–1,451]
030	M119 MODIFICATIONS	20,599	20,599
032	MORTAR MODIFICATION	6,300	6,300
033	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	3,737	3,737
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
034	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	391	391
035	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	9,027	11,484
	Army requested realignment		[2,457]
036	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	304	304
037	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	2,392	2,392
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**1,887,073**	**2,035,690**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION		
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	43,489	43,489
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	40,715	40,715
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES	7,753	6,753
	Army request – program reduction		[–1,000]
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	24,728	24,728
005	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	8,305	8,305
006	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	34,330	34,330
007	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	79,972	69,972
	Program reduction		[–10,000]
	MORTAR AMMUNITION		
008	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	42,898	42,898
009	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	43,500	43,500
010	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	64,372	64,372
	TANK AMMUNITION		
011	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES	105,541	105,541
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION		
012	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES	57,756	57,756
013	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	77,995	77,995
014	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	45,518	45,518
015	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	78,024	78,024
	ROCKETS		
016	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	7,500	7,500
017	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	33,653	33,653
	OTHER AMMUNITION		
018	CAD/PAD, ALL TYPES	5,639	5,639
019	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	9,751	9,751
020	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	19,993	19,993

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
021	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	9,761	9,761
022	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	9,749	9,749
	MISCELLANEOUS		
023	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	3,521	3,521
024	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	1,700	1,700
025	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (AMMO)	6,181	6,181
026	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	17,811	17,811
027	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	14,695	14,695
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		
029	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	221,703	221,703
030	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION	113,250	113,250
031	ARMS INITIATIVE	3,575	3,575
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	**1,233,378**	**1,222,378**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	12,855	12,855
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	53	53
004	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	308,336	308,336
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	90,040	90,040
006	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP	8,444	8,444
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	27,549	27,549
008	PLS ESP	127,102	127,102
010	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	48,292	48,292
011	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	130,993	130,993
012	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS	19,146	19,146
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES		
014	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	1,248	1,248
015	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER	9,614	9,614
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS		
016	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	783,116	743,116
	Unobligated balances		*[–40,000]*
017	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	49,898	49,898
018	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY	4,062	4,062
019	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	5,008	5,008
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
020	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	196,306	196,306
021	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS	44,998	34,998
	Program Reduction		*[–10,000]*
022	SHF TERM	7,629	7,629
023	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	14,027	14,027
024	SMART-T (SPACE)	13,453	13,453
025	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS	6,265	6,265
026	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	1,042	1,042
027	ENROUTE MISSION COMMAND (EMC)	7,116	7,116
	COMM—C3 SYSTEM		
028	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	10,137	10,137
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS		
029	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	64,640	54,640
	Unobligated balances		*[–10,000]*
030	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	27,762	22,762
	Excess Program Management Costs		*[–5,000]*
031	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)	9,422	9,422
032	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	26,020	26,020
033	TRACTOR DESK	4,073	4,073
034	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	1,403	1,403
035	SPIDER FAMILY OF NETWORKED MUNITIONS INCR	9,199	9,199
036	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS	349	349
037	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM	25,597	25,597
038	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE	21,854	21,854
040	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE	24,388	24,388
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM		
042	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	1,349	1,349
043	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	3,695	3,695
	INFORMATION SECURITY		
045	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	19,920	19,920
046	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	72,257	72,257
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS		
047	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	16,082	16,082
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS		
048	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	86,037	86,037
050	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	8,550	8,550
051	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM	73,496	73,496
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)		
054	JTT/CIBS-M	881	881
055	PROPHET GROUND	63,650	48,650
	Program reduction		*[–15,000]*
057	DCGS-A (MIP)	260,268	250,268
	Program reduction		*[–10,000]*

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
058	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	3,906	3,906
059	TROJAN (MIP)	13,929	13,929
060	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)	3,978	3,978
061	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)	7,542	7,542
062	CLOSE ACCESS TARGET RECONNAISSANCE (CATR)	8,010	8,010
063	MACHINE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM-M	8,125	8,125
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)		
064	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	63,472	63,472
065	EW PLANNING & MANAGEMENT TOOLS (EWPMT)	2,556	2,556
066	AIR VIGILANCE (AV)	8,224	8,224
067	CREW	2,960	2,960
068	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE	1,722	1,722
069	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	447	447
070	CI MODERNIZATION	228	228
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)		
071	SENTINEL MODS	43,285	43,285
072	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	124,216	124,216
074	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	23,216	23,216
076	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS	60,679	60,679
077	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS)	53,453	53,453
078	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	3,338	3,338
079	PROFILER	4,057	4,057
081	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	133,339	133,339
082	JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS)	47,212	47,212
083	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	22,314	22,314
084	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	12,131	12,131
085	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	10,075	10,075
086	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	217,379	187,379
	Unobligated balances		*[–30,000]*
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS		
087	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	1,190	1,190
090	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	28,176	28,176
091	IAMD BATTLE COMMAND SYSTEM	20,917	15,917
	Program Reduction		*[–5,000]*
092	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	5,850	5,850
093	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE	12,738	12,738
094	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	145,405	145,405
095	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A)	162,654	162,654
096	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP	4,446	4,446
098	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET	16,218	16,218
099	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (ENFIRE)	1,138	1,138
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION		
100	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	12,089	12,089
101	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	105,775	105,775
102	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM	18,995	18,995
103	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP)	62,319	62,319
104	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	17,894	17,894
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)		
106	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	4,242	4,242
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT		
107	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	425	425
108	BCT EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES	7,438	7,438
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
108A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,467	6,467
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT		
109	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	248	248
110	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	1,487	1,487
112	CBRN DEFENSE	26,302	26,302
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT		
113	TACTICAL BRIDGING	9,822	9,822
114	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	21,516	21,516
115	BRIDGE SUPPLEMENTAL SET	4,959	4,959
116	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP	52,546	42,546
	Program decrease		*[–10,000]*
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT		
117	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)	58,682	58,682
118	HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS)	13,565	13,565
119	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)	2,136	2,136
120	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION	6,960	6,960
121	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	17,424	17,424
122	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS	8,284	8,284
123	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	5,459	5,459
124	FAMILY OF BOATS AND MOTORS	8,429	8,429
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
125	HEATERS AND ECU'S	18,876	18,876
127	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	2,287	2,287
128	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)	7,733	7,733
129	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	49,798	49,798
130	MOBILE SOLDIER POWER	43,639	43,639

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
132	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	13,118	13,118
133	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	28,278	28,278
135	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	34,544	34,544
136	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)	595	595
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT		
137	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	5,368	5,368
138	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	35,381	35,381
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		
139	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	73,828	73,828
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT		
140	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	25,270	25,270
141	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	2,760	2,760
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		
142	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)	5,903	5,903
143	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	26,125	26,125
146	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	27,156	27,156
147	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	16,750	16,750
148	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	984	984
149	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	2,656	2,656
150	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP	2,531	2,531
151	FAMILY OF DIVER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	446	446
152	CONST EQUIP ESP	19,640	19,640
153	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	5,087	5,087
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT		
154	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP	39,772	39,772
155	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	5,835	94,835
	Strategic mobility shortfall mitigation – railcar acquisition		[89,000]
	GENERATORS		
156	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	166,356	146,356
	Program decrease		[–20,000]
157	TACTICAL ELECTRIC POWER RECAPITALIZATION	11,505	11,505
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
159	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	17,496	17,496
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
160	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	74,916	74,916
161	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	303,236	278,236
	Program reduction		[–25,000]
162	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	45,210	45,210
163	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	30,068	30,068
164	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING	9,793	9,793
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)		
165	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	4,650	4,650
166	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	34,487	34,487
167	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	11,083	11,083
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
169	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	17,937	17,937
170	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	52,040	52,040
171	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT	1,568	1,568
172	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)	64,219	64,219
173	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	1,525	1,525
174	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	3,268	3,268
176	TRACTOR YARD	7,191	7,191
	OPA2		
177	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	48,511	48,511
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**5,899,028**	**5,808,028**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT		
002	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET		1,150,000
	Additional 12 Aircraft—Navy Unfunded Requirement		[1,150,000]
003	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	897,542	873,042
	Anticipated contract savings		[–7,700]
	Cost growth for support equipment		[–16,800]
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	48,630	48,630
005	JSF STOVL	1,483,414	2,458,314
	Additional 6 Aircraft—Marine Corps Unfunded Requirement		[1,000,000]
	Anticipated contract savings		[–17,600]
	Cost growth for support equipment		[–7,500]
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	203,060	203,060
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	41,300	41,300
008	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	1,436,355	1,436,355
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	43,853	43,853
010	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	800,057	800,057
011	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	56,168	56,168
012	MH–60S (MYP)	28,232	28,232
014	MH–60R (MYP)	969,991	969,991
016	P–8A POSEIDON	3,008,928	3,008,928
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	269,568	269,568
018	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	857,654	857,654

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
019	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	195,336	195,336
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT		
020	JPATS	8,914	8,914
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
021	KC–130J	192,214	192,214
022	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	24,451	24,451
023	MQ–4 TRITON	494,259	559,259
	Additional Air Vehicle		[65,000]
024	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	54,577	72,577
	Additional Advance Procurement		[18,000]
025	MQ–8 UAV	120,020	156,020
	MQ–8 UAV-Additional three air vehicles		[36,000]
026	STUASL0 UAV	3,450	3,450
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
028	EA–6 SERIES	9,799	9,799
029	AEA SYSTEMS	23,151	38,151
	Additional Low Band Transmitter Modifications		[15,000]
030	AV–8 SERIES	41,890	41,890
031	ADVERSARY	5,816	5,816
032	F–18 SERIES	978,756	968,456
	Unjustified request		[–10,300]
034	H–53 SERIES	46,887	46,887
035	SH–60 SERIES	107,728	107,728
036	H–1 SERIES	42,315	42,315
037	EP–3 SERIES	41,784	41,784
038	P–3 SERIES	3,067	3,067
039	E–2 SERIES	20,741	20,741
040	TRAINER A/C SERIES	27,980	27,980
041	C–2A	8,157	8,157
042	C–130 SERIES	70,335	70,335
043	FEWSG	633	633
044	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	8,916	8,916
045	E–6 SERIES	185,253	185,253
046	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	76,138	76,138
047	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	23,702	23,702
048	T–45 SERIES	105,439	105,439
049	POWER PLANT CHANGES	9,917	9,917
050	JPATS SERIES	13,537	13,537
051	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	131,732	131,732
052	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	202,745	202,745
053	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM	3,062	3,062
054	ID SYSTEMS	48,206	48,206
055	P–8 SERIES	28,492	28,492
056	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION	7,680	7,680
057	MQ–8 SERIES	22,464	22,464
058	RQ–7 SERIES	3,773	3,773
059	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	121,208	121,208
060	F–35 STOVL SERIES	256,106	256,106
061	F–35 CV SERIES	68,527	68,527
062	QRC	6,885	6,885
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
063	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	1,563,515	1,553,515
	Program decrease		[–10,000]
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES		
064	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	450,959	450,959
065	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	24,010	24,010
066	WAR CONSUMABLES	42,012	42,012
067	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	2,455	2,455
068	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	50,859	50,859
069	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	1,801	1,801
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**16,126,405**	**18,340,505**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		
001	TRIDENT II MODS	1,099,064	1,099,064
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	7,748	7,748
	STRATEGIC MISSILES		
003	TOMAHAWK	184,814	214,814
	Minimum Sustaining Rate Increase		[30,000]
	TACTICAL MISSILES		
004	AMRAAM	192,873	192,873
005	SIDEWINDER	96,427	96,427
006	JSOW	21,419	69,219
	Industrial Base Sustainment		[47,800]
007	STANDARD MISSILE	435,352	435,352
008	RAM	80,826	80,826
011	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	4,265	4,265
012	AERIAL TARGETS	40,792	40,792

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
013	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	3,335	3,335
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		
014	ESSM	44,440	44,440
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	54,462	54,462
016	HARM MODS	122,298	122,298
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
017	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	2,397	2,397
018	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	39,932	39,932
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
019	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	57,641	57,641
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP		
020	SSTD	7,380	7,380
021	MK–48 TORPEDO	65,611	65,611
022	ASW TARGETS	6,912	6,912
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP		
023	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS	113,219	113,219
024	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	63,317	63,317
025	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	13,254	13,254
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
026	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	67,701	67,701
027	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	3,699	3,699
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		
028	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	3,342	3,342
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS		
029	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	11,937	11,937
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS		
030	CIWS MODS	53,147	53,147
031	COAST GUARD WEAPONS	19,022	19,022
032	GUN MOUNT MODS	67,980	67,980
033	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	19,823	19,823
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
035	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	149,725	149,725
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**3,154,154**	**3,231,954**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		
	NAVY AMMUNITION		
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	101,238	101,238
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	67,289	67,289
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	20,340	20,340
004	PRACTICE BOMBS	40,365	40,365
005	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	49,377	49,377
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	59,651	59,651
007	JATOS	2,806	2,806
008	LRLAP 6″ LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE	11,596	11,596
009	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	35,994	35,994
010	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	36,715	36,715
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	45,483	45,483
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	52,080	52,080
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	10,809	10,809
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,469	4,469
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	46,848	46,848
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	350	350
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES	500	500
018	60MM, ALL TYPES	1,849	1,849
019	81MM, ALL TYPES	1,000	1,000
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	13,867	13,867
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	1,390	1,390
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	14,967	14,967
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	45,219	45,219
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES	29,335	29,335
027	NON LETHALS	3,868	3,868
028	AMMO MODERNIZATION	15,117	15,117
029	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	11,219	11,219
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	**723,741**	**723,741**
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		
	OTHER WARSHIPS		
001	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	1,634,701	1,634,701
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	874,658	874,658
003	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	3,346,370	3,346,370
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	1,993,740	1,993,740
005	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	678,274	678,274
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	14,951	14,951
007	DDG 1000	433,404	433,404
008	DDG–51	3,149,703	3,149,703
010	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	1,356,991	1,356,991
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		
012	LPD–17	550,000	550,000

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
013A	AFLOAT FORWARD STAGING BASE ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		97,000
	Procurement		[97,000]
014A	LX(R) ADVANCE PROCURMENT (CY)		250,000
	LX(R) Acceleration		[250,000]
015	LHA REPLACEMENT ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	277,543	277,543
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST		
017	TAO FLEET OILER	674,190	0
	Transfer to NDSF—Title XIV		[–674,190]
019	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	138,200	138,200
020	OUTFITTING	697,207	697,207
021	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR	255,630	255,630
022	SERVICE CRAFT	30,014	30,014
023	LCAC SLEP	80,738	80,738
024	YP CRAFT MAINTENANCE/ROH/SLEP	21,838	21,838
025	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	389,305	389,305
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	**16,597,457**	**16,270,267**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		
001	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE	4,881	4,881
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	5,814	5,814
003	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED)	32,906	32,906
	GENERATORS		
004	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E	36,860	36,860
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		
005	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	87,481	87,481
	PERISCOPES		
006	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	63,109	63,109
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		
007	DDG MOD	364,157	424,157
	Additional DDG Modification-Unfunded Requirement		[60,000]
008	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	16,089	16,089
009	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	2,255	2,255
010	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE	28,571	28,571
011	LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM	12,313	12,313
012	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	16,609	16,609
013	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,498	10,498
014	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	35,747	35,747
015	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	48,399	48,399
016	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	23,072	23,072
017	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	55,283	55,283
018	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	18,563	18,563
019	DSSP EQUIPMENT	7,376	7,376
021	LCAC	20,965	20,965
022	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	51,652	51,652
023	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	102,498	102,498
024	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	3,027	3,027
025	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	7,399	7,399
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT		
027	REACTOR COMPONENTS	296,095	296,095
	OCEAN ENGINEERING		
028	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	15,982	15,982
	SMALL BOATS		
029	STANDARD BOATS	29,982	29,982
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
030	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	66,538	66,538
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		
031	OPERATING FORCES IPE	71,138	71,138
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT		
032	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	132,625	132,625
033	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT	23,500	23,500
034	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES	85,151	85,151
035	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES	35,228	35,228
036	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	87,627	87,627
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT		
037	LSD MIDLIFE	2,774	2,774
	SHIP SONARS		
038	SPQ–9B RADAR	20,551	20,551
039	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	103,241	103,241
040	SSN ACOUSTICS	214,835	234,835
	Submarine Towed Array-Unfunded Requirement		[20,000]
041	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,331	7,331
042	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	11,781	11,781
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
044	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	21,119	21,119
045	SSTD	8,396	8,396
046	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	146,968	146,968
047	SURTASS	12,953	12,953
048	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNSAISANCE FORCE	13,725	13,725

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT		
049	AN/SLQ–32	324,726	352,726
	SEWIP Block II-Unfunded Requirement		[28,000]
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT		
050	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	148,221	148,221
051	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	152	152
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		
052	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	79,954	79,954
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
053	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	25,695	25,695
054	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	284	284
055	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	14,416	14,416
056	ATDLS	23,069	23,069
057	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	4,054	4,054
058	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	21,014	21,014
059	SHALLOW WATER MCM	18,077	18,077
060	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	12,359	12,359
061	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE	4,240	4,240
062	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	17,440	17,440
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
063	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	41,314	41,314
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
064	MATCALS	10,011	10,011
065	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,346	9,346
066	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	21,281	21,281
067	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	25,621	25,621
068	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	8,249	8,249
069	LANDING SYSTEMS	14,715	14,715
070	ID SYSTEMS	29,676	29,676
071	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	13,737	13,737
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
072	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL	1,314	1,314
074	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	13,600	13,600
075	DCGS-N	31,809	31,809
076	CANES	278,991	278,991
077	RADIAC	8,294	8,294
078	CANES-INTELL	28,695	28,695
079	GPETE	6,962	6,962
080	MASF	290	290
081	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	14,419	14,419
082	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	4,175	4,175
083	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	44,176	44,176
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS		
084	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	8,722	8,722
085	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	108,477	108,477
086	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	16,613	16,613
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS		
087	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT	20,691	20,691
088	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	60,945	60,945
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
089	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	30,892	30,892
090	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)	118,113	118,113
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		
091	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	4,591	4,591
092	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	1,403	1,403
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		
093	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	135,687	135,687
094	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM	970	970
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT		
095	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	11,433	11,433
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT		
096	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	2,529	2,529
	SONOBUOYS		
097	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES	168,763	168,763
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
098	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	46,979	46,979
100	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	123,884	127,384
	F–35 Visual/Optical Landing System Training Equipment Unfunded Requirement		[3,500]
103	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	15,090	15,090
104	DCRS/DPL	638	638
106	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	14,098	14,098
111	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	49,773	49,773
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT		
112	SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT	5,300	5,300
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		
115	SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	298,738	298,738
120	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	71,245	71,245
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
123	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	240,694	240,694

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
124	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	96,040	96,040
125	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	30,189	30,189
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
129	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	22,623	22,623
130	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,906	9,906
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE		
134	TRAINING DEVICE MODS	99,707	99,707
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
135	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	2,252	2,252
136	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	2,191	2,191
137	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	2,164	2,164
138	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	14,705	14,705
139	TACTICAL VEHICLES	2,497	2,497
140	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	12,517	12,517
141	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	3,018	3,018
142	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	14,403	14,403
143	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	1,186	1,186
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
144	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	18,805	18,805
145	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,469	10,469
146	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	5,720	5,720
147	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	211,714	211,714
	TRAINING DEVICES		
148	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,468	7,468
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
149	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	36,433	36,433
150	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,180	3,180
151	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,790	4,790
153	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,608	4,608
154	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,655	5,655
155	C4ISR EQUIPMENT	9,929	9,929
156	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	26,795	26,795
157	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	88,453	88,453
159	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	99,094	99,094
	OTHER		
160	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE SERVICE	99,014	99,014
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
160A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	21,439	21,439
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
161	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	328,043	328,043
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**6,614,715**	**6,726,215**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
001	AAV7A1 PIP	26,744	26,744
002	LAV PIP	54,879	54,879
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS		
003	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,652	2,652
004	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	7,482	7,482
005	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	17,181	17,181
006	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION	8,224	8,224
	OTHER SUPPORT		
007	MODIFICATION KITS	14,467	14,467
008	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	488	488
	GUIDED MISSILES		
009	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE	7,565	7,565
010	JAVELIN	1,091	78,591
	Program increase to support Unfunded Requirements		[77,500]
011	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW	4,872	4,872
012	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)	668	668
	OTHER SUPPORT		
013	MODIFICATION KITS	12,495	12,495
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS		
014	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	13,109	13,109
015	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C	35,147	35,147
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		
016	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	21,210	21,210
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)		
017	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	792	792
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)		
019	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	3,642	3,642
020	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	3,520	3,520
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
021	RADAR SYSTEMS	35,118	35,118
022	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	130,661	90,661
	Delay in IOTE		[–40,000]
023	RQ–21 UAS	84,916	84,916
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
024	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	9,136	9,136
025	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	29,936	29,936
028	DCGS-MC	1,947	1,947
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
031	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	2,018	2,018
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)		
032	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN)	67,295	67,295
033	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	43,101	43,101
034	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	29,255	29,255
035	RADIO SYSTEMS	80,584	80,584
036	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	66,123	66,123
037	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	79,486	79,486
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
037A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,803	2,803
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES		
038	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	3,538	3,538
039	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	22,806	22,806
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
041	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS	7,743	7,743
043	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	79,429	79,429
044	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS	3,157	3,157
	OTHER SUPPORT		
045	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	6,938	6,938
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		
046	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	94	94
047	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	896	896
048	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	136	136
049	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	10,792	10,792
050	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,235	3,235
051	EOD SYSTEMS	7,666	7,666
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
052	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	33,145	33,145
053	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)	1,419	1,419
	GENERAL PROPERTY		
057	TRAINING DEVICES	24,163	24,163
058	CONTAINER FAMILY	962	962
059	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	6,545	6,545
060	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)	7,533	7,533
	OTHER SUPPORT		
062	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,322	4,322
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
063	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	8,292	8,292
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**1,131,418**	**1,168,918**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	TACTICAL FORCES		
001	F–35	5,260,212	5,161,112
	Anticipated contract savings		*[–75,500]*
	Cost growth for support equipment		*[–23,600]*
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	460,260	460,260
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT		
003	KC–46A TANKER	2,350,601	2,326,601
	Program Decrease		*[–24,000]*
	OTHER AIRLIFT		
004	C–130J	889,154	962,154
	Unfunded Requirements		*[73,000]*
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	50,000	50,000
006	HC–130J	463,934	463,934
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	30,000	30,000
008	MC–130J	828,472	828,472
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	60,000	60,000
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT		
011	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	2,617	2,617
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
012	TARGET DRONES	132,028	132,028
014	RQ–4	37,800	37,800
015	MQ–9	552,528	552,528
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT		
017	B–2A	32,458	32,458
018	B–1B	114,119	114,119
019	B–52	148,987	148,987
020	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES	84,335	84,335
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT		
021	A–10		240,000
	A–10 restoration— wing replacement program		*[240,000]*
022	F–15	464,367	464,367
023	F–16	17,134	17,134
024	F–22A	126,152	126,152
025	F–35 MODIFICATIONS	70,167	70,167

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
026	INCREMENT 3.2B	69,325	69,325
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		
028	C–5	5,604	5,604
030	C–17A	46,997	46,997
031	C–21	10,162	10,162
032	C–32A	44,464	44,464
033	C–37A	10,861	861
	Program decrease		[–10,000]
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT		
034	GLIDER MODS	134	134
035	T–6	17,968	17,968
036	T–1	23,706	23,706
037	T–38	30,604	30,604
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
038	U–2 MODS	22,095	22,095
039	KC–10A (ATCA)	5,611	5,611
040	C–12	1,980	1,980
042	VC–25A MOD	98,231	98,231
043	C–40	13,171	13,171
044	C–130	7,048	80,248
	C–130 AMP increase		[10,000]
	Eight-Bladed Propeller		[30,000]
	T–56 3.5 Engine Mod		[33,200]
045	C–130J MODS	29,713	29,713
046	C–135	49,043	49,043
047	COMPASS CALL MODS	68,415	97,115
	EC–130H Force Structure Restoration		[28,700]
048	RC–135	156,165	156,165
049	E–3	13,178	13,178
050	E–4	23,937	23,937
051	E–8	18,001	18,001
052	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	183,308	183,308
053	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	44,163	34,163
	Program decrease		[–10,000]
054	H–1	6,291	6,291
055	UH–1N REPLACEMENT	2,456	2,456
056	H–60	45,731	45,731
057	RQ–4 MODS	50,022	50,022
058	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS	21,660	21,660
059	OTHER AIRCRAFT	117,767	117,767
060	MQ–1 MODS	3,173	3,173
061	MQ–9 MODS	115,226	115,226
063	CV–22 MODS	58,828	58,828
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
064	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	656,242	656,242
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
065	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP	33,716	33,716
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		
067	B–2A	38,837	38,837
068	B–52	5,911	5,911
069	C–17A	30,108	30,108
070	CV–22 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	3,353	3,353
071	C–135	4,490	4,490
072	F–15	3,225	3,225
073	F–16	14,969	33,669
	Additional Mission Trainers		[24,700]
	Unobligated balances		[–6,000]
074	F–22A	971	971
076	MQ–9	5,000	5,000
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		
077	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS	18,802	18,802
	WAR CONSUMABLES		
078	WAR CONSUMABLES	156,465	156,465
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		
079	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	1,052,814	1,052,814
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
079A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	42,503	42,503
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**15,657,769**	**15,948,269**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC		
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	94,040	94,040
	TACTICAL		
003	JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE	440,578	440,578
004	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	200,777	200,777
005	AMRAAM	390,112	390,112
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	423,016	423,016
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	133,697	133,697
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
008	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION	397	397
	CLASS IV		
009	MM III MODIFICATIONS	50,517	50,517
010	AGM–65D MAVERICK	9,639	9,639
011	AGM–88A HARM	197	197
012	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	25,019	25,019
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
014	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	48,523	48,523
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		
028	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	276,562	276,562
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
028A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	893,971	893,971
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**2,987,045**	**2,987,045**
	SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	SPACE PROGRAMS		
001	ADVANCED EHF	333,366	333,366
002	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)	53,476	79,476
	SATCOM Pathfinder		[26,000]
003	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	199,218	199,218
004	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	18,362	18,362
005	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	66,135	66,135
006	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	89,351	89,351
007	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH CAPABILITY	571,276	571,276
008	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	800,201	800,201
009	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	452,676	452,676
	TOTAL SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**2,584,061**	**2,610,061**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		
	ROCKETS		
001	ROCKETS	23,788	23,788
	CARTRIDGES		
002	CARTRIDGES	131,102	131,102
	BOMBS		
003	PRACTICE BOMBS	89,759	89,759
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	637,181	637,181
005	MASSIVE ORDNANCE PENETRATOR (MOP)	39,690	39,690
006	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	374,688	354,688
	Program reduction		[–20,000]
	OTHER ITEMS		
007	CAD/PAD	58,266	58,266
008	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)	5,612	5,612
009	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	103	103
010	MODIFICATIONS	1,102	1,102
011	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	3,044	3,044
	FLARES		
012	FLARES	120,935	120,935
	FUZES		
013	FUZES	213,476	213,476
	SMALL ARMS		
014	SMALL ARMS	60,097	60,097
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**1,758,843**	**1,738,843**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	8,834	8,834
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES		
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	58,160	58,160
003	CAP VEHICLES	977	977
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	12,483	12,483
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES		
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES	4,728	4,728
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,662	4,662
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES	10,419	10,419
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
008	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	23,320	23,320
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT		
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP	6,215	6,215
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	87,781	87,781
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)		
011	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	136,998	136,998
012	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	677	677
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS		
013	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	4,041	4,041
014	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT	22,573	22,573
015	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	14,456	14,456
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS		
016	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS	31,823	31,823

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
017	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	5,833	5,833
018	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED	1,687	1,687
019	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS	22,710	22,710
020	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	21,561	21,561
021	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	286,980	286,980
022	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	36,186	36,186
024	INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN)	9,597	9,597
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
025	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	27,403	27,403
026	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	7,212	7,212
027	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	11,062	11,062
028	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	131,269	131,269
029	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	33,606	33,606
030	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N	5,232	5,232
031	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	7,453	7,453
032	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM	3,976	3,976
033	GCSS-AF FOS	25,515	25,515
034	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE ACCOUNTING AND MGMT SYSTEM	9,255	9,255
035	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	7,523	7,523
036	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	12,043	12,043
037	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) 10.2	24,246	24,246
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS		
038	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	74,621	74,621
039	AFNET	103,748	103,748
041	JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT (JCSE)	5,199	5,199
042	USCENTCOM	15,780	15,780
	SPACE PROGRAMS		
043	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	79,592	64,592
	Program decrease		*[–15,000]*
044	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	90,190	90,190
045	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	2,029	2,029
046	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	5,095	5,095
047	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	76,673	76,673
048	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	113,275	113,275
049	MILSATCOM SPACE	35,495	35,495
050	SPACE MODS SPACE	23,435	23,435
051	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	43,065	43,065
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
052	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	77,538	111,438
	Battlefield Airmen Kits Unfunded Requirement		*[19,900]*
	Joint Terminal Control Training Simulation Unfunded Requirement		*[14,000]*
054	RADIO EQUIPMENT	8,400	8,400
055	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	6,144	6,144
056	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	77,010	77,010
	MODIFICATIONS		
057	COMM ELECT MODS	71,800	71,800
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP		
058	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	2,370	2,370
059	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	79,623	79,623
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ		
060	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	7,249	7,249
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
061	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	9,095	13,095
	Additional Equipment		*[4,000]*
062	ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT	17,866	17,866
064	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	61,850	61,850
065	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	30,477	30,477
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
067	DARP RC135	25,072	25,072
068	DCGS-AF	183,021	183,021
070	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	629,371	629,371
071	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	100,663	100,663
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
071A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	15,038,333	15,038,333
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
073	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	59,863	59,863
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**18,272,438**	**18,295,338**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA		
001	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,488	1,488
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA		
002	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	2,494	2,494
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA		
003	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	9,341	9,341
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA		
007	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	8,080	23,080
	SHARKSEER		*[15,000]*
008	TELEPORT PROGRAM	62,789	62,789

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
009	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,399	9,399
010	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	1,819	1,819
011	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK	141,298	141,298
012	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	12,732	12,732
013	WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY	64,098	64,098
014	SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE	617,910	617,910
015	JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT	84,400	84,400
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA		
016	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	5,644	5,644
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT		
017	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	11,208	11,208
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA		
018	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS	1,298	1,298
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS		
020	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	1,048	1,048
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY		
021	VEHICLES	100	100
022	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	5,474	5,474
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY		
023	THAAD	464,067	464,067
024	AEGIS BMD	558,916	679,361
	SM–3 Block IB		[117,880]
	SM–3 Block IB (Canisters)		[2,565]
025	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	147,765	0
	SM–3 Block IB		[–147,765]
026	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS	78,634	78,634
027	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III	30,587	30,587
028	IRON DOME	55,000	55,000
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA		
035	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	37,177	37,177
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		
036	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	46,939	46,939
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		
038	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	13,027	13,027
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		
040	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	27,859	27,859
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY		
028A	DAVID SLING		150,000
	David's Sling Weapon System Procurement—Subject to Title XVI		[150,000]
028B	ARROW 3		15,000
	Arrow 3 Upper Tier Procurement—Subject to Title XVI		[15,000]
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
040A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	617,757	617,757
	AVIATION PROGRAMS		
041	MC–12	63,170	63,170
042	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT	135,985	135,985
044	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	61,275	61,275
047	RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	20,087	20,087
048	CV–22 MODIFICATION	18,832	18,832
049	MQ–1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	1,934	1,934
050	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	11,726	26,926
	Medium Altitude Long Endurance Tactical (MALET) MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle		[15,200]
051	STUASL0	1,514	1,514
052	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE	204,105	204,105
053	AC/MC–130J	61,368	25,968
	MC–130 Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance Radar Program		[–35,400]
054	C–130 MODIFICATIONS	66,861	66,861
	SHIPBUILDING		
055	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	32,521	32,521
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS		
056	ORDNANCE ITEMS <$5M	174,734	174,734
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS		
057	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	93,009	93,009
058	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	14,964	14,964
059	OTHER ITEMS <$5M	79,149	79,149
060	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	33,362	33,362
061	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	143,533	143,533
062	TACTICAL VEHICLES	73,520	73,520
063	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <$5M	186,009	186,009
064	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	19,693	19,693
065	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,967	3,967
066	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	19,225	19,225
068	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	213,252	213,252
	CBDP		
074	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS	141,223	141,223
075	CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION	137,487	137,487
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**5,130,853**	**5,263,333**

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	99,701	0
	Program reduction		[–99,701]
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	**99,701**	**0**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**106,967,393**	**109,735,699**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	FIXED WING		
003	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	99,500	99,500
004	MQ–1 UAV	16,537	16,537
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
016	MQ–1 PAYLOAD (MIP)	8,700	8,700
023	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP)	32,000	32,000
031	RQ–7 UAV MODS	8,250	8,250
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**164,987**	**164,987**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM		
003	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	37,260	37,260
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**37,260**	**37,260**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		
016	MORTAR SYSTEMS	7,030	7,030
021	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	19,000	19,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**26,030**	**26,030**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION		
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	4,000	4,000
	MORTAR AMMUNITION		
008	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	11,700	11,700
009	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	4,000	4,000
010	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	7,000	7,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION		
012	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES	5,000	5,000
013	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	10,000	10,000
015	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	2,000	2,000
	ROCKETS		
017	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	136,340	136,340
	OTHER AMMUNITION		
019	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	4,000	4,000
021	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	8,000	8,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	**192,040**	**192,040**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	243,998	243,998
009	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	223,276	223,276
011	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	130,000	130,000
012	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS	393,100	393,100
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
021	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS	5,724	5,724
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS		
051	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM	29,500	29,500
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)		
057	DCGS-A (MIP)	54,140	54,140
059	TROJAN (MIP)	6,542	6,542
061	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)	3,860	3,860
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)		
068	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE	14,847	14,847
069	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	19,535	19,535
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)		
084	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	2,601	2,601
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS		
087	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	48	48
094	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	252	252
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION		

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
101	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	652	652
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT		
111	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	4,035	4,035
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
131	FORCE PROVIDER	53,800	53,800
133	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	700	700
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
159	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	10,486	10,486
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
169	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	8,500	8,500
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**1,205,596**	**1,205,596**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		
	NETWORK ATTACK		
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK	219,550	219,550
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT		
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE	77,600	77,600
	FORCE TRAINING		
003	TRAIN THE FORCE	7,850	7,850
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE		
004	OPERATIONS	188,271	137,571
	Program Reduction		[–50,700]
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND	**493,271**	**442,571**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
026	STUASL0 UAV	55,000	55,000
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
030	AV–8 SERIES	41,365	41,365
032	F–18 SERIES	8,000	8,000
037	EP–3 SERIES	6,300	6,300
047	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	14,198	14,198
051	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	72,700	72,700
052	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	13,988	13,988
059	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	4,900	4,900
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES		
065	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	943	943
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**217,394**	**217,394**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	TACTICAL MISSILES		
010	LASER MAVERICK	3,344	3,344
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**3,344**	**3,344**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		
	NAVY AMMUNITION		
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	9,715	9,715
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	11,108	11,108
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	3,603	3,603
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	11,982	11,982
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	4,674	4,674
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	3,456	3,456
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	1,989	1,989
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,674	4,674
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	10,719	10,719
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	3,993	3,993
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	67,200	67,200
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	518	518
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES	3,299	3,299
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	**136,930**	**136,930**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
135	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	186	186
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
160A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,000	12,000
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**12,186**	**12,186**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
	GUIDED MISSILES		
010	JAVELIN	7,679	7,679
	OTHER SUPPORT		
013	MODIFICATION KITS	10,311	10,311
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS		
014	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	8,221	8,221
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)		
018	MODIFICATION KITS	3,600	3,600
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)		

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
019	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	8,693	8,693
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
027	RQ–11 UAV	3,430	3,430
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
052	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	7,000	7,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**48,934**	**48,934**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
015	MQ–9	13,500	13,500
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
044	C–130	1,410	1,410
056	H–60	39,300	39,300
058	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS	5,690	5,690
061	MQ–9 MODS	69,000	69,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**128,900**	**128,900**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	TACTICAL		
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	280,902	280,902
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	2,520	2,520
	CLASS IV		
010	AGM–65D MAVERICK	5,720	5,720
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**289,142**	**289,142**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		
	CARTRIDGES		
002	CARTRIDGES	8,371	8,371
	BOMBS		
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	17,031	17,031
006	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	184,412	184,412
	FLARES		
012	FLARES	11,064	11,064
	FUZES		
013	FUZES	7,996	7,996
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**228,874**	**228,874**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
025	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	3,953	3,953
027	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	2,000	2,000
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS		
042	USCENTCOM	10,000	10,000
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
052	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	4,065	4,065
056	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	15,400	15,400
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP		
058	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	3,580	3,580
059	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	3,407	3,407
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
062	ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT	46,790	46,790
064	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	400	400
065	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,800	9,800
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
071	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	28,070	28,070
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
071A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,732,499	3,732,499
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**3,859,964**	**3,859,964**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA		
008	TELEPORT PROGRAM	1,940	1,940
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
040A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	35,482	35,482
	AVIATION PROGRAMS		
041	MC–12	5,000	5,000
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS		
056	ORDNANCE ITEMS <$5M	35,299	35,299
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS		
061	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	15,160	15,160
063	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <$5M	15,000	15,000
068	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	104,537	104,537
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**212,418**	**212,418**
	NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT		
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
007	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		250,000
	NGREA Program Increase		[250,000]
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT		**250,000**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**7,257,270**	**7,456,570**

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
001	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	13,018	13,018
002	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	239,118	239,118
003	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	72,603	72,603
004	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	100,340	100,340
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**425,079**	**425,079**
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
005	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	28,314	28,314
006	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	38,374	38,374
007	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	6,879	6,879
008	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	56,884	56,884
009	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	19,243	19,243
010	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	45,053	53,053
		A2/AD Anti-Ship Missile Study		[8,000]
011	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	29,428	29,428
012	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	27,862	27,862
013	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	68,839	68,839
014	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	92,801	92,801
015	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,866	3,866
016	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,487	5,487
017	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	48,340	48,340
018	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	55,301	55,301
019	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	33,807	33,807
020	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	25,068	25,068
021	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	23,681	23,681
022	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	20,850	20,850
023	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	36,160	36,160
024	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	12,656	12,656
025	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	63,409	63,409
026	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	24,735	19,735
		Program decrease		[–5,000]
027	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	35,795	35,795
028	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	76,853	76,853
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**879,685**	**882,685**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
029	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	46,973	46,973
030	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	69,584	69,584
031	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	89,736	89,736
032	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,663	57,663
033	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	113,071	113,071
034	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,554	5,554
035	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	12,636	12,636
037	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	7,502	7,502
038	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	17,425	17,425
039	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	11,912	11,912
040	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	27,520	27,520
041	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	2,381	2,381
042	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,431	2,431
043	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	26,874	26,874
044	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	49,449	49,449
045	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	10,999	10,999
046	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	177,159	177,159
047	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,993	13,993
048	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,105	5,105
049	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	40,929	40,929
050	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	10,727	10,727
051	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,145	20,145
052	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	38,163	38,163
053	0603794A	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,816	37,816
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**895,747**	**895,747**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
054	0603305A	ARMY MISSLE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	10,347	10,347
055	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	25,061	25,061
056	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV	49,636	49,636
057	0603627A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	13,426	13,426
058	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	46,749	46,749
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	6,258	6,258
061	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	13,472	13,472
062	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	7,292	7,292
063	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	8,813	8,813
065	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	294	294
067	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	21,233	21,233
068	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	31,962	31,962
069	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	22,194	22,194
071	0604100A	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	9,805	9,805
072	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	40,917	40,917
073	0604120A	ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT)	30,058	30,058
074	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2–INTERCEPT (IFPC2)	155,361	155,361
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**492,878**	**492,878**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
076	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	12,939	12,939
078	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	18,843	18,843
079	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	9,861	9,861
080	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	8,763	8,763
081	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	4,309	4,309
082	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	15,138	15,138
083	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	74,128	80,628
		Army requested realignment		[1,500]
		Soldier Enhancement Program		[5,000]
085	0604611A	JAVELIN	3,945	3,945
087	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	10,076	10,076
088	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	40,374	40,374
089	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	67,582	67,582
090	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	1,763	1,763
091	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	27,155	27,155
092	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	24,569	24,569
093	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	23,364	23,364
094	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	8,960	8,960
095	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	9,138	9,138
096	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	21,622	21,622
097	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	99,242	99,242
098	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	21,379	21,379
099	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	48,339	48,339
100	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	2,726	2,726
101	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	45,412	45,412
102	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	55,215	55,215
104	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	163,643	163,643
105	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	12,309	12,309
106	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	15,700	15,700
107	0604823A	FIREFINDER	6,243	6,243
108	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	18,776	18,776
109	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	1,953	1,953
110	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	67,358	67,358
111	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	136,011	136,011
112	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV)	230,210	230,210
113	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	13,357	13,357
114	0605031A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN)	18,055	18,055
115	0605032A	TRACTOR TIRE	5,677	5,677
116	0605035A	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM)	77,570	101,570
		Apache Survivability Enhancements—Army Unfunded Requirement		[24,000]
117	0605051A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT	18,112	93,112
		Apache Survivability Enhancements—Army Unfunded Requirement		[60,000]
		Concept development by the Army of a CPGS option		[15,000]
118	0605350A	WIN-T INCREMENT 3—FULL NETWORKING	39,700	39,700
119	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)	12,987	12,987
120	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	88,866	68,866
		EMD contract delays		[–20,000]
121	0605456A	PAC–3/MSE MISSILE	2,272	2,272
122	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	214,099	214,099
123	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	49,247	39,247
		Funding ahead of need		[–10,000]
124	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	2	2
125	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP)	10,599	10,599
126	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH.	32,486	32,486
127	0605830A	AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	8,880	8,880
128	0210609A	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	152,288	152,288
129	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	5,022	5,022

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
130	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	12,686	12,686
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**2,068,950**	**2,144,450**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
131	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	20,035	20,035
132	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,684	16,684
133	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	62,580	62,580
134	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,853	20,853
135	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	205,145	205,145
136	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	19,430	19,430
138	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	277,646	277,646
139	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	51,550	51,550
140	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	33,246	33,246
141	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,760	4,760
142	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	8,303	8,303
143	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	20,403	20,403
144	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	10,396	10,396
145	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	49,337	49,337
146	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	52,694	52,694
147	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	938	938
148	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	60,319	60,319
149	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	28,478	28,478
150	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	32,604	24,604
		Program reduction		[–8,000]
151	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	3,186	3,186
152	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	48,955	48,955
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,027,542**	**1,019,542**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
154	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	18,397	18,397
155	0603813A	TRACTOR PULL	9,461	9,461
156	0607131A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	4,945	4,945
157	0607133A	TRACTOR SMOKE	7,569	7,569
158	0607135A	APACHE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	69,862	69,862
159	0607136A	BLACKHAWK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	66,653	66,653
160	0607137A	CHINOOK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	37,407	37,407
161	0607138A	FIXED WING PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,151	1,151
162	0607139A	IMPROVED TURBINE ENGINE PROGRAM	51,164	51,164
163	0607140A	EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FROM NIE	2,481	2,481
164	0607141A	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION	1,673	1,673
166	0607665A	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS	13,237	13,237
167	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	105,816	105,816
169	0202429A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT—COCOM EXERCISE	40,565	40,565
171	0203728A	JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOCS)	35,719	35,719
172	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	257,167	292,167
		Stryker Lethality Upgrades		[35,000]
173	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	15,445	15,445
175	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	364	364
176	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	4,361	4,361
177	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	3,154	3,154
178	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	35,951	35,951
179	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	34,686	34,686
180	0205402A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV	10,750	10,750
181	0205410A	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	402	402
183	0205456A	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM	64,159	64,159
184	0205778A	GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS)	17,527	17,527
185	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	20,515	20,515
187	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	12,368	12,368
188	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	31,154	31,154
189	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	12,274	12,274
190	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	9,355	9,355
191	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	7,053	7,053
193	0305179A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	750	750
194	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	13,225	13,225
195	0305206A	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	22,870	22,870
196	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	25,592	25,592
199	0305233A	RQ–7 UAV	7,297	7,297
201	0310349A	WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING	3,800	3,800
202	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	48,442	48,442
202A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,536	4,536
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,129,297**	**1,164,297**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**6,919,178**	**7,024,678**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
001	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	116,196	134,196
		Defense University Research Instumentation Program increase		[18,000]
002	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	19,126	19,126

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
003	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	451,606	451,606
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**586,928**	**604,928**
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
004	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	68,723	68,723
005	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	154,963	154,963
006	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	49,001	49,001
007	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	42,551	42,551
008	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	45,056	45,056
009	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	115,051	115,051
010	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	42,252	62,252
		Service Life Extension for the AGOR Ship		[20,000]
011	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,119	6,119
012	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	123,750	123,750
013	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	179,686	179,686
014	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	37,418	37,418
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**864,570**	**884,570**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
015	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,093	37,093
016	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	38,044	38,044
017	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	34,899	34,899
018	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	137,562	137,562
019	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,745	12,745
020	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	258,860	248,860
		Program decrease		[–10,000]
021	0603680N	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	57,074	57,074
022	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,807	4,807
023	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,748	13,748
024	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	66,041	66,041
025	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	1,991	1,991
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**662,864**	**652,864**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
026	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	41,832	41,832
027	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	5,404	5,404
028	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	3,086	3,086
029	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	11,643	11,643
030	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	5,555	5,555
031	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	3,087	3,087
032	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,636	1,636
033	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	118,588	118,588
034	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	77,385	77,385
035	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,348	8,348
036	0603525N	PILOT FISH	123,246	123,246
037	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	28,819	28,819
038	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	112,678	112,678
039	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	710	710
040	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	1,096	1,096
041	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	87,160	135,160
		Program increase		[48,000]
042	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	10,371	10,371
043	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	11,888	11,888
044	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	4,332	4,332
045	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	482,040	62,740
		Transfer to National Sea-Based Deterrance Fund		[–419,300]
046	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	25,904	25,904
047	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	511,802	511,802
048	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	118,416	118,416
049	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	35,901	35,901
050	0603595N	OHIO REPLACEMENT	971,393	0
		Transfer to National Sea-Based Deterrance Fund-OR Development		[–971,393]
051	0603596N	LCS MISSION MODULES	206,149	206,149
052	0603597N	AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST (ATRT)	8,000	8,000
053	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	7,678	7,678
054	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	219,082	219,082
055	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	623	623
056	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	18,260	18,260
057	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	76,247	76,247
058	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,520	4,520
059	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	20,711	20,711
060	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	47,761	47,761
061	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	5,226	5,226
062	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	182,771	182,771
063	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,866	3,866
064	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	360,065	360,065
065	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	237,416	237,416
066	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	37,944	37,944
067	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	47,312	47,312

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
068	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	17,408	17,408
069	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,359	9,359
070	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	887	10,887
		5–Inch Guided Projectile Technology		[10,000]
071	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	29,448	29,448
072	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	91,479	91,479
073	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	67,360	67,360
074	0604112N	GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80)	48,105	48,105
075	0604122N	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	20,089	20,089
076	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	18,969	18,969
077	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	7,874	7,874
078	0604292N	MH-XX	5,298	5,298
079	0604454N	LX (R)	46,486	75,486
		LX(R) Acceleration		[29,000]
080	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	3,817	3,817
081	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	9,595	9,595
082	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	29,581	29,581
083	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	285,849	285,849
084	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH.	36,656	36,656
085	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	9,835	9,835
086	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	580	580
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**5,024,626**	**3,720,933**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
087	0603208N	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	21,708	21,708
088	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	11,101	11,101
089	0604214N	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	39,878	39,878
090	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	53,059	53,059
091	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	21,358	21,358
092	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	4,515	4,515
093	0604221N	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,514	1,514
094	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	5,875	5,875
095	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	81,553	81,553
096	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	272,149	272,149
097	0604245N	H–1 UPGRADES	27,235	52,235
		UH–1Y/AH–1Z Readiness Improvement Unfunded Requirement		[25,000]
098	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	35,763	35,763
099	0604262N	V–22A	87,918	87,918
100	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	12,679	12,679
101	0604269N	EA–18	56,921	56,921
102	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	23,685	23,685
103	0604273N	EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	507,093	507,093
104	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	411,767	411,767
105	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	25,071	25,071
106	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	443,433	443,433
107	0604311N	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	747	747
108	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	97,002	97,002
109	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	129,649	129,649
110	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	11,647	11,647
111	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION	2,778	2,778
112	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	23,695	23,695
113	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM.	134,708	134,708
114	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	43,914	43,914
115	0604503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	109,908	109,908
116	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	57,928	57,928
117	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	120,217	135,217
		Concept development		[15,000]
118	0604522N	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM	241,754	241,754
119	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	122,556	122,556
120	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	48,213	60,213
		Program increase		[12,000]
121	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	49,712	49,712
122	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	4,096	4,096
123	0604580N	VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM)	167,719	167,719
124	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	15,122	15,122
125	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	33,738	33,738
126	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,123	8,123
127	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	7,686	7,686
128	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	405	405
129	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	153,836	153,836
130	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	99,619	99,619
131	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	116,798	116,798
132	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	4,353	4,353
133	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	9,443	9,443
134	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	32,469	32,469
135	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	537,901	537,901
136	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	504,736	504,736

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
137	0604810M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—MARINE CORPS	59,265	46,765
		Program delay		[–12,500]
138	0604810N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—NAVY	47,579	35,079
		Program delay		[–12,500]
139	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	5,914	5,914
140	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	89,711	89,711
141	0605212N	CH–53K RDTE	632,092	632,092
142	0605220N	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC)	7,778	7,778
143	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	25,898	25,898
144	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	247,929	247,929
145	0204202N	DDG–1000	103,199	103,199
146	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	998	998
147	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	17,785	17,785
148	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	35,905	35,905
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**6,308,800**	**6,335,800**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
149	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	30,769	30,769
150	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	112,606	112,606
151	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	61,234	61,234
152	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	6,995	6,995
153	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	4,011	4,011
154	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	48,563	48,563
155	0605285N	NEXT GENERATION FIGHTER	5,000	5,000
157	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	925	925
158	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	78,143	78,143
159	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,258	3,258
160	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	76,948	76,948
161	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	132,122	132,122
162	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	351,912	351,912
163	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	17,985	17,985
164	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	5,316	5,316
165	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	6,519	6,519
166	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	13,649	13,649
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**955,955**	**955,955**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
174	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	107,039	107,039
175	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	46,506	46,506
176	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	3,900	3,900
177	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	16,569	16,569
178	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	18,632	18,632
179	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	133,265	133,265
181	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	62,867	62,867
182	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	36,045	36,045
183	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	25,228	25,228
184	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	54,218	54,218
185	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	11,335	11,335
186	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	80,129	80,129
187	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	39,087	54,087
		Anti-Submarine Warfare Underwater Range Instrumentation Upgrade		[15,000]
188	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,915	1,915
189	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	46,609	46,609
190	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	52,708	52,708
191	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	149,997	149,997
192	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	24,460	24,460
193	0205632N	MK–48 ADCAP	42,206	42,206
194	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	117,759	117,759
195	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	101,323	101,323
196	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	67,763	67,763
197	0206335M	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S)	13,431	13,431
198	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	56,769	56,769
199	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	20,729	20,729
200	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	13,152	13,152
201	0206629M	AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT VEHICLE	48,535	48,535
202	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	76,016	76,016
203	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	32,172	32,172
208	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	53,239	53,239
209	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	21,677	21,677
210	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	28,102	28,102
211	0303150M	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	294	294
213	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	599	599
214	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	6,207	6,207
215	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,550	8,550
216	0305205N	UAS INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	41,831	41,831
217	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	1,105	1,105
218	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	33,149	33,149
219	0305220N	RQ–4 UAV	227,188	227,188
220	0305231N	MQ–8 UAV	52,770	52,770

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
221	0305232M	RQ–11 UAV	635	635
222	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	688	688
223	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	4,647	4,647
224	0305239M	RQ–21A	6,435	6,435
225	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	49,145	49,145
226	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP)	9,246	9,246
227	0305421N	RQ–4 MODERNIZATION	150,854	150,854
228	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	4,757	4,757
229	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	24,185	24,185
231	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	4,321	4,321
231A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,252,185	1,252,185
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**3,482,173**	**3,497,173**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**17,885,916**	**16,652,223**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
001	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	329,721	329,721
002	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	141,754	141,754
003	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,778	13,778
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**485,253**	**485,253**
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
004	0602102F	MATERIALS	125,234	125,234
005	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	123,438	123,438
006	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	100,530	90,530
		Program decrease		[–10,000]
007	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	182,326	177,326
		Program decrease		[–5,000]
008	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	147,291	147,291
009	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	116,122	116,122
010	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	99,851	99,851
011	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	115,604	115,604
012	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	164,909	164,909
013	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	42,037	42,037
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,217,342**	**1,202,342**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
014	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	37,665	47,665
		Metals Affordability Initiative		[10,000]
015	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	18,378	18,378
016	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	42,183	42,183
017	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	100,733	100,733
018	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	168,821	168,821
019	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	47,032	47,032
020	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	54,897	54,897
021	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	12,853	12,853
022	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	25,448	25,448
023	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	48,536	48,536
024	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	30,195	30,195
025	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	42,630	52,630
		Maturation of advanced manufacturing for low-cost sustainment		[10,000]
026	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	46,414	46,414
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**675,785**	**695,785**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
027	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,032	5,032
029	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	4,070	4,070
030	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	21,790	21,790
031	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,736	4,736
033	0603830F	SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM	30,771	30,771
034	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	39,765	39,765
036	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	1,246,228	786,228
		Program decrease		[–460,000]
037	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	3,512	13,512
		Technology transfer program increase		[10,000]
038	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	54,637	54,637
040	0604422F	WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON	76,108	56,108
		Unjustified increase and analysis of alternatives		[–20,000]
044	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	6,457	20,457
		SSA, Weather, or Launch Activities		[14,000]
045	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	246,514	246,514
046	0605230F	GROUND BASED STRATEGIC DETERRENT	75,166	75,166
049	0207110F	NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE	8,830	3,930
		Program reduction		[–4,900]
050	0207455F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR)	14,939	14,939
051	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	142,288	142,288
052	0306250F	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	81,732	81,732
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**2,062,575**	**1,601,675**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
055	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	929	929
056	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	60,256	60,256
057	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	5,973	5,973
058	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	32,624	32,624
059	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	24,208	24,208
060	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	32,374	32,374
061	0604426F	SPACE FENCE	243,909	243,909
062	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	8,358	8,358
063	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	292,235	302,235
		Exploitation of SBIRS		[10,000]
064	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	40,154	40,154
065	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,506	2,506
066	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	57,678	57,678
067	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	8,187	8,187
068	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	15,795	15,795
069	0604800F	F–35—EMD	589,441	589,441
071	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	84,438	184,438
		EELV Program—Launch Vehicle Development		[–84,438]
		EELV Program—Rocket Propulsion System Development		[184,438]
072	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	36,643	36,643
073	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	142,551	142,551
074	0605213F	F–22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	140,640	140,640
075	0605214F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	3,598	3,598
076	0605221F	KC–46	602,364	402,364
		Program decrease		[–200,000]
077	0605223F	ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING	11,395	11,395
078	0605229F	CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION	156,085	156,085
080	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	228,230	228,230
081	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	72,084	72,084
082	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	56,343	52,343
		Excess to need		[–4,000]
083	0605458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RDT&E	47,629	47,629
084	0605931F	B–2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	271,961	271,961
085	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	212,121	212,121
086	0207171F	F–15 EPAWSS	186,481	186,481
087	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	18,082	18,082
088	0305176F	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	993	993
089	0307581F	NEXTGEN JSTARS	44,343	44,343
091	0401319F	PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT (PAR)	102,620	102,620
092	0701212F	AUTOMATED TEST SYSTEMS	14,563	14,563
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**3,847,791**	**3,753,791**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
093	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	23,844	23,844
094	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	68,302	73,302
		Airborne Sensor Data Correlation Project		[5,000]
095	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	34,918	34,918
097	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	10,476	10,476
098	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	673,908	673,908
099	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	21,858	21,858
100	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	28,228	28,228
101	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	40,518	40,518
102	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,895	27,895
103	0606017F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	16,507	16,507
104	0606116F	SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT	18,997	18,997
106	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	185,305	185,305
107	0308602F	ENTEPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS)	4,841	4,841
108	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	15,357	15,357
109	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,315	1,315
111	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	2,315	2,315
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,174,584**	**1,179,584**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
112	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	350,232	350,232
113	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	10,465	10,465
114	0604445F	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	24,577	24,577
117	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	69,694	69,694
118	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	26,718	26,718
119	0605278F	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	10,807	10,807
121	0101113F	B–52 SQUADRONS	74,520	74,520
122	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	451	451
123	0101126F	B–1B SQUADRONS	2,245	2,245
124	0101127F	B–2 SQUADRONS	108,183	108,183
125	0101213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	178,929	178,929
126	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	28,481	28,481
127	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	87	87
128	0101316F	WORLDWIDE JOINT STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	5,315	5,315

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
131	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES	8,090	8,090
132	0205219F	MQ–9 UAV	123,439	123,439
134	0207131F	A–10 SQUADRONS		16,200
		A–10 restoration: operational flight program development		[16,200]
135	0207133F	F–16 SQUADRONS	148,297	188,297
		AESA Radar Integration		[50,000]
		Unobligated balances		[–10,000]
136	0207134F	F–15E SQUADRONS	179,283	169,283
		Duplicative effort with the Navy		[–10,000]
137	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,860	14,860
138	0207138F	F–22A SQUADRONS	262,552	262,552
139	0207142F	F–35 SQUADRONS	115,395	90,395
		Program delay		[–25,000]
140	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	43,360	43,360
141	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	46,160	46,160
143	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	412	412
144	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	657	657
145	0207247F	AF TENCAP	31,428	31,428
146	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,105	1,105
147	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	14,249	14,249
148	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	103,942	103,942
149	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	12,793	12,793
150	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	21,193	21,193
151	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	559	559
152	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	161,812	161,812
153	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	6,001	6,001
155	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	7,793	7,793
156	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	12,465	12,465
157	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,681	1,681
159	0207452F	DCAPES	16,796	16,796
161	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	21,564	21,564
162	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	24,994	24,994
163	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	6,035	6,035
164	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	4,358	4,358
165	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	55,835	55,835
167	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	12,874	12,874
168	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	7,681	7,681
171	0301017F	GLOBAL SENSOR INTEGRATED ON NETWORK (GSIN)	5,974	5,974
177	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	13,815	13,815
178	0302015F	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	80,360	80,360
179	0303001F	FAMILY OF ADVANCED BLOS TERMINALS (FAB-T)	3,907	3,907
180	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	75,062	75,062
181	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	46,599	46,599
183	0303142F	GLOBAL FORCE MANAGEMENT—DATA INITIATIVE	2,470	2,470
186	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	112,775	112,775
189	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,235	4,235
192	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	7,879	5,879
		Unjustified increase in systems engineering		[–2,000]
193	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	29,955	29,955
194	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	21,485	21,485
195	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	2,515	2,515
198	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	472	472
199	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	12,137	12,137
200	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	361	361
203	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,162	3,162
204	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,543	1,543
205	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	7,860	7,860
206	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	6,902	6,902
207	0305202F	DRAGON U–2	34,471	34,471
209	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	50,154	60,154
		Wide Area Surveillance Capability		[10,000]
210	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,245	13,245
211	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	22,784	22,784
212	0305219F	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	716	716
213	0305220F	RQ–4 UAV	208,053	208,053
214	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	21,587	21,587
215	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK EXECUTIVE AGENT (CDL EA)	43,986	43,986
216	0305238F	NATO AGS	197,486	197,486
217	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	28,434	28,434
218	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	180,902	180,902
220	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	81,911	81,911
221	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	3,149	3,149
222	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	14,447	14,447
223	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	20,077	20,077
225	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	853	853
226	0401115F	C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	33,962	33,962
227	0401119F	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	42,864	42,864
228	0401130F	C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	54,807	54,807
229	0401132F	C–130J PROGRAM	31,010	31,010

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
230	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	6,802	6,802
231	0401219F	KC–10S	1,799	1,799
232	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	48,453	48,453
233	0401318F	CV–22	36,576	36,576
235	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	7,963	7,963
236	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,525	1,525
237	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	112,676	112,676
238	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	12,657	12,657
239	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	1,836	1,836
240	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	121	121
241	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	5,911	5,911
242	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	3,604	3,604
243	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	4,598	4,598
244	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	1,103	1,103
246	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	101,840	101,840
246A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,780,142	12,780,142
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**17,010,339**	**17,039,539**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**26,473,669**	**25,957,969**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
001	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	38,436	38,436
002	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	333,119	333,119
003	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	42,022	42,022
004	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	56,544	56,544
005	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	49,453	59,453
		STEM program increase		[10,000]
006	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS	25,834	35,834
		Program increase		[10,000]
007	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	46,261	46,261
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**591,669**	**611,669**
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
008	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	19,352	19,352
009	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	114,262	114,262
010	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,026	51,026
011	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	48,226	48,226
012	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	356,358	356,358
014	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	29,265	29,265
015	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	208,111	208,111
016	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	13,727	13,727
018	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	314,582	314,582
019	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	220,115	195,115
		Program decrease		[–25,000]
020	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	174,798	174,798
021	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	155,415	155,415
022	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH	8,824	8,824
023	1160401BB	SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	37,517	37,517
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,751,578**	**1,726,578**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
024	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,915	25,915
026	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	71,171	136,171
		Anti-Tunneling Defense System		[40,000]
		Increase for Combating Terrorism Technology Activities		[25,000]
027	0603133D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	21,782	21,782
028	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	290,654	290,654
030	0603176C	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	12,139	12,139
031	0603177C	DISCRIMINATION SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	28,200	28,200
032	0603178C	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	45,389	3,131
		High Power Directed Energy—Missile Destruct		[–30,291]
		Move to support Multiple Object Kill Vehicle		[–11,967]
033	0603179C	ADVANCED C4ISR	9,876	9,876
034	0603180C	ADVANCED RESEARCH	17,364	17,364
035	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	18,802	18,802
036	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	2,679	2,679
037	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	64,708	64,708
038	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	185,043	185,043
039	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	126,692	126,692
040	0603288D8Z	ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS	14,645	14,645
041	0603289D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS	59,830	49,830
		Program decrease		[–10,000]
042	0603294C	COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	46,753	2,195
		MOKV Concept Development		[–44,558]
043	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	140,094	140,094
044	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	118,666	108,666
		Program decrease		[–10,000]
045	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	43,966	30,466

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
		Program decrease		*[–13,500]*
046	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	141,540	129,540
		Program decrease		*[–12,000]*
047	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	6,980	6,980
050	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	157,056	142,056
		Unjustified growth		*[–15,000]*
051	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	33,515	43,515
		Efforts to counter-ISIL and Russian aggression		*[10,000]*
052	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	16,543	16,543
053	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	29,888	29,888
054	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	65,836	65,836
055	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	79,037	99,037
		Trusted Source Implementation for Field Programmable Gate Arrays Study		*[20,000]*
056	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	9,626	9,626
057	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	79,021	79,021
058	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	201,335	201,335
059	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	452,861	427,861
		Excessive program growth		*[–25,000]*
060	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	257,127	257,127
061	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,771	10,771
062	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	15,202	15,202
063	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	90,500	70,500
		Unjustified growth		*[–20,000]*
066	0603833D8Z	ENGINEERING SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	18,377	18,377
067	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	82,589	82,589
068	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	37,420	37,420
069	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	42,488	42,488
070	1160402BB	SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	57,741	57,741
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**3,229,821**	**3,132,505**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES		
071	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	31,710	31,710
073	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	90,567	90,567
074	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM	15,900	19,900
		Advanced Sensors Application Program		*[4,000]*
075	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	52,758	52,758
076	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	228,021	228,021
077	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,284,891	1,284,891
077A	0603XXXX	MULTIPLE-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE		86,525
		Adding from Weapons Technology Line		*[11,967]*
		Establish MOKV Program of Record		*[74,558]*
078	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	172,754	172,754
079	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	233,588	233,588
080	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	409,088	409,088
080A	0603XXXC	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY—HIGH POWER DE		30,291
		High Power Directed Energy—Missile Destruct		*[30,291]*
081	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	400,387	400,387
082	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	843,355	870,675
		Undifferentiated Block IB costs		*[27,320]*
083	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	31,632	31,632
084	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	23,289	23,289
085	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI.	450,085	450,085
086	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	49,570	49,570
087	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	49,211	49,211
088	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	9,583	9,583
089	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	72,866	72,866
090	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	102,795	267,595
		Arrow 3		*[19,500]*
		Arrow System Improvement Program		*[45,500]*
		David's Sling		*[99,800]*
091	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	274,323	274,323
092	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	513,256	513,256
092A	0603XXXC	INF RESPONSE OPTION DEVELOPMENT		25,000
		Program increase		*[25,000]*
093	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	10,129	10,129
094	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	10,350	10,350
095	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	1,518	6,518
		Corrosion		*[5,000]*
096	0604115C	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	96,300	96,300
097	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	469,798	469,798
098	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT.	3,129	3,129
103	0604826J	JOINT C5 CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT, INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY ASSESSMENTS.	25,200	25,200
105	0604873C	LONG RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR (LRDR)	137,564	137,564
106	0604874C	IMPROVED HOMELAND DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS	278,944	278,944
107	0604876C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT TEST	26,225	26,225
108	0604878C	AEGIS BMD TEST	55,148	55,148

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
109	0604879C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR TEST	86,764	86,764
110	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	34,970	34,970
111	0604881C	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	172,645	172,645
112	0604887C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE SEGMENT TEST	64,618	64,618
114	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	2,660	2,660
115	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	963	963
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES	**6,816,554**	**7,159,490**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION		
116	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	8,800	8,800
117	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	78,817	78,817
118	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	303,647	303,647
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	23,424	23,424
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	14,285	14,285
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	7,156	7,156
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,542	12,542
123	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	191	191
124	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	3,273	3,273
125	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	5,962	5,962
126	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	13,412	13,412
127	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	2,223	2,223
128	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INTIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM	31,660	31,660
129	0605090S	DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS)	13,085	13,085
130	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	7,209	7,209
131	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	15,158	15,158
132	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	4,414	4,414
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	**545,258**	**545,258**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
133	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	5,581	5,581
134	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	3,081	3,081
135	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	229,125	229,125
136	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	28,674	21,674
		Program decrease		[–7,000]
138	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	45,235	45,235
139	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	24,936	24,936
141	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	35,471	35,471
144	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	37,655	37,655
145	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	3,015	3,015
146	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	5,287	5,287
147	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	5,289	5,289
148	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	2,120	2,120
149	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	102,264	102,264
158	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.	2,169	2,169
159	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	13,960	13,960
160	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	51,775	51,775
161	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	9,533	9,533
162	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	17,371	21,371
		Program increase		[4,000]
163	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	71,571	71,571
164	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,123	4,123
165	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	1,946	1,946
166	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	7,673	7,673
169	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	10,413	10,413
170	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	971	971
171	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE	6,579	6,579
173	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)—MHA	43,811	43,811
174	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	35,871	35,871
176	0903230D8W	WHS—MISSION OPERATIONS SUPPORT - IT	1,072	1,072
177A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	49,500	49,500
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**856,071**	**853,071**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT		
178	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	7,929	7,929
179	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA.	1,750	1,750
180	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	294	294
181	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT	22,576	22,576
182	0607310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS: OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,901	1,901
183	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS).	8,474	8,474
184	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	33,561	33,561
186	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	3,061	3,061
187	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	64,921	64,921
189	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	3,645	3,645
193	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	963	963
194	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	10,186	10,186
195	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	36,883	36,883

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
196	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	13,735	13,735
197	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	6,101	6,101
198	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	43,867	43,867
199	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	8,957	8,957
200	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	146,890	146,890
201	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	21,503	21,503
202	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	20,342	20,342
203	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	444	444
205	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	1,736	1,736
206	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	65,060	19,460
		Ahead of need		[–45,600]
210	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,976	2,976
215	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	4,182	4,182
216	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	18,130	18,130
218	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,302	5,302
221	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,239	3,239
225	0305327V	INSIDER THREAT	11,733	11,733
226	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,119	2,119
234	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	24,605	28,605
		Casting Solutions for Readiness Program		[4,000]
235	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	1,770	1,770
236	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	2,978	2,978
237	1105219BB	MQ–9 UAV	18,151	23,151
		Medium Altitude Long Endurance Tactical (MALET) MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle		[5,000]
238	1105232BB	RQ–11 UAV	758	758
240	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS	173,934	189,134
		MC–130 Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance Radar Program		[15,200]
241	1160405BB	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	6,866	6,866
242	1160408BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	63,008	63,008
243	1160431BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS	25,342	25,342
244	1160432BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	3,401	3,401
245	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,212	3,212
246	1160483BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS	63,597	64,597
		Combat Diver		[1,000]
247	1160489BB	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,933	3,933
248	1160490BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	10,623	10,623
248A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,564,272	3,564,272
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	**4,538,910**	**4,518,510**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**18,329,861**	**18,547,081**
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
001	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	76,838	76,838
002	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	46,882	46,882
003	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	46,838	46,838
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**170,558**	**170,558**
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**170,558**	**170,558**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**69,779,182**	**68,352,509**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	1,500	1,500
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**1,500**	**1,500**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**1,500**	**1,500**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
231A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	35,747	35,747
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**35,747**	**35,747**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**35,747**	**35,747**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
133	0205671F	JOINT COUNTER RCIED ELECTRONIC WARFARE	300	300
246A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	16,800	16,800
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**17,100**	**17,100**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**17,100**	**17,100**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
026	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT		25,000
		Combating Terrorism and Technical Support Office		[25,000]
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		**25,000**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT		
248A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	137,087	137,087
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	**137,087**	**137,087**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**137,087**	**162,087**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**191,434**	**216,434**

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,094,429	1,594,429
	Force Readiness Restoration—Operations Tempo		[500,000]
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,546,129	1,687,829
	Flying Hour Program Restoration Unfunded Requirement		[55,000]
	H–60 A-L Conversion Acceleration		[86,700]
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,158,606	3,272,606
	Army Reserve cyber education efforts		[6,000]
	Insider Threat Unfunded Requirements		[80,000]
	Open Source Intelligence/Human Terrain Systems Unfunded Requirements		[28,000]
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,214,116	1,215,846
	Gun Tube Depot Maintenance Shortfall Recovery Acceleration		[1,730]
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,616,008	7,607,508
	Public Affairs at Local Installations Unjustified Growth		[–8,500]
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,617,169	2,809,869
	GTMO Critical Building Maintenance		[20,500]
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[172,200]
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	448,633	469,633
	Afloat Forward Staging Base Unfunded Requirement		[21,000]
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**17,695,090**	**18,657,720**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	981,000	990,800
	Cyber Defender (25D) Series Course		[9,800]
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	940,872	984,472
	Cyber Basic Officer Leadership Course		[3,100]
	Initial Entry Rotary Wing Training Backlog Reduction		[40,500]
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	230,324	247,624
	Advanced Civil Schooling – Civilian Graduate School 10 Percent Reduction		[–3,000]
	Unmanned Aircraft Systems Training		[20,300]
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	603,519	631,519
	Intelligence Support for PACOM Unfunded Requirement		[28,000]
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	491,922	491,922
330	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS	170,118	170,118
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,417,755**	**3,516,455**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES		
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	714,781	715,141
	TRADOC Mobile Training Team (MTT) Support Unfunded Requirement		[360]
390	ADMINISTRATION	384,813	376,313
	Unjustified Growth in Public Affairs		[–8,500]
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,119,848	1,115,348
	Spirit of America program growth		[–4,500]
530	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	490,368	490,368
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**2,709,810**	**2,697,170**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
540	UNDISTRIBUTED		–1,107,000
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–83,400]
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–431,000]
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[3,300]

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	Unobligated balances		*[–595,900]*
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		***–1,107,000***
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	***23,822,655***	***23,764,345***
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
060	*AVIATION ASSETS*	*87,587*	*87,587*
090	*LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE*	*59,574*	*59,574*
100	*BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT*	*570,852*	*570,852*
110	*FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION*	*245,686*	*259,286*
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		*[13,600]*
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	***963,699***	***977,299***
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
140	*ADMINISTRATION*	*18,390*	*18,390*
170	*RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING*	*52,928*	*52,928*
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	***71,318***	***71,318***
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
190	*UNDISTRIBUTED*		*–7,600*
	Excessive standard price for fuel		*[–7,600]*
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		***–7,600***
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	***1,035,017***	***1,041,017***
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	*MANEUVER UNITS*	*709,433*	*1,094,533*
	Increased Operations Tempo to Meet Readiness Objectives		*[385,100]*
060	*AVIATION ASSETS*	*943,609*	*1,063,009*
	C3 High Frequency Radio System Unfunded Requirement		*[5,600]*
	Operational Support and Initial Entry Rotary Wing Training		*[69,900]*
	Restoration of Flying Hours Unfunded Requirement		*[43,900]*
090	*LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE*	*166,848*	*166,848*
100	*BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT*	*1,022,970*	*1,022,970*
110	*FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION*	*673,680*	*708,880*
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		*[35,200]*
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	***3,516,540***	***4,056,240***
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
140	*ADMINISTRATION*	*59,629*	*59,219*
	National Guard State Partnership Program increase		*[1,000]*
	NGB Heritage Painting Program		*[–1,410]*
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	***59,629***	***59,219***
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
200	*UNDISTRIBUTED*		*–25,300*
	Excessive standard price for fuel		*[–25,300]*
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		***–25,300***
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	***3,576,169***	***4,090,159***
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	*MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS*	*4,940,365*	*4,943,665*
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—CH–53 Contract Maintenance		*[3,300]*
020	*FLEET AIR TRAINING*	*1,830,611*	*1,830,611*
040	*AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT*	*103,456*	*110,256*
	MV–22 Fleet Engineering Support Unfunded Requirement		*[6,800]*
050	*AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT*	*376,844*	*390,744*
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—AV–8B Program Related Logistics		*[4,000]*
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—CH–53 Program Related Logisitics		*[1,900]*
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—MV–22 Program Related Logisitics		*[1,200]*
	MV–22 Fleet Engineering Support Unfunded Requirement		*[6,800]*
060	*AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE*	*897,536*	*914,536*
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—AV–8B Depot Maintenance		*[11,200]*
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—CH–53 Depot Maintenance		*[1,000]*
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—F–18 Depot Maintenance		*[4,800]*
080	*AVIATION LOGISTICS*	*544,056*	*555,956*
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—MV–22 Aviation Logisitics		*[5,300]*
	KC–130J Aviation Logistics Unfunded Requirement		*[6,600]*
090	*MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS*	*4,287,658*	*4,287,658*
110	*SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE*	*5,960,951*	*5,960,951*
120	*SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT*	*1,554,863*	*1,554,863*
200	*DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT*	*2,443*	*2,443*
220	*COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT*	*73,110*	*73,110*
230	*CRUISE MISSILE*	*110,734*	*110,734*
240	*FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE*	*1,206,736*	*1,206,736*

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	523,122	535,122
	Ship Self-Defense Systems Maintenance Backlog Reduction		[12,000]
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	2,220,423	2,245,723
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[25,300]
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,472,468	4,472,468
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**29,105,376**	**29,195,576**
	MOBILIZATION		
320	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,464	6,964
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—F–18 Aircraft Activations/Inactivations		[500]
330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	361,764	361,764
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**368,228**	**368,728**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
380	RECRUIT TRAINING	9,035	9,035
410	FLIGHT TRAINING	8,171	8,171
420	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	168,471	152,971
	Civilian Institutions Graduate Education Program		[–16,500]
	Naval Sea Cadets		[1,000]
440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	234,233	234,733
	1–800 US Navy Call Center		[500]
470	JUNIOR ROTC	47,653	47,653
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**467,563**	**452,563**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
480	ADMINISTRATION	923,771	914,771
	Navy Fleet Band National Tours		[–5,000]
	Unjustified Growth External Relations		[–3,500]
	Unjustified Growth Navy Call Center		[–500]
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	13,967	10,467
	Navy External Relations		[–3,500]
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	265,948	260,948
	Navy Fleet Band National Tour		[–5,000]
590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	48,587	48,587
600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	25,599	25,599
610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	72,768	72,768
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	577,803	577,803
710	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	560,754	560,754
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**2,489,197**	**2,471,697**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
720	UNDISTRIBUTED		–887,100
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–591,400]
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–87,000]
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[2,300]
	Unobligated balances		[–211,000]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–887,100**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**32,430,364**	**31,601,464**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	931,079	931,079
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	227,583	227,583
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	746,237	775,037
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[28,800]
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,057,362	2,057,362
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,962,261**	**3,991,061**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	40,786	40,786
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	164,806	164,806
140	JUNIOR ROTC	23,397	23,397
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**228,989**	**228,989**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
160	ADMINISTRATION	358,395	342,595
	Unjustified Growth Marine Corps Heritage Center		[–15,800]
200	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	45,429	45,429
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**403,824**	**388,024**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
210	UNDISTRIBUTED		–338,200
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–24,600]
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–28,000]
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[800]
	Unobligated balances		[–286,400]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–338,200**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**4,595,074**	**4,269,874**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	563,722	607,222
	Reversing the disestablishment of HSC–84 and HSC–85		[43,500]
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	6,218	6,218
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	82,712	82,712
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	326	326
050	AVIATION LOGISTICS	13,436	13,436
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	557	557
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	48,513	49,213
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[700]
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	102,858	102,858
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**818,342**	**862,542**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	ADMINISTRATION	1,505	1,505
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**1,505**	**1,505**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
210	UNDISTRIBUTED		–39,700
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–39,700]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–39,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**819,847**	**824,347**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	OPERATING FORCES	97,631	97,631
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	18,254	18,254
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	28,653	30,053
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[1,400]
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	111,923	111,923
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**256,461**	**257,861**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
060	ADMINISTRATION	10,866	10,866
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,785	8,785
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**19,651**	**19,651**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
080	UNDISTRIBUTED		–1,000
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–1,000]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–1,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**276,112**	**276,512**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,336,868	3,612,468
	A–10 restoration: Force Structure Restoration		[249,700]
	A–10 to F–15E Training Transition		[–1,400]
	EC–130H Force Structure Restoration		[27,300]
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,897,315	1,935,015
	Increase Range Use Support Unfunded Requirement		[37,700]
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,797,549	1,719,349
	A–10 to F–15E Training Transition		[–78,200]
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,537,127	6,537,127
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,997,712	2,132,812
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[135,100]
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,841,948	2,841,948
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	930,341	930,341
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	924,845	924,845
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	900,965	900,965
135	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	907,496	907,496
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**22,072,166**	**22,442,366**
	MOBILIZATION		
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,617,571	1,617,571
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	259,956	259,956
180	BASE SUPPORT	708,799	708,799
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**2,586,326**	**2,586,326**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	228,500	228,500
230	BASE SUPPORT	772,870	772,870
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	359,304	379,304
	Remotely Piloted Aircraft Flight Training Acceleration		[20,000]

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	710,553	726,553
	Unmanned Aerial Surveillance (UAS) Training		[16,000]
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	228,252	227,322
	Air Force Civilian Graduate Education Program Unjustified Growth		[–930]
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	375,513	375,513
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	79,690	79,690
330	JUNIOR ROTC	59,263	59,263
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**2,813,945**	**2,849,015**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,141,491	1,141,491
360	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	61,745	61,745
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	298,759	298,759
380	BASE SUPPORT	1,108,220	1,108,220
390	ADMINISTRATION	689,797	669,097
	Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System		[–20,700]
420	CIVIL AIR PATROL	25,411	27,911
	Civil Air Patrol		[2,500]
460	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	519,626	519,626
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**3,845,049**	**3,826,849**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
470	UNDISTRIBUTED		–813,600
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–562,100]
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–217,000]
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[2,900]
	Unobligated balances		[–37,400]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–813,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**31,317,486**	**30,890,956**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,779,378	1,781,878
	A–10 restoration: Force Structure Restoration		[2,500]
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	487,036	487,036
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	109,342	109,642
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[300]
050	BASE SUPPORT	373,707	373,707
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,749,463**	**2,752,263**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
060	ADMINISTRATION	53,921	53,921
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	14,359	14,359
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**68,280**	**68,280**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
110	UNDISTRIBUTED		–101,000
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–101,000]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–101,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**2,817,743**	**2,719,543**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,526,471	3,608,671
	A–10 restoration: Force Structure Restoration		[42,200]
	Aircraft Support Equipment Shortfall Restoration		[40,000]
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	740,779	740,779
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,763,859	1,763,859
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	288,786	307,586
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[18,800]
050	BASE SUPPORT	582,037	582,037
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,901,932**	**7,002,932**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES		
060	ADMINISTRATION	23,626	24,626
	National Guard State Partnership Program increase		[1,000]
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	30,652	30,652
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES	**54,278**	**55,278**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
080	UNDISTRIBUTED		–162,600
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–162,600]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–162,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**6,956,210**	**6,895,610**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	534,795	534,795
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	4,862,368	4,946,968
	Global Inform and Influence Activities Increase		[15,000]
	Increased Support for Counterterrorism Operations		[25,000]
	USSOCOM Combat Development Activities		[44,600]
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,397,163**	**5,481,763**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
060	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING	354,372	354,372
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**354,372**	**354,372**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
070	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	160,320	180,320
	STARBASE		[20,000]
100	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,374,536	1,374,536
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	642,551	643,551
	Critical Language Training		[1,000]
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,282,755	1,292,755
	SHARKSEER		[10,000]
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	366,429	366,429
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	192,625	192,625
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	524,723	524,723
240	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	415,696	415,696
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,753,771	2,753,771
270	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	432,068	432,068
290	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	110,612	110,612
295	OFFICE OF NET ASSESSMENT		9,092
	Transfer from line 300		[9,092]
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,388,285	1,361,693
	Commission to Assess the Threat to the U.S. from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack		[2,000]
	OUSD AT&L Congressional Mandate (BRAC Support)		[–10,500]
	Program decrease		[–24,000]
	Readiness environmental protection initiative—program increase		[15,000]
	Transfer funding for Office of Net Assessment to line 295		[–9,092]
310	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES	83,263	83,263
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	621,688	621,688
330	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,379,428	14,384,428
	Program increase		[5,000]
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**24,728,750**	**24,747,250**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
340	UNDISTRIBUTED		–494,700
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–29,700]
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–78,400]
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[2,700]
	Unobligated balances		[–389,300]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–494,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**30,480,285**	**30,088,685**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS		
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS		
020	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	100,266	100,266
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**100,266**	**100,266**
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**100,266**	**100,266**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**138,227,228**	**136,562,778**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	257,900	257,900
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	1,110,836	1,110,836
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	261,943	261,943
060	AVIATION ASSETS	22,160	22,160
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,119,201	1,119,201
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	117,881	117,881

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	50,000	50,000
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	4,500,666	4,526,466
	Army expenses related to Syria Train and Equip program		[25,800]
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	10,000	5,000
	Program decrease		[–5,000]
160	RESET	1,834,777	1,834,777
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT		100,000
	AFRICOM Intelligence, Surveilance, and Reconnissance		[100,000]
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**9,285,364**	**9,406,164**
	MOBILIZATION		
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	40,000	40,000
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**40,000**	**40,000**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES		
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	529,891	529,891
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	5,033	5,033
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	100,480	100,480
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	154,350	154,350
530	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,267,632	1,267,632
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**2,057,386**	**2,057,386**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**11,382,750**	**11,503,550**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	2,442	2,442
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	813	813
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	779	779
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,525	20,525
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**24,559**	**24,559**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**24,559**	**24,559**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,984	1,984
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	4,671	4,671
060	AVIATION ASSETS	15,980	15,980
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	12,867	12,867
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	23,134	23,134
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	1,426	1,426
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**60,062**	**60,062**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	783	783
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**783**	**783**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**60,845**	**60,845**
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND		
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE		
010	SUSTAINMENT	2,214,899	2,552,642
	Support for ANSF end strength		[337,743]
030	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	182,751	182,751
040	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	281,555	281,555
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	**2,679,205**	**3,016,948**
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR		
060	SUSTAINMENT	901,137	901,137
080	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	116,573	116,573
090	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	65,342	65,342
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	**1,083,052**	**1,083,052**
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	**3,762,257**	**4,100,000**
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
010	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	715,000	715,000
	SUBTOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**715,000**	**715,000**
	TOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**715,000**	**715,000**
	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
010	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	600,000	531,450
	Realignment to Air Force		[–42,750]
	Realignment to Army		[–25,800]
	SUBTOTAL SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**600,000**	**531,450**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	TOTAL SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**600,000**	**531,450**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	358,417	358,417
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	110	110
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	4,513	4,513
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	126,501	126,501
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	75,897	75,897
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,770	2,770
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	34,101	34,101
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,184,878	1,184,878
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	16,663	16,663
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,922,829	1,922,829
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	33,577	33,577
160	WARFARE TACTICS	26,454	26,454
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	22,305	22,305
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	513,969	513,969
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	10,007	10,007
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	60,865	60,865
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	275,231	275,231
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	7,819	7,819
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	61,422	61,422
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,738,328**	**4,738,328**
	MOBILIZATION		
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	5,307	5,307
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	160,002	160,002
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**165,309**	**165,309**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	44,845	44,845
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**44,845**	**44,845**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
480	ADMINISTRATION	2,513	2,513
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	500	500
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,309	5,309
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,469	1,469
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	156,671	156,671
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	8,834	8,834
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,490	1,490
710	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,320	6,320
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**183,106**	**183,106**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**5,131,588**	**5,131,588**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	353,133	353,133
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	259,676	259,676
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	240,000	240,000
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	16,026	16,026
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**868,835**	**868,835**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	37,862	37,862
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**37,862**	**37,862**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	43,767	43,767
200	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,070	2,070
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**45,837**	**45,837**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**952,534**	**952,534**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,033	4,033
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	60	60
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	20,300	20,300
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	7,250	7,250
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**31,643**	**31,643**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**31,643**	**31,643**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
010	OPERATING FORCES	2,500	2,500
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	955	955
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,455**	**3,455**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**3,455**	**3,455**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,505,738	1,548,488
	Air Force expenses related to Syria Train and Equip program		[42,750]
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	914,973	914,973
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	31,978	31,978
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,192,765	1,192,765
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	85,625	85,625
060	BASE SUPPORT	917,269	917,269
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	30,219	30,219
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	174,734	174,734
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	869	869
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,008	5,008
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	100,190	716,690
	Assistance for the border security of Jordan		[300,000]
	Jordanian Military Capability Enhancement		[300,000]
	Support to Jordanian Training and Operations		[16,500]
135	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	22,893	22,893
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,982,261**	**5,641,511**
	MOBILIZATION		
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,995,703	2,995,703
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	108,163	108,163
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	511,059	511,059
180	BASE SUPPORT	4,642	4,642
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**3,619,567**	**3,619,567**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	92	92
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	11,986	11,986
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**12,078**	**12,078**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	86,716	86,716
380	BASE SUPPORT	3,836	3,836
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	165,348	165,348
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	204,683	204,683
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	61	61
460	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	15,463	15,463
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**476,107**	**476,107**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**9,090,013**	**9,749,263**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	51,086	51,086
050	BASE SUPPORT	7,020	7,020
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**58,106**	**58,106**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**58,106**	**58,106**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	19,900	19,900
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**19,900**	**19,900**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**19,900**	**19,900**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	9,900	9,900
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	2,345,835	2,424,835
	Classified adjustment		[64,000]
	Global Inform and Influence Activities Increase		[15,000]
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,355,735**	**2,434,735**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	18,474	18,474
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	29,579	29,579
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	110,000	110,000
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	5,960	5,960
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,677,000	1,677,000
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	73,000	73,000

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	106,709	321,709
	U.S. Special Operations Command inform and influence activities		[15,000]
	Ukraine Train & Equip		[200,000]
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	2,102	2,102
330	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,427,074	1,427,074
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**3,449,898**	**3,664,898**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**5,805,633**	**6,099,633**
	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND		
	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND		
090	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	2,100,000	0
	Program decrease		[–2,100,000]
	SUBTOTAL COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	**2,100,000**	**0**
	TOTAL COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	**2,100,000**	**0**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**39,738,283**	**38,981,526**

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	68,873	68,873
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	508,008	508,008
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	763,300	763,300
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,054,322	1,054,322
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	438,909	438,909
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	421,269	421,269
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	164,743	164,743
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,419,424**	**3,419,424**
	MOBILIZATION		
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	401,638	401,638
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	261,683	261,683
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,532	6,532
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**669,853**	**669,853**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	131,536	131,536
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	47,843	47,843
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	42,565	42,565
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	490,378	490,378
300	EXAMINING	194,079	194,079
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	227,951	227,951
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	161,048	161,048
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,295,400**	**1,295,400**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES		
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	485,778	485,778
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	813,881	813,881
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	322,127	322,127
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,781,350	1,781,350
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	292,532	292,532
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	375,122	375,122
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	225,358	225,358
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	239,755	239,755
460	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS	223,319	223,319
470	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	469,865	469,865
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	40,521	40,521
530	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	630,606	630,606
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**5,900,214**	**5,900,214**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**11,284,891**	**11,284,891**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	16,612	16,612
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	486,531	486,531
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	105,446	105,446
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	516,791	516,791

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	348,601	348,601
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	81,350	81,350
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	40,962	40,962
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**1,596,293**	**1,596,293**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,665	10,665
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	14,976	14,976
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,841	8,841
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**34,482**	**34,482**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**1,630,775**	**1,630,775**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	167,324	167,324
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	741,327	741,327
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	88,775	88,775
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	32,130	32,130
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	703,137	703,137
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	84,066	84,066
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	954,574	954,574
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,771,333**	**2,771,333**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	6,570	6,570
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	68,452	68,452
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,841	8,841
170	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	283,670	283,670
180	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	2,942	2,942
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**370,475**	**370,475**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**3,141,808**	**3,141,808**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	37,225	37,225
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	33,201	33,201
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	787,446	787,446
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	704,415	704,415
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	96,916	96,916
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	192,198	192,198
160	WARFARE TACTICS	453,942	453,942
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	351,871	351,871
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,186,847	1,186,847
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	123,948	123,948
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	98,914	98,914
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	141,664	141,664
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	371,872	371,872
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	896,061	896,061
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,476,520**	**5,476,520**
	MOBILIZATION		
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	422,846	422,846
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	69,530	69,530
350	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,237	2,237
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	21,823	21,823
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**516,436**	**516,436**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
370	OFFICER ACQUISITION	149,375	149,375
390	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	156,290	156,290
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	653,728	653,728
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	196,048	196,048
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	137,855	137,855
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	77,257	77,257
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,370,553**	**1,370,553**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	120,812	120,812
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	350,983	350,983
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	335,482	335,482
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	197,724	197,724
570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	274,936	274,936
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,122,178	1,122,178
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,768	4,768
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**2,406,883**	**2,406,883**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**9,770,392**	**9,770,392**

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	931,757	931,757
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	86,259	86,259
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**1,018,016**	**1,018,016**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
070	RECRUIT TRAINING	16,460	16,460
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	977	977
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	97,325	97,325
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	347,476	347,476
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	39,963	39,963
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**502,201**	**502,201**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	37,386	37,386
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	76,105	76,105
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**113,491**	**113,491**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**1,633,708**	**1,633,708**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	14,499	14,499
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	117,601	117,601
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	29,382	29,382
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**161,482**	**161,482**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	13,782	13,782
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,437	3,437
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,210	3,210
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**20,429**	**20,429**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**181,911**	**181,911**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE		
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	924	924
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**924**	**924**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**924**	**924**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	271,177	271,177
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	382,824	382,824
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	205,078	205,078
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**859,079**	**859,079**
	MOBILIZATION		
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,229,196	2,229,196
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	148,318	148,318
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**2,377,514**	**2,377,514**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	92,191	92,191
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	21,871	21,871
210	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	77,527	77,527
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	76,464	76,464
300	EXAMINING	3,803	3,803
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	180,807	180,807
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	167,478	167,478
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**620,141**	**620,141**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	862,022	862,022
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	498,053	498,053
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	900,253	900,253
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	89,148	89,148
460	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	668,233	668,233
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**3,017,709**	**3,017,709**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**6,874,443**	**6,874,443**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	226,243	226,243

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**226,243**	**226,243**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	13,665	13,665
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,606	6,606
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**20,271**	**20,271**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**246,514**	**246,514**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	485,888	485,888
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**485,888**	**485,888**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
040	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	142,659	142,659
050	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	78,416	78,416
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**221,075**	**221,075**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	570,177	570,177
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	26,073	26,073
180	DEFENSE PERSONNEL ACCOUNTING AGENCY	115,372	115,372
200	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	508,396	508,396
230	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	33,577	33,577
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**1,253,595**	**1,253,595**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**1,960,558**	**1,960,558**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS		
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS		
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	14,078	14,078
030	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	358,496	358,496
040	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	84,140	84,140
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	234,829	234,829
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	292,453	292,453
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	368,131	368,131
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	8,232	8,232
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	203,717	203,717
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,564,076**	**1,564,076**
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,564,076**	**1,564,076**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**38,290,000**	**38,290,000**

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	**130,491,227**	**130,199,735**
A–10 restoration: Military Personnel		*[132,069]*
Basic Housing Allowance		*[400,000]*
EC–130H Force Structure Restoration		*[19,639]*
Financial Literacy Training		*[85,000]*
Foreign Currency adjustments		*[–480,500]*
National Guard State Partnership Program increase		*[5,000]*
Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		*[12,000]*
Reversing the disestablishment of HSC–84 and HSC–85		*[30,700]*
Unobligated balances		*[–495,400]*
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	**6,243,449**	**6,243,449**

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	**3,204,758**	**3,204,758**

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	*FY 2016 Request*	*House Authorized*
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY		
INDUSTRIAL OPERATIONS		
SUPPLY MANAGEMENT—ARMY	*50,432*	*55,432*
Pilot program for Continuous Technology Refreshment		*[5,000]*
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	***50,432***	***55,432***
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, NAVY		
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS		*5,000*
Pilot program for Continuous Technology Refreshment		*[5,000]*
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, NAVY		***5,000***
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE		
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS	*62,898*	*67,898*
Pilot program for Continuous Technology Refreshment		*[5,000]*
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	***62,898***	***67,898***
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE		
SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT—DEF		
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	*45,084*	*45,084*
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	***45,084***	***45,084***
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA		
COMMISSARY RESALE STOCKS		
COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	*1,154,154*	*1,476,154*
Restoration of Proposed Efficiencies		*[183,000]*
Restoration of Savings from Legislative Proposals		*[139,000]*
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	***1,154,154***	***1,476,154***
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND		
MPF MLP		
POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING	*15,456*	*689,646*
Transfer from SCN—TAO(X)		*[674,190]*
NATIONAL DEF SEALIFT VESSEL		
LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE	*124,493*	*124,493*
DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS	*8,243*	*8,243*
TAH MAINTENANCE	*27,784*	*27,784*
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	*25,197*	*25,197*
READY RESERVE FORCE	*272,991*	*272,991*
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	***474,164***	***1,148,354***
NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND		
DEVELOPMENT		*971,393*
Transfer from RDTE, Navy, line 050		*[971,393]*
PROPULSION		*419,300*
Transfer from RDTE, Navy, line 045		*[419,300]*
TOTAL NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND		***1,390,693***
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION		
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	*139,098*	*139,098*
RDT&E	*579,342*	*579,342*
PROCUREMENT	*2,281*	*2,281*
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	***720,721***	***720,721***
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF		
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	*739,009*	*789,009*
Plan Central America		*[50,000]*
DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	*111,589*	*111,589*
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	***850,598***	***900,598***
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	*310,459*	*310,459*
RDT&E	*4,700*	*4,700*
PROCUREMENT	*1,000*	*0*
Program decrease		*[–1,000]*
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	***316,159***	***315,159***
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
IN-HOUSE CARE	*9,082,298*	*9,082,298*
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	*14,892,683*	*14,892,683*
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	*2,415,658*	*2,415,658*
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	*1,677,827*	*1,677,827*
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	*327,967*	*327,967*
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	*750,614*	*750,614*
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	*1,742,893*	*1,742,893*
RESEARCH	*10,996*	*10,996*
EXPLORATRY DEVELOPMENT	*59,473*	*59,473*

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	231,356	231,356
DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION	103,443	103,443
ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	515,910	515,910
MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	41,567	41,567
CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT	17,356	17,356
INITIAL OUTFITTING	33,392	33,392
REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION	330,504	330,504
THEATER MEDICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM	1,494	1,494
IEHR	7,897	7,897
UNDISTRIBUTED		–508,000
Foreign Currency adjustments		[–54,700]
Unobligated balances		[–453,300]
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**32,243,328**	**31,735,328**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**35,917,538**	**37,860,421**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE		
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS		
TRANSPORTATION OF FALLEN HEROES	2,500	2,500
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**2,500**	**2,500**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE		
SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT—DEF		
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	86,350	86,350
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**86,350**	**86,350**
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF		
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	186,000	186,000
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**186,000**	**186,000**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	10,262	10,262
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**10,262**	**10,262**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
IN-HOUSE CARE	65,149	65,149
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	192,210	192,210
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	9,460	9,460
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT		
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES		
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	5,885	5,885
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**272,704**	**272,704**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**557,816**	**557,816**

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
	Alaska			
Army	Fort Greely	Physical Readiness Training Facility	7,800	7,800
	California			
Army	Concord	Pier	98,000	98,000
	Colorado			
Army	Fort Carson	Rotary Wing Taxiway	5,800	5,800
	Georgia			
Army	Fort Gordon	Command and Control Facility	90,000	90,000
	Germany			
Army	Grafenwoehr	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	51,000	51,000
	New York			
Army	Fort Drum	NCO Academy Complex	19,000	19,000
Army	U.S. Military Academy	Waste Water Treatment Plant	70,000	70,000
	Oklahoma			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
Army	Fort Sill	Reception Barracks Complex Ph2	56,000	56,000
Army	Fort Sill	Training Support Facility	13,400	13,400
	Texas			
Army	Corpus Christi	Powertrain Facility (Infrastructure/Metal)	85,000	85,000
Army	Joint Base San Antonio	Homeland Defense Operations Center	43,000	0
	Virginia			
Army	Fort Lee	Training Support Facility	33,000	33,000
Army	Joint Base Myer-Henderson	Instruction Building	37,000	0
	Worldwide Unspecified			
Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Host Nation Support	36,000	36,000
Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction	25,000	25,000
Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	73,245	73,245
	Military Construction, Army Total		**743,245**	**663,245**
	Arizona			
Navy	Yuma	Aircraft Maint. Facilities & Apron (So. Cala)	50,635	50,635
	Bahrain Island			
Navy	SW Asia	Mina Salman Pier Replacement	37,700	0
Navy	SW Asia	Ship Maintenance Support Facility	52,091	0
	California			
Navy	Camp Pendleton	WRA Water Pipeline Pendleton to Fallbrook	44,540	44,540
Navy	Coronado	Coastal Campus Utilities	4,856	4,856
Navy	Lemoore	F–35C Hangar Modernization and Addition	56,497	56,497
Navy	Lemoore	F–35C Training Facilities	8,187	8,187
Navy	Lemoore	Rto and Mission Debrief Facility	7,146	7,146
Navy	Point Mugu	E–2C/D Hangar Additions and Renovations	19,453	19,453
Navy	Point Mugu	Triton Avionics and Fuel Systems Trainer	2,974	2,974
Navy	San Diego	LCS Support Facility	37,366	37,366
Navy	Twentynine Palms	Microgrid Expansion	9,160	9,160
	Florida			
Navy	Jacksonville	Fleet Support Facility Addition	8,455	8,455
Navy	Jacksonville	Triton Mission Control Facility	8,296	8,296
Navy	Mayport	LCS Mission Module Readiness Center	16,159	16,159
Navy	Pensacola	A-School Unaccopanied Housing (Corry Station)	18,347	18,347
Navy	Whiting Field	T–6B JPATS Training Operations Facility	10,421	10,421
	Georgia			
Navy	Albany	Ground Source Heat Pumps	7,851	7,851
Navy	Kings Bay	Industrial Control System Infrastructure	8,099	8,099
Navy	Townsend	Townsend Bombing Range Expansion Phase 2	48,279	48,279
	Guam			
Navy	Joint Region Marianas	Live-Fire Training Range Complex (Nw Field)	125,677	125,677
Navy	Joint Region Marianas	Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Closure	10,777	10,777
Navy	Joint Region Marianas	Sanitary Sewer System Recapitalization	45,314	45,314
	Hawaii			
Navy	Barking Sands	PMRF Power Grid Consolidation	30,623	30,623
Navy	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	UEM Interconnect Sta C to Hickam	6,335	6,335
Navy	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Welding School Shop Consolidation	8,546	8,546
Navy	Kaneohe Bay	Airfield Lighting Modernization	26,097	26,097
Navy	Kaneohe Bay	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	68,092	68,092
Navy	Kaneohe Bay	P–8A Detachment Support Facilities	12,429	12,429
	Italy			
Navy	Sigonella	P–8A Hangar and Fleet Support Facility	62,302	0
Navy	Sigonella	Triton Hangar and Operation Facility	40,641	0
	Japan			
Navy	Camp Butler	Military Working Dog Facilities (Camp Hansen)	11,697	11,697
Navy	Iwakuni	E–2D Operational Trainer Complex	8,716	8,716
Navy	Iwakuni	Security Modifications—CVW5/MAG12 HQ	9,207	9,207
Navy	Kadena AB	Aircraft Maint. Shelters & Apron	23,310	23,310
Navy	Yokosuka	Child Development Center	13,846	13,846
	Maryland			
Navy	Patuxent River	Unaccompanied Housing	40,935	40,935
	North Carolina			
Navy	Camp Lejeune	2nd Radio BN Complex Operations Consolidation	0	0
Navy	Camp Lejeune	Simulator Integration/Range Control Facility	54,849	54,849
Navy	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	KC130J Enlsited Air Crew Trainer Facility	4,769	4,769
Navy	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Unmanned Aircraft System Facilities	29,657	29,657
Navy	New River	Operational Trainer Facility	3,312	3,312
Navy	New River	Radar Air Traffic Control Facility Addition	4,918	4,918
	Poland			
Navy	Redzikowo Base	Aegis Ashore Missile Defense Complex	51,270	0
	South Carolina			
Navy	Parris Island	Range Safety Improvements & Modernization	27,075	27,075
	Virginia			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
Navy	Dam Neck	Maritime Surveillance System Facility	23,066	23,066
Navy	Norfolk	Communications Center	75,289	75,289
Navy	Norfolk	Electrical Repairs to Piers 2,6,7, and 11	44,254	44,254
Navy	Norfolk	MH60 Helicopter Training Facility	7,134	7,134
Navy	Portsmouth	Waterfront Utilities	45,513	45,513
Navy	Quantico	ATFP Gate	5,840	5,840
Navy	Quantico	Electrical Distribution Upgrade	8,418	8,418
Navy	Quantico	Embassy Security Guard BEQ & Ops Facility	43,941	43,941
	Washington			
Navy	Bangor	Regional Ship Maintenance Support Facility	0	0
Navy	Bangor	Wra Land/Water Interface	34,177	34,177
Navy	Bremerton	Dry Dock 6 Modernization & Utility Improve.	22,680	22,680
Navy	Indian Island	Shore Power to Ammunition Pier	4,472	4,472
	Worldwide Unspecified			
Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCON Design Funds	91,649	91,649
Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	22,590	22,590
	Military Construction, Navy Total		**1,605,929**	**1,361,925**
	Alaska			
AF	Eielson AFB	F–35A Flight Sim/Alter Squad Ops/AMU Facility	37,000	37,000
AF	Eielson AFB	Rpr Central Heat & Power Plant Boiler Ph3	34,400	34,400
	Arizona			
AF	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC–130J Age Covered Storage	4,700	4,700
AF	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC–130J Wash Rack	12,200	12,200
AF	Luke AFB	F–35A ADAL Fuel Offload Facility	5,000	5,000
AF	Luke AFB	F–35A Aircraft Maintenance Hangar/Sq 3	13,200	13,200
AF	Luke AFB	F–35A Bomb Build-up Facility	5,500	5,500
AF	Luke AFB	F–35A Sq Ops/AMU/Hangar/Sq 4	33,000	33,000
	Colorado			
AF	U.S. Air Force Academy	Front Gates Force Protection Enhancements	10,000	10,000
	Florida			
AF	Cape Canaveral AFS	Range Communications Facility	21,000	21,000
AF	Eglin AFB	F–35A Consolidated HQ Facility	8,700	8,700
AF	Hurlburt Field	ADAL 39 Information Operations Squad Facility	14,200	14,200
	Greenland			
AF	Thule AB	Thule Consolidation Ph 1	41,965	41,965
	Guam			
AF	Joint Region Marianas	APR—Dispersed Maint Spares & Se Storage Fac	19,000	19,000
AF	Joint Region Marianas	APR—Installation Control Center	22,200	22,200
AF	Joint Region Marianas	APR—South Ramp Utilities Phase 2	7,100	7,100
AF	Joint Region Marianas	PAR—LO/Corrosion Cntrl/Composite Repair	0	0
AF	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC Roads	2,500	2,500
	Hawaii			
AF	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	F–22 Fighter Alert Facility	46,000	46,000
	Japan			
AF	Yokota AB	C–130J Flight Simulator Facility	8,461	8,461
	Kansas			
AF	Mcconnell AFB	KC–46A ADAL Deicing Pads	4,300	4,300
	Maryland			
AF	Fort Meade	Cybercom Joint Operations Center, Increment 3	86,000	86,000
	Missouri			
AF	Whiteman AFB	Consolidated Stealth Ops & Nuclear Alert Fac	29,500	29,500
	Montana			
AF	Malmstrom AFB	Tactical Response Force Alert Facility	19,700	19,700
	Nebraska			
AF	Offutt AFB	Dormitory (144 Rm)	21,000	21,000
	Nevada			
AF	Nellis AFB	F–35A Airfield Pavements	31,000	31,000
AF	Nellis AFB	F–35A Live Ordnance Loading Area	34,500	34,500
AF	Nellis AFB	F–35A Munitions Maintenance Facilities	3,450	3,450
	New Mexico			
AF	Cannon AFB	Construct AT/FP Gate—Portales	7,800	7,800
AF	Holloman AFB	Marshalling Area Arm/DE-Arm Pad D	3,000	3,000
AF	Kirtland AFB	Space Vehicles Component Development Lab	12,800	12,800
	Niger			
AF	Agadez	Construct Airfield and Base Camp	50,000	0
	North Carolina			
AF	Seymour Johnson AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower/Base Ops Facility	17,100	17,100
	Oklahoma			
AF	Altus AFB	Dormitory (120 Rm)	18,000	18,000
AF	Altus AFB	KC–46A FTU ADAL Fuel Cell Maint Hangar	10,400	10,400
AF	Tinker AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower	12,900	12,900
AF	Tinker AFB	KC–46A Depot Maintenance Dock	37,000	37,000
	Oman			
AF	AL Musannah AB	Airlift Apron	25,000	0
	South Dakota			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
AF	Ellsworth AFB	Dormitory (168 Rm)	23,000	23,000
	Texas			
AF	Joint Base San Antonio	BMT Classrooms/Dining Facility 3	35,000	35,000
AF	Joint Base San Antonio	BMT Recruit Dormitory 5	71,000	71,000
	United Kingdom			
AF	Croughton RAF	Consolidated SATCOM/Tech Control Facility	36,424	36,424
AF	Croughton RAF	JIAC Consolidation—Ph 2	94,191	94,191
	Utah			
AF	Hill AFB	F–35A Flight Simulator Addition Phase 2	5,900	5,900
AF	Hill AFB	F–35A Hangar 40/42 Additions and AMU	21,000	21,000
AF	Hill AFB	Hayman Igloos	11,500	11,500
	Worldwide Classified			
AF	Classified Location	Long Range Strike Bomber	77,130	77,130
AF	Classified Location	Munitions Storage	3,000	3,000
	Worldwide Unspecified			
AF	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	89,164	89,164
AF	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Military Construction	22,900	22,900
	Wyoming			
AF	F. E. Warren AFB	Weapon Storage Facility	95,000	95,000
	Military Construction, Air Force Total		**1,354,785**	**1,279,785**
	Alabama			
Def-Wide	Fort Rucker	Fort Rucker ES/PS Consolidation/Replacement	46,787	46,787
Def-Wide	Maxwell AFB	Maxwell ES/MS Replacement/Renovation	32,968	32,968
	Arizona			
Def-Wide	Fort Huachuca	JITC Buildings 52101/52111 Renovations	3,884	3,884
	California			
Def-Wide	Camp Pendleton	SOF Combat Service Support Facility	10,181	10,181
Def-Wide	Camp Pendleton	SOF Performance Resiliency Center-West	10,371	0
Def-Wide	Coronado	SOF Logistics Support Unit One Ops Fac. #2	47,218	0
Def-Wide	Fresno Yosemite IAP ANG	Replace Fuel Storage and Distrib. Facilities	10,700	10,700
	Colorado			
Def-Wide	Fort Carson	SOF Language Training Facility	8,243	8,243
	Conus Classified			
Def-Wide	Classified Location	Operations Support Facility	20,065	0
	Delaware			
Def-Wide	Dover AFB	Construct Hydrant Fuel System	21,600	21,600
	Djibouti			
Def-Wide	Camp Lemonier	Construct Fuel Storage & Distrib. Facilities	43,700	0
	Florida			
Def-Wide	Hurlburt Field	SOF Fuel Cell Maintenance Hangar	17,989	17,989
Def-Wide	Macdill AFB	SOF Operational Support Facility	39,142	39,142
	Georgia			
Def-Wide	Moody AFB	Replace Pumphouse and Truck Fillstands	10,900	10,900
	Germany			
Def-Wide	Garmisch	Garmisch E/MS-Addition/Modernization	14,676	14,676
Def-Wide	Grafenwoehr	Grafenwoehr Elementary School Replacement	38,138	38,138
Def-Wide	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	Medical Center Replacement Incr 5	85,034	85,034
Def-Wide	Spangdahlem AB	Construct Fuel Pipeline	5,500	5,500
Def-Wide	Spangdahlem AB	Medical/Dental Clinic Addition	34,071	34,071
Def-Wide	Stuttgart-Patch Barracks	Patch Elementary School Replacement	49,413	49,413
	Hawaii			
Def-Wide	Kaneohe Bay	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	122,071	90,257
Def-Wide	Schofield Barracks	Behavioral Health/Dental Clinic Addition	123,838	87,800
	Japan			
Def-Wide	Kadena AB	Airfield Pavements	37,485	37,485
	Kentucky			
Def-Wide	Fort Campbell, Kentucky	SOF Company HQ/Classrooms	12,553	12,553
Def-Wide	Fort Knox	Fort Knox HS Renovation/MS Addition	23,279	23,279
	Maryland			
Def-Wide	Fort Meade	NSAW Campus Feeders Phase 2	33,745	33,745
Def-Wide	Fort Meade	NSAW Recapitalize Building #2 Incr 1	34,897	34,897
	Nevada			
Def-Wide	Nellis AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	39,900	39,900
	New Mexico			
Def-Wide	Cannon AFB	Construct Pumphouse and Fuel Storage	20,400	20,400
Def-Wide	Cannon AFB	SOF Squadron Operations Facility	11,565	11,565
Def-Wide	Cannon AFB	SOF ST Operational Training Facilities	13,146	13,146
	New York			
Def-Wide	West Point	West Point Elementary School Replacement	55,778	55,778
	North Carolina			
Def-Wide	Camp Lejeune	SOF Combat Service Support Facility	14,036	14,036
Def-Wide	Camp Lejeune	SOF Marine Battalion Company/Team Facilities	54,970	54,970
Def-Wide	Fort Bragg	Butner Elementary School Replacement	32,944	32,944
Def-Wide	Fort Bragg	SOF 21 STS Operations Facility	16,863	14,334
Def-Wide	Fort Bragg	SOF Battalion Operations Facility	38,549	38,549
Def-Wide	Fort Bragg	SOF Indoor Range	8,303	8,303
Def-Wide	Fort Bragg	SOF Intelligence Training Center	28,265	28,265

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
Def-Wide	Fort Bragg	SOF Special Tactics Facility (Ph 2)	43,887	43,887
	Ohio			
Def-Wide	Wright-Patterson AFB	Satellite Pharmacy Replacement	6,623	6,623
	Oregon			
Def-Wide	Klamath Falls IAP	Replace Fuel Facilities	2,500	2,500
	Pennsylvania			
Def-Wide	Philadelphia	Replace Headquarters	49,700	49,700
	Poland			
Def-Wide	Redzikowo Base	Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System Complex	169,153	0
	South Carolina			
Def-Wide	Fort Jackson	Pierce Terrace Elementary School Replacement	26,157	26,157
	Spain			
Def-Wide	Rota	Rota ES and HS Additions	13,737	13,737
	Texas			
Def-Wide	Fort Bliss	Hospital Replacement Incr 7	239,884	189,884
Def-Wide	Joint Base San Antonio	Ambulatory Care Center Phase 4	61,776	61,776
	Virginia			
Def-Wide	Arlington National Cemetery	Arlington Cemetery Southern Expansion (DAR)	0	30,000
Def-Wide	Fort Belvoir	Construct Visitor Control Center	5,000	5,000
Def-Wide	Fort Belvoir	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	4,500	4,500
Def-Wide	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Replace Fuel Pier and Distribution Facility	28,000	28,000
Def-Wide	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story	SOF Applied Instruction Facility	23,916	23,916
	Worldwide Unspecified			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Contingency Construction	10,000	0
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ECIP Design	10,000	10,000
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Energy Conservation Investment Program	150,000	150,000
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Exercise Related Minor Construction	8,687	8,687
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	3,041	3,041
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	31,628	31,628
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	1,078	1,078
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	27,202	27,202
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	42,183	42,183
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	13,500	13,500
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,000	5,000
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000	3,000
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,676	15,676
Def-Wide	Various Worldwide Locations	East Coast Missle Site Planning and Design	0	30,000
Def-Wide	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	31,772	31,772
	Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total		**2,300,767**	**1,939,879**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
NATO	NATO Security Investment Program	NATO Security Investment Program	120,000	150,000
	NATO Security Investment Program Total		**120,000**	**150,000**
	Connecticut			
Army NG	Camp Hartell	Ready Building (CST-WMD)	11,000	11,000
	Delaware			
Army NG	Dagsboro	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	10,800	0
	Florida			
Army NG	Palm Coast	National Guard Readiness Center	18,000	18,000
	Illinois			
Army NG	Sparta	Basic 10m–25m Firing Range (Zero)	1,900	1,900
	Kansas			
Army NG	Salina	Automated Combat Pistol/MP Firearms Qual Cour	2,400	2,400
Army NG	Salina	Modified Record Fire Range	4,300	4,300
	Maryland			
Army NG	Easton	National Guard Readiness Center	13,800	13,800
	Nevada			
Army NG	Reno	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop Add/Alt	8,000	8,000
	Ohio			
Army NG	Camp Ravenna	Modified Record Fire Range	3,300	3,300
	Oregon			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
Army NG	Salem	National Guard/Reserve Center Bldg Add/Alt (JFHQ)	16,500	16,500
	Pennsylvania			
Army NG	Fort Indiantown Gap	Training Aids Center	16,000	16,000
	Vermont			
Army NG	North Hyde Park	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop Add	7,900	7,900
	Virginia			
Army NG	Richmond	National Guard/Reserve Center Building (JFHQ)	29,000	29,000
	Washington			
Army NG	Yakima	Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training	19,000	0
	Worldwide Unspecified			
Army NG	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	20,337	20,337
Army NG	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,000	15,000
	Military Construction, Army National Guard Total		**197,237**	**167,437**
	California			
Army Res	Miramar	Army Reserve Center	24,000	24,000
	Florida			
Army Res	Macdill AFB	AR Center/ AS Facility	55,000	55,000
	Mississippi			
Army Res	Starkville	Army Reserve Center	9,300	0
	New York			
Army Res	Orangeburg	Organizational Maintenance Shop	4,200	4,200
	Pennsylvania			
Army Res	Conneaut Lake	DAR Highway Improvement	5,000	5,000
	Worldwide Unspecified			
Army Res	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	9,318	9,318
Army Res	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,777	6,777
	Military Construction, Army Reserve Total		**113,595**	**104,295**
	Nevada			
N/MC Res	Fallon	Navopsptcen Fallon	11,480	11,480
	New York			
N/MC Res	Brooklyn	Reserve Center Storage Facility	2,479	2,479
	Virginia			
N/MC Res	Dam Neck	Reserve Training Center Complex	18,443	18,443
	Worldwide Unspecified			
N/MC Res	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR Planning & Design	2,208	2,208
N/MC Res	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR Unspecified Minor Construction	1,468	1,468
	Military Construction, Naval Reserve Total		**36,078**	**36,078**
	Alabama			
Air NG	Dannelly Field	TFI—Replace Squadron Operations Facility	7,600	7,600
	Arkansas			
Air NG	Fort Smith Map	Consolidated SCIF	0	0
	California			
Air NG	Moffett Field	Replace Vehicle Maintenance Facility	6,500	6,500
	Colorado			
Air NG	Buckley Air Force Base	ASE Maintenance and Storage Facility	5,100	5,100
	Georgia			
Air NG	Savannah/Hilton Head IAP	C–130 Squadron Operations Facility	9,000	9,000
	Iowa			
Air NG	Des Moines MAP	Air Operations Grp/Cyber Beddown-Reno Blg 430	6,700	6,700
	Kansas			
Air NG	Smokey Hill ANG Range	Range Training Support Facilities	2,900	2,900
	Louisiana			
Air NG	New Orleans	Replace Squadron Operations Facility	10,000	10,000
	Maine			
Air NG	Bangor IAP	Add to and Alter Fire Crash/Rescue Station	7,200	7,200
	New Hampshire			
Air NG	Pease International Trade Port	KC–46A Adal Flight Simulator Bldg 156	2,800	2,800
	New Jersey			
Air NG	Atlantic City IAP	Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control Hangar	10,200	10,200
	New York			
Air NG	Niagara Falls IAP	Remotely Piloted Aircraft Beddown Bldg 912	7,700	7,700
	North Carolina			
Air NG	Charlotte/Douglas IAP	Replace C–130 Squadron Operations Facility	9,000	9,000
	North Dakota			
Air NG	Hector IAP	Intel Targeting Facilities	7,300	7,300
	Oklahoma			
Air NG	Will Rogers World Airport	Medium Altitude Manned ISR Beddown	7,600	7,600

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
	Oregon			
Air NG	Klamath Falls IAP	Replace Fire Crash/Rescue Station	7,200	7,200
	West Virginia			
Air NG	Yeager Airport	Force Protection- Relocate Coonskin Road	3,900	3,900
	Worldwide Unspecified			
Air NG	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	5,104	5,104
Air NG	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,734	7,734
	Military Construction, Air National Guard Total		**123,538**	**123,538**
	Arizona			
AF Res	Davis-Monthan AFB	Guardian Angel Operations	0	0
	California			
AF Res	March AFB	Satellite Fire Station	4,600	4,600
	Florida			
AF Res	Patrick AFB	Aircrew Life Support Facility	3,400	3,400
	Ohio			
AF Res	Youngstown	Indoor Firing Range	9,400	9,400
	Texas			
AF Res	Joint Base San Antonio	Consolidate 433 Medical Facility	9,900	9,900
	Worldwide Unspecified			
AF Res	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	13,400	13,400
AF Res	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Military Construction	6,121	6,121
	Military Construction, Air Force Reserve Total		**46,821**	**46,821**
	Florida			
FH Con Army	Camp Rudder	Family Housing Replacement Construction	**8,000**	**8,000**
	Germany			
FH Con Army	Wiesbaden Army Airfield	Family Housing Improvements	**3,500**	**3,500**
	Illinois			
FH Con Army	Rock Island	Family Housing Replacement Construction	**20,000**	**20,000**
	Korea			
FH Con Army	Camp Walker	Family Housing New Construction	**61,000**	**61,000**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
FH Con Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Family Housing P & D	**7,195**	**7,195**
	Family Housing Construction, Army Total		**99,695**	**99,695**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
FH Ops Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings	25,552	25,552
FH Ops Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leased Housing	144,879	144,879
FH Ops Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property Facilities	75,197	75,197
FH Ops Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	3,047	3,047
FH Ops Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	45,468	45,468
FH Ops Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Military Housing Privitization Initiative	22,000	22,000
FH Ops Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous	840	840
FH Ops Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services	10,928	10,928
FH Ops Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities	65,600	65,600
	Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Army Total		**393,511**	**393,511**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
FH Con AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Improvements	150,649	150,649
FH Con AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	9,849	9,849
	Family Housing Construction, Air Force Total		**160,498**	**160,498**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
FH Ops AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	38,746	38,746
FH Ops AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Housing Privatization	41,554	41,554

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
FH Ops AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	28,867	28,867
FH Ops AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance	114,129	114,129
FH Ops AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	52,153	52,153
FH Ops AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	2,032	2,032
FH Ops AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	12,940	12,940
FH Ops AF	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	40,811	40,811
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Air Force Total			**331,232**	**331,232**
	Virginia			
FH Con Navy	Wallops Island	Construct Housing Welcome Center	438	438
	Worldwide Unspecified			
FH Con Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Design	4,588	4,588
FH Con Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Improvements	11,515	11,515
Family Housing Construction, Navy And Marine Corps Total			**16,541**	**16,541**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	17,534	17,534
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	64,108	64,108
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	99,323	99,323
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	56,189	56,189
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	373	373
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Privatization Support Costs	28,668	28,668
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	19,149	19,149
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	67,692	67,692
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Navy And Marine Corps Total			**353,036**	**353,036**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	3,402	3,402
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	20	20
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	781	781
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	10,679	10,679
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	41,273	41,273
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	1,104	1,104
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	344	344
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	388	388
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	31	31
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	474	474
FH Ops DW	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	172	172
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Defense-Wide Total			**58,668**	**58,668**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
BRAC	Base Realignment & Closure, Army	Base Realignment and Closure	29,691	29,691
Base Realignment and Closure—Army Total			**29,691**	**29,691**
	Worldwide Unspecified			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
BRAC	Base Realignment & Closure, Navy	Base Realignment & Closure	118,906	118,906
BRAC	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–100: Planing, Design and Management	7,787	7,787
BRAC	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–101: Various Locations	20,871	20,871
BRAC	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–138: NAS Brunswick, ME	803	803
BRAC	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–157: Mcsa Kansas City, MO	41	41
BRAC	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA	4,872	4,872
BRAC	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg Ap	3,808	3,808
	Base Realignment and Closure—Navy Total		**157,088**	**157,088**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
BRAC	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DOD BRAC Activities—Air Force	64,555	64,555
	Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force Total		**64,555**	**64,555**
	Worldwide Unspecified			
PYS	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Air Force	0	–52,600
PYS	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Army	0	–96,000
PYS	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Defense-Wide	0	–134,000
PYS	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Housing Assistance Program	0	–103,918
	Prior Year Savings Total		**0**	**–386,518**
	Total, Military Construction		**8,306,510**	**7,151,000**

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Agreement
	Cuba			
Army	Guantanamo Bay	Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	0	76,000
	Military Construction, Army Total		**0**	**76,000**
	Bahrain			
Navy	Bahrain Island	Mina Salman Pier Replacement	0	37,700
Navy	Bahrain Island	Ship Maintenance Support Facility	0	52,091
	Italy			
Navy	Sigonella	P–8A Hangar and Fleet Support Facility	0	62,302
Navy	Sigonella	Triton Hangar and Operation Facility	0	40,641
	Poland			
Navy	Redzikowo	AEGIS Shore Missile Defense Complex	0	51,270
	Military Construction, Navy Total		**0**	**244,004**
	Niger			
AF	Agadez	Construct Air Field and Base Camp	0	50,000
	Oman			
AF	Al Mussanah AB	Airlift Apron	0	25,000
	Military Construction, Air Force Total		**0**	**75,000**
	Djibouti			
Def-Wide	Camp Lemonier	Construct Fuel Storage and Distribution Facilities	0	43,700
	Poland			
Def-Wide	Redzikowo	AEGIS Shore Missile Defense Complex	0	93,296
	Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total		**0**	**136,996**
	Total, Military Construction		**0**	**532,000**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation		
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies		
Appropriation Summary:		
Energy Programs		
Nuclear Energy	*135,161*	*135,161*
Atomic Energy Defense Activities		
National nuclear security administration:		
Weapons activities	*8,846,948*	*9,084,648*
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	*1,940,302*	*1,901,302*
Naval reactors	*1,375,496*	*1,387,496*
Federal salaries and expenses	*402,654*	*396,654*
Total, National nuclear security administration	***12,565,400***	***12,770,100***
Environmental and other defense activities:		
Defense environmental cleanup	*5,527,347*	*5,143,150*
Other defense activities	*774,425*	*778,625*
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	***6,301,772***	***5,921,775***
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	***18,867,172***	***18,691,875***
Total, Discretionary Funding	***19,002,333***	***18,827,036***
Nuclear Energy		
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	*126,161*	*126,161*
Used nuclear fuel disposition	*9,000*	*9,000*
Total, Nuclear Energy	***135,161***	***135,161***
Weapons Activities		
Directed stockpile work		
Life extension programs		
B61 Life extension program	*643,300*	*643,300*
W76 Life extension program	*244,019*	*244,019*
W88 Alt 370	*220,176*	*220,176*
W80–4 Life extension program	*195,037*	*195,037*
Total, Life extension programs	***1,302,532***	***1,302,532***
Stockpile systems		
B61 Stockpile systems	*52,247*	*73,247*
W76 Stockpile systems	*50,921*	*50,921*
W78 Stockpile systems	*64,092*	*64,092*
W80 Stockpile systems	*68,005*	*68,005*
B83 Stockpile systems	*42,177*	*51,177*
W87 Stockpile systems	*89,299*	*89,299*
W88 Stockpile systems	*115,685*	*115,685*
Total, Stockpile systems	***482,426***	***512,426***
Weapons dismantlement and disposition		
Operations and maintenance	*48,049*	*48,049*
Stockpile services		
Production support	*447,527*	*447,527*
Research and development support	*34,159*	*34,159*
R&D certification and safety	*192,613*	*203,813*
Management, technology, and production	*264,994*	*264,994*
Total, Stockpile services	***939,293***	***950,493***
Nuclear material commodities		
Uranium sustainment	*32,916*	*32,916*
Plutonium sustainment	*174,698*	*183,098*
Tritium sustainment	*107,345*	*107,345*
Domestic uranium enrichment	*100,000*	*100,000*
Total, Nuclear material commodities	***414,959***	***423,359***
Total, Directed stockpile work	***3,187,259***	***3,236,859***
Research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E)		
Science		
Advanced certification	*50,714*	*50,714*
Primary assessment technologies	*98,500*	*120,100*
Dynamic materials properties	*109,000*	*109,000*
Advanced radiography	*47,000*	*47,000*
Secondary assessment technologies	*84,400*	*84,400*
Total, Science	***389,614***	***411,214***
Engineering		
Enhanced surety	*50,821*	*51,921*

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	17,371	17,371
Nuclear survivability	24,461	26,861
Enhanced surveillance	38,724	38,724
Total, Engineering	**131,377**	**134,877**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield		
Ignition	73,334	67,334
Support of other stockpile programs	22,843	22,843
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	58,587	58,587
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	4,963	4,963
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	8,900	8,900
Facility operations and target production	333,823	322,823
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield	**502,450**	**485,450**
Advanced simulation and computing	623,006	617,006
Advanced manufacturing		
Component manufacturing development	112,256	112,256
Processing technology development	17,800	17,800
Total, Advanced manufacturing	**130,056**	**130,056**
Total, RDT&E	**1,776,503**	**1,778,603**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)		
Operating		
Program readiness	75,185	75,185
Material recycle and recovery	173,859	173,859
Storage	40,920	40,920
Recapitalization	104,327	104,327
Total, Operating	**394,291**	**394,291**
Construction:		
15–D–302, TA–55 Reinvestment project, Phase 3, LANL	18,195	18,195
11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL	3,903	3,903
07–D–220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	11,533	11,533
07–D–220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, LANL	40,949	40,949
06–D–141 PED/Construction, Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project Y–12	430,000	430,000
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy replacement project, LANL	155,610	155,610
Total, Construction	**660,190**	**660,190**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,054,481**	**1,054,481**
Secure transportation asset		
Operations and equipment	146,272	146,272
Program direction	105,338	105,338
Total, Secure transportation asset	**251,610**	**251,610**
Infrastructure and safety		
Operations of facilities		
Kansas City Plant	100,250	100,250
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	70,671	70,671
Los Alamos National Laboratory	196,460	196,460
Nevada National Security Site	89,000	89,000
Pantex	58,021	58,021
Sandia National Laboratory	115,300	115,300
Savannah River Site	80,463	80,463
Y–12 National security complex	120,625	120,625
Total, Operations of facilities	**830,790**	**830,790**
Safety operations	107,701	107,701
Maintenance	227,000	251,000
Recapitalization	257,724	407,724
Construction:		
16–D–621 Substation replacement at TA–3, LANL	25,000	25,000
15–D–613 Emergency Operations Center, Y–12	17,919	17,919
Total, Construction	**42,919**	**42,919**
Total, Infrastructure and safety	**1,466,134**	**1,640,134**
Site stewardship		
Nuclear materials integration	17,510	17,510
Minority serving institution partnerships program	19,085	19,085
Total, Site stewardship	**36,595**	**36,595**
Defense nuclear security		
Operations and maintenance	619,891	631,891
Construction:		
14–D–710 Device assembly facility argus installation project, NV	13,000	13,000
Total, Defense nuclear security	**632,891**	**644,891**
Information technology and cybersecurity	157,588	157,588
Legacy contractor pensions	283,887	283,887

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
Total, Weapons Activities	**8,846,948**	**9,084,648**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation		
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs		
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D		
Global material security	426,751	336,751
Material management and minimization	311,584	331,584
Nonproliferation and arms control	126,703	126,703
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D	419,333	439,333
Nonproliferation Construction:		
99–D–143 Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, SRS	345,000	345,000
Total, Nonproliferation construction	**345,000**	**345,000**
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs	**1,629,371**	**1,579,371**
Legacy contractor pensions	94,617	94,617
Nuclear counterterrorism and incident response program	234,390	245,390
Use of prior-year balances	–18,076	–18,076
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,940,302**	**1,901,302**
Naval Reactors		
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	445,196	445,196
Naval reactors development	444,400	444,400
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	186,800	186,800
S8G Prototype refueling	133,000	133,000
Program direction	45,000	45,000
Construction:		
15–D–904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3	900	900
15–D–903 KL Fire System Upgrade	600	600
15–D–902 KS Engineroom team trainer facility	3,100	3,100
14–D–902 KL Materials characterization laboratory expansion, KAPL	30,000	30,000
14–D–901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF	86,000	98,000
10-D–903, Security upgrades, KAPL	500	500
Total, Construction	**121,100**	**133,100**
Total, Naval Reactors	**1,375,496**	**1,387,496**
Federal Salaries And Expenses		
Program direction	402,654	396,654
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**402,654**	**396,654**
Defense Environmental Cleanup		
Closure sites:		
Closure sites administration	4,889	4,889
Hanford site:		
River corridor and other cleanup operations:		
River corridor and other cleanup operations	196,957	268,957
Central plateau remediation:		
Central plateau remediation	555,163	555,163
Richland community and regulatory support	14,701	14,701
Construction:		
15–D–401 Containerized sludge removal annex, RL	77,016	77,016
Total, Hanford site	**843,837**	**915,837**
Idaho National Laboratory:		
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	357,783	357,783
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,000	3,000
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**360,783**	**360,783**
NNSA sites		
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,366	1,366
Nevada	62,385	62,385
Sandia National Laboratories	2,500	2,500
Los Alamos National Laboratory	188,625	188,625
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**254,876**	**254,876**
Oak Ridge Reservation:		
OR Nuclear facility D & D		
OR Nuclear facility D & D	75,958	75,958
Construction:		
14–D–403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility	6,800	6,800
Total, OR Nuclear facility D & D	**82,758**	**82,758**
U233 Disposition Program	26,895	26,895

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Authorized
OR cleanup and disposition:		
OR cleanup and disposition	60,500	60,500
Total, OR cleanup and disposition	**60,500**	**60,500**
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,400	4,400
Solid waste stabilization and disposition		
Oak Ridge technology development	2,800	2,800
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**177,353**	**177,353**
Office of River Protection:		
Waste treatment and immobilization plant		
01–D–416 A-D/ORP-0060 / Major construction	595,000	595,000
01–D–16E Pretreatment facility	95,000	95,000
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	**690,000**	**690,000**
Tank farm activities		
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	649,000	649,000
Construction:		
15–D–409 Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System, Hanford	75,000	75,000
Total, Tank farm activities	**724,000**	**724,000**
Total, Office of River protection	**1,414,000**	**1,414,000**
Savannah River sites:		
Savannah River risk management operations	386,652	398,252
SR community and regulatory support	11,249	11,249
Radioactive liquid tank waste:		
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	581,878	581,878
Construction:		
15–D–402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #6	34,642	34,642
05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	194,000	194,000
Total, Construction	**228,642**	**228,642**
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	**810,520**	**810,520**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,208,421**	**1,220,021**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant		
Waste isolation pilot plant	212,600	212,600
Construction:		
15–D–411 Safety significant confinement ventilation system, WIPP	23,218	23,218
15–D–412 Exhaust shaft, WIPP	7,500	7,500
Total, Construction	**30,718**	**30,718**
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**243,318**	**243,318**
Program direction	281,951	281,951
Program support	14,979	14,979
Safeguards and Security:		
Oak Ridge Reservation	17,228	17,228
Paducah	8,216	8,216
Portsmouth	8,492	8,492
Richland/Hanford Site	67,601	67,601
Savannah River Site	128,345	128,345
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,860	4,860
West Valley	1,891	1,891
Technology development	14,510	18,510
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**5,055,550**	**5,143,150**
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	471,797	0
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,527,347**	**5,143,150**
Other Defense Activities		
Specialized security activities	221,855	226,055
Environment, health, safety and security		
Environment, health, safety and security	120,693	120,693
Program direction	63,105	63,105
Total, Environment, Health, safety and security	**183,798**	**183,798**
Enterprise assessments		
Enterprise assessments	24,068	24,068
Program direction	49,466	49,466
Total, Enterprise assessments	**73,534**	**73,534**
Office of Legacy Management		
Legacy management	154,080	154,080
Program direction	13,100	13,100

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	*FY 2016 Request*	*House Authorized*
Total, Office of Legacy Management	***167,180***	***167,180***
Defense-related activities		
Defense related administrative support		
Chief financial officer	*35,758*	*35,758*
Chief information officer	*83,800*	*83,800*
Management	*3,000*	*3,000*
Total, Defense related administrative support	***122,558***	***122,558***
Office of hearings and appeals	*5,500*	*5,500*
Subtotal, Other defense activities	***774,425***	***778,625***
Total, Other Defense Activities	***774,425***	***778,625***

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–112 and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 260.

Each amendment printed in the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report not earlier disposed of. Such amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 68, line 18, strike ''**SEC. 2463a. ASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN NEW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON DETERMINATIONS OF COST-EFFICIENCY**.'' and insert ''**§ 2463a. Assignment of certain new requirements based on determinations of cost-efficiency**''.

Page 68, line 25, strike ''Armed Forces'' and insert ''armed forces''.

Page 69, line 5, strike ''(''Estimating and Comparing the Full Costs of Civilian and Active Duty Military Manpower and Contract Support'')'' and insert ''('Estimating and Comparing the Full Costs of Civilian and Active Duty Military Manpower and Contract Support')''.

Page 69, line 14, strike ''Armed Forces'' and insert ''armed forces''.

Page 95, line 1, strike ''**SEC. 116. OPERATIONAL USE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.**'' and insert ''**§ 116. Operational use of the National Guard**''.

Page 99, line 15, strike extraneous quotation marks.

Page 103, line 5, strike ''section 101'' and insert ''section 101(a)(5)''.

Page 132, line 6, strike ''or12406'' and insert ''or 12406''.

Page 134, line 9, strike ''semicolon'' and insert ''period''.

Page 144, beginning line 19, strike paragraphs (44), (45), and (46).

Page 145, beginning line 24, strike paragraph (48).

Page 148, line 14, insert a comma after ''(D)''.

Page 148, line 15, insert a comma after ''(C)''.

Page 152, line 2, strike ''section 206'' and insert ''section 3121''.

Page 188, line 19, strike two of the four quotation marks.

Page 239, line 2, strike ''Subsection (e)(1)'' and insert ''Subsection (e)(2)''.

Page 241, strike lines 12 and 13 and insert the following:

SEC. 593. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SUPPORT FOR MILITARY DIVERS.

Page 243, strike lines 9 and 10.

Page 243, lines 17 through 19, strike ''and supports the Department of Defense to designate 2015 as the Year of the Military Diver'' and insert ''the Department of Defense''.

Page 314, line 10, strike the semicolon in the quoted matter.

Page 368, line 5 strike ''as amended by section 9 of this Act'' and insert ''as amended by subsection (b)(1)''.

Page 394, line 25, strike ''by adding at the end'' and insert ''by striking the item relating to section 2222 and inserting''.

Page 457, line 15, strike ''subsection (m)'' and insert ''subsection (l)''.

Page 478, line 8, insert ''and'' after ''air lift,''.

Page 478, line 8, strike '', and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance''

Page 490, line 10, insert ''as enacted into law by'' before ''Public Law''.

Page 490, line 16, strike ''26'' and insert ''261''.

Page 495, line 6, insert ''Defense'' after ''National''.

Page 496, line 7, before the period insert the following: '', and the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 83 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to that section''.

Page 500, line 17, insert ''subchapter I of'' before ''chapter 21''.

Page 501, line 8, strike ''Section 9314a(b)'' and insert ''Subsection (d)(4) of section 9314a, as redesignated by section 591(a) of this Act,''.

Page 564, line 18, strike ''be a country for purposes of meeting'' and insert ''meet''.

Page 623, line 9, strike ''301'' and insert ''1504''.

Page 623, line 10, strike ''4301'' and insert ''4303''.

Page 623, line 16, strike ''301'' and insert ''1504''.

Page 623, line 17, strike ''4301'' and insert ''4303''.

Page 623, line 23, strike ''301'' and insert ''1504''.

Page 623, line 24, strike ''4301'' and insert ''4303''.

Page 693, line 1, strike ''for'' and insert ''at the beginning of''.

Page 693, line 5, strike ''inserting'' and insert ''adding''.

Page 697, line 23, strike ''2016 through 2020'' and insert ''2017 through 2021''.

Page 726, line 7, insert ''a'' after ''fielding''.

Page 726, line 8, strike ''alternatives''.

Page 776, line 8, strike ''by redesigning'' and insert ''by redesignating''.

Page 827, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3104. NUCLEAR ENERGY.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016 for nuclear energy as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

Page 850, line 25, strike '', as amended by section 3118, is further'' and insert ''is''.

Page 907, in the table of section 4201, in the entry relating to ''AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT'', strike ''93,112'' and insert ''78,112''.

Page 907, in the table of section 4201, under the heading ''AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT'', strike the entry ''Concept development by the Army of a CPGS option ..... [15,000]''.

Page 908, in the table of section 4201, in the entry relating to ''SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION'', strike ''2,144,450'' and insert ''2,129,450''.

Page 909, in the table of section 4201, in the entry relating to ''TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY'' , strike ''7,024,678'' and insert ''7,009,678''.

Page 911, in the table of section 4201, in the entry relating to ''SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS'', strike ''135,217'' and insert ''120,217''.

Page 911, in the table of section 4201, under the heading ''SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS'', strike the entry ''Concept development .....[15,000]''.

Page 911, in the table of section 4201, in the entry relating to ''SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION'', strike ''6,335,800'' and insert ''6,320,800''.

Page 912, in the table of section 4201, in the entry relating to ''TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY'', strike ''16,652,223'' and insert ''16,637,223''.

Page 918, in the table of section 4201, in the entry relating to ''PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT'', strike ''78,817'' and insert ''108,817''.

Page 918, in the table of section 4201, under the heading ''PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT'', insert the following entries (with the dollar amounts aligned under the ''House Authorized'' column):

Concept development by the Army of a CPGS option.....[15,000]

Concept development by the Navy of a CPGS option.....[15,000]

Page 918, in the table of section 4201, in the entry relating to ''SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION'', strike the second ''545,258'' (under the ''House Authorized'' column) and insert ''575,258''.

Page 919, in the table of section 4201, in the entry relating to ''TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW'', strike ''18,547,081'' and insert ''18,577,081''.

Page 924, in the table of section 4301, in the entry relating to ''Unobligated balances'', strike ''-286,400'' and insert ''-37,400''.

Page 924, in the table of section 4301, in the entry relating to ''SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED'', strike ''-338,200'' and insert ''-89,200''.

Page 924, in the table of section 4301, in the entry relating to ''TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS'', strike ''4,269,874'' and insert ''4,518,874''.

Page 925, in the table of section 4301, in the entry relating to ''Unobligated balances'', strike ''-37,400'' and insert ''-286,400''.

Page 925, in the table of section 4301, in the entry relating to ''SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED'', strike ''-813,600'' and insert ''-1,062,600''.

Page 925, in the table of section 4301, in the entry relating to ''TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE'', strike ''30,890,956'' and insert ''30,641,956''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment makes several technical, conforming, and clarifying changes to the bill. It has been drafted in full consultation with the minority and is cosponsored by the ranking member, Mr. SMITH.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting Chair. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is the manager's amendment. I agree completely with what the chairman just said, technical corrections that we ought to support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title I, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1___. MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN NUMBER OF AIRCRAFT CARRIERS OF THE NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5062(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''11'' and inserting ''10''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2447) is repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is currently stated in permanent law the Navy, under law, must maintain at all times 11 aircraft carriers. That is an arbitrary restrictive requirement—perhaps, they should have more; perhaps, they should have less.

My amendment would simply grant the Navy the flexibility to choose their needs and requirements in a rapidly evolving world, setting the floor of 10 carriers, rather than 11.

It is important to point out that the Navy is currently operating under a waiver from this very law for 10 active carriers anyway. My amendment simply conforms the underlying law to the reality that already exists.

In some ways, this amendment is really about giving the Navy control over spending choices. Aircraft carriers are expensive. Everybody knows that. At its heart, this amendment is about empowering the Navy to help determine its own fate in evolving and how we can best put our sailors in the best position to combat present and future threats.

I don't think any of us in Congress can sit here today and see what the future of naval warfare is. We might see an open ocean conflict in 10 years, or we might see shallow waterways under duress in 30 years.

To be sure, carriers have played a historic role in establishing a naval dominance we enjoy today, but so did battleships of decades past. We can't let ourselves be mired in our past success, even though, today, we no longer have a single battleship in the force.

The point being, the threats of the next 30 years will evolve. Carriers likely will be an important part of that equation, but they are not a perfect tool for every threat.

As former Secretary Gates himself said:

> Consider the massive overmatch the U.S. already enjoys. Consider, too, the growing antiship capabilities of adversaries. Do we really need 11 carrier strike groups for 30 years when no other country has more than one?

I don't think we, as a political body, are here to answer that; but I think by removing the arbitrary limit that forces the Navy at all times—unless they have a waiver—to have 11 active aircraft carrier groups prevents the Navy from evolving with the times.

We face a number of threats, whether it is fighting ISIS in the Middle East or ongoing operations in Afghanistan or rising threats from Asia or global piracy, but it is clear these threats require a broad range of tools, not just the largest and most expensive tool that we can find.

□ 1630

Aircraft carriers are likely to remain necessary and are an essential tool of force projection. They help us maintain our status as the first station to arrive on the scene, and they are often the first persons on the scene in the conflict as part of carrier strike groups. All of the tools the Navy needs cost money. When you are looking at unmanned aircraft assets that can deploy from other types of ships, just as with the battleships of yesteryear, there was a time when our carriers were invincible. Naval experts aren't so sure anymore.

It is not that these challenges can't be overcome. We have faced challenges before, but requiring the Navy to keep 11 carriers for the next several decades in permanent law is an arbitrary minimum and limits the Navy's flexibility to make the critical spending decisions to maximize our national security.

We know we can't afford everything, certainly not if we play by the budget rules and caps that we, ourselves, have written, so let's not make this whole thing harder by arbitrarily requiring 11 carriers for political reasons rather than maximizing our national defense.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, when a crisis arises and American lives and

interests are at risk, the first question decisionmakers ask is: Where are the carriers?

An 11 aircraft carrier fleet is central to U.S. defense and diplomatic policy. A robust fleet of carriers makes Ronald Reagan's timeless adage of ''peace through strength'' possible.

Recently, the USS *Theodore Roosevelt* responded to Iran's seizure of a cargo ship, and its actions helped to keep the vital shipping lanes in the Middle East safe and open. The *Roosevelt* continues to sail in the gulf, and its courageous crew is currently conducting operations against ISIS.

The USS *Roosevelt* provides a perfect example of the crucial role aircraft carriers play in the defense and in the prosperity of our Nation. To reduce our aircraft carrier fleet puts our ability to defend our Nation and our critical interest around the globe at risk. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), the ranking member of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, just to reiterate the prior point, a few weeks ago, the Iranian Government attempted to send a fleet of ships bearing arms for Houthi rebels in Yemen, a mission that would further drive that region into a dangerous failed state. Luckily, for the world, the USS *Theodore Roosevelt*, a Navy aircraft carrier, led a carrier group into the waters off Yemen and blocked the delivery of those weapons.

It is the quintessential platform: an aircraft carrier that can respond to external threats, such as the one a few weeks ago, at a time when there is a resurgent Russian Navy that is back, intruding on the territorial waters of Scandinavian allies, when a Chinese PLA Navy is creating island military outposts in international waters, and, as was mentioned earlier, when ISIS' advance is being confronted by U.S. airstrikes flown off U.S. carriers.

Cutting our fleet to 10 from 11 will cripple our Nation's ability to respond to these challenges and will reverse last year's decision by Congress to refuel the George Washington ahead of schedule to ensure the capability of an 11-ship fleet. Nothing in the testimony we have heard in the House Armed Services Committee suggests that the Navy can get by with fewer carriers. In fact, it is the exact opposite. Eleven is the minimum we need in order to meet the missions of today and in the future.

The Seapower report on carriers is a balanced plan for America's carrier fleet. Let's vote this amendment down and move forward with that plan.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At multiple points over the last 5 years, the Navy has only had 10 carriers. They actually had to request a waiver from the current law. This is ridiculous to put the Navy through this political decisionmaking process rather than a military decision process about the number of carrier groups that exist.

On a basic level, this idea of statutorily requiring weapons for future decades makes very little sense. Do we tell the Army, ''You need precisely X number of tanks for Desert Storm; therefore, you have to have 'this many' tanks for the next 30 years''? Do we tell the Air Force, ''You need 'this many' helicopters for Somalia; therefore, you have to have exactly 'this many' regardless of changing threats or challenges or budgetary realities''?

That is exactly what this amendment will help change in order to give the naval force the flexibility it needs to meet the changing dangers of the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

While I respect the sponsor's intent on reducing spending, shrinking our carrier fleet is not the way to do it.

Our fleet of aircraft carriers is the envy of the world because of the power and capability that they bring to bear. A fleet of 11 carriers allows the United States to be a powerful force of stability around the globe, that keeps sea lanes open and protects our merchant fleet against hostile governments and piracy. They allow our troops to respond quickly to natural disasters and humanitarian crises all over the world.

Reducing the number of aircraft carriers would have bad consequences. It would reduce our ability to protect ourselves and our interests abroad. It would have a dramatic impact on the morale of men and women who serve on them as longer deployments place an unfair burden on these sailors; and it would result in longer and more expensive maintenance to be conducted, reducing the time the vessels are able to react when needed.

For these reasons and others, I must urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Department of Defense is in the midst of a major reality check as the global threat changes, as budgets shrink, and as new technologies emerge, but where we go from here should be up to our naval experts, not Congress. At $14.2 billion apiece, one less carrier would allow the Navy to prioritize other programs, like increasing the capabilities of less costly, unmanned assets.

This amendment is about breaking down the walling off of defense spending for political reasons. We should be enabling those charged with our national defense to make the decisions they need to make for national interests. It simply doesn't stand up to the commonsense test that we would require in law an arbitrary number of carriers, so I urge the adoption of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I do agree with the gentleman that it is difficult to project what our seapower needs would be out two decades down the road or even a decade down the road, but we must try. That is why you will see a bipartisan opposition to his amendment.

One thing about each of the individuals who spoke in opposition to his amendment is that I sit side by side with them in classified hearings and in nonclassified hearings as we try to make those projections, because, under the Constitution, we have to raise Armies and we have to maintain Navies, and to create the carriers that we would need would take 6 to 9 years. We don't have that option when we need them.

Had we not stepped in as a Congress, we would never have had a carrier with the strike capability, because the Pentagon actually wanted them for ISR capabilities. Had Congress not stepped in, we wouldn't have had Tomahawk missiles because the Pentagon actually was not going to try to produce them. Without Congress' stepping in, we would not have had jointness.

The reason we have to step in for this number of carriers is that, as you have heard mentioned, if we don't have these carriers, we will automatically go from 7 months deployment for our sailors on these carriers to as many as 9 months or 10 months—an extra 2 to 3 months. Ask those families what an imposition that is.

The second thing, Mr. Chairman, is, if we don't have them, we will have gaps in the national defense of this country. As my friend Mr. COURTNEY mentioned, just recently, we had a carrier out there for 54 days, fighting ISIL, when we had no other capabilities of doing it. Had we not had that carrier, we would have had difficulties as a country.

The third thing is, by not having these carriers, we run our other carriers harder, faster, and burn them out more. Essentially, we are consuming the next generation's national defense.

The final thing, Mr. Chairman, is, if you were to look just a few years ago, our commanders around the globe were able to meet 90 percent of the requirements they needed for the United States Navy. This year, we will only meet 44 percent of those requirements. If we allow this amendment, there will be a commander somewhere who won't

have that carrier group when he needs it. I hope we defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 25, 29, 36, 76, and 94 printed in House Report No. 114–112, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 136. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE OCONUS BASING OF THE F–35A AIRCRAFT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Defense is continuing its process of permanently stationing the F–35 aircraft at installations in the Continental United States (in this section referred to as ''CONUS'') and forward-basing Outside the Continental United States (in this section referred to as ''OCONUS'').

(2) The Secretary of the Air Force has, from a list of bases which included two United States candidate bases in Alaska and three foreign OCONUS candidate bases, selected Eielson Air Force Base as the preferred alternative for two of Pacific Air Force's F-35A Lightning II squadrons in Alaska.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force, in the strategic basing process for the F–35A aircraft, should continue to place emphasis on the benefits derived from sites that—

(1) are capable of hosting fighter-based bilateral and multilateral training opportunities with international partners;

(2) have sufficient airspace and range capabilities and capacity to meet the training requirements;

(3) have existing facilities to support personnel, operations, and logistics associated with the flying mission;

(4) have limited encroachment that would adversely impact training or operations; and

(5) minimize the overall construction and operational costs.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle A of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 302. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense an additional $25,000,000 for the Office of Economic Adjustment to be available, until expended and notwithstanding any other provision of law, for transportation infrastructure improvements associated with congestion mitigation in urban areas related to recommendations of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

(b) FUNDING OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amounts specified in the funding table in section 4301 of division D, relating to Operation and Maintenance, are each hereby reduced by $5,000,000 (for a total of $25,000,000), as follows:

(1) Army, Line 540.
(2) Navy, Line 720.
(3) Marine Corps, Line 210.
(4) Air Force, Line 470.
(5) Defense-wide, Line 340.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER OF INDIANA

Page 68, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 317. COMPREHENSIVE STUDY ON IMPACT OF PROPOSED OZONE RULE.

Not earlier than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a comprehensive study on the impact of any final rule that succeeds the proposed regulation entitled National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone (published at 79 Fed. Reg. 75234) on military readiness, including the impact of such rule on training exercises, military installations, land owned and operated by the Department of Defense, the infrastructure upon which the national security system relies, and the impact military activities may have on attainment designations.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. TAKAI OF HAWAII

At the end of subtitle F of title V (page 227, after line 19), add the following new section:

SEC. 5____. MARINER TRAINING.

Section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) SPECIAL RULES FOR MARINER DUTIES.—(1) The program required by subsection (a) shall ensure to the greatest extent practicable that—

''(A) members of the armed forces whose duties are primarily as a mariner receive training opportunities necessary to meet the requirements for licenses, certificates of registry, and merchant mariners' documents issued under part E of subtitle II of title 46, and to acquire a Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping for Seafarers endorsement to such licenses and documents;

''(B) such members assigned to a vessel's deck and engineering departments have a designated path to meet the requirements for such licenses, documents, and endorsement commensurate with their positional responsibilities;

''(C) courses in marine navigation, leadership, operation, and maintenance taken while such a member is in the armed forces are submitted to the National Maritime Center for use in assessments of the fulfillment by the member of the requirements for receiving such licenses, documents, and endorsement; and

''(D) such members in the deck and engineering departments have the opportunity to attend merchant mariner credentialing programs that meet training requirements not offered by the armed forces.

''(2) The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall ensure that any assessment of the training and experience of an applicant who is or has been a member of the armed forces is conducted without any limitation related to the member's military pay grade.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5____. ATOMIC VETERANS SERVICE MEDAL.

(a) SERVICE MEDAL REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall design and produce a military service medal, to be known as the ''Atomic Veterans Service Medal'', to honor retired and former members of the Armed Forces who are radiation-exposed veterans (as such term is defined in section 1112(c)(3) of title 38, United States Code).

(b) DISTRIBUTION OF MEDAL.—

(1) ISSUANCE TO RETIRED AND FORMER MEMBERS.—At the request of a radiation-exposed veteran, the Secretary of Defense shall issue the Atomic Veterans Service Medal to the veteran.

(2) ISSUANCE TO NEXT-OF-KIN.—In the case of a radiation-exposed veteran who is deceased, the Secretary may provide for issuance of the Atomic Veterans Service Medal to the next-of-kin of the person.

(3) APPLICATION.—The Secretary shall prepare and disseminate as appropriate an application by which radiation-exposed veterans and their next-of-kin may apply to receive the Atomic Veterans Service Medal.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle E of title VI, add the following new section:

SEC. 6____. AVAILABILITY FOR PURCHASE OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEMORIAL HEADSTONES AND MARKERS FOR MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS WHO PERFORMED CERTAIN TRAINING.

Section 2306 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i)(1) The Secretary shall make available for purchase a memorial headstone or marker for the marked or unmarked grave of an individual described in paragraph (2) or for the purpose of commemorating such an individual whose remains are unavailable.

''(2) An individual described in this paragraph is an individual who—

''(A) as a member of a National Guard or Reserve component performed inactive duty training or active duty for training for at least six years but did not serve on active duty; and

''(B) is not otherwise ineligible for a memorial headstone or marker on account of the nature of the individual's separation from the Armed Forces or other cause.

''(3) A headstone or marker for the grave of an individual may be purchased under this subsection by—

''(A) the individual;

''(B) the surviving spouse, child, sibling, or parent of the individual; or

''(C) an individual other than the next of kin, as determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(4) In establishing the prices of the headstones and markers made available for purchase under this section, the Secretary shall ensure the prices are sufficient to cover the costs associated with the production and delivery of such headstones and markers.

''(5) No person may receive any benefit under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs solely by reason of this subsection.

''(6) This subsection does not authorize any new burial benefit for any person or create any new authority for any individual to be buried in a national cemetery.

''(7) The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Defense in establishing procedures to determine whether an individual is an individual described in paragraph (2).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

Page 285, after line 16, insert the following new section:

SEC. 705. ACCESS TO TRICARE PRIME FOR CERTAIN BENEFICIARIES.

(a) ACCESS.—Section 732(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 1097a note) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) RESIDENCE AT TIME OF ELECTION.—

''(A) Except as provided by subparagraph (B), an affected eligible beneficiary may not make the one-time election under paragraph (1) if, at the time of such election, the beneficiary does not reside—

''(i) in a ZIP code that is in a region described in subsection (d)(1)(B); and

''(ii) within 100 miles of a military medical treatment facility.

''(B) Subparagraph (A)(ii) shall not apply with respect to an affected eligible beneficiary who—

''(i) as of December 25, 2013, resides farther than 100 miles from a military medical treatment facility; and

''(ii) is such an eligible beneficiary by reason of service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps.''.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1406 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, is hereby increased by $4,000,000.

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, Navy, Line 040, Air Operations and Safety Support, MV–22 Fleet Engineering Support Unfunded Requirement, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, is hereby reduced by $4,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7___. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense Healthcare Management Systems Modernization, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of Defense makes the certification required by section 713(g)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7___. PRIMARY BLAST INJURY RESEARCH.

The peer-reviewed Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury Research Program shall conduct a study on blast injury mechanics covering a wide range of primary blast injury conditions, including traumatic brain injury, in order to accelerate solution development in this critical area.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. HURD OF TEXAS

Page 311, line 2, after ''shall'' insert ''cover the entire Federal Government and''.

Page 311, line 17, strike ''Secretary and'' and insert ''Secretary,''.

Page 311, line 18, after ''committees'' insert '', the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate''.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8___. MODIFICATION TO AND SCORECARD PROGRAM FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING GOALS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO GOVERNMENTWIDE GOAL FOR SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION IN PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS.—Section 15(g)(1)(A)(i) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(1)(A)(i) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''In meeting this goal, the Government shall ensure the participation of small business concerns from a wide variety of industries and from a broad spectrum of small business concerns within each industry.''.

(b) SCORECARD PROGRAM FOR EVALUATING FEDERAL AGENCY COMPLIANCE WITH SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING GOALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in consultation with the Federal agencies, shall—

(A) develop a methodology for calculating a score to be used to evaluate the compliance of each Federal agency with meeting the goals established pursuant to section 15(g)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(1)(B)); and

(B) develop a scorecard based on such methodology.

(2) AGENCY ANNUAL GOAL.—In developing the methodology for calculating a score described in paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consider each annual goal established by each Federal agency pursuant to section 15(g)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(1)(B)).

(3) USE OF SCORECARD.—Beginning in fiscal year 2017, the Administrator shall establish and carry out a program to use the scorecard developed under paragraph (1) to evaluate whether each Federal agency is creating the maximum practicable opportunities for the award of prime contracts and subcontracts to small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women, by assigning a score to each Federal agency. If the Administrator fails to establish and carry out this program before the end of fiscal year 2017, the Administrator may not exercise the authority under section 7(a)(25)(A) until such time as the program is implemented.

(4) CONTENTS OF SCORECARD.—The scorecard developed under paragraph (1) shall include, for each Federal agency, the following information:

(A) A determination of whether the Federal agency met each of the prime contract goals established pursuant to section 15(g)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(1)(B)) with respect to small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women.

(B) A determination of whether the Federal agency met each of the subcontract goals established pursuant to such section with respect to small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women.

(C) The number of small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women awarded prime contracts in each North American Industrial Classification System code during the fiscal year and a comparison to the number awarded contracts during the prior fiscal year, if available.

(D) The number of small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women awarded subcontracts in each North American Industrial Classification System code during the fiscal year and a comparison to the number awarded contracts during the prior fiscal year, if available.

(E) Any other factors that the Administrator deems important to achieve the maximum practicable utilization of small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women.

(5) WEIGHTED FACTORS.—In using the scorecard to evaluate and assign a score to a Federal agency, the Administrator shall base—

(A) fifty percent of the score on the dollar value of prime contracts described in paragraph (4)(A); and

(B) fifty percent of the score on the information provided in subparagraphs (B) through (E) of paragraph (4), weighted in a manner determined by the Administrator to encourage the maximum practicable opportunity for the award of prime contracts and subcontracts to small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women.

(6) PUBLICATION.—The scorecard used by the Administrator under this subsection shall be submitted to the President and Congress along with the report submitted under section 15(h)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(h)(2)).

(7) REPORT.—After the Administrator submits the scorecard for fiscal year 2018, but not later than March 31, 2019, the Administrator shall report to the Committee on

Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate. Such report shall include the following:

(A) A description of any increase in the dollar amount of prime contracts and subcontracts awarded to small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women.

(B) A description of any increase in the dollar amount of prime contracts and subcontracts awarded to small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women in each North American Industrial Classification System code.

(C) A description of any increase to the number of small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women awarded contracts in each North American Industrial Classification System code.

(D) The recommendation of the Administrator on continuing, modifying, expanding, or terminating the program established under this subsection.

(8) GAO REPORT ON SCORECARD METHODOLOGY.—Not later than September 30, 2018, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate a report that—

(A) evaluates whether the methodology used to calculate a score under this subsection accurately and effectively—

(i) measures the compliance of each Federal agency with meeting the goals established pursuant to section 15(g)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(1)(B)); and

(ii) encourages Federal agencies to expand opportunities for mall business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women to compete for and be awarded Federal procurement contracts across North American Industrial Classification System Codes; and

(B) if warranted, makes recommendations on how to improve such methodology to improve its accuracy and effectiveness.

(9) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(B) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ''Federal agency'' has the meaning given the term ''agency'' by section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code, but does not include the United States Postal Service or the Government Accountability Office.

(C) SCORECARD.—The term ''scorecard'' shall mean any summary using a rating system to evaluate a Federal agency's efforts to meet goals established under section 15(g)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(1)(B)) that—

(i) includes the measures described in paragraph (4); and

(ii) assigns a score to each Federal agency evaluated.

(D) SMALL BUSINESS ACT DEFINITIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The terms ''small business concern'', ''small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans'', ''qualified HUBZone small business concern'', and ''small business concern owned and controlled by women'' shall have the meanings given such terms under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(ii) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS.—The term ''small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals'' has the meaning given that term under section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)).

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 474, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 1060. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR REALIGNMENT OF FORCES AT OR CLOSURE OF UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be used, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to—

(1) close or abandon United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba;

(2) relinquish control of Guantanamo Bay to the Republic of Cuba; or

(3) modify the Treaty Between the United States of America and Cuba signed at Washington, D.C. on May 29, 1934, including a modification of the boundaries of Guantanamo Bay, unless ratified with the advice and consent of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF NEW YORK

Page 485, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 10___. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF DETECTION, IDENTIFICATION, AND DISABLEMENT CAPABILITIES RELATED TO REMOTELY PILOTED AIRCRAFT.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report addressing the suitability of existing capabilities to detect, identify, and disable remotely piloted aircraft operating within special use and restricted airspace. The report shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the degree to which existing capabilities to detect, identify, and potentially disable remotely piloted aircraft within special use and restricted airspace are able to be deployed and combat prevailing threats.

(2) An assessment of existing gaps in capabilities related to the detection, identification, or disablement of remotely piloted aircraft within special use and restricted airspace.

(3) A plan that outlines the extent to which existing research and development programs within the Department of Defense can be leveraged to fill identified capability gaps and/or the need to establish new programs to address such gaps as are identified pursuant to paragraph (2).

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

In section 1090, redesignate subsections (a) through (d) as subsections (b) through (e), respectively, and insert before subsection (b), as so redesignated, the following:

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in order to ensure the safety and security of members of the Armed Forces of the United States overseas—

(1) members of the Armed Forces of the United States should have the proper authorized resources at all times to protect themselves while participating in an ordered evacuation of a United States embassy or consulate abroad; and

(2) no restrictions should be placed on the ability of members of the Armed Forces of the United States to maintain on their person and use authorized weapons and equipment for personal and evacuee security at all times and to take authorized protective actions subject to applicable law and orders from the chain of command, during an ordered evacuation of a United States embassy or consulate.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle C of title XII (page 570, after line 23), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT TO ASSESS THE POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS OF AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFE ZONES OR A NO-FLY ZONE IN SYRIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) March 2015 marked the fourth year of the crisis in Syria, which has resulted in the world's largest ongoing humanitarian disaster.

(2) Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and supporting militias, including Hezbollah, continue to carry out sectarian mass atrocities, which have included mass targeted killings, mass graves, the extermination of entire families, including their children, incidents of ethnic cleansing, sexual violence, widespread torture, aerial bombardment of residential areas, and forced displacement of certain Syrian civilians especially from areas in western Syria where Assad is attempting to increase the dominance of his own loyalists.

(3) Approximately 220,000 people have been killed, including thousands of children, many more have been seriously wounded, and civilian casualties continue to mount as widespread and systematic attacks on schools, hospitals, and other civilian facilities persist in violation of international norms and principles.

(4) Assad's forces and supporting militias have used air power to target Syrian civilians, including the deployment of barrel bombs filled with explosives, shrapnel, and chemical weapons.

(5) Assad's forces, supporting militias, and other parties to the conflict are systematically blocking humanitarian aid delivery, including food and medical care, from many civilian areas in violation of international norms and principles.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report that—

(A) assesses the potential effectiveness, risks, and operational requirements of the establishment and maintenance of a no-fly zone over part or all of Syria, including—

(i) the operational and legal requirements for United States and coalition air power to establish a no-fly zone in Syria;

(ii) the impact a no-fly zone in Syria would have on humanitarian and counterterrorism efforts in Syria and the surrounding region;

(iii) the potential for force contributions from other countries to establish a no-fly zone in Syria; and

(iv) the impact of the establishment of a no-fly zone in Syria on the recipients of training provided by section 1209 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3541); and

(B) assesses the potential effectiveness, risks, and operational requirements for the establishment of one or more safe zones in Syria for internally displaced people or for the facilitation of humanitarian assistance, including—

(i) the operational and legal requirements for United States and coalition forces to establish one or more safe zones in Syria;

(ii) the impact one or more safe zones in Syria would have on humanitarian and counterterrorism efforts in Syria and the surrounding region;

(iii) the potential for contributions from other countries and vetted non-state actor partners to establish and maintain one or more safe zones in Syria; and

(iv) the impact of the establishment of one or more safe zones in Syria on the recipients of training provided by section 1209 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3541).

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''specified congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS RELATING TO SOVEREIGNTY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION OVER CRIMEA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended—

(1) to implement any action or policy that recognizes the de jure or de facto sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea, its airspace, or its territorial waters; or

(2) to provide assistance for the central government of a country that has taken affirmative steps intended to recognize or otherwise be supportive of the Russian Federation's forcible and illegal occupation of Crimea.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the restriction on assistance required by subsection (a)(2) if the Secretary certifies and reports to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that to do so is in the national interest of the United States.

(c) SUNSET.—The requirements of subsection (a) shall cease to be in effect if the Secretary of Defense certifies and reports to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that the armed forces of the Russian Federation have withdrawn from Crimea and the Government of Ukraine has reestablished sovereignty over Crimea.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII (page 775, after line 19), add the following new section:

SEC. 28___. SPECIAL AUTHORITY FOR MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FACILITIES.

Section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

''(e) CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FACILITIES.—(1) Using such amounts as may be appropriated to the Secretary concerned in advance for operation and maintenance to carry out this subsection, the Secretary concerned may carry out an unspecified minor military construction project that—

''(A) has an approved cost equal to or less than $15,000,000, notwithstanding subsections (a) and (c); and

''(B) creates, expands, or modifies a child development program facility serving children under 13 years of age.

''(2) The approval and congressional notification requirements of subsection (b) shall apply to an unspecified minor military construction project carried out pursuant to paragraph (1), except that, paragraph (1) of subsection (b) shall be applied by substituting '$7,500,000' for '$1,000,000'.

''(3) The authority to commence an unspecified minor military construction project pursuant to paragraph (1) expires September 30, 2018.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE OF LOUISIANA

Page 400, after line 23, insert the following new section:

SEC. 865. EXCEPTION FOR ABILITYONE PRODUCTS FROM AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES PRODUCED IN AFGHANISTAN, CENTRAL ASIAN STATES, AND DJIBOUTI.

(a) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN ITEMS NOT PRODUCED IN AFGHANISTAN.—Section 886 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and except as provided in subsection (d),'' after ''subsection (b),''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) EXCEPTION FOR ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT LIST.—The requirements of this section shall not apply to any product that is included in the procurement list described in section 8503(a) of title 41.''.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN ITEMS NOT PRODUCED IN CENTRAL ASIAN STATES.—Section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2400) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and except as provided in subsection (h),'' after ''subsection (b),''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) EXCEPTION FOR ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT LIST.—The requirements of this section shall not apply to any product that is included in the procurement list described in section 8503(a) of title 41.''.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN ITEMS NOT PRODUCED IN DJIBOUTI.—Section 1263 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting ''and except as provided in subsection (g),'' after ''subsection (c),''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) EXCEPTION FOR ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT LIST.—The requirements of this section shall not apply to any product that is included in the procurement list described in section 8503(a) of title 41.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

Page 548, line 22, after ''through 2018'' insert ''while also maintaining a focus on the protection of human rights''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

There are, I believe, 19 amendments in this en bloc package from both Republicans and Democrats. Both Republicans and Democrats have contributed to this bill, and I hope all of the Members who have sponsored the 19 amendments that are included in this package will vote for the final passage of the bill, because, if you get an amendment adopted but then you vote against the final passage, you have pretty much negated your own work. I hope that is not the case. I hope Members on both sides of the aisle support its final passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the ranking member, and I thank the chairman for including my amendment in the en bloc set of amendments.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply create a service medal to be awarded to atomic veterans or their surviving family members in honor of their service and sacrifice to our Nation.

Between 1945 and 1962, 225,000 members of our Armed Forces participated in hundreds of nuclear weapons tests. The atomic veterans were placed in extremely dangerous areas, constantly exposed to dangerous levels of radiation in the performance of their duties. They were sworn to secrecy, unable to even talk to their doctors about their past exposure to radiation.

Thankfully, Presidents Clinton and George H. W. Bush recognized the atomic veterans' valiant service and acted to provide specialized care and compensation for their harrowing duty.

One of my constituents, Joe Mondello from Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, is an atomic veteran and is very proud of his service to our country. Like me, he believes it is past time for the Defense Department to honor with a medal the unique service carried out by atomic veterans.

The DOD has claimed that it would be too difficult to identify which veterans would be awarded this medal. Thankfully, the U.S. Code clearly identifies exactly which veterans are considered atomic veterans.

This is a good amendment, and I urge the support of it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished House majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to present an amendment that is bipartisan and that deals with AbilityOne agencies.

The Department of Defense has created three procurement programs for Afghanistan, central Asian states, and Djibouti to support businesses and local economies in these countries and to cultivate positive relationships in the region and the world. The problem is, while I surely appreciate their intentions, there have been unintended consequences with this program in implementing these programs.

The GSA has allowed businesses located in these countries to supply products manufactured by AbilityOne agencies, which employ blind and disabled Americans. The result of that policy has been devastating to many of these AbilityOne agencies across the country. We have seen job losses here in America in implementing this new policy by the Department of Defense.

This amendment addresses the problem of these job losses by exempting those AbilityOne agencies from this Department of Defense procurement program. If you look at what has happened with this program, we have seen facilities not only in Louisiana but in States like New York, Texas, Ohio, Kansas, North Carolina, Nebraska, and Washington all experience job losses here in America from shipping those jobs over to foreign countries.

Again, I think—or I surely would hope—that that was not the intention of the program, Mr. Chairman, to take jobs away from disabled Americans and ship those jobs overseas.

□ 1645

So what this amendment does is restore those jobs back here in America for those blind and other disabled Americans who have one of the highest underemployment populations in the country. Let's keep those jobs here. We can continue building relations with other countries, but just not at the expense of American jobs for disabled workers. That is what the amendment does.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), who is a cosponsor.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, the majority whip, for yielding to me. I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment.

This amendment basically exempts AbilityOne products from certain DOD procurement programs in this legislation. These procurement programs have severely affected Louisiana's disabled workers in the recent past, and in Louisiana alone these programs have forced disabled workers to be laid off to the tune of approximately $18 million in lost revenue, so while I believe it is important to support these critical overseas partners that we have as they rebuild their economies, we also need to focus on jobs here at home. That is why I have cosponsored this. It is a commonsense amendment. It is revenue neutral. I strongly believe that this amendment will allow AbilityOne disabled workers nationwide to hold on to jobs.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank both Mr. SMITH, the ranking member, and Mr. THORNBERRY, the chairman of this committee, for working very hard on this bill. Both of them are responsible leaders in this House and work well together to make sure that our national security is well served. I regret, therefore, that I will be opposing this bill for reasons that I will discuss.

Both have been fighting tirelessly for the defense authorization bill that gives our troops the tools they need to achieve their mission's objectives, enhance our national security, and bolster key U.S. partners. These are, of course, positive aspects of this bill.

I particularly commend my friend GWEN GRAHAM for authoring an amendment that will help develop a joint U.S.-Israeli anti-tunneling system, which is included in this bill. Representative MARC VEASEY had an amendment adopted in committee that asked the Pentagon to explore the effects of the DACA program on military recruitment. Congressman GALLEGO worked hard to get language included in the bill expressing the sense of Congress that DREAMers, undocumented immigrants who were brought here as children, ought to be able to serve the country they love in our military and be rewarded for that service with a chance to stay here legally.

I think that is common sense. Some across the aisle have made it their mission to remove that language from the bill. I urge my colleagues to defeat that amendment, given how important these issues are and that the language in the bill does not force the Defense Department to take any action it does not deem to be in the best interests of the national security. The amendment striking this provision, as I said, ought to be defeated.

The bill contains provisions that continue to prevent President Obama, however, from finally closing the detention center at Guantanamo Bay. Not only does that facility cost taxpayers $2.4 million per detainee. I know my budget hawks think, well, $2.4 million to keep one person in jail for a year, that makes sense. I disagree with you on that if you think that. But not only does it cost way too much, it is a blot against our country in the eyes of the world and in the hearts of so many of our own citizens here at home.

Furthermore, in his budget request, the President laid out a path to lift the sequester level, which is undermining our national security. Hear me. The sequester that this bill honors by exception is undermining the national security of America.

This bill, however, perpetuates the sequester for everything except that which some think is important. I share their view that national security is critically important. For 34 years in the authorization bills and on the appropriation bills, I have been a strong supporter of a robust national security, whether it was President Reagan or President Bush or President Clinton or President Bush or, yes, President Obama.

I do not yield to anybody on this floor in my support of national security over those three-and-a-half decades, but our national security is being put at risk because we are honoring sequester in this bill. Not only are we honoring sequester in this bill, we are, in fact—for the investments in education, in infrastructure, in the environment—undermining our country's well-being. For that reason alone, I will vote against this bill until we fix the sequester and take care of America's national security.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, regret that the distinguished minority whip has chosen not to support this bipartisan legislation. It is absolutely true that this bill does not fix sequester for all those nondefense issues, and as I mentioned yesterday, I think there are a lot of people on both sides of the aisle who would like to find something better than the Budget Control Act—with the caps and sequester—to deal with our budgeting.

But that is not what a defense authorization bill is or does or can do. So the idea that we would hold our military and their pay and their weapons and the policies involved hostage in the hopes that we can put enough pressure to have the President and Congress somehow come together to fix all these other problems, I just think that is unrealistic, and I am afraid that that is

not fair to the people we support with this legislation. I think that is an unfortunate political tactic that some have chosen to take that puts our men and women at greater risk. They ought to get better from us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, my amendment would direct the Department of Defense to conduct a study on blast injury mechanics covering a wide range of primary blast injury conditions, including traumatic brain injury, in order to accelerate solution development in this critical area.

As the co-chair and cofounder of the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force, I have spent the last 14 years fighting for patients with brain injuries, both on and off the battlefield. We all know that TBI is the signature wound of the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, and while we have made great progress on ensuring our soldiers have the best care, there is still more work to be done.

The DOD's peer-reviewed Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury Research Program conducts extensive research on TBI. However, little is known about a primary blast injury and its connection to TBI. Researchers still do not know the exact mechanisms by which a primary blast injury damages the brain cells and circuits. Understanding how a primary blast injury affects the brain is imperative to developing appropriate prevention measures, including ensuring proper equipment.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment in the en bloc.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment and the underlying bill. My amendment language would simply require a study of the effects of any final EPA ozone rule on our military readiness.

Mr. Chairman, we all want a healthy planet, but we must also recognize the real world consequences of any regulations that we pass. For example, according to NERA Economic Consulting, stricter ozone standards could reduce U.S. GDP by $1.7 trillion over 20 years, killing 340,000 jobs in Indiana alone.

The EPA ozone rule will no doubt affect our military readiness as well. Estimates show 11 million acres of land under DOD control could be impacted. Tighter ozone standards could force imposition of new emission controls on our military vehicles. Military air bases could be impacted as well. No matter what you think of the EPA ozone rule, we should all agree that we ought to know how the final rule impacts our military readiness.

Congress has no more important responsibility than protecting our national security. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of three measures I offered that are part of this and a later en bloc amendment.

First is an amendment I coauthored with the Committee on Foreign Affairs chairman, ED ROYCE. For more than 4 years, the Assad regime has rained down terror on its own citizens in the form of barrel bombs in Syria. Thousands upon thousands of Syrians have abandoned their homes and spilled across the border into Lebanon, Turkey, and Jordan. They are begging the world for help. While it wouldn't nearly solve this problem, a no-fly zone or a safe zone would provide a glimmer of hope for these people. Our amendment would require the Pentagon leaders to take a hard look at the feasibility of establishing a no-fly zone.

My second amendment would require the Pentagon to report to Congress on the way reductions in U.S. military readiness in Europe would affect NATO's core mission of collective defense. This report would be required before any reduction in Europe takes place. I view Vladimir Putin's aggression as the greatest threat to European security since World War II. Today, NATO's article 5 must remain a credible deterrent. My amendment takes a step in that direction.

Finally, I offered legislation to make sure U.S. training programs for Afghan National Security Forces include training on the protection of human rights. Since the defeat of the Taliban in 2001, not enough has been done to make human rights protections a priority for law enforcement agencies in Afghanistan. This issue should be a major part of our training efforts.

I urge my colleagues to support these provisions.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, across our Nation, aviation is quickly changing. Today, basic unmanned aircraft can be purchased for a few hundred dollars, flown virtually anywhere by an operator with little or no experience.

When a small quadcopter landed on the east lawn of the White House in January, we saw the potential danger of such aircraft. In my district, the Air Force Research Laboratory in Rome, New York, working with NUAIR, is one of the six FAA test sites in the country to integrate these systems into our national airspace. We are on the cutting edge of advances in UAVs, unmanned aerial aircraft. My amendment would simply require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a departmentwide review of its current capacities to detect, identify, and remotely disarm unmanned aircraft.

It would further require the Secretary to examine how the Department of Research and Development resources can be leveraged to enhance these capacities. Within the Department of Defense, some of our Nation's most advanced research is taking place.

I appreciate the committee's recognition and including this in the en bloc.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a bipartisan amendment I introduced with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT). This amendment prohibits the authorization of funds to implement any action that recognizes Russian sovereignty over the Crimea. The language mirrors my legislation, H.R. 93, the Crimea Annexation Non-recognition Act, which passed out of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously.

□ 1700

It also is consistent with language included in the CR/Omnibus signed into law in December.

Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea undermines Ukrainian sovereignty and sets a dangerous precedent that cannot be overstated. The U.S. must make a simple, declarative statement on Russia's illegal annexation. This bipartisan amendment does just that.

I also want to thank the Armed Services Committee leadership and staff for working with us on three other amendments that promote monitoring and evaluation for humanitarian assistance programs, improve management of information technology projects, and foster better communication between government and industry.

I thank both Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. SMITH for their leadership.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), chair of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today as chairman of the House Small Business Committee to support the en bloc amendment, which includes the bipartisan amendment offered by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and myself. It is really commonsense acquisition reform.

There are numerous small business contracting programs aimed at ensuring that the Department of Defense has a reliable small business technological and industrial base, but we rarely look

at the results of these programs. The current method used to assess the health of the small business base focuses almost exclusively on one factor, and that is prime contract dollars.

While this is an important factor, we are missing a lot of the picture. For example, the current method ignores the fact that since 2013 we have lost over 25 percent of the small firms registered to do business with the Federal Government. That is over 100,000 small businesses that are no longer competing for contracts.

We also have a declining small business participation rate, which threatens the core principle of competition. It is basic supply and demand: when there are fewer offers, prices go up. And that harms the taxpayer. That is what we are trying to deal with.

I urge my colleagues to support this.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI).

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment will help men and women in the armed services that gain experience in maritime trades during their military career to transition into careers in the U.S. merchant marine so they can continue to serve our country.

This program will provide access to training opportunities necessary to meet the requirements for licenses and certificates of registry.

The program established by my amendment will help build on past successes, allowing the tens of thousands of currently serving military servicemembers in the maritime trades to leave the military fully licensed to serve in the U.S. merchant marine.

We can fix this now and, in doing so, not only allow already qualified servicemembers a better opportunity to find a job, but a chance to continue to ensure our national security.

A strong, domestic maritime industry is a critical component of our national security strategy. We must ensure that an adequate supply of mariners is available to support this industry. This not only preserves American security, but it preserves American jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply note that I am pleased to support the amendments that we have just discussed en bloc.

I noticed the amendments offered by our Democratic colleagues include such important issues as Russia, traumatic brain injury, a Syrian no-fly zone, human rights in Afghanistan, and maritime job training. All are important issues, and I appreciate the contributions of all the Members who authored these amendments, who presented them, and who have argued for them here before the House.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that all of those Members will not just throw away the results of their efforts by voting against final passage because voting against final passage essentially means all of this work that they have put in goes for nothing.

Members on both sides of the aisle have contributed to this product. Members on both sides of the aisle need to contribute to having it become law.

With that, I encourage Members on both sides to support the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I take the chairman's point, but it is one that really doesn't make any sense from a legislative standpoint.

Anybody who has ever voted knows that you can like portions of a bill and still vote against the bill. I don't think there is a legislator alive who hasn't ever been in that position.

So this idea that if you get something, anything, however small in the bill, you are then somehow morally obligated to vote for it, goes against every aspect of legislating that I have ever seen.

It is our constant challenge as legislators that we have pieces of legislation before us where there is a lot in it that we like and there is some in it that we don't like. And you have got to decide.

So I reject the argument that if you get something in this bill, you have to vote for it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of the time that I yielded back.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point that the gentleman made. My point is that for 53 years this product has been the result of bipartisan effort. And never before, I don't believe, have we had a party decision to oppose the NDAA in order to try to leverage it for some purpose outside of defense. And yet that is what is happening here.

So my point is simple. I appreciate the contributions that Members on both sides have made. It is not some little something that the Members have just gotten in here. These are important issues: traumatic brain injury, Russia, Syria, human rights, maritime job training. They are significant contributions.

But my point is not necessarily a moral one, it is a practical one. You work to get these amendments included in the bill, but then if you vote against the bill and it goes down in defeat, what have you accomplished? Nothing.

So I hope that Members on both sides who have made contributions and who do support a strong military will rethink the position that they are being asked to take with this bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 538 (page 179, beginning line 6), relating to a sense of the House of Representatives regarding Secretary of Defense review of section 504 of title 10, United States Code, regarding enlisting certain aliens in the Armed Forces.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Brooks amendment. I opposed the Gallego amendment when it was considered in committee, and I remain opposed to bringing the sensitive issue of immigration into the defense authorization bill.

There are Members on both sides of the aisle with a variety of positions when it comes to immigration, but a Defense Authorization Act is not the appropriate time or place to have this debate.

Remember, the Gallego language does not change any law. It is a sense of Congress that the Secretary should review existing authorities. So having sensitive debate when there can be no result that changes anything only distracts from the essential provisions in this bill that do matter to our troops and our Nation's security.

I notice that the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee has said publicly: ''We're not going to do anything on immigration in the NDAA.'' That is my view as well.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support the Brooks amendment to remove this provision now so that we can better focus on the things that are essential for our troops and our security.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, the DREAMers in this country are deeply patriotic.

For many, America is the only country they have ever known. It is the country they love and call home. Many want nothing more than the chance to serve the United States in uniform.

The Brooks amendment cruelly seeks to deny these talented young people that opportunity. It would strike my amendment encouraging the Secretary of Defense to use his authority under existing law to enable DACA recipients to enlist.

If we approve this amendment, we leave the deeply unjust status quo unchanged. Right now, in America, DREAMers can be drafted into the military, but they can't sign up to serve in the military force they choose. That is simply unacceptable. These young people are Americans in every respect, except on paper.

I fought in Iraq, and I know what really matters on the battlefield isn't whether you have the right papers; it is whether you have the heart to fight, patriotism for your country, and the right character.

Mr. Chairman, for the good of our country, I hope we will defeat this deeply misguided Brooks amendment.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support his amendment.

The House should not take action to legitimize the President's unconstitutional overreach regarding immigration, especially that of creating a program to defer removal for an entire class of hundreds of thousands of unlawful aliens.

The gentleman's amendment is necessary to preserve the Congress' constitutionally guaranteed plenary power over immigration law and policy.

Whether and how to deal with unlawful aliens brought to the U.S. as minors by their parents is a question that we should debate thoroughly. And any legislative efforts regarding these individuals should move through regular order in the House Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over immigration law and policy.

Legitimate concerns must be considered when discussing this issue, not the least of which is whether the parents who brought the minor to the U.S. illegally should be able to ultimately benefit from the illegal activity by becoming permanent residents based on the legal status of the minor they brought here illegally in the first place. As the policy currently stands, that will happen if any Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals recipient enlists in the military.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the great State of Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chair, Jesus said that there is no greater love than to lay down your life for your friend. Abraham Lincoln said that giving your life for your country is the last full measure of devotion. And that is why I am opposed to this amendment.

I am proud that, in America, citizenship means something. It is worthy to be earned. Amnesty, to me, means giving it away, and I don't support that.

I do support the ability to earn citizenship. If a person has the courage and conviction to take the oath and to join our Nation's warriors to defend you and me, what more can they do to prove their allegiance?

The military is not a jobs program. And if someone through their merit and hard work earns acceptance into that elite fighting force, where they could die defending you and me, then I leave you with this question: What country's flag would you have draped on the casket of that brave soul?

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Alabama for yielding, and I support his amendment.

The House already has voted against the President's executive amnesty several times.

The language this amendment seeks to strike would legitimize the President's unlawful immigration actions, which violates Congress' constitutional authority over immigration policy. Serving in our military forces and defending our country should be a privilege reserved for those who are citizens and legal U.S. residents.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment and tell the President: No more unlawful actions on immigration.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1715

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, our men and women who risk their lives every day to keep our country safe and free deserve the utmost respect and admiration. They are tasked with a responsibility far greater than the rest of us.

It takes bravery and honor to put their lives on the line every day to protect our Nation and to promote our ideals of liberty and freedom. I believe we can all agree on this.

What I cannot believe or understand is that some of my Republican colleagues think that it is fair to punish those who want to take on this courageous responsibility simply because they have not yet been granted full citizenship.

My colleague from Arizona's amendment passed out of committee and merely recognizes the willingness of DREAMers, young people brought to this country as children, to serve in the military for the country they love. For most, this is the only country they have ever known. We shouldn't allow our broken immigration system to stand in the way of their distinguished military service.

I urge opposition to the Brooks amendment.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time for closing. How much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close on this amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has the right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, Americans in our Armed Forces are being hammered with layoffs and reductions in force. Representative GALLEGO's amendment to the NDAA worsens their plight.

Over the past 5 years, 92,000 Armed Forces positions were eliminated. This year, 28,000 military positions will be eliminated. Over the next 4 years, another 38,000 military positions will be cut.

Between 2010 and 2019, the Armed Forces will eliminate a total of 158,000 uniformed personnel positions, thereby costing American citizens and lawful immigrants 158,000 military service opportunities.

What is the result? Americans serving around the world today have been handed ''pink slips'' while they are risking their lives for America. That is outrageous.

For emphasis, there is no military recruitment and retention deficit that

justifies supplanting Americans and lawful immigrants with illegal aliens.

In 2014, every branch of the military—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines—met their recruiting and retention requirements, while turning away thousands of highly qualified Americans and lawful immigrants.

Each year, there are a limited number of enlistment opportunities. Each time GALLEGO'S amendment helps an illegal alien enlist, an American or lawful immigrant loses—loses—an enlistment opportunity. The ratio is 1 to 1, period. That is the math.

This Congress should support and represent Americans by voting to stop military service opportunities from being taken from struggling American families in order to give them to illegal aliens.

As such, I urge this House to support my amendment to strike the Gallego amendment from the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for considering my thoughts and request.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, let me just say I agree completely with the comments of the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER) and can't say it any better, that, if you are willing to put your life on the line for your country, then your country ought to accept you; and it truly is your country.

Second of all, the United States military is not a jobs program. If you are willing to show up and put your life on the line, then that ought to be honored, and you ought to be accepted.

The notion that these people are taking jobs from Americans is, frankly, one that doesn't make any sense. We are asking people to serve in a very difficult job to defend our country. If people in this country are willing to do this, we ought to, at a minimum, accept them.

I will even go further than that. The undocumented population in this country is a population that, for too long, has been ignored and shoved into the shadows. We all imagine that they are somehow different from the rest of us, but I guarantee you everybody in this room knows someone who is undocumented, and the overwhelming majority of them are law-abiding people who have jobs, raise families, contribute to our community.

They deserve an opportunity to be part of the country that they have unquestionably claimed as their own.

Now, Mr. GALLEGO's amendment that we put on in committee is one small piece of doing that, to give them the opportunity to serve in the United States military, and then be given legal status.

I think we need to do a lot more than that. I think we need comprehensive immigration reform so we can bring the undocumented population out of the shadows, give them a path to citizenship.

I support Mr. GALLEGO's amendment. I oppose the effort by Mr. BROOKS to strip it. I think it is the least our country can do for someone who is willing to fight and potentially die on our behalf, to give them legal status, to treat them as the Americans that they truly are.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 438, line 9, strike ''the Department of Defense'' and insert ''any department or agency of the United States Government''.

Page 438, line 11, strike ''December 31, 2016,'' and insert ''the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act''.

Page 439, lines 7 through 8, strike ''the Department of Defense'' and insert ''any department or agency of the United States Government''.

Page 439, lines 9 through 10, strike ''December 31, 2016,'' and insert ''the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act''.

Page 443, line 12, strike ''assessment'' and all that follows through the period on line 15 and insert ''assessment conducted by the Director of National Intelligence, in classified or unclassified form, that such government or entity has the capacity and willingness, and demonstrated past practices (if applicable) to comply with the requirements under paragraph (1).''.

Page 444, line 15, strike ''The'' and insert ''Except as provided in paragraph (3), the''.

Page 446, after line 25, insert the following:

(3) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may not exercise the waiver authority under paragraph (1) with respect to any individual detained at Guantanamo, who has ever been determined or assessed to be a detainee referred for prosecution, a detainee approved for detention, or a detainee approved for conditional detention by the Guantanamo Detainee Review Task Force established pursuant to Executive Order number 13492.

Page 447, after line 17, insert the following:

(f) COORDINATION WITH PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER TO YEMEN.—During the period when section 1042 is in effect, the exception in subsection (c)(2) and the waiver authority under subsection (d) shall not apply to the transfer of any individual detained at Guantanamo to Yemen.

(g) COORDINATION WITH PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER TO COMBAT ZONES.—During the period when section 1038 is in effect, the exception in subsection (c)(2) and the waiver authority under subsection (d) shall not apply to the transfer of any individual detained at Guantanamo to a combat zone, as such term is defined in subsection (b) of such section.

Page 447, line 17, strike ''(f)'' and insert ''(h)''.

Page 448, line 23, strike ''(g)'' and insert ''(i)''.

Page 453, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 1042. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO YEMEN.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to any department or agency of the United States Government may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the Republic of Yemen or any entity within Yemen.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his support of my amendment.

I just wanted to start out by saying this debate is fundamentally about risk and trust. It is safe to assume the administration is risking our national security for the sake of fulfilling a misguided campaign promise. Simply put, we have too much at stake to trust an executive order from the President.

My amendment protects our national security, further strengthens and extends commonsense restrictions on Guantanamo transfers. It prohibits detainees from coming to the U.S., policy which has, in the past, had strong bipartisan support. In addition, it restricts the most dangerous detainees from being transferred.

Finally, it bans transfers to Yemen, an al Qaeda stronghold, one of the most dangerous places on Earth to set terrorists free.

When it comes to foreign policy and the security of the U.S., including the threat of Islamic extremism, President Obama doesn't seem to get it. It seems like the only thing we can trust the administration to do is underestimate the threat.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment in large part because of the broader debate over closing Guantanamo, and this amendment makes it even more difficult to close Guantanamo, which is a policy we ought do.

Again, President Bush, Secretary Gates, endless string of military leaders, and, in a bipartisan way, when JOHN MCCAIN was running for President, people have said that we should close Guantanamo. It is not a policy that we should continue.

For beginners, it costs nearly $3 million an inmate now to house them there, when the ones that need to be kept can be safely housed in the United States. We have proven that we are perfectly capable of locking up terrorists and protecting our country.

We have well over 300 terrorists right now locked up in the United States of America, including Ramzi Yousef, The Blind Sheik, Zacarias Moussaoui, and a number of very, very bad guys. We can do it in the U.S. We do not need Guantanamo.

Beyond that, the amendment here makes it very, very difficult to transfer anybody, and a large number of inmates at Guantanamo have been cleared for transfer. They have been deemed not to be a threat, and they are cleared to be transferred. Mrs. WALORSKI's amendment would make it pretty much impossible to transfer them.

These are people that we have already decided are not going to be a threat, and now, we are going to pass an amendment saying we are simply going to lock them up and hold them forever just because.

Now, I understand the because; the because is there is a risk, and I am not going to deny that there is a risk if you release somebody.

I will say that the statistics on people returning to the fight who have been in Guantanamo are very skewed. Back before 2008, I think, at one point, we had as many as 700 inmates at Guantanamo; a lot of people were released without proper care. Now, they were also brought there without proper investigation to figure out whether or not they were people we should legitimately pick up.

Since 2008, the percentage of the people who have been released who have returned to the fight is less than 10 percent. It has gone down considerably.

Beyond that, just as a basic system of justice, it is not our principle here in the U.S. that, if there is any possibility whatsoever that someone will reoffend, well, we are just going to lock you up forever—that is not the principle of justice that we have.

We have a principle of justice that says you serve your time and then you are let out. At Guantanamo, we have released a fair number of people in the last year because they were deemed to not be a threat. This amendment would eliminate our ability to do that and also make it more difficult to close Guantanamo—which, again, $3 million an inmate—when we can safely do it here.

Internationally, Guantanamo continues to be a blight on the U.S. record. Now, I will not make the argument that some make that say this is a recruitment tool—it is a recruitment tool for al Qaeda and like-minded groups—but they have no shortage of recruitment tools. I am not even going to begin to argue that somehow, if we close Guantanamo, they would no longer be trying to attack us.

However, our allies, countries in Europe, other Arab states that want to work with us to try to contain groups like ISIL and al Qaeda, they have to deal with citizens who hate Guantanamo, who see it as a symbol of injustice and a betrayal of their values and our values, so working with our allies to properly confront the terrorist threat is made more difficult by the presence of Guantanamo Bay prison.

I oppose this amendment. I will have an amendment after this one that would give us a path to closing the prison, but I oppose this amendment because it makes it more difficult to do what we ought to do in this country, and that is close Guantanamo Bay prison.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), an original cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Walorski amendment.

Today, sadly, the threat from radical terrorism only continues to grow, and I take that threat very seriously.

Unfortunately, the administration is still determined to close Guantanamo Bay detention facility, regardless of the risk that it poses to U.S. national security.

As in previous conflicts, it is appropriate and lawful to hold detainees and, in this case, until al Qaeda and associated forces are defeated and surrender. Guantanamo is the safest and most appropriate location. It is secure and relatively distant from the United States and terrorist safe havens.

Guantanamo also provides humane conditions for the detainees. They have appropriate access to health care, recreational activities, and cultural and religious materials. Members of the House of Representatives and others routinely visit Guantanamo and have seen the conditions in which the dangerous detainees are held.

Additionally, data shows released Guantanamo detainees have a high rate of recidivism. New reports indicate that the U.S. military and intelligence community suspect that one of the Taliban Five has attempted to return to the fight.

No one has escaped Guantanamo, unlike other terrorist detention facilities around the world, and the facility has not been attacked, unlike other facilities.

I ask for your support.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

No terrorist has escaped from a U.S. prison either, just to be absolutely clear about that. I am not sure which prisons this gentleman is talking about, but no one has escaped from a U.S. prison either; no terrorist has escaped.

I believe we have the right to close; is that correct?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has the right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Then I have just one further speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), the chairwoman of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very important amendment.

We live in a dangerous world. Whether it is ongoing conflict in Yemen, the march of ISIL, the slaughter of Christians by Boko Haram, the murder of innocents by al Shabaab, or the continued desire of al Qaeda to attack Americans, the rise of Islamic extremism is real; and we need a safe, effective place to detain these combatants.

GTMO is an appropriate facility to house this unique mission. Now is not the time to transfer these detainees or close its doors.

□ 1730

I had the opportunity to visit Guantanamo Bay and see the operations there firsthand, and I can confirm that GTMO is currently the safest and most appropriate location to hold detainees who were engaged in dangerous acts threatening the U.S. and our allies.

We need to continue to protect American citizens from some of the world's most dangerous individuals. We need to pass this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

I have already expressed my deep concern for the rushed, almost frenzied manner in which the administration is emptying the detention center at Guantanamo Bay.

We saw the dangerous Taliban Five transfer.

Just this past December, the administration released six Guantanamo Bay detainees to the small South American country of Uruguay. These six detainees had been trained in munitions and document forgery. In quiet negotiations with Uruguay to take the six, the Obama administration offered the President of Uruguay written assurances that none of them had ever been involved in conducting or facilitating terrorist activities, throwing out with a stroke of a pen the intelligence and analysis that had led to their detention.

These six former terrorists and Guantanamo Bay detainees live only six blocks away from the U.S. Embassy, which has forced the Embassy to heighten its security posture. The Obama administration has effectively prioritized its political goal of closing Guantanamo over our national security interests. The administration's desperation to empty Guantanamo has caused six hardened terrorists to land dangerously close to an embassy in our hemisphere.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment because a catch-and-release program is not how to defeat and destroy Islamic terrorist organizations.

I served 23 years as a Navy SEAL. Most of the last decade of my career was spent hunting, killing, or capturing dangerous terrorists who had American blood on their hands.

As the acting and deputy commander for the Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force, I had the honor of leading special operations troops in hunting these dangerous assailants and bringing them to justice. Releasing terrorists from Guantanamo Bay who are committed to killing American citizens not only is a national security risk, but it is also a slap in the face to every American, every man, every woman who died in the battlefield to put them there.

The President insists these terrorists are reformed; however, the facts say differently. According to the Director of National Intelligence, nearly 30 percent of former GTMO detainees are confirmed or suspected of engaging in terrorist activities. The majority remain at large.

A catch-and-release program may work for trout in Montana, but it doesn't work for terrorists.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, it is truly astonishing that in 2015 the United States continues to hold people indefinitely who have not been charged, let alone convicted, of any crime, who have been judged not to pose any threat to the United States. Our continuing to hold prisoners indefinitely without charging them, without trial, is a rebuke to our professed support of liberty.

Now, I know some will say they are dangerous terrorists, and some are. But some of them are not. They are people who were captured in some way, who have been judged by our military not to pose a threat to the United States, who have not been charged or judged as terrorists. Some of them may be simply victims to the fact that we paid bounties to people in Afghanistan to turn in people who they said were terrorists. The Hatfields turned in the McCoys because—why not?—we were giving them a bounty of a few thousand dollars.

We have, for those who need it, supermax prisons in the United States, from which no one has ever escaped. There is no reason to spend all the money in Guantanamo and have this continuing shame on the reputation of the United States.

I oppose this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 1036, 1037, 1038, and 1039, and insert the following:

SEC. 1036. GUANTANAMO BAY DETENTION FACILITY CLOSURE ACT OF 2015.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility Closure Act of 2015''.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after the date that is 90 days after the date on which the President submits a plan pursuant to subsection (h), amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used to—

(1) construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment; and

(2) transfer, or assist in transferring, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions any individual detained at Guantanamo.

(c) LIMITATION ON RELEASE.—An individual detained at Guantanamo may not be released within the United States, its territories, or possessions under the authority in subsection (b). An individual detained at Guantanamo who is transferred under the authority in subsection (b) may be subsequently released in accordance with section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 128 Stat. 851).

(d) STATUS WHILE IN THE UNITED STATES.—An individual who is transferred under the authority in subsection (b), while in the United States—

(1) may not be permitted to apply for asylum under section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158), be placed in removal proceedings under section 240 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a), or be eligible to apply for admission into the United States; and

(2) may not be permitted to avail himself of any right, privilege, or benefit of any law of the United States beyond those available to any similarly situated alien in the United States.

(e) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days before transferring any individual detained at Guantanamo to the United States, its territories, or possessions, the President shall submit to Congress a report about such individual that includes—

(1) notice of the proposed transfer; and

(2) the assessment of the Secretary of Defense and the intelligence community (under the meaning given such term section 3(4) of the National Security 18 Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) of any risks to public safety that could arise in connection with the proposed transfer of the individual and a description of any steps taken to address such risks.

(f) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used after December 31, 2017, for the detention facility or detention operations at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(g) PERIODIC REVIEW BOARDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each periodic review board established pursuant to Executive Order No. 13567 or section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1564;10 U.S.C. 801 note) is completed by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(h) PRESIDENTIAL PLAN.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan describing each of the following:

(1) The locations to which the President seeks to transfer individuals detained at Guantanamo.

(2) The individuals detained at Guantanamo whom the President seeks to transfer to overseas locations, the overseas locations to which the President seeks to transfer such individuals, and the conditions under which the President would transfer such individuals to such locations.

(3) The proposal of the President for the detention and treatment of individuals captured overseas in the future who are suspected of being terrorists.

(4) For any location in the United States to which the President seeks to transfer such an individual or an individual detained at Guantanamo, estimates of each of the following costs:

(A) The costs of constructing infrastructure to support detention operations or prosecution at such location.

(B) The costs of facility repair, sustainment, maintenance, and operation of all infrastructure supporting detention operations or prosecution at such location.

(C) The costs of military personnel, civilian personnel, and contractors associated with the detention operations or prosecution at such location, including any costs likely to be incurred by other Federal departments or agencies or State or local governments.

(D) Any other costs associated with supporting the detention operations or prosecution at such location.

(5) The estimated security costs associated with trying such individuals in the United States, including the costs of military personnel, civilian personnel, and contractors associated with the prosecution at such location, including any costs likely to be incurred by other Federal departments or agencies, or State or local governments.

(6) A plan developed by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the heads of other relevant departments and agencies, identifying a disposition, other than continued detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for each individual detained at Guantanamo as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) INTERIM LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date that is 90 days after the President submits a plan pursuant to subsection (h) to exercise the authority in subsection (b).

(j) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO.—In this section, the term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take out of the bill all of the things that are in it that make it impossible to close Guantanamo Bay prison.

This is a debate we have had many times. The provisions are typically banning any transfers to the U.S., banning any construction in the U.S. of any facilities to house the folks being housed right now at Guantanamo. It strips out those two, and it also asks the President to give us a detailed plan on how he would go about closing Guantanamo and what he would do with the inmates that are there now, and it requires a 90-day notice period to Congress before any action could be taken on that. And it is basically the same argument that I just made as to why we should close Guantanamo.

It was opened in the first place as a way to try to get around the U.S. Constitution. Basically, the thought was, since it wasn't in the continental U.S., habeas corpus and other constitutional protections wouldn't apply. But the Supreme Court a number of years ago said that it is effectively under U.S. control, so all the same rules apply.

One argument that is frequently trotted out is that somehow, if they were brought to the U.S., they would suddenly have constitutional rights that they don't have in Guantanamo. The Supreme Court has already ruled on that. They have ruled that it is effectively under U.S. control, and they have the exact same rights to habeas corpus and all other rights that a criminal or a law of war prisoner would have. So if we brought them to the U.S., it would not be a problem.

My two basic arguments are, number one, we have an alternative to Guantanamo. It is not like there is no option. There are now, I believe, 122 inmates—I forget the exact number—who have been cleared for transfer back to another country. But it is somewhere roughly half of that amount, we would be looking at between 50 and 60 inmates that would need to be transferred to the U.S. And we have the facilities here. As I said, we already house some of the most dangerous terrorists we have ever arrested and convicted. We have the facilities. We have the ability to hold them safely here. So there is an alternative.

The current situation in Guantanamo Bay has a number of negatives. The high cost, as I have mentioned several times, almost $3 million an inmate; and then the international eyesore that Guantanamo Bay is—not just to the terrorists. I don't care about them. I don't care what they say, how they feel about us holding people at Guantanamo. But to our allies in Europe, to people in the Arab world who want to help us defeat the scourge of Islamic extremism, this is an international eyesore that we should close, and we should make the transfers as soon as we possibly can. This amendment makes that possible.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express one retired Navy SEAL commander's opposition to closing the military prison at GTMO.

I have no doubt that closing GTMO and releasing or transferring terrorists who have committed to killing American citizens jeopardizes both the safety and security of the United States and our citizens abroad.

If the success or failure of the mission at GTMO is based on the number of attacks against the United States after 9/11, I am confident everyone in this room would join me in judging the mission has been successful. Intelligence collection and national security have been strengthened as a result of GTMO, and America remains a safer place thanks to the men and women serving there.

Keeping dangerous terrorists in a military prison and away from American families is the way it should be done. To me, closing GTMO is simply not an option.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

Everything that has happened since last year's debate should force us to be more careful with detainee decisions, not less careful. The rise of ISIL, the alarming release of the Taliban Five, and the war in Yemen are just a few events that remind us of the urgency of this debate, and it is an urgent debate. Potentially most troubling is the growing threat of AQAP, al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. Enabled by the complete power vacuum in Yemen, AQAP was formed by GTMO detainees, the group arguably most capable and most committed to attacking the United States homeland.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need a commonsense detainee policy that protects Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and oppose this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have only one more speaker, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

In March of 2014, the Director of National Intelligence reported that 29 percent of detainees released from Guantanamo Bay have engaged in or were suspected of resuming their roles as terrorists. Those who remain in Guantanamo are the ''worst of the worst.'' So it is safe to presume that, if released, an even higher percentage of them will remain a threat to our national security.

I struggle to understand why we would close the Guantanamo Bay detention camp, only to finance the incarceration of enemy combatants within the United States.

The need for a place to detain enemy combatants unfortunately will not go

away anytime soon, so, unquestionably, we need a facility like Guantanamo. As we engage an enemy with no respect for borders, we must not move them to our maximum security prisons while the courts determine how we should legally proceed.

For our Nation's security, I implore you to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), the chair of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Why? There are many reasons. But the predominant reason is because it allows the following people to come to America's shore or possibly be released. Here are a few people who are in Guantanamo Bay that the sponsor of this amendment wants to bring here:

Sixteen detainees associated with Osama bin Laden or other top al Qaeda leaders; eight detainees who have received explosives training; four detainees closely associated with al Qaeda recruiters; two detainees knowledgeable about poisons; others involved in a plot against a U.S. Embassy; volunteered to be a suicide bomber; commander of an al Qaeda training camp; agreed to commit to jihad if let out; and a terrorist financier. Also, KSM, the architect of the 9/11 attacks, KSM's third in command; another senior al Qaeda operative who trained and selected the 9/11 hijackers; the mastermind of the USS *Cole* attack; on and on.

The idea of bringing these individuals to America is foolish, and it makes no sense. We already have a secure facility that is working, is constitutional, and is keeping Americans safe. We need to keep GTMO open.

I oppose this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that the only flaw in that statement is the part about them being released in the U.S. That is not going to happen. And yes, if that were the plan, I would be absolutely opposed to it; but again, there are over 300 very dangerous terrorists held in the U.S. right now, today. We have proven we can do it here. We are not going to bring them here and release them. That is not what I am arguing for.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I listen to this debate, and it sounds as if we have forgotten everything we ever learned about American justice and American liberty.

We are told that 29 percent of the people released from Guantanamo have returned to terror. Well, that simply says that the Bush administration did a lousy job in deciding who should be released because, since then, it has been a tiny percentage. Yes, a large percentage of those the Bush administration released became recidivists.

□ 1745

So the argument is everyone held in Guantanamo should be held there forever. That is the argument. The amendment we just considered a moment ago would make it even harder, make it impossible, to release anyone from Guantanamo. The opposition to this amendment is for the same purpose.

We are told that these are the worst of the worst. Who says? Some of them have never been charged with any crime, have never been charged with any terrorism, have been judged safe to release, and have been told, have been labeled by our military as not being terrorists, not being threats to the United States, and yet we continue to hold them indefinitely. Why? And by what right?

KSM is a great menace; indeed, he is. He should be brought to the United States and placed on trial in a Federal court. He has been waiting for trial for almost 14 years now because we can't get our military tribunals to work, put him on trial in an Article III Federal court, and sentence him to life imprisonment without parole, as others have been. Nobody escapes from our supermax prisons, but justice ought to be done. It ought to be meted out.

We are told that people will be released here. We are not demanding that everyone be released or even that anyone in particular be released, certainly not into the United States. We are saying that the normal processes of justice should go forward. We are saying that the fact that someone lived in Afghanistan and that some other tribe had a grudge against his family and turned him in for a bounty, even though he had nothing to do with terrorism or anything else, we ought to know that. And when we know that, that person ought to be releasable because we know that about some people.

Instead, what we are faced with is a statute that says nobody ought to ever be released; we ought to hold people indefinitely for life for no crime and no reason. That is against American justice, and it poses a threat that the President under the authority of the 2012 law can hold Americans in Guantanamo indefinitely, and we should close it to prevent that, too.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody says we have to leave Guantanamo open forever or necessarily keep these folks, the detainees, there forever. Under the laws of war, detainees may be kept for the duration of the war. And it is absolutely true, we don't know how long this war is going to go. It is also true that if the President came up with a plan that could get the confidence of the American people first about what he would do with the Guantanamo detainees, then there may be something to talk about.

But, unfortunately, this amendment would strike the provisions of the bill which prevent them from coming to the U.S., would prevent them from being released to war zones, would prevent construction of new facilities. And make no mistake, new facilities would have to be built because they couldn't be commingled with inmates who are here in the U.S. And it strikes the facility for foreign transfers, but it does that first, and then says, oh, by the way, Mr. President, give us a plan within so much time.

How about we get a plan first? And how about we see whether that plan stands up to the light of day?

At one point, the President had a plan to take these folks to New York City and have a trial there, but there was an uproar. There was a plan to take them to a rehabilitative facility in Illinois, but there was an uproar. None of that has gained the support of this Congress under either party, and therefore, I think this amendment should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1060. SALE OR DONATION OF EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY FOR BORDER SECURITY ACTIVITIES.

Section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''counter-drug and counter-terrorism activities'' and inserting ''counterdrug, counterterrorism, and border security activities''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the Attorney General and the Director of National Drug Control Policy'' and inserting ''the Attorney General, the Director of National Drug Control Policy, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, as appropriate.''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''counterdrug and counter-terrorism activities'' and inserting ''counterdrug, counterterrorism, or border security activities''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

First, I would like to express my thanks to Chairman THORNBERRY for his leadership and hard work on this important legislation.

This amendment deals with border security. It is an integral part of our national security, and as we draw down our military presence in Afghanistan, equipment used successfully in combat can be used to enhance border security at home and, in the process, save taxpayer dollars.

Today, five aerostats used to protect forward operating bases in Iraq and Afghanistan are now providing situational awareness in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. Their use has helped agents apprehend dangerous aliens and interdict drugs that are en route to our neighborhoods.

My amendment makes sure DHS can continue to acquire advanced DOD excess equipment by modifying current law, last updated in 1996, before the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, to provide preference for ''border security activities.''

This change puts border security and the Department of Homeland Security on equal footing with the Department of Justice and the Office of National Drug Control Policy. With this small change, DHS' border security components can readily tap into DOD's excess equipment on a preferential basis.

In the past, United States Customs and Border Protection has missed out on thousands of articles of DOD excess gear because the equipment is often distributed on a first-come first-served basis. With the higher priorities, CBP will have a better opportunity to evaluate the cost effectiveness of a system before acquiring it. My amendment simply brings the law up to date and gives DHS the ability to apply military technology for the border security mission.

Before I close, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address what this amendment does not do. It does not supply local police forces with equipment recently used in a war zone. It does not militarize our local law enforcement officials. In fact, if that is a concern, you should support my amendment, which will put more military excess in the hands of DHS.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is important to note to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the administration actually supports the idea posed behind this amendment. The arguments in opposition, I believe, do not withstand scrutiny, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for my colleague from Texas for his leadership and service as the chair of the Homeland Security Committee and had the pleasure of serving with him on that committee in the last Congress. But I rise to oppose this amendment today because it is unnecessary.

First of all, it is redundant. The Department of Defense already has the authority and ability to distribute excess military equipment to the Department of Homeland Security and the Border Patrol.

Secondly, it is not needed on the border right now. I will give you some examples. The city that I have the honor of representing, El Paso, Texas, the largest city on the U.S.-Mexico border in Texas, is the safest city today in the United States, and it was also the safest city in the United States at the time when Ciudad Juarez across the river was the most dangerous city in the world.

Today, we have record low apprehensions on our southern border. We are spending record amounts—$18 billion a year—to secure it. We have doubled the size of the Border Patrol from 10,000 to 20,000 in the last 10 years, and we have hundreds of miles of walls.

We have also heard from the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, and the Director of the FBI that there is not now, nor has there ever been, a credible terrorist threat on our southern border. So we do not need mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles. We do not need grenade launchers. We do not need armed drones.

Mr. Chairman, we do not need to militarize the border, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleague, Customs and Border Protection have asked for this authority. They have a very different point of view, I would say, than you do, sir, from where you stand.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank Mr. MCCAUL for yielding me 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the opposition to this amendment is based on a misconception that it expands eligibility for surplus military equipment to include border security. Customs and Border Protection is already authorized to receive this equipment. It would just elevate their priority to where Justice Department is in allowing them to receive the equipment that they need.

I was a sheriff in a 1033 program that provided equipment as it would exactly to Customs and Border Protection. It does not—it does not—provide armed drones. Everything that they receive is demilitarized in regard to the fact they aren't receiving tanks, no military equipment that fires a rocket, or given rockets. That is a misconception that others have tried to move forward.

Mr. Chairman, border security activities are the front lines of counternarcotics and counterterrorism before those threats hit American airspace, American waters, and American soil, and I support this amendment.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

It is déjà vu all over again. Once again, the Congress is confronted with a Republican effort to militarize our borders by funneling billions of dollars of military equipment to local law enforcement anywhere in the country for border security activities. The 1033 program transfers billions of dollars of military equipment to law enforcement agencies without any congressional oversight or community input.

This amendment adds a border security activities priority to the program that will quietly funnel military-grade weaponry to law enforcement for this poorly defined priority. Passage of this amendment means that any law enforcement agency anywhere in the country can get an MRAP or an M–16 straight from the battlefield in Iraq if they simply tell the DOD they need it for border security activities, regardless of whether the agency is 10 miles or thousands of miles from the border with Mexico or Canada.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also means that campus police at local school districts and colleges can get the same MRAP or M–16 straight from the battlefield in Iraq if they tell the DOD they need it for border security activities.

Last year, Republicans tried to include this language in the fiscal year '15 NDAA. Congress wisely chose to reject it. Earlier this year, Republicans tried to pass this language by burying it in their failed border security bill, but, fortunately, the Congress wisely chose to reject the idea once again. But here we are once again confronted with this absurd reality and this effort to give local police this equipment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It is a commonsense amendment that passed

the House last year with bipartisan support because it simply provides the Department of Homeland Security with increased resources, and it saves the taxpayers money. This amendment makes a small change to current law.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the excess property owned by the Department of Defense, DHS and U.S. Customs and Border Protection have benefited greatly from DOD equipment in years past. For instance, Vehicle and Dismount Exploitation Radar, or VADER, is providing better situational awareness on my border in Tucson, the Tucson sector, and allows Border Patrol to be smart about deploying their resources.

The technology used by the DOD in Afghanistan was transferred to CBP. When deployed, VADER will allow operators to track ground movement with great detail and make this information available to ground commanders in real time, often in tough terrain, allowing them to be more efficient with their resources. The sensors are capable of detecting even subtle human movement along the ground and increase their aerial surveillance, enforcement, and security to prevent potential threats from transnational criminal organizations illegally entering the United States. These organizations are trafficking drugs, money, people, and weapons through the border and into our communities.

Mr. Chairman, since 2012 VADER has detected over 33,000 people moving across the southwest border. Since 2006 this versatile platform has been credited with interdicting and disrupting over 6 tons of cocaine and 250,000 pounds of marijuana. CBP has also benefited from aerostats and helicopters which allowed CBP to have greater visibility of this illicit activity on the border.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is a short amendment. It is one page. It just allows them to work together. It is not about militarizing our border. It is about being a good steward of our taxpayer resources so we can keep our borders secure.

Mr. MCCAUL. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

□ 1800

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the border, for many in politics, there is no greater boogeyman. The fact is that the border has more resources committed to it today than ever before, 21,000 Border Patrol agents, more than double what we had in 2004.

We should not militarize the U.S. border with Mexico or with Canada. This amendment would not only allow resources to go south and affect States like Texas and communities in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, but would also allow these military objects to go into New York and Washington State along our northern border.

There is also no indication that the Department of Homeland Security has asked for these resources or indicated that they are either short-staffed or undermanned when it comes to the resources that they need to deal with the border situation.

Painting our border as a war zone does a disservice to the men and women who live along our U.S.-Mexico border and also the border with Canada.

I think that, just as the 1033 program has had some troubling issues with respect to our local law enforcement, it is a bad idea to extend this program to DHS.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Everything that the proponents of this amendment have highlighted, the Border Patrol and the Department of Homeland Security already have access to and already received from the Department of Defense. As I said earlier, this amendment is redundant because that authority and that ability already exists.

What it does do is create further anxiety and fear about the border at a time that is not warranted because of the record levels that we are spending on homeland security and the record levels of security that we have, the record low apprehensions that we see, and the relevant safety of the U.S. side of the U.S.-Mexico border relative to the rest of the country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 528, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 1092. INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.

(a) INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism. For purposes of carrying out the duties described in paragraph (2), such officer shall have the title of ''Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator''.

(2) DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall have the following duties:

(A) Coordinate and direct all activities of the Federal Government relating to each hostage situation described in paragraph (1) to ensure efforts to secure the release of all hostages in the hostage situation are properly resourced and correct lines of authority are established and maintained.

(B) Establish and direct a fusion cell consisting of appropriate personnel of the Federal Government with purview over each hostage situation described in paragraph (1).

(C) Develop a strategy to keep family members of hostages described in paragraph (1) informed of the status of such hostages and inform such family members of updates, procedures, and policies that do not compromise the national security of the United States.

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator shall be limited to countries that are state sponsors of terrorism and areas designated as hazardous for which hostile fire and imminent danger pay are payable to members of the Armed Forces for duty performed in such area.

(c) QUARTERLY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On a quarterly basis, the Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the members of Congress described in paragraph (2) a report that includes a summary of each hostage situation described in subsection (a)(1) and efforts to secure the release of all hostages in such hostage situation.

(2) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DESCRIBED.—The members of Congress described in this subparagraph are, with respect to a United States person hostage covered by a report under paragraph (1), the Senators representing the State, and the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives representing the district, where a hostage described in subjection (a)(1) resides.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.— Each report under this subsection may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Federal Government to negotiate with a state sponsor of terrorism or an organization that the Secretary of State has designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COORDINATOR.—The term ''Coordinator'' means the Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator designated under subsection (a).

(2) HOSTILE GROUP.—The term ''hostile group'' means—

(A) a group that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a));

(B) a group that is engaged in armed conflict with the United States; or

(C) any other group that the President determines to be a hostile group for purposes of this paragraph.

(3) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—The term ''state sponsor of terrorism''—

(A) means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or any other provision of law, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(B) includes North Korea.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, we have a problem right now, and the problem is this: you have radical Islamic terrorists in places where there is no U.S. law enforcement presence capturing and detaining and holding hostage American citizens, not American military personnel, but American citizens.

In the past, the problem has not been as exacerbated as it has been since 9/11. You have the FBI. The FBI has always had purview and has had jurisdiction over hostage cases, but the problem is in Iraq, there is no FBI; in Syria, there is no FBI; in Afghanistan, there is no FBI. In war zones, you don't have the FBI.

What you have is the Department of Defense and different intelligence agencies are ones that track the networks, know the networks, know who the bad guys are, know where the hostages may be, and then in case that we actually get good intelligence, the Department of Defense and our intelligence communities, those are the people that would act on the intelligence, not the FBI.

If there is a hostage situation here at the Capitol, the FBI would take care of it; if there is a hostage situation in San Diego or New York, the FBI would take care of it—again, not if it is ISIS, not if it is al Qaeda, and not if it is in Somalia, Yemen, Iraq, Syria, or other war zone type country.

What my amendment does is make sure that there is now a joint interagency coordinator under the President who works directly with the President and anybody else that they need to.

We have, to date, five people—five American citizens—that have been killed by radical Islamic terrorists. We haven't freed one of them. Not a single American citizen has made it home alive, except for the trade that we did with the five terrorists from GTMO for Private Bergdahl. That is the only one. The rest have died.

Sixty days after this bill passes both the House and the Senate, the President is required to appoint an existing Federal officer to coordinate rescue efforts for Americans held by hostile groups such as ISIS or al Qaeda.

It also allows for Congress to be informed. If you have a member from your district who is one of these hostages, you get quarterly reports from the FBI from this fusion cell on what is happening with your hostage.

It also requires reporting to the different committees in Congress that have oversight over this what is going on with the hostages because, right now, people don't really know. Those of us here in this room, we don't really know, unless we reach out and contact them and ask for a special meeting. It shouldn't be the case.

There is one thing I can guarantee this body: over the next 25 years, radical Islam is not going away. You are going to have more Americans taken hostage. We need to make sure that we at least have somebody where the buck stops, and this creates a person where the buck stops, finally, who can answer our questions from this body and can answer questions from the families and everybody else.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for supporting this amendment, and I want to thank my colleague from California for giving me the opportunity to work with him on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I care about the subject matter of this amendment is because one of my constituents, Warren Weinstein, was recently killed by a U.S. drone strike while he was being held in an al Qaeda compound along the border in Pakistan. Obviously, we weren't aware that he was held there.

Warren was originally captured over 3 years ago while he was doing work in Pakistan on behalf of USAID. He was 73 years old. He spent his whole life in service to his country working for USAID on foreign aid matters. He was a wonderful man and has a wonderful family.

Across the last several years, I worked very closely with his wife and his family in helping them try to influence our government to find Warren. The one thing I realized across the last several years working on these matters is that, even though we have incredibly dedicated men and women who work at the FBI, who work at the CIA, who work at the State Department, who work on hostage recovery matters, as my colleague from California has pointed out, these efforts are not nearly as well coordinated as they should be.

We do not have someone on point who wakes up every day with the mission of finding American hostages that are held in the Middle East.

This amendment does this. By appointing and creating a hostage recovery coordinator, we will have that single person on point who will be able to take all of the resources of the U.S. Government—our technological resources, our intelligence resources, our military resources, and the resources of this Congress—and do a better job in identifying Americans that are held hostage overseas by terrorists.

It is an incredibly important thing to do. Again, I saw firsthand in my experience working with Warren's family and working with very dedicated people in our government that the bureaucracy is getting in the way. The people are dedicated, but they don't have the ability to cut through the bureaucracy and grab whatever resources exist in the government.

What this bill does is empower a person, an individual, who can do that, who can grab whatever assets are needed in the U.S. Government to help find hostages who are held overseas, which is why I support the amendment.

As my colleague from California pointed out, they will also do a very important function, which is to communicate and coordinate with the families, the families who are suffering like Warren's family has for over 3 years with the uncertainty and a lack of information about where he is.

I strongly support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from California for his leadership in this area and for giving me an opportunity to work with him on behalf of my constituent, Warren.

I want to thank, again, the ranking member and chairman for supporting this amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland, too, for his work on this. He shouldn't have to and Warren's family shouldn't have to go through what they go through. Hopefully, this makes it better.

I would like to thank the ranking member and Chairman THORNBERRY for supporting this as well.

Lastly, to get something like this done, it takes people within the Department of Defense, within the system, who actually know what needs to get done. Lieutenant Colonel Jason Amerine has worked in my office now for about 2 years on this amendment, and he is someone who really cares.

He has been working hostage stuff with about every government agency that there is. I just want to say he played a big role in getting this to where it is at now.

I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 40, 43, 47, 48, 49, and 50 printed in House Report No. 114–112, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle E of title X (page 474, after line 17), add the following new section:

SEC. 10___. CIVILIAN AVIATION ASSET MILITARY PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, may participate in a Civilian Aviation Asset Military Partnership Pilot Program (in this section referred to as the ''Program'') in accordance with this section.

(b) GRANT AUTHORITY.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, may make a grant under the Program, on a competitive basis, to an eligible airport to assist a project—

(1) to improve aviation infrastructure; or

(2) to repair, replace, or otherwise improve an eligible tower facility at that airport.

(c) NUMBER.—Not more than three eligible airports may receive a grant under the Program for a fiscal year.

(d) AMOUNT.—The amount provided to each eligible airport that receives a grant under the Program may not exceed $2,500,000.

(e) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under the Program, an eligible airport shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, determines is appropriate. An application shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(1) the proposed project with respect to which a grant is requested, including estimated costs;

(2) the need for the project at the eligible airport, including how the project will assist both civil aircraft and military aircraft; and

(3) the non-Federal funding available for the project.

(f) SELECTION AND TERMS.—The Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall jointly—

(1) select eligible airports to receive grants under the Program; and

(2) establish the terms of each grant made under the Program.

(g) FUNDING.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with a grant under the Program may not exceed 70 percent. Prioritization shall be given to projects with the lowest Federal share.

(2) COORDINATION.—With respect to the Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with a grant under the Program, 50 percent of that Federal share shall be paid by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and 50 percent shall be paid by the Secretary of Defense.

(h) TERMINATION.—The Program shall terminate at the end of the third fiscal year in which a grant is made under the Program.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) ELIGIBLE AIRPORT.—The term ''eligible airport'' means an airport at which—

(A) military aircraft conducts operations; and

(B) civil aircraft operations are conducted.

(2) ELIGIBLE TOWER FACILITY.—The term ''eligible tower facility'' means a tower facility that—

(A) is located at an eligible airport;

(B) is greater than 30 years of age; and

(C) has demonstrated failings.

(3) AVIATION INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ''aviation infrastructure'' means any activity defined under the term ''airport development'' in section 47102 of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Strike section 1225 and insert the following:

SEC. 1225. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO THE VETTED SYRIAN OPPOSITION.

(a) MODIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1209(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3543) is amended—

(A) by striking ''The Secretary of Defense'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense'';

(B) by striking ''for Overseas Contingency Operations'' and inserting ''under the Syria Train and Equip Fund''; and

(C) by further adding at the end the following:

''(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—At the same time the Secretary of Defense submits a request for a reprogramming or transfer of funds under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the following:

''(A) UPDATE.—An update of the comprehensive strategy required under section 1225(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—A certification that—

''(i) a required number and type of United States Armed Forces have been established to meet the objectives of the strategy and such Armed Forces, including support and enablers, have been or will be deployed to meet the objectives of the strategy; and

''(ii) a required amount of support, including support provided by United States Armed Forces and enablers, has been or will be provided by the United States to the elements of the Syrian opposition that are to be trained and equipped under this section to ensure that such elements are able to defend themselves from attacks by ISIL and Government of Syria forces consistent with the purposes set forth in subsection (a).

''(C) USE OF FUNDS.—A detailed description of how the funds subject to the request for a reprogramming or transfer of funds under paragraph (1) will be used to meet the objectives of the strategy.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any request for a reprogramming or transfer of funds under section 1209(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as amended by paragraph (1), that is submitted on or after such date of enactment.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive strategy for Syria and Iraq.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The comprehensive strategy shall contain the following:

(A) An identification of requirements that have been established to ensure that assistance provided to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals achieve the purposes set forth in section 1209(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3541).

(B) A description of United States policy and strategy for addressing the Assad regime in Syria and the post-Assad regime in Syria.

(C) A detailed explanation of how the military campaigns in Syria and Iraq are integrated and a description of the goals, objectives, and the end states for Syria and Iraq, including a description of how the train and equip programs in Iraq and Syria support the goals, objectives, and end states in Iraq and Syria.

(D) A description of the roles and responsibilities of each coalition country under the strategy.

(E) A description of the relevant agency roles and responsibilities and interagency coordination under the strategy.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' has the meaning given the term in section 1209(e)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3543).

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

Page 575, line 7, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 575, line 10, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 575, after line 10, insert the following:

(10) the sale of advanced weaponry to Iran, particularly advanced air defenses, encourages bad behavior by Iran and poses a high risk of destabilizing the region and should be opposed; and

(11) no terrorism-related sanctions should be lifted or loosened as a part of any nuclear agreement and additional sanctions should be considered against Iran due to Iran's continued state sponsorship of terrorism, its development and proliferation of ballistic missile technology, its continued biological and chemical weapons programs, and the egregious violation of the human rights of the Iranian people.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle E of title XII (page 594, after line 25), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. LIMITATION ON MILITARY CONTACT AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made

available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be used for any bilateral military-to-military contact or cooperation between the Governments of the United States and the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the armed forces of the Russian Federation are no longer illegally occupying Ukrainian territory;

(2) the Russian Federation is respecting the sovereignty of all Ukrainian territory;

(3) the Russian Federation is no longer taking actions that are inconsistent with the INF Treaty; and

(4) the Russian Federation has not sold or otherwise transferred the Club-K land attack cruise missile system to any foreign country or foreign person during fiscal year 2015.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) with respect to a certification requirement specified in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) if—

(1) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) a notification that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States and a description of the national security interest covered by the waiver; and

(B) a report explaining why the Secretary of Defense cannot make the certification under subsection (a); and

(2) a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the information in the report under paragraph (1)(B).

(c) ADDITIONAL WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation required by subsection (a)(4) with respect to the sale or other transfer of the Club-K land attack cruise missile system if—

(1) the United States has imposed sanctions against the manufacturer of such system by reason of such sale or other transfer; or

(2) the Secretary has developed and submitted to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to prevent the sale or other transfer of such system in the future.

(d) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN MILITARY BASES.—The certification requirement specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall not apply to military bases of the Russian Federation in Ukraine's Crimean peninsula operating in accordance with its 1997 agreement on the Status and Conditions of the Black Sea Fleet Stationing on the Territory of Ukraine.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) BILATERAL MILITARY-TO-MILITARY CONTACT OR COOPERATION.—The term ''bilateral military-to-military contact or cooperation''—

(A) means—

(i) reciprocal visits and meetings by high-ranking delegations;

(ii) information sharing, policy consultations, security dialogues or other forms of consultative discussions;

(iii) exchanges of military instructors, training personnel, and students;

(iv) exchanges of information;

(v) defense planning; and

(vi) military training or exercises; but

(B) does not include any contact or cooperation that is in support of United States stability operations.

(3) INF TREATY.—The term ''INF Treaty'' means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to funds described in subsection (a) that are unobligated as of such date of enactment.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the of subtitle F of title XII (page 604, after line 16), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON OPPORTUNITIES TO ENHANCE THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCE WITH THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea has served as an anchor for stability, security, and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula, in the Asia-Pacific region, and around the world;

(2) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to strengthen and adapt the comprehensive strategic alliance of bilateral, regional, and global scope to serve as a linchpin of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, recognizing the shared values of democracy, human rights, free and open market, and the rule of law, as reaffirmed in the May 2013 ''Joint Declaration in Commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States of America'';

(3) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to broaden and deepen the scope and level of alliance cooperation by strengthening the combined defense posture on the Korean Peninsula, enhancing mutual security based on the Republic of Korea-United States Mutual Defense Treaty, and promoting cooperation for regional and global security in the 21st century, recognizing the significance of 2015 as it marks the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II;

(4) the United States and the Republic of Korea share deep concerns that North Korea's nuclear and ballistic missiles programs and its repeated provocations pose grave threats to peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia and recognize that both nations are determined to achieve the peaceful denuclearization of North Korea, and remain fully committed to continuing close cooperation on the full range of issues related to North Korea;

(5) the United States supports the vision of a Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons, free from the fear of war, and peacefully reunited on the basis of democratic and free market principles, as articulated in President Park's Dresden address; and

(6) the United States and the Republic of Korea share the future interests of both nations in securing peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN OF FLORIDA

At the appropriate place in title XII of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 12xx. COMBATING CRIME THROUGH INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITIES.

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to deploy assets, personnel, and resources to United States Southern Command, in coordination with the Joint Interagency Task Force South, to combat the following by supplying sufficient intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities:

(1) Transnational criminal organizations.

(2) Drug trafficking.

(3) Bulk shipments of narcotics or currency.

(4) Narco-terrorism and terrorist financing.

(5) Human trafficking.

(6) The presence and influence of Iran, Russia, and China in the Western Hemisphere.

(7) The national security threat posed by the presence and influence of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Hezbollah, or any other foreign terrorist organization in the Western Hemisphere.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 649, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 1543. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON USE OF FUNDS PROVIDED FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on how funds authorized to be appropriated for overseas contingency operations were ultimately used.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 689, line 18, strike ''and''.

Page 689, after line 18, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the subsequent paragraph accordingly):

(2) by striking paragraph (3) of subsection (c) and inserting the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall limit the dissemination of information obtained or derived through such procedures to entities—

''(A) with missions that may be affected by such information;

''(B) that may be called upon to assist in the diagnosis, detection, or mitigation of cyber incidents;

''(C) that conduct counterintelligence or law enforcement investigations; or

''(D) for national security purposes, including cyber situational awareness and defense purposes.''; and

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN OF CALIFORNIA

Page 851, line 2, strike ''section'' and insert ''sections''.

Page 851, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 852, line 9, and insert the following new subsections:

''f.(1) In accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary may not make an authorization under subsection b.(2) with respect to a covered foreign country with a nuclear naval propulsion program unless—

''(A) the Director of National Intelligence and the Chief of Naval Operations jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the risks of diversion, and the likely consequences of such diversion, of the technology and material covered by such authorization;

''(B) following the date on which such assessment is submitted, and, to the extent practicable, concurrently during the process under which the Secretary evaluates such authorization, the Administrator for Nuclear Security certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

''(i) there is sufficient diversion control as part of the transfer under such authorization; and

''(ii) such transfer presents a minimal risk of diversion of such technology to a military program that would degrade the technical advantage of the United States; and

''(C) a period of 14 days has elapsed following the date of such certification.

''(2) The limitation in paragraph (1) shall apply as follows:

''(A) During the period preceding the date on which the Chief of Naval Operations first makes a determination under paragraph (3), with respect to technology and material covered by an authorization under subsection b.(2).

''(B) During the period beginning on the date on which the Chief first makes such determination, with respect to the critical civil nuclear technologies of the United States covered by a determination made under paragraph (3).

''(3) Not later than June 1, 2016, and quinquennially thereafter, the Chief of Naval Operations shall determine the critical civil nuclear technologies of the United States that should be protected from diversion to a military program of a covered foreign country, including with respect to naval propulsion and weapons. The Chief shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of each such determination.

''(4) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Director of National Intelligence determines that there is evidence to believe that critical civil nuclear technology of the United States has been diverted to a foreign country not covered by an authorization made pursuant to subsection b., including an agreement for cooperation made pursuant to section 123, the Director shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such determination.

''(5) The Secretary shall annually notify the appropriate congressional committees that each covered foreign country is in compliance with its obligations under any authorization made pursuant to subsection b., including an agreement for cooperation made pursuant to section 123.

''(6) In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(i) the congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code);

''(ii) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

''(iii) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

''(B) The term 'covered foreign country' means a foreign country that is a nuclear-weapon state, as defined by Article IX (3) of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, signed at Washington, London, and Moscow on July 1, 1968, but does not include the United Kingdom or France.

''g.(1) The Secretary may not make an authorization under subsection b.(2) with respect to a covered foreign country if a foreign person of the covered foreign country has been sanctioned under the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act (Public Law 106-178; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) during the five-year period preceding the date of the transfer being sought unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the covered foreign country is taking adequate measures to prevent, or is making significant progress in preventing, transfers or acquisitions covered by section 2(a) of the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act.

''(2) The terms 'appropriate congressional committees' and 'covered foreign country' have the meanings given those terms in subsection f.(6).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 53, after line 14, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(c) In implementing the requirements of this section, the Secretary of Defense may seek information from the directorates of the Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation program (LSAMP) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities Undergraduate Program (HBCU-UP) of the National Science Foundation; the American Association for the Advancement of Science; the Emerging Researchers National Conference in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics; the University of Florida Institute for African-American Mentoring in Computing Sciences (iAAMCS); the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities; the National Indian Education Association; and such other institutions, organizations, or associations as the Secretary deems useful.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR OF CALIFORNIA

Page 58, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 226. REPORT ON GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS IN SUPPORT OF SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND ENGINEERING EDUCATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on—

(1) the number of individuals from racial or ethnic minority groups, women, and disabled individuals who have participated in the graduate fellowship program under section 2191 of title 10, United States Code, over the ten-year period preceding the date of the report;

(2) barriers encountered in recruiting individuals from racial and ethnic minority groups, women, and disabled individuals to participate in such programs; and

(3) recommended policy changes to increase such participation.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of subtitle C of title II (page 58, after line 5), add the following new section:

SEC. 226. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FFRDC FACILITATION OF A HIGH QUALITY TECHNICAL WORKFORCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The quality of the United States' future scientific and technical workforce is a matter of national security concern.

(2) Department of Defense support for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education programs facilitates the training of a future scientific and technical workforce that will contribute significantly to Department of Defense research, development, test, and evaluation functions, and the readiness of the future force.

(3) Federally Funded Research and Development Centers sponsored by the Department of Defense employ a highly skilled workforce that is qualified to support science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education initiatives, including through meaningful volunteer opportunities in primary and secondary educational settings, and through cooperative relationships and arrangements with private sector organizations and State and local governments, to facilitate the training of a future scientific and technical workforce.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should explore using existing authorities for promoting science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, such as section 233 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291), to allow Federally Funded Research and Development Centers to help facilitate and shape a high quality scientific and technical future workforce that can support Department of Defense needs.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY OF TEXAS

Page 58, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2___. FUNDING FOR MV–22A DIGITAL INTEROPERABILITY PROGRAM.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(1) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for aircraft procurement, Navy, for the V–22, line 059, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for the digital interoperability program is hereby increased by $64,300,000; and

(2) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy, for the V–22A, line 099, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for the digital interoperability program is hereby increased by $10,700,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for aircraft procurement, Navy, for spares and repair parts, line 063, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, is hereby reduced by $75,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 68, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 317. REPORT ON MERGER OF OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR OPERATIONAL ENERGY PLANS AND DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the merger of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment under section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3462. Such report shall include—

(1) a description of how the office is implementing its responsibilities under sections 138(b)(9), 138(c), and 2925(b) of title 10, United States Code, and Department of Defense Directives 5134.15 (Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs) and 4280.01 (Department of Defense Energy Policy);

(2) a description of any efficiencies achieved as a result of the merger; and

(3) the number of Department of Defense personnel whose responsibilities are focused on energy matters specifically.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, in this en bloc package, which I encourage all Members on both sides of the aisle to adopt, there are 14 total amendments. Six of those amendments are from my Democratic colleagues; eight are from my Republican colleagues.

There are a lot of important subjects that are in these amendments, as Members on both sides of the aisle make contributions to the bill, and I hope that Members on both sides of the aisle, when it comes to final passage—if this en bloc package is adopted—that when it comes to final passage of the bill, they will support final passage of the bill so that their work can come to fruition.

That is what it takes, Mr. Chairman. It is support on final passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The chairman of the committee, on a couple of occasions, has made reference to the fact that, if you have things in the bill, it doesn't make any sense to vote against it because then you are basically nullifying your own work.

Then there was a statement earlier about how never before has a party asked for a ''no'' vote on this National Defense Authorization Act. He is actually wrong about that.

In 2009 and in 2010, the Republican Party asked for a ''no'' vote on the National Defense Authorization Act. In fact, 160 Republicans in one year voted ''no''—that was virtually all of them—and 131 voted ''no'' in another year.

To now argue that, A, you shouldn't oppose the NDAA because it supports our troops after having opposed it in 2010 and in 2011 is very, very inconsistent.

Now, they had their reasons. I think one of them was hate crimes was included, and I think the other one was that repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell was included. I would also venture to guess that, as a very senior member of the Armed Services Committee at the time, Mr. THORNBERRY had stuff in both of those bills. He can correct me if I am wrong about that, but I would be stunned if he hadn't worked on those bills and had amendments in them; yet he voted ''no'' on both occasions.

I hope for the rest of this debate we can at least dispense with that argument, that notion that, number one, no party has ever asked to oppose the defense bill when, in fact, the Republicans did it when they didn't like the substance.

Let me say and be clear on that. I completely respect that. That is the choice we, as legislators, have to make. You have to decide whether or not, on balance, a bill is worth voting for or voting against; but this notion that, somehow, you can never vote against the NDAA rings unbelievably hollow from people who have voted against the NDAA.

This idea that, if you get something in the bill that you support, it doesn't make any sense to vote against it, rings every little bit as hollow when at least the Members who were here in 2009 and 2010 on the Republican side of the aisle, virtually all of them did exactly that.

□ 1815

This year, what we as Democrats are saying is there is something about this bill that we don't like that regrettably—and I say this with all sincerity—trumps the things about the bill that we do like. The thing about the bill that we don't like is it uses the overseas contingency operations fund to bust the budget caps.

One, as Secretary of Defense Ash Carter has made clear, that is a terrible way to budget within the Pentagon, and he has said he opposes it because of the restrictions that it places on them and because of the difficulties that it places on the Department of Defense.

Two, it is disingenuous to claim that you are keeping the budget caps and that the OCO money somehow doesn't count because it is, I guess, free money; it is outside of the budget caps.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Lastly, if you simply let defense out of jail in this awkward way and keep everything else under the budget caps, we will never get rid of the budget caps.

That is the reason, and it is, I think, a pretty legitimate reason. If the Republican budget holds, we will never be able to get rid of the budget caps. That is why we are opposed to it. It is a legitimate reason. You can disagree with it, but let's stop with this whole, ''Oh, if you have an amendment in it, you can't oppose it, and you can't oppose the NDAA because it supports our troops'' when the very people who are making that argument and who had a reason did exactly that. You can argue about whether or not the reason was justified, but, certainly, it is not consistent to make the opposite argument now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I remember very well the instances that the gentleman from Washington talked about.

In one case, it was the Senate that added hate crimes to the conference report of the NDAA when it came back from the conference. It is absolutely true that, when that happened—an issue completely outside of the military—and went to conference, I and many others voted against it because we thought that was a mistake. It is also true that many of us on this side of the aisle voted against the bill the next year, but that was because of what was in the bill. It was related to the Don't Ask, Don't Tell issue and how that was being handled.

That is exactly what the gentleman talked about earlier, which was where you balance what is in it and what is not and the good and the bad, and we all do that all the time. Absolutely right.

What is different about this case is this bill is being held hostage to fix something else. Mr. Chairman, I would like to fix ObamaCare, but I am not going to vote against the NDAA until that happens. I would like to have a simpler Tax Code, but I am not going to vote against the NDAA until that happens. It is trying to use this and the good it does for our troops to put political pressure on Congress to agree with the President about changes in the Budget Control Act. It is different here.

My point is really very practical. If people get amendments in the bill and then they vote against the bill and the bill goes down, what happens to those amendments? They are dead. I am not arguing it morally; I am arguing it practically. That is what happens to any bill that goes down. The content of the bill is defeated, and I just don't think that makes much sense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, last week, I led a congressional delegation to the Middle East to investigate the flow of foreign fighters in and out of Syria and Iraq. While in Baghdad, I met with senior U.S. officials and leaders in the Iraqi Government, including the Prime Minister of Iraq.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that the lessons of the Maliki years in Iraq are not being learned as Sunnis and Kurds in Iraq continue to be on the sidelines. Sectarian divisions are being inflamed by the rise of Shia militants in Sunni communities. That is the proxy arm of Iran. The Kurds, meanwhile, are not getting access to the weapons they need from the central government quickly enough to fight ISIS. We need to empower the Peshmerga and the moderate Sunni tribes.

This act takes important steps to not only counter ISIS, but to hold the Iraqi Government accountable to the major constituencies in the country—Shias, Sunnis, and Kurds. Specifically, section 1223 of the bill before us ties assistance to the Iraqi Government to

progress in key areas, such as the central government's addressing grievances of ethnic and sectarian minorities; increasing political inclusiveness; reducing support for ISIS; and ensuring that U.S.-supplied equipment and weaponry is making it to the security forces in Iraq, who need it the most to defeat ISIS.

The passage of this bill before us will go a long way in addressing the ISIS threat to the region and to the homeland.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds just to say that the OCO spending, which is the problem, is in the bill. We are not just opposing this because of stuff that isn't in the bill. The OCO workaround that busts the budget caps without busting the budget caps is in the bill. It is a substantive part of it.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for including my amendment in this en bloc.

Section 3119 of the bill, as reported from the Armed Services Committee, seeks to deal with a significant issue that has come to light regarding some commercial nuclear transfers.

The potential for some U.S. reactor technology to be diverted by recipient countries with naval programs is a serious concern that needs to be addressed. Section 3119 begins that process. My amendment is designed to improve it.

There has been discussion in the press and in a Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on the renewal of the China 123 agreement that China would divert U.S. nuclear technology to its naval program, particularly with regard to the propulsion of naval vessels.

My amendment would streamline the process by which we would license technology under a 123 agreement. It would also provide that Congress should be notified whenever there is substantial evidence that the 123 agreement, a nuclear cooperation agreement, has been violated, as, perhaps, when nuclear technology is diverted for military purposes, including the propulsion of naval vessels.

Most importantly, we know that China has not yet taken the steps it needs to take to prevent proliferation. My amendment adds a requirement that, when we are going to license the transfer of nuclear technology to Beijing, we can do that only if there is a certification that China is taking the steps necessary to prevent proliferation to Iran and other problem countries.

I look forward to our using our nuclear cooperation with China on civilian matters to prod them into a nonproliferation policy that makes sense for the safety of the world.

I thank the chairman and his staff for working closely with my staff in crafting this amendment, and I thank the ranking member and chair for including this in the en bloc.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), a member of the Armed Services Committee and the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, amendment No. 26. This amendment would add two important components to the underlying language on Iran contained in the bill.

First, it highlights our concerns about the negative consequences of the Russians' selling the S–300 antiaircraft system to Iran. This will only encourage Iran's bad behavior.

Second, it adds language that makes it clear that no terrorism-related sanctions should be lifted as part of a nuclear deal with Iran. We should not turn a blind eye to Iran's continued sponsorship of terrorism around the world.

In a later en bloc, I will have amendment No. 101, prohibiting military exchanges with Iran. President Obama, unfortunately, treats our adversaries, many times, better than our friends. That is wrong and dangerous. My amendment will prevent the administration from forcing our military to be too friendly with the Iranian regime.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me, and let me thank the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support Jackson Lee amendment No. 64, and I am very pleased to have the support of the ranking member and the chairman. This amendment is supported by Mr. BUTTERFIELD, who is the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, along with Ms. ADAMS and Ms. BARBARA LEE.

It focuses on Historically Black Colleges—it is something that I have offered on a number of occasions—and their ability to expand their capacity in science, technology, engineering, and math. It includes Hispanic-serving institutions, Native American colleges, and the National Science Foundation Directorates. It focuses these entities on building their capacities by collaborating with the Department of Defense.

We know that the Department of Defense has a myriad of opportunities for research and development, i.e., some of the research that has been done on triple negative breast cancer, which is an amendment that I offered in the last DOD. Certainly, it is well renowned that the Internet had its early beginnings with the Department of Defense, and many other powerful research finds and successes have come from that.

I would just say that this amendment is now included in the en bloc, and I thank both the chairman and the ranking member as it now opens the doors for these institutions of higher learning to collaborate with their professors and their students academically to do research or to collaborate where necessary and build capacity on science, technology, engineering, and math.

I thank the gentleman for including my amendment. I believe it enhances the educational opportunities of young people, and it moves forward the R&D, which is so vital to this country, by expanding the opportunities to unique institutions which serve a very special population and which have educated these young people from the 1800s.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the distinguished former chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the chairman for including my amendment en bloc.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is very simple. It authorizes the Secretary of Defense to deploy assets, personnel, and resources to SOUTHCOM and to the Joint Interagency Task Force South in order to take on threats with sufficient intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities.

Terror groups receive a large number of financial resources through the illicit drug trade and in their cooperation with drug cartels in our region, and we are dangerously ill-equipped to tackle these threats. It is in our vital national security interests to bolster our efforts to counter the nexus between drug traffickers and terror groups. To do so, we need to give SOUTHCOM the resources it needs to get the job done.

Not nearly enough attention is being paid to the Western Hemisphere, and with our limited resources and intelligence capabilities, our visibility and assessment of the threats in our hemisphere are dangerously inadequate.

This lack of resources jeopardizes our national security as terrorist organizations like Hezbollah and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant are increasingly operating in our hemisphere; and we all know that Iran, Russia, and China are expanding their influences here in order to undermine our regional interests.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, diversifying our military's fuel supply is a national security imperative given the serious new threats we face as a country. More than 3,000 men and women in uniform have been killed or wounded since September 11, 2001, in attacks on our military's fuel convoys.

Delivering technologies to our troops that improve efficiency so that they depend less on traditional sources of fuel is a lifesaving strategy. We need a strong, smart, forward-looking military force that provides our warfighters with the tools necessary to quickly and decisively confront the dynamic new threats our country is facing. As our military adapts in order to fight these new threats, we will need to increase our technological superiority, and part of that will depend on creating, developing, and delivering new kinds of energy to troops in the field.

My amendment, which is included in this en bloc package—and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on that—asks the Department of Defense to report on its plan to merge two offices at the Pentagon that handle parts of the military's energy strategy and sustainability efforts.

Congress and the American people need assurance that these Pentagon offices have enough staff and resources to complete the missions asked of them and that we are seeing the desired increase in efficiency.

□ 1830

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. THORNBERRY, for yielding. I am also grateful to Ranking Member SMITH for the opportunity to discuss the issue of mental health treatment for our military servicemembers.

I know we all care deeply about the health of our servicemembers. For those who have borne the battle, we share a commitment to come to their aid, whether their wounds are a visible amputation or the invisible problems of post-traumatic stress disorder.

The statistics, as you know, are sobering: 22 vets die by suicide each day, and more than 600,000 vets are diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder. Delivering proper treatment for mental health is really a matter of life and death. We can provide these warriors with treatment and medications they need, or we can continue to provide their families with folded flags and our condolences to their widows.

But it is not enough to just provide a few limited medications, because people react differently to medication. Some medications can work well with one person or result in adverse side effects to another with the same diagnosis. Side effects may include drug-to-drug interactions, allergic reactions, excessive sedation, and weight gain, with increased risk of diabetes. That is why doctors must be able to choose the medication that fits for the soldier. But when DOD or the VA limits the choices, that puts soldiers at risk. The servicemember may stop taking the medication, withdraw from treatment, and may deteriorate. We should not add to their risk.

I would ask the chairman and the ranking member to work with me to ensure that the full array of FDA-approved medications are accessible for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who need these lifesaving drugs. They fought for our country overseas; they should not have to fight the Department of Defense and the VA over here.

Chairman THORNBERRY, I seek a commitment that we do not allow accountants to choose which medications are available for the psychiatric conditions of our servicemen and -women. Let the physician working with the servicemember or veteran make those decisions.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, for I have tremendous respect for his opinion and for his service that bears directly on these issues. I share the gentleman's commitment to do everything we can to improve suicide rates, to have better care for those who serve, and I absolutely commit to work with the gentleman to get the best possible outcomes for those who serve. I know that is what the gentleman works for in all his capacities, and it is what the committee wants to work for, too.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, hoping that all Members support the bill on final passage, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I have serious concerns with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

This amendment authorizes the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to create a new grant program, the Asset Military Partnership Pilot Program, to fund air traffic control towers and airport infrastructure at airports that support DOD missions.

Although I recognize that both the FAA and DOD have a shared interest in keeping our national airspace safe and secure, it is unclear how this new program achieves these goals. To my knowledge, neither the FAA nor DOD has requested that Congress authorize this new program. Moreover, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is in the midst of developing a bill to reauthorize the FAA and its programs. Neither the gentleman from Ohio nor anyone else has put forward the need for this program. Instead, it is added on the Floor as an amendment with a possible 10 minutes of debate. In fact, the amendment is likely to be adopted without any debate. That is not how we should be legislating in this body.

Why are we doing this? All indications are that this amendment is simply an attempt to fund specific airport projects at Rickenbacker International Airport, a civil-military public airport near Columbus, Ohio.

I do not object to the FAA offering grants to assist an airport in improving infrastructure or repairing or replacing an air traffic control tower. In fact, a process for this already exists. The Airport Improvement Program (AIP) has a grant set-aside of approximately $15 million a year under the Military Airport Program (MAP) for the conversion of military airfields to civil or joint-use airports. Over the past 30 years, Rickenbacker Airport has received more than $62 million of AIP and MAP funds for airport-related projects.

Although Rickenbacker has long participated in the AIP and MAP programs, this amendment creates a new program with the same objectives as existing programs but its own pot of money. It authorizes grants of up to $2.5 million for three airports, which must meet very specific criteria. It requires the FAA and DOD to each contribute one-half of the funds. The purpose appears simply to create an additional source of funding for a particular airport.

As this bill moves to Conference with the other body, I am hopeful that the Committees on Armed Services will take a hard look at whether creating this new program is in the Nation's best interests and how it relates to the existing AIP and MAP programs.

Mr. Chair, without a better explanation, I do not see why Congress would create another airport program.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–112 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

Amendment No. 15 by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. SMITH of Washington.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 60, noes 363, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

AYES—60

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Cárdenas
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
DeFazio
DeGette
DeSaulnier
Doggett
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Foster
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Huffman
Kennedy
Lee
Lewis
Lipinski
Lowenthal
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McDermott
McNerney
Meng
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Pallone
Payne
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Velázquez
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Yarmuth

NOES—363

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Barletta
Capps
Cleaver
Davis, Danny
Edwards
Mulvaney
Ribble
Sanchez, Loretta
Sessions

□ 1859

Messrs. BUTTERFIELD, HOYER, OLSON, VAN HOLLEN, PERRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MEEKS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Messrs. PRICE of North Carolina, LIPINSKI, POCAN, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 202, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

AYES—221

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers

Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—202

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Barletta
Capps
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Davis, Danny
Edwards
Mulvaney
Ribble
Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1903

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 180, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

AYES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—180

Adams
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Barletta
Capps
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Davis, Danny
Edwards
Mulvaney
Ribble
Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1907

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 249, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—174

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—249

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Barletta
Capps
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Davis, Danny
Edwards
Mulvaney
Ribble
Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1912

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCCARTHY. Members are advised that we will continue debating amendments to the NDAA after this vote series and will complete consideration of the bill tomorrow.

Members are further advised that they should be prepared to vote as early as 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. MC CAUL

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 166, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

AYES—253

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)

Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—166

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Capps
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Davis, Danny
Edwards
Mulvaney
Ribble
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1917

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REED) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1927

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARDY) at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 644. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

H.R. 1295. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1356. An act to clarify that certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 will not take effect until after the Director of the Office of Personnel Management promulgates and makes effective regulations relating to such provisions.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 260 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1735.

Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) kindly take the chair.

□ 1929

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. REED (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 114–112 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO DR. SHAKIL AFRIDI.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The attacks of September 11, 2001, killed approximately 3,000 people, most of whom were Americans, but also included hundreds of individuals with foreign citizenships, nearly 350 New York Fire Department personnel, and about 50 law enforcement officers.

(2) Downed United Airlines flight 93 was reportedly intended, under the control of the al-Qaeda high-jackers, to crash into the White House or the Capitol in an attempt to kill the President of the United States or Members of the United States Congress.

(3) The September 11, 2001, attacks were largely planned and carried out by the al-Qaeda terrorist network led by Osama bin

Laden and his deputy Ayman al Zawahiri, after which Osama bin Laden enjoyed safe haven in Pakistan from where he continued to plot deadly attacks against the United States and the world.

(4) The United States has obligated nearly $30 billion between 2002 and 2014 in United States taxpayer money for security and economic aid to Pakistan.

(5) The United States very generously and swiftly responded to the 2005 Kashmir Earthquake in Pakistan with more than $200 million in emergency aid and the support of several United States military aircraft, approximately 1,000 United States military personnel, including medical specialists, thousands of tents, blankets, water containers and a variety of other emergency equipment.

(6) The United States again generously and swiftly contributed approximately $150 million in emergency aid to Pakistan following the 2010 Pakistan flood, in addition to the service of nearly twenty United States military helicopters, their flight crews, and other resources to assist the Pakistan Army's relief efforts.

(7) The United States continues to work tirelessly to support Pakistan's economic development, including millions of dollars allocated towards the development of Pakistan's energy infrastructure, health services and education system.

(8) The United States and Pakistan continue to have many critical shared interests, both economic and security related, which could be the foundation for a positive and mutually beneficial partnership.

(9) Dr. Shakil Afridi, a Pakistani physician, is a hero to whom the people of the United States, Pakistan and the world owe a debt of gratitude for his help in finally locating Osama bin Laden before more innocent American, Pakistani and other lives were lost to this terrorist leader.

(10) Pakistan, the United States and the international community had failed for nearly 10 years following attacks of September 11, 2001, to locate and bring Osama bin Laden, who continued to kill innocent civilians in the Middle East, Asia, Europe, Africa and the United States, to justice without the help of Dr. Afridi.

(11) The Government of Pakistan's imprisonment of Dr. Afridi presents a serious and growing impediment to the United States' bilateral relations with Pakistan.

(12) The Government of Pakistan has leveled and allowed baseless charges against Dr. Afridi in a politically motivated, spurious legal process.

(13) Dr. Afridi is currently imprisoned by the Government of Pakistan, a deplorable and unconscionable situation which calls into question Pakistan's actual commitment to countering terrorism and undermines the notion that Pakistan is a true ally in the struggle against terrorism.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Dr. Shakil Afridi is an international hero and that the Government of Pakistan should release him immediately from prison.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1930

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1735, a sense of the Congress that Dr. Afridi, a hero of freedom and decency, is imprisoned and that Pakistan should release him from prison immediately.

Last year, this very same amendment was adopted by the House but stripped during the House-Senate conference negotiations process. Yes, a short note of acknowledging this amendment was included in the fiscal year '15 NDAA Joint Explanatory Statement, but that amendment itself was nevertheless stripped. I intend to request a recorded vote to demonstrate solid bipartisan support for Dr. Afridi so that future conferees will take this language more seriously and include it in the final fiscal year '16 NDAA.

Mr. Chairman, we need to make a statement in support of this American and international hero against terrorism. We need to support Dr. Afridi. If we abandon this friend, we put ourselves at great risk because he put himself at great risk for us. No amount of aircraft carriers will make us secure if we abandon our friends who stand with us.

Dr. Afridi is the Pakistani medical doctor who helped pinpoint the location for Osama bin Laden, the terrorist coward who masterminded the massacre of 3,000 Americans on 9/11.

Because of his cooperation with the United States, Dr. Afridi was tried and imprisoned by Pakistan's corrupt and oppressive government. That should be considered a hostile act by Pakistan against the people of the United States. Worse, after years of effort on the part of the United States to free him, Dr. Afridi continues to languish in a Pakistan dungeon. Yes, it is shameful we have abandoned such an heroic friend. All the while, of course, we continue to provide weapons and cash to his captors. Since 9/11 we have given Pakistan over $25 billion, the majority of which goes to the military and security services which they use to murder and oppress their own people, people like the heroic Baloch people or the Sindhis, who are struggling for their freedom under Pakistan oppression.

It is a grotesque charade to suggest that our aid is buying Pakistan's cooperation in the war on terror or anything else. So long as Dr. Afridi remains left to suffer this brutal imprisonment, no Pakistani promise of cooperation means anything if they cannot get themselves to release such an heroic person who never should have been arrested and who risked his life for us. How can we believe they are not supporting or even arming or supplying the world's worst and most bloodthirsty terrorists? Pakistan has taken us for fools, and shame on us for being so stupid for financing a regime that so blatantly despises us.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will remind the Government of Pakistan and our own government that we have not forgotten Dr. Afridi nor his courageous actions, and it will remind other brave allies of freedom as well as intelligence assets throughout the world that the United States will not forget them if they risk their lives for us. We will not turn our back and leave them to suffer a terrible fate because they were loyal to us.

Save Dr. Afridi. I ask my colleagues to join me in that statement, and Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no speakers, so at this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me just remind all of us as we try to decide how much money we are going to be spending on the military, let's remind ourselves that we can arm ourselves to the teeth, we can make sure that we have rockets, aircraft carriers, and new airplanes, but if the people around the world cannot trust us, if people put themselves in an alliance with the United States, if we lose those people who can be intelligence assets, who will fight battles against terrorists like up in Erbil, which is going on right now, we have no chance at peace.

We can't carry the load ourselves. I just voted against that added aircraft carrier because what we need to do is to make sure that we are enlisting the people around the world to carry their part of the load. The American people can't do this alone. But I will tell you, if we abandon our friends like this, if we abandon Dr. Afridi, we are putting ourselves at risk for it.

It is shameful that we couldn't even get a statement in legislation last year supporting this heroic man who risked his life to finger Osama bin Laden, the murderer, the man who slaughtered 3,000 Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join me in this noble endeavor to send a message to Dr. Afridi, and send a message to our adversaries, the brutal terrorists around the world, that we will stand with those free people who are willing to stand with us and not forget them.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 27.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW START TREATY.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be used for implementation of the New START Treaty until the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the armed forces of the Russian Federation are no longer illegally occupying Ukrainian territory;

(2) the Russian Federation is respecting the sovereignty of all Ukrainian territory;

(3) the Russian Federation is no longer taking actions that are inconsistent with the INF Treaty;

(4) the Russian Federation is in compliance with the CFE Treaty and has lifted its suspension of Russian observance of its treaty obligations; and

(5) there have been no inconsistencies by the Russian Federation with New START Treaty requirements.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) CFE TREATY.—The term ''CFE Treaty'' means the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, signed at Paris November 19, 1990, and entered into force July 17, 1992.

(3) INF TREATY.—The term ''INF Treaty'' means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(4) NEW START TREATU.—The term ''New START Treaty'' means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed on April 8, 2010, and entered into force on February 5, 2011

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to funds described in subsection (a) that are unobligated as of such date of enactment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. We should not implement a treaty—the New START treaty in this case—unless we believe the other party to the treaty is trustworthy and will uphold their end of the bargain. Now, if you don't trust Vladimir Putin, then you should vote for this amendment, and let me explain why.

Right now, I don't believe the Russians are trustworthy. We know that they are already violating three major agreements: the INF Treaty, the CFE Treaty, and the Budapest Memorandum. Mr. Putin also continues to deny that Russian forces are engaged in combat in Ukraine.

Because this amendment deals with treaties, let me expand on the details of these three treaties. First, in 1994, Russia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, and the United States signed the Budapest Memorandum. This agreement included a commitment to ''respect''—and I have got a copy right here—''respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine'' and a commitment to ''refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine.''

Clearly, the recent invasions of Crimea and eastern Ukraine show that the Russian Federation is in violation of the Budapest Memorandum.

Second, in 1987, Reagan and Gorbachev signed the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, or INF Treaty. Last year, the State Department released its annual compliance report which states—and I have a copy of it right here—''the United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty.''

Third, in 2007 President Putin announced that he was suspending Russian participation in the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, or the CFE Treaty. This came after years of Russian violations of that treaty. Today, as we speak, the Russian military continues to occupy Ukrainian territory.

Russian noncompliance with treaties cannot be disputed. My amendment would prevent the continued reduction of our nuclear weapons as required by the New START treaty unless the President can certify to Congress that the Russian Federation is no longer occupying Ukrainian territory and also certifies that the Russian Federation is abiding by their obligations under these three treaties.

So if you think that the Russian Federation might not be trustworthy, then please support this amendment. We should not unilaterally disarm and blindly assume that the Russians will do their part. If the President can certify that the Russians are doing their part on these treaties, then the funding to implement the New START treaty will be released.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I stand second to no one in my dislike of Vladimir Putin. I think most everyone in this body hates Vladimir Putin. We despise his territorial aggression vis-a-vis Ukraine, but this is not the right way to get back at Putin and Russia. The gentleman is a very senior and distinguished member of the committee. He is my friend. I don't recall the gentleman offering this amendment in the Armed Services Committee markup. Did the gentleman offer this amendment?

Mr. LAMBORN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. No.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask why?

Mr. LAMBORN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I thought that it was better timing to do it in this particular venue because we had other things going on in committee.

Mr. COOPER. But we spent some 18 hours in committee. We considered hundreds of amendments. But the gentleman did not offer our committee, the Armed Services Committee, the opportunity to discuss this amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. I didn't want it to be 18½ hours.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would call this amendment by my friend from Colorado the boomerang amendment because it does not hit the intended target. Instead, it comes back and hits us.

How does it do this? His amendment, as proposed, would amount to a unilateral U.S. treaty violation. This would effectively blind the United States when it comes to looking at things like the number of Russian nuclear weapons on deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles, the number of deployed submarine-launched ballistic missiles, counting nuclear weapons onboard or attached to deployed heavy bombers, and confirming weapons systems conversions. These are the things that the New START treaty allows us to do with Russia. We need the continued ability to look at those Russian weapons systems. By cutting off funding for these essential national security activities, the gentleman has hit the wrong target here. That is why this is the boomerang amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman pointed out that Russia is despicable in so many ways. They probably violated the INF Treaty, the CFE Treaty, and the Budapest Treaty. But the gentleman is using the New START treaty to get back at those violations. He has picked the wrong target. So I have the highest regard for the gentleman, but he proposed this last year, and it was dropped in conference. Instead, it was substituted. We had an inquiry to the Pentagon to get their opinion on this, and they wrote us back, and they said that the New START treaty facilitates conditions to make the United States more secure, and its continued implementation remains in the national security interests of the Nation.

The Pentagon went on to say that the New START treaty sustains effective deterrence and increases stability in the U.S.-Russian nuclear relationship at significantly lower levels of strategic delivery systems and warheads. Finally, the report said that the New START treaty provides the United States a vital window into the Russian strategic nuclear arsenal.

Let's not blind the United States. The gentleman had a chance in the committee to offer this. The gentleman offered this last year, and this is the response of the Secretary of Defense, who is strongly against the gentleman's amendment; the Joint Chiefs of Staff are strongly against the gentleman's amendment. And I would suggest that, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not in the national security interests of the United States. For the gentleman to propose a unilateral treaty violation, a solemn obligation of this country, is a serious undertaking, and we need more than 10 minutes to debate such a serious breach.

This is a treaty, after all, only entered into in 2010, but it was entered into by a solid vote of the United States Senate, 71–26. I know many of us here wish that we were Senators, but we are not. The Senate entered into that treaty solemnly. This would be a grave mistake for this body to accept the gentleman's amendment.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Lamborn amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say it is not the right time to continue to unilaterally disarm under the terms that we would be facing in the face of these violations.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama, Representative MIKE ROGERS, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished vice chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee for this amendment and for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, the New START treaty is the only bilateral arms control treaty I am aware of that only requires one party to reduce its nuclear weapons, and that is the United States, while the other party, Russia, increases its stockpile.

□ 1945

I have a prediction here for you today. If this truly is fully implemented by the United States prior to the 2018 deadline, we will see Russia cheating on the treaty immediately thereafter. Mark my words, unless there is a U.S. President in office at the time Putin respects, he will cheat on this treaty as soon as he gets a chance.

The Russians have no respect for the agreements they make. They have no respect for international law or sovereignty. They respect one thing and one thing alone: strength.

I urge support of this prudent amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my distinguished friends and colleagues, this should have been offered in committee where Members are more conversant with these issues.

This is not the right way to get back at Putin and Russia, for the United States to commit a unilateral treaty breach. The gentleman has not even alleged that the Russians have violated the New START treaty. This is one treaty that they actually seem to be adhering to. Now, we may question the wisdom of that treaty, but the Senate voted to confirm it, to ratify the treaty. It would be a grave mistake for this lower body to challenge that judgment.

The key point is this: Why blind the United States to counting the number of Russian nuclear weapons? Why defund those activities? Don't we want to know how many ICBMs are in their silos, how many nuclear armed submarines they have? Why don't we want to know what is really going on in Russia?

I think the gentleman is mistaken by proposing this as an appropriate way to get back at Putin. We need more insight into what the Russians are doing, not less. This is a boomerang amendment; it attacks the wrong target. In fact, it comes back and hits us.

I would urge the defeat of the Lamborn amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would just conclude by saying that we are being taken for suckers if we are expected to keep up one end of a bargain and we are dealing with a country that, in so many cases, is not keeping their end of the bargain. That is why this amendment is proposed, not to get back at them, but to protect ourselves.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1407 and insert the following:

SEC. 1407. REPEAL OF NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 2218a of title 10, United States Code is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 131 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2218a.

SEC. 1408. ELIMINATION OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS FOR NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for Navy, Advanced Component Development and Prototypes, Advanced Nuclear Power Systems (Line 045) is hereby increased by $419,300,000.

(b) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for Navy, Advanced Component Development and Prototypes, Ohio Replacement (Line 050) is hereby increased by $971,393,000.

(c) REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4501 for the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund is hereby reduced by $1,390,693,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It would move the funding authority for the Navy's next submarine—the Ohio class replacement—out of the so-called national sea-based deterrence fund and

put it back where it belongs, in the Navy's shipbuilding budget.

The amendment would not reduce funding for this project. It is a vote, however, for sound budget process because the sea-based deterrence fund is no different than using any other sleight of hand oversea contingency operations, some sort of slush fund, to get around the cost caps for other programs.

This fund was created in the last defense authorization because the Navy could not afford to simultaneously build back up a 300-plus surface fleet and procure the 12 Ohio class replacement nuclear submarines.

The problem with the deterrence fund is that it doesn't solve how we pay for all of this. It simply would shift that burden onto the Pentagon in some magic way.

That is why the appropriators refused to put money into the account after it was authorized. It doesn't take an accountant to understand, if you buy the same amount of goods but charge them on two different credit cards, your debt will be the same amount.

This fund will only lead to increased costs for the program and decrease transparency stability for manufacturers. The increased costs come from untethering the program from the Navy's shipbuilding budget, thereby reducing scrutiny and discipline, the tradeoffs that we expect.

Shipbuilders will face increased uncertainty because no one has yet answered the question about where that funding will come from, setting them up for dramatic cuts once reality catches up with the budgetary gimmick.

I ask my colleagues if this is, in fact, a national priority, then make the case to amend the restrictions. Find the room to pay for the program through the traditional means.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee and especially the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee is probably the most bipartisan committees in Congress. We work very, very carefully to make sure that we are defending and protecting the United States of America.

That is why we will have bipartisan opposition to this amendment. If you are against nuclear deterrence, you should vote for this amendment; but, if you are for it, you should vote against this amendment because this sea-based deterrence fund begins us down the path to fund the Ohio class replacement.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind this body that these 12 submarines will carry 70 percent of the nuclear capacity of our deterrence for the United States of America. To not have this deterrence fund would be absolutely irresponsible. It is something we have worked for, and, while it is true it is not the complete solution, it puts us on the road to that solution. That is why I hope we will reject this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), ranking member on the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, who has worked very, very hard for this fund and done great work on it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, again, I thank the chairman who, it is true, over the last 3 years, we have worked together, as well as our predecessors going back to Gene Taylor and Roscoe Bartlett, who started this discussion about the challenge of funding the Ohio replacement program.

Mr. Chairman, when President Obama signed the New START treaty on April 8, 2010, after ratification by the U.S. Senate, one thing became crystal clear: the U.S. Navy's nuclear strategic mission became even more critical than ever.

Why? Because, as the chairman said, the implementation of a nuclear arsenal in the post-New START era will rest even more heavily on ballistic submarines—in fact, two-thirds of the triad in the post-New START era will be sea-based, and that is why every strategic review going back to Secretary Gates has identified construction of the Ohio replacement program as one of the top—if not the number one—defense priority of the country.

Let's be clear, the Ohio program will be built. That is not in debate. The question for Congress is whether we will let this once in a multigenerational cost suffocate the rest of the Navy shipbuilding account. The Seapower report in the underlying bill provides a solution to this problem, which will provide help both for our fleet and the industrial base.

The underlying bill activates the national sea-based deterrence fund passed last year on a bipartisan, bicameral basis to fund the design and engineering work for the Ohio replacement program and is a responsible way to support construction of the Ohio replacement fleet.

Sponsors of this amendment call the fund a gimmick and a shell game. It is not a gimmick, and there is a clear precedent for this. In fact, Congress has supported the construction of defense and Navy sealift ships through a similar fund called the national defense sealift fund, which was created in 1993, and to this day pays for construction of new oilers, troop transport ships, supply ships, and the like outside of the Navy shipbuilding account. We have done it before to protect recurring upgrades to our fleet, and we should do it again.

Vote ''no'' on this amendment to protect our shipbuilding fleet and account and also to protect America's shipbuilding industrial base.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my friend.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise as well in opposition to the Blumenauer amendment and echo the comments of the chairman and the ranking member.

The national sea-based deterrence fund is crucial to the future of our national security. It provides space outside the shipbuilding fund for the most survivable piece of our national deterrence, a bill that last came due in the eighties and the Reagan defense buildup.

These boats are absolutely essential. This is not just a Navy issue. As Secretary of Defense Carter has said, ''This is a national priority.''

The deterrence fund allows us to treat it accordingly and avoid pressuring the Navy out of badly needed investment in other ships and capabilities. Unless Congress acts, these boats will consume half of the projected shipbuilding funding for a decade, causing crippling shortages that would echo in our fleet for decades thereafter.

Congress has already acknowledged these problems ahead, and last year, this body took a bipartisan, bicameral step, modeled on existing funding mechanisms to help.

This amendment does nothing to address the fundamental challenges at stake and simply moves us backward in policy as time marches on.

I urge this amendment's defeat.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has the right to close.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, this is by no stretch of the imagination a vote on whether or not one believes in nuclear deterrence.

The United States has in its possession now and will continue to have far more nuclear firepower than is necessary to deter anybody in the world. We have not only the submarine-based weapons, we have 450 land-based missiles, and we have the bomber fleet.

It has been acknowledged repeatedly by studies at the Pentagon that we can effectively reduce the amount of nuclear armaments we have by a third or

more without jeopardizing our deterrence, our ability to destroy any country in the world many times over.

The question is: How do we pay for what we have and where we are going? An amendment that I had, which was not ruled in order, I am sad to say, would have requested a CBO study for what our costs are over the course of the next 25 years.

Most estimates are that we are in a pattern of spending $1 trillion or more over the course of these 30 years. That is big money, no matter how you cut it.

We are in the process of hollowing out our military. We have got problems in terms of compensation and benefit. We have a military that has been strained, stretched, and damaged by the ill-advised adventure in Iraq.

Now, we are embarking upon, without doing the tough decisionmaking about setting priorities, we are launching down a road here that would allow us to bypass the budgetary process and make appropriate tradeoffs, whether it is within the Department of Defense overall, but I would argue that it ought to be within the Navy budget.

My amendment wouldn't stop going forward. The money involved would go into submarine construction, but it would inject a little bit of discipline here.

Now, this doesn't tell us where the money is going to come from for the project and their account, this sleight of hand, doesn't make it easier to finance, but it makes it harder to track, and it eliminates the discipline, as I say, by forcing the Navy and then the Pentagon to be able to deal with it openly, honestly, and know where we are at. There is no reason to go down this path.

I hope some day we have a spirited debate on the floor of the House about how much deterrence is enough. Are the Pentagon experts right that we can reduce it? Or do we need to go down a path spending $1 trillion over the course of the next 30 years?

The truth is we are going to have to face some very difficult budgetary decisions. This proposal doesn't help us do that. It helps us to evade it.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2000

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, the sponsor of this amendment would suggest that we need to pick priorities. This is not just a priority—it is the national strategic priority. If you ask the CNO of the Navy, he would tell you that this is his top priority.

As far as being open and transparent, how much more could we be than to lay out this fund now and to begin to fund it now instead of waiting until midnight when we need it and say, ''We need $95 billion''?

Mr. Chairman, I close where I began: if you are against nuclear deterrence, then vote for this amendment and take away the capacity that we have for ships that will carry 70 percent of our nuclear deterrence. If you believe, as a bipartisan group of people in the Armed Services believes, that this fund is valuable, that this fund is important, and that these votes are vital to the national security of this country, we should reject this amendment. I hope we will vote ''no'' on it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of subtitle D of title XVI the following:

SEC. 1657. PROHIBITION ON DE-ALERTING INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that—

(1) the responsiveness and alert levels of intercontinental ballistic missiles are a unique feature of the ground-based leg of the United States nuclear triad;

(2) such responsiveness and alert levels are critical to providing robust nuclear deterrence and assurance; and

(3) any action to reduce the responsiveness and alert levels of United States intercontinental ballistic missiles would be contrary to longstanding United States policy, and deeply harmful to national security and strategic stability in a crisis.

(b) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 shall be obligated or expended for reducing, or preparing to reduce, the responsiveness or alert level of United States intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(2) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO MAINTENANCE, SAFETY, SECURITY, ETC.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any of the following activities:

(A) Maintenance or sustainment of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(B) Ensuring the safety, security, or reliability of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of the Lummis-Zinke-Cramer-Smith amendment: to prohibit the unilateral decrease of the alert status of our Nation's ICBM force.

Nuclear deterrence is based on the fundamental belief that a nuclear attack on the United States would cause us to retaliate. Reducing the alert status would change the time needed to retaliate from as few as 30 minutes to 3 days. This makes it much easier for an enemy to strike first, wiping out the U.S. nuclear force before it can retaliate. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE), my colleague and a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment that prohibits reducing the alert posture of the ICBM forces.

What has changed? Are we safer today than yesterday?

Dr. Kissinger, former Secretary of State, testified before Congress, stating:

> The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War.

On top of the threats that Dr. Kissinger was referring to, we have seen since: the framework of a nuclear agreement with Iran that may give a legal pathway to a nuclear weapon; Russia has announced it will lift its ban and sell advanced missile systems to Iran; and just this past week, there were reports that North Korea has tested a submarine-launched ballistic missile.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time to gamble with our safety and with the security of the United States. I support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER). He lives in the State that houses Minot Air Force Base.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank my colleagues who have helped cosponsor this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the author of the amendment did a great job in discerning between 3 days and 30 minutes, as 30 minutes is hardly what some have called a ''hair trigger.'' Clearly, we want to be at a strategic advantage, and we would be at a tremendous strategic disadvantage should we have to take 3 days. Anybody who has been to one of these bases, as many of us have—anybody who has been in the bunkers and has seen the control system—knows that the protocols that are in place are anything but a hair trigger. We can be confident that we have the ability to respond quickly but not the ability to respond too quickly.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

While I applaud my colleagues for their attention to the ICBM force, I think their attention is in the wrong place. First of all, the amendment is unnecessary, and no one is even proposing reducing alert levels at this time.

My concern here is that investigations, DOD reviews, and press articles over the past few years have revealed that we have had significant problems in the ICBM force, including the nearly 100 officers involved in cheating on tests, the possession of narcotics, security violations, pervasive morale issues, an instance of an ICBM officer who was later found to have been a gang member, a two-star general in charge of all U.S. ICBM who was stripped of his command for going on a drinking binge during an official visit to Russia, an ICBM wing at Minot Air Force Base failing a safety and security test, and reported narcotics by which launch control officers violated security regulations designed to protect the ICBM firing keys.

Mr. Chairman, these are problems rising to the level of congressional attention, but instead of focusing on those very real issues affecting national defense, we are spending time on parochial concerns, quite frankly.

There are no near-term plans, as I said in my opening, to reduce alert levels, and there are no FY16 funding requests to do so. This is a solution, quite frankly, in search of a problem and is a dangerous example of micromanaging in the area of our national defense in which very small actions, considered rationally and in isolation, reduce the strategic flexibility of the Commander in Chief. In no other area is the possibility for cataclysmic error so real. Let's not make deterrence harder.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, in recognition of the fact that the concern here is the unilateral decrease of the alert status, I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the chair of the Armed Services Committee's Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment, and I urge its passage.

As chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, I understand the responsiveness of our ICBMs as their most critical feature and their most significant contribution to our nuclear triad. The U.S. has had ICBMs on alert since the early 1960s. This amendment ensures that there is no change to the longstanding, bipartisan U.S. defense posture that ICBMs are kept on high alert levels.

In recent weeks, the usual groups who want to disarm the United States have been calling on the U.S. to de-alert ICBMs. We should continue to pay no attention to these tired, repetitive voices who long for the nuclear freeze days of the cold war when they were relevant. Instead, Admiral Haney, the current commander of U.S. Strategic Command, said just last week he ''fundamentally disagrees'' with these calls to de-alert U.S. ICBMs.

Finally, this amendment ensures the administration follows its own stated policy. In an April 2015 hearing before my subcommittee, the DOD witnesses told us that the administration explicitly examined and rejected de-alerting our ICBMs.

Those who are arguing against the amendment are even further to the left on nuclear weapons than our global zero President. This is not just a missile state issue—this is a profound national security issue. De-alerting our ICBMs is a terrible idea. I urge a ''yes'' vote on my colleague's amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I do appreciate the gentleman from Rhode Island for setting the context here.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to be concerned about what is going on. My understanding is that they found out about the widespread cheating among the missileers because they were investigating the drug abuse.

There are things that ought to concern us, not something that to this point is, as they just testified, a proposal on behalf of the administration, but, rather, the notion that somehow any action to reduce responsiveness is contrary to longstanding policy and is deeply harmful to national security and strategic stability in a crisis. There may well come a time when we are able to make some changes that would remove a little bit of the hair trigger. I don't think that is something that we should prejudge.

In the meantime, if people care about these missiles, they ought to make sure that they are managed in an effective fashion, that we take care of the longstanding abuses, and that we deal with the point that I made a moment ago: when we are launching on a $1 trillion program over the next three decades, we ought to find out how much we need and how we are going to pay for it.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I will just close by saying, as I said in the beginning, that this amendment is a solution in search of a problem, and I would say it is not necessary at this time. No one is proposing reducing the alert levels at this time, and I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 37, 39, 42, 44, 45, 46, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 63, 64, and 66 printed in House Report No. 114–112, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. HARDY OF NEVADA

At the end of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28____. USE OF MILITARY OPERATIONS AREAS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY ACTIVITIES.

The expansion or establishment of a national monument by the President under the authority of chapter 3203 of title 54, United States Code (commonly known as the Antiquities Act of 1906; 54 U.S.C. 320301 et seq.), after the date of the enactment of this Act on land located beneath or associated with a Military Operations Area (MOA) shall not be construed to prohibit or constrain any activities on or above the land conducted by the Department of Defense or other Federal agencies for national security purposes, including training and readiness activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. ZINKE OF MONTANA

At the end of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28____. RENAMING OF THE CAPTAIN WILLIAM WYLIE GALT GREAT FALLS ARMED FORCES READINESS CENTER IN HONOR OF CAPTAIN JOHN E. MORAN, A RECIPIENT OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR.

(a) RENAMING.—The Captain William Wylie Galt Great Falls Armed Forces Readiness Center in Great Falls, Montana, shall hereafter be known and designated as the ''Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, map, document, paper, other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. COSTELLO OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Army personnel face an increasingly complex and evolving threat environment

that requires advanced and effective technology to protect our soldiers while allowing them to effectively carry out their mission;

(2) the heavy tactical vehicle protection kits program provides the Army with improved and necessary ballistic protection for the heavy tactical vehicle fleet;

(3) a secure heavy tactical vehicle fleet provides the Army with greater logistical tractability and offers soldiers the necessary flexibility to tailor armor levels based on threat levels and mission requirements; and

(4) as Congress provides for a modern and secure Army, it is necessary to provide the appropriate funding levels to meet its tactical wheeled vehicle protection kits acquisition objectives.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 226. COMMERCIAL-OFF-THE-SHELF WIDE-AREA SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS FOR ARMY TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress finds that—

(1) unmanned aerial systems provide the military services with high-endurance, wide-area surveillance;

(2) wide-area surveillance has proven to be a significant force multiplier for intelligence gathering and dismounted infantry operations;

(3) currently fielded wide-area surveillance sensors are too heavy to be incorporated into tactical unmanned aerial systems; and

(4) the growing commercial market for unmanned aerial systems with full-motion video sensors may offer a commercial-off-the-shelf solution suitable for use on the military services' tactical unmanned aerial systems.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that contains the findings of a market survey and flight assessment of commercial-off-the-shelf wide-area surveillance sensors suitable for insertion into Army tactical unmanned aerial systems.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The market survey and flight assessment required by subsection (b) shall include—

(1) specific details regarding the capabilities of current and commercial-off-the-shelf wide-area surveillance sensors utilized on the Army unmanned aerial systems, including—

(A) daytime and nighttime monitoring coverage;

(B) video resolution outputs;

(C) bandwidth requirements;

(D) activity-based intelligence and forensic capabilities;

(E) simultaneous region of interest monitoring capability;

(F) interoperability with other sensors and subsystems currently utilized on Army tactical unmanned aerial systems;

(G) sensor weight;

(H) sensor cost; and

(I) any other factors the Secretary deems relevant;

(2) an assessment of the impact on Army tactical unmanned aerial systems due to the insertion of commercial-off-the-shelf wide-area surveillance sensors; and

(3) recommendations to upgrade or enhance the wide-area surveillance sensors of Army tactical unmanned aerial systems, as deemed appropriate by the Secretary.

(d) FORM.—The report required under subsection (b) may contain a classified annex.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Army tactical unmanned aerial systems'' includes, at minimum, the MQ–1C Grey Eagle, the MQ–1 Predator, and the MQ–9 Reaper.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 58, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 226. REPORT ON TACTICAL COMBAT TRAINING SYSTEM INCREMENT II.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than January 29, 2016, the Secretary of Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the baseline and alternatives to the Navy's Tactical Air Combat Training System (TCTS) Increment II.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An explanation of the rationale for a new start TCTS II program as compared to an incremental upgrade to the existing TCTS system.

(2) An estimate of total cost to develop, procure, and replace the existing Department of the Navy TCTS architecture with an encrypted TCTS II compared to upgrades to existing TCTS.

(3) A cost estimate and schedule comparison of achieving encryption requirements into the existing TCTS program as compared to TCTS II.

(4) A review of joint Department of the Air Force and the Department of the Navy investment in live-virtual-constructive advanced air combat training and planned timeline for inclusion into TCTS II architecture.

(5) A cost estimate to integrate F-35 aircraft with TCTS II and achieve interoperability between the Department of the Navy and Department of the Air Force.

(6) A cost estimate for coalition partners to achieve TCTS II interoperability within the Department of Defense.

(7) An assessment of risks posed by non-interoperable TCTS systems within the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force.

(8) An explanation of the acquisition strategy for the TCTS program.

(9) An explanation of key performance parameters for the TCTS II program.

(10) Any other information the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of the Air Force determine is appropriate to include.

(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Navy shall not proceed with the approval or designation of a contract award for TCTS II until 15 days after the date of the submittal of the report required by subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO OF MISSISSIPPI

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 226. IMPROVEMENT TO COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION OF DEFENSE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2364 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(a) COORDINATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND TECHNOLOGICAL DATA.—The Secretary of Defense shall promote, monitor, and evaluate programs for the communication and exchange of research, development, and technological data—

''(1) among the Defense research facilities, combatant commands, and other organizations that are involved in developing for the Department of Defense the technological requirements for new items for use by combat forces;

''(2) among Defense research facilities and other offices, agencies, and bureaus in the Department that are engaged in related technological matters;

''(3) among other research facilities and other departments or agencies of the Federal Government that are engaged in research, development, and technological matters;

''(4) among private commercial, research institution, and university entities engaged in research, development, and technological matters potentially relevant to defense on a voluntary basis; and

''(5) to the extent practicable, to achieve full awareness of scientific and technological advancement and innovation wherever it may occur, whether funded by the Department of Defense, another element of the Federal Government, or other entities.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(3) that the managers of such facilities have broad latitude to choose research and development projects based on awareness of activities throughout the technology domain, including within the Federal Government, the Department of Defense, public and private research institutions and universities, and the global commercial marketplace;''; and

(3) in the section heading, by inserting ''**and technology domain awareness**'' after ''**activities**''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2364 and inserting the following:

''2364. Coordination and communication of defense research activities and technology domain awareness.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. FARENTHOLD OF TEXAS

At the end of title III (page 77, after line 21), add the following new section:

SEC. 3____. ACCESS TO WIRELESS HIGH-SPEED INTERNET AND NETWORK CONNECTIONS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DEPLOYED OVERSEAS.

Consistent with section 2492a of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense is encouraged to enter into contracts with third-party vendors in order to provide members of the Armed Forces who are deployed overseas at any United States military facility, at which wireless high-speed Internet and network connections are otherwise available, with access to such Internet and network connections without charge.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK OF IOWA

Page 77, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 334. TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO EXTEND CONTRACTS AND LEASES UNDER THE ARMS INITIATIVE.

Contracts or subcontracts entered into pursuant to section 4554(a)(3)(A) of title 10, United States Code, on or before the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act may include an option to extend the term of the contract or subcontract for an additional 25 years.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING OF LOUISIANA

At the end of title IV (page 83, after line 16), add the following new section:

SEC. 422. REPORT ON FORCE STRUCTURE OF THE ARMY.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(1) An assessment by the Secretary of Defense of reports by the Secretary of the Army on the force structure of the Army submitted to Congress under section 1066 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1943) and section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

(2) An evaluation of the adequacy of the Army force structure proposed for the future-years defense program for fiscal years 2017 through 2021 to meet the goals of the national military strategy of the United States.

(3) An independent risk assessment by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the proposed Army force structure and the ability of such force structure to meet the operational requirements of combatant commanders.

(4) A description of the planning assumptions and scenarios used by the Department of Defense to validate the size and force structure of the Army, including the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard.

(5) A certification by the Secretary of Defense that the Secretary has reviewed the reports by the Secretary of the Army and the assessments of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and determined that an end strength for active duty personnel of the Army below the end strength level authorized in section 401(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) will be adequate to meet the national military strategy of the United States.

(6) A description of various alternative options for allocating funds to ensure that the end strengths of the Army do not fall below levels of significant risk, as determined pursuant to the risk assessment conducted by the Chairman of the Joint Chief under paragraph (3).

(7) Such other information or updates as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle B of title V (page 96, after line 22), add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. ELECTRONIC TRACKING OF OPERATIONAL ACTIVE-DUTY SERVICE PERFORMED BY MEMBERS OF THE READY RESERVE OF THE ARMED FORCES.

The Secretary of Defense shall establish an electronic means by which members of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces can track their operational active-duty service performed after January 28, 2008, under section 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10, United States Code. The tour calculator shall specify early retirement credit authorized for each qualifying tour of active duty, as well as cumulative early reserve retirement credit authorized to date under section 12731(f) of such title.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY OF NEW YORK

Page 179, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 539. SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE DIVERSITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States military includes individuals with a variety of national, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds that have roots all over the world.

(2) In addition to diverse backgrounds, members of the Armed Forces come from numerous religious traditions, including Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh, non-denominational, non-practicing, and many more.

(3) Members of the Armed Forces from diverse backgrounds and religious traditions have lost their lives or been injured defending the national security of the United States.

(4) Diversity contributes to the strength of the Armed Forces, and service members from different backgrounds and religious traditions share the same goal of defending the United States.

(5) The unity of the Armed Forces reflects the strength in diversity that makes the United States a great nation.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to recognize and promote diversity in the Armed Forces; and

(2) honor those from all diverse backgrounds and religious traditions who have made sacrifices in serving the United States through the Armed Services.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

Page 226, after line 13, insert the following:

(C) A comparison of the pilot program to other programs conducted by the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs to provide unemployment and underemployment support to members of the reserve components and veterans.

Page 226, line 14, strike ''(C)'' and insert ''(D)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL OF NEW YORK

Page 227, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 569. REPORT ON CIVILIAN AND MILITARY EDUCATION TO RESPOND TO FUTURE THREATS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing both civilian and military education requirements necessary to meet any threats anticipated in the future security environment as described in the quadrennial defense review. Such report shall include—

(1) an assessment of the learning outcomes required of future members of the Armed Forces and senior military leaders to meet such threats;

(2) an assessment of the shortfalls in current professional military education requirements in meeting such threats;

(3) an assessment of successful professional military education programs that further the ability of the Department of Defense to meet such threats;

(4) recommendations of subjects to be covered by civilian elementary and secondary schools in order to better prepare students for potential military service;

(5) recommendations of subjects to be included in professional military education programs;

(6) recommendations on whether partnerships between the Department of Defense and private institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) would help meet such threats; and

(7) an identification of opportunities for the United States to strengthen its leadership role in the future security environment and a description of how the recommendations made in this report contribute to capitalizing on such opportunities.

(b) UPDATED REPORTS.—Not later than 10 months after date of the publication of each subsequent quadrennial defense review, the Secretary of Defense shall update the report described under subsection (a) and shall submit such report to the congressional defense committees.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DESIRABILITY OF SERVICE-WIDE ADOPTION OF GOLD STAR INSTALLATION ACCESS CARD.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of each military department and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating should—

(1) provide for the issuance of a Gold Star Installation Access Card to Gold Star family members who are the survivors of deceased members of the Armed Forces in order to expedite the ability of a Gold Star family member to gain unescorted access to military installations for the purpose of obtaining the on-base services and benefits for which the Gold Star family member is entitled or eligible;

(2) work jointly to ensure that a Gold Star Installation Access Card issued to a Gold Star family member by one Armed Force is accepted for access to military installations of another Armed Force; and

(3) in developing, issuing, and accepting the Gold Star Installation Access Card—

(A) prevent fraud in the procurement or use of the Gold Star Installation Access Card;

(B) limit installation access to those areas that provide the services and benefits for which the Gold Star family member is entitled or eligible; and

(C) ensure that the availability and use of the Gold Star Installation Access Card does not adversely affect military installation security.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 247, after line 20, insert the following:

SEC. 596. ANNUAL REPORT ON PERFORMANCE OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 7734 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: ''and on the performance of any regional office that fails to meet its administrative goals'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'';

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) in the case of any regional office that, for the year covered by the report, did not meet the administrative goal of no claim pending for more than 125 days and an accuracy rating of 98 percent—

''(A) a signed statement prepared by the individual serving as director of the regional office as of the date of the submittal of the report containing—

''(i) an explanation for why the regional office did not meet the goal;

''(ii) a description of the additional resources needed to enable the regional office to reach the goal; and

''(iii) a description of any additional actions planned for the subsequent year that are proposed to enable the regional office to meet the goal; and

''(B) a statement prepared by the Under Secretary for Benefits explaining how the failure of the regional office to meet the goal affected the performance evaluation of the director of the regional office; and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 302, after line 18, insert the following new section:

SEC. 723. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) It has been shown that some members of the Armed Forces struggle with post-traumatic stress and other behavioral health disorders from traumatic events experienced during combat.

(2) It has also been shown that emotional distress and trauma from life events can be exacerbated by traumatic events experienced during combat.

(3) Members of the Armed Forces who struggle with post-traumatic stress and other behavioral health disorders are often unable to provide emotional support to spouses and children, causing emotional distress and the risk of behavioral health disorders among the dependents of the members.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Department of Defense should continue to support members of the Armed Forces and their families by providing family counseling and individual counseling services that reduce the symptoms of post-traumatic stress and other behavioral health disorders and empowers members to be emotionally available to their spouses and children;

(2) such services should be readily available at branches of the Department and military bases;

(3) the Department should rely on industry standards established by the medical community when developing standards for their own practice of family and individual counseling; and

(4) the Department should conduct a five-year study of the progress of members of the Armed Forces that are treated for mental health disorders, including with respect to—

(A) difficulty keeping up with treatment;

(B) familial status before and after treatment; and

(C) access to mental health counseling at Department facilities and military installations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

In this en bloc package, which I hope Members will support, there are a total of 16 amendments. Nine of them have been sponsored by Republican Members of the House, and seven of them have been sponsored by Democratic Members of the House. They cover a variety of very important topics related to our country's national defense.

With all of the hard work that went into writing and now adopting, hopefully, these amendments, I hope that all Members who sponsored these amendments will see their work to its logical conclusion, and that is in their adoption in a bill that passes the House, for it would seem fruitless to me to go through all of the work on these amendments and not have those amendments as part of a bill that passes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY).

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment was inspired by the Obama administration's proposal to establish a national monument in the Basin and Range area of Nevada, directly under the airspace of the Nevada Test and Training Range.

My amendment is not about disputing land ownership. My amendment is about protecting America's national security, and that means ensuring that our military has guaranteed access to land located beneath—or associated with—military operations areas for essential training and readiness activities. These activities are often tied directly to flight operations and can include anything from tactical ground parties, SERE, pararescue training, ground instrumentation maintenance, and the list goes on and on.

My amendment elevates national security above politics and legacy projects, and it gives our military the certainty it needs to adequately train and prepare for current and future conflicts.

□ 2015

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. I thank my colleague for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to bring attention to a provision that is included in this package that, besides being completely unnecessary, may have far-reaching impacts on the management of our Nation's public lands. Specifically, this package contains language that would allow the Department of Defense to utilize certain public lands designated as national monuments for whatever purpose it chooses.

Our national monuments are part of America's story. Sixteen Presidents, both Democrats and Republicans, from Teddy Roosevelt to George Bush to President Obama, have utilized their authority under the Antiquities Act to designate land as national monuments. These designations have protected iconic parts of our Nation, such as Chimney Rock in Colorado, San Juan Islands in the Puget Sound, and the ancient flint quarries in the Texas Panhandle. In each and every case, careful consideration and collaboration with other Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, occurred.

Now, representing southern Nevada, I have an acute understanding of the importance of our armed services and the training necessary to support national security missions, but the language included in this package ignores the fact that today's military operations continue at our national monuments.

Just look to Oregon Mountain-Desert Peaks National Monument in New Mexico, which was created with clear exceptions for military overflight operations, or the Sonoran Desert National Monument in Arizona, designated by President Clinton, which abuts the Barry Goldwater Range and to this day continues to serve as an example of how our national security and conservation goals can coexist.

Closer to home, the recently designated Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument north of Las Vegas was designed in coordination with the needs of neighboring Nellis and Creech Air Force bases. If this provision were to become law, it would essentially cede national monuments to the Department of Defense, dismissing the long history of the armed services working to conserve our sensitive lands while protecting the mission.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. TITUS. So instead of having the DOD at the table to evaluate and inform the monument creation process on a case-by-case basis, this provision would grant a virtual veto over any future designations.

Mr. Chairman, as this legislation moves forward, I hope that we can remove unnecessary provisions such as this one that are really just solutions in search of a problem.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, which will rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, to the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center.

As many of you may know, Montana has a strong heritage of military service, with more veterans per capita than almost any other State in the Union. Captain Moran and Captain Galt are an inspiration to every Montanan, myself included. Both Captain Moran and Captain Galt received the Medal of Honor, one in the Spanish-American War and one in World War II.

Memorializing these two heroes by renaming the Armed Forces Reserve

Center will provide a daily reminder to us all in Montana of the service and sacrifice Captain Moran and Captain Galt made to this country and Montana.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, most of us in this Chamber have had the honor to meet and to get to know Gold Star families, those families who have lost loved ones in the service in defense of our country. Most of us on those occasions also told those families, if there is anything we can ever do to help you in any way going forward, please let us know.

Gold Star families in my district came to me on an issue that really was something that was quite difficult for them at times and bothersome, and that is the issue that the access they had while their loved ones were alive was no longer there for military installations. The military installations would often have memorials to those that served. They would have survivor workshops, and things that could help them. They would have military exercises and ceremonies that they would want to participate in that had greater meaning to them than perhaps any other group of people.

They told me how, gaining access many times, they had to relive the story by again explaining who they were and why they wanted to come. I investigated this and found that the Army had a pilot program that provided an access card for these institutions, these military institutions, and that that made the process so much easier for them.

This amendment simply expands the pilot program and demonstrates Congress' support for expanding these programs beyond the pilot stage and to all services. I hope we can move forward and actually see the implementation of this occur.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support of this amendment en bloc, and I want to express, I think, the sentiment of our entire body to really be there in something that is a modest request, but an important one for our Gold Star families.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the Army faces an increasingly complex threat environment and must be prepared to rapidly deploy soldiers with the most advanced and effective vehicle armor critical to the safety and mobility of our soldiers.

The tactical wheeled vehicle protection kits program provides our men and women in uniform the adaptable armor protection that minimally impacts performance. The Army needs this proven program in order to improve ballistic protection for the tactical wheeled vehicle fleet. This program enables greater logistical flexibility and allows our soldiers to tailor armor levels based on the threat level and mission requirements.

Lastly, the use of these armor kits will allow the Army to greatly extend vehicle service life and reduce maintenance costs. It is important that Congress provide the necessary funding levels for the Army to meet their tactical wheeled vehicle protection kits acquisition objectives. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I also wish to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their efforts in providing the necessary and critical funding for our Nation's defense.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I have no speakers. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of my amendment encouraging the Department of Defense to provide free WiFi access to our military members deployed overseas.

Communications with family members back home is critical not only for the mental health and well-being of our servicemembers but also for their families who support them while they defend our great Nation. Our military members sacrifice time with their spouses and children and their loved ones they leave behind when they proudly serve our Nation. Giving them the ability to stay in touch with their family through Skype and FaceTime so they can watch those important moments, birthdays or children's first steps, makes it easier for servicemembers to cope with the physical and emotional distance deployment brings.

Family members play a crucial role in helping our servicemembers persevere through tough times and manage through long deployments. Right now military members have to pay $60, sometimes $100 a month just to stay in touch with their families. I am encouraging the Department of Defense to strongly consider working internally and with third-party vendors to remove this burden from servicemembers and urge support of this entire en bloc amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional speakers at this time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time just to say I hope that all 16 Members who have amendments in this en bloc package will support this package as well as the logical conclusion of their efforts, which would be to support final passage of this legislation.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. LUCAS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 823, after line 20, insert the following:

SEC. ___. IMPLEMENTATION OF LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN RANGE-WIDE CONSERVATION PLAN AND OTHER CONSERVATION MEASURES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CANDIDATE CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS.—The terms ''Candidate Conservation Agreement'' and ''Candidate and Conservation Agreement With Assurances'' have the meaning given those terms in—

(A) the announcement of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce entitled ''Announcement of Final Policy for Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances'' (64 Fed. Reg. 32726 (June 17, 1999)); and

(B) sections 17.22(d) and 17.32(d) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(2) RANGE-WIDE PLAN.—The term ''Range-Wide Plan'' means the Lesser Prairie-Chicken Range-Wide Conservation Plan of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, as endorsed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on October 23, 2013, and published for comment on January 29, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 4652).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) PROHIBITION ON TREATMENT AS THREATENED OR ENDANGERED SPECIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any prior action by the Secretary, the lesser prairie chicken shall not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) before January 31, 2021.

(2) PROHIBITION ON PROPOSAL.—Beginning on January 31, 2021, the lesser prairie chicken may not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) unless the Secretary publishes a determination, based on the totality of the scientific evidence, that conservation (as that term is used in that Act) under the Range-Wide Plan and the agreements, programs, and efforts referred to in subsection (c) have not achieved the conservation goals established by the Range-Wide Plan.

(c) MONITORING OF PROGRESS OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall monitor and annually submit to Congress a report on progress in conservation of the lesser prairie chicken under the Range-Wide Plan and all related—

(1) Candidate Conservation Agreements and Candidate and Conservation Agreements With Assurances;

(2) other Federal conservation programs administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Department of Agriculture;

(3) State conservation programs; and

(4) private conservation efforts.

SEC. ___. REMOVAL OF ENDANGERED SPECIES STATUS FOR AMERICAN BURYING BEETLE.

Notwithstanding the final rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the American Burying Beetle'' (54 Fed. Reg. 29652 (July 13, 1989)), the American burying beetle shall not be listed as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I offer an amendment that will de-list the lesser prairie chicken from the list of threatened species over a period of at least 5 years. This time will allow the five States in the prairie chicken's range to implement their joint rangewide plan, which has been endorsed by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Again, this does not permanently delist the lesser prairie chicken. If in 5 years' time the Department of Interior thinks this plan hasn't worked, they can begin the process of re-listing the chicken. I am confident, however, though, that the rangewide plan will be effective not only in maintaining but in increasing the population of the lesser prairie chicken.

The second portion of my amendment would de-list the American burying beetle. Since being deemed endangered in the 1980s, the beetle's population has skyrocketed well beyond the targets set in the Fish and Wildlife's own recovery plan.

Military installations are among the entities that have to ensure their new development projects do not infringe on the habitats of these endangered species. Any military exercises that would take place on critical habitat also must meet those requirements before they can commence. It is highly inappropriate for such exercises critical to national defense readiness to be dependent on a bureaucratic process, especially given the large populations and State-level plans for these two species. There are numerous military bases in the lesser prairie chicken's range and dozens more in the ever-larger estimated range of the American burying beetle that are affected. This amendment would help many of our military bases to perform the critical functions that comprise our national readiness. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. This amendment attempts to add yet another completely unrelated Endangered Species Act rider to the underlying bill. Specifically, this amendment would prohibit the lesser prairie chicken and the American burying beetle from being listed as endangered species under the Endangered Species Act. The lesser prairie chicken was listed as threatened under the ESA in March 2014, and the American burying beetle was listed as endangered in 1989.

Given the very broad language of this amendment, it is clear that DOD lands are not the primary driver of this attack on the Endangered Species Act. If the sponsors really wanted to protect DOD activities and military readiness, they would have written the language as such. In fact, the amendment does not make a single reference to military readiness.

The Department of Defense does not believe this amendment is necessary. DOD has given no indication that the listings of these species has negatively impacted military readiness, for good reason. Since being listed, neither the lesser prairie chicken nor the burying beetle have had critical habitat designated on DOD lands. Just look at this map. There is virtually no overlap between our military installations, which are in red, and the lesser prairie chicken's range. In fact, if you look, they are separated in most instances by hundreds of miles, with the green areas representing the current range of the species and the red areas our military installations.

For the record, DOD also does not believe that the language already included in the bill regarding the greater sage grouse is necessary to protect military readiness, either.

The Endangered Species Act has been successful in preventing the extinction of species since its enactment 40 years ago. Congress should allow the Fish and Wildlife Service to make species-listing decisions in accordance with the law and the best available science. Congress should not further delay these scientific decisions by micromanaging the process on a species-by-species basis, especially in the context of the NDAA.

The administration has already indicated they would strongly consider vetoing this bill, in part because of the nongermane provisions that would delay listing of the greater sage grouse for 10 years. Adoption of this amendment would add another provision to their list of objections. The Senate has already agreed that harmful Endangered Species Act riders do not belong in the NDAA, instead referring the matter to the Environment and Public Works Committee.

□ 2030

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. TSONGAS. I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided amendment and vote to protect the scientific integrity of the Endangered Species Act, as well as the integrity of the NDAA.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate everybody's concerns that may or may not live around the area, but the truth is, I do, and no one wants to protect the habitat more than I do.

I have worked on this issue since arriving in Congress because I believe we must protect our job creators and ensure the military has the ability to prepare itself against threats at home and overseas.

Matters of national defense and readiness should not be subject to the schedule of agency bureaucrats. It is inappropriate that military bases within the proximity of these two species must consider its habitat before developing new facilities or even planning training exercises.

The people living in the States that contain the lesser prairie chicken and the American burying beetle know how to best conserve the species, while protecting military preparedness, jobs, and land rights; and they have already taken steps to do so.

I urge you to support this amendment and delist the lesser prairie chicken and the American burying beetle and support our military readiness.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding.

Mr. Chair, one of our most solemn duties in Congress is dealing with emerging national security threats. We eliminated bin Laden. We are making process in weakening ISIL.

Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have alerted us to a new threat emerging deep in the heart of the Western United States, a sort of feathery sleeper cell that just can't wait to disrupt our way of life. What is inspiring so much fear? It is the lesser prairie chicken.

Listening to this debate, you would think that the lesser prairie chicken was single-handedly providing aid and comfort to the enemy, not just living on the prairie and doing the occasional little dance; but, as with its unfortunate relative, the greater sage grouse, my colleagues across the aisle are trying to use the NDAA to do a little dance of their own around the science of the Endangered Species Act.

The prairie chicken has not attacked our citizens, threatened our allies, or disrupted our military operations. Listing the prairie chicken as endangered is a scientific decision not within the purview of Congress and will have absolutely no effect on Department of Defense operations.

The worst that anyone can say about the prairie chicken is that it is really not a chicken, but a grouse.

This amendment has no place in the NDAA, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the great State of Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), where they are working very diligently on a State level to repopulate the species.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment which would delist the lesser prairie chicken under the Endangered Species Act. I have long opposed this listing for many reasons because the rules unnecessarily restrict and hamper defense operations on Federal land under the species' habitat.

In Kansas, we have a proud military tradition and a number of important installations, including Fort Riley. An enormous benefit to Fort Riley is its huge training areas which have no encroachment issues and are some of the largest and most cost effective in the Nation.

Any similarly ill-advised listing affecting Fort Riley would potentially complicate this vital training area, amounting to nothing more than an overreach of the Endangered Species Act because it would imperil the actions taken by our military and hamper our local economies which these installations complement.

Preservation efforts do not have to come at a cost to our national defense preparedness, and I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), from another one of those States working very diligently to increase the population of these species in a very scientific way.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. LUCAS' amendment.

Contrary to what was said, New Mexico has Cannon Air Force Base, and the listing of the prairie chicken falls right in the bombing regions held by Cannon.

For those people who say it is just alarmist, remember 1999 and 2000, when almost all of Camp Pendleton was shut completely down? The marines had to push their boats on the beach, but they couldn't get out because of the endangered species. They, instead, flew their boats over to Utah, set up stakes where the water would have been, and offloaded them there.

When we talk about the effect of the Endangered Species Act, we have to remember the past. Remember that it was the spotted owl that shut down 85 percent of the timber logging in this country, only to have the Fish and Wildlife Service say a couple of years ago: Oh, never mind. It wasn't logging that was causing the spotted owl to go extinct.

The Fish and Wildlife Service shut down 23,000 jobs in California because of a species.

We want our national defense to reign supreme.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee and an individual who has worked diligently on preserving all of our environment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, whether one is talking about the sage grouse, which is yet to be listed, or the prairie chicken, which has been listed, it is true that each of those does have an impact on the readiness of our military. It does have an impact, and each branch of the military has actually said so.

On one Army base alone, they are spending $1.5 million a year to manage 250 birds. That is the cost that goes to that, as well as to the readiness of this Nation.

It would be nice—and one would presume—that each department would be talking to each other about the impacts of their decisions. As chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, I am going to say that did not happen. It should.

I urge adoption.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 3121.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike from the bill section 3121, which attempts to undermine our efforts to destroy unnecessary nuclear weapons that have already been retired and scheduled for dismantlement.

Section 3121 of the bill was a last-minute addition to the NDAA that is both totally unnecessary and counterproductive to our long-term national security goals. Our Armed Forces and National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA, firmly oppose this provision to limit the dismantlement of surplus nuclear weapons.

Section 3121, which my amendment would strike, does three things.

First, it caps at $50 million a program that is scheduled to cost about $50 million, thereby having no practical impact whatever.

Second, the section prohibits for 5 years the scheduled dismantlement of the W84 nuclear warhead. The W84 warhead was retired back in 2007, 8 years ago, and was recently retired again in favor of keeping the W80 for the long-range standoff option. There is no reason to keep the W84 around longer than necessary. Storing and securing unneeded and retired nuclear weapons wastes a large amount of money in maintaining them.

Third, there is a large queue of warheads waiting for dismantlement. There are approximately 2,500 retired nuclear warheads scheduled for dismantlement. Storing these warheads costs money. Why would we want to slow down the process of dismantlement of retired warheads?

We have about 5,000 active nuclear warheads, and 2,000 would suffice to destroy the entire world. Why waste money maintaining retired warheads beyond the 5,000 active warheads sufficient to destroy the world two and a half times over?

In fact, by seeking to limit nuclear dismantlement, this section of the bill sends the wrong message to the rest of the world about the value of nuclear weapons, and it undermines our efforts at nuclear nonproliferation. We have promised, as part of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, to reduce our nuclear warheads eventually to zero. The other nuclear nations have made the same promise. On that basis, the nonnuclear nations have undertaken not to develop nuclear weapons.

By delaying dismantlement of retired weapons, we are sending the wrong message of nonadherence to the nonproliferation treaty.

Contrary to the claims of the authors of section 3121, this section of the bill is not about unilateral disarmament. All of these weapons have already been retired and are scheduled to be dismantled.

This section, by delaying dismantlement by 5 years, would simply waste a large sum of taxpayers' money, would not contribute at all to national security—because having retired weapons in the storage bin doesn't help national security—and would send the wrong message on nonproliferation. It is a total waste of money for no useful purpose whatsoever.

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment to strike section 3121. We must not needlessly restrict the Defense Department's ability to determine the appropriate rate of warhead dismantlement of retired and surplus warheads.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly oppose this amendment because it strikes a section that helps us set priorities in defense spending. Dismantling U.S. nuclear weapons is not a priority. Getting nuclear modernization done is the priority.

Two weeks ago, Secretary of State Kerry announced at the NPT review conference that the U.S. would accelerate its dismantlement of nuclear warheads by 20 percent. While Russia continues to make overt nuclear threats to the U.S. and our allies, we accelerate unilateral nuclear disarmament. This is insane.

Let's be clear about one point in particular. Section 3121 of the underlying bill does not contradict any U.S. treaty obligations. Current arms control treaties do not require the U.S. to dismantle any nuclear warheads.

In the FY16 budget request, NNSA detailed its plan to focus the next 5 years of dismantlement work on warheads retired prior to 2009. Section 3121 provides them enough money to do so, and it does not restrict this work on pre-2009 warheads.

Section 3121 allows the administration to carry out the dismantlement plan it described in the FY16 budget request. It simply prevents the unilateral disarmament and acceleration proposed by Secretary Kerry, which is a misguided attempt to appease those who would disarm the United States.

Section 3121 also prohibits dismantlement of certain U.S. nuclear cruise missile warheads for 5 years. This is a prudent measure because Russia is in plain violation of the INF Treaty through its flight testing and deployment of ground-launched, intermediate-range cruise missiles.

Simply put, we should not unilaterally disarm the United States cruise missile warheads when Russia is building and deploying its own cruise missiles in direct violation of the INF Treaty.

As Russia continues to make nuclear threats against the U.S. and our allies, accelerating the U.S. nuclear weapon dismantlement by 20 percent is exactly the wrong message to send.

□ 2045

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 90 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Alabama has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, I oppose this amendment as wrong policy.

Why would we rush headlong into unilateral disarmament at the same time Russia has not lived up to its treaty obligations with the INF treaty?

Section 3121 wisely prohibits the disarmament of nuclear warheads for 5 years, enough time to see if actually Russia will live up to its agreement.

If you are actually going to get rid of a weapons system, for heaven's sakes, get something for it. Unilateral disarmament gets us nothing. That is why this is the wrong policy with the wrong message that would go to our potential adversaries but, more importantly, the wrong message that would go to our allies, who are waiting to see if the United States will retreat from a position of leadership.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, the central flaw in the argument against this amendment is that we are not talking about disarmament, unilateral or otherwise. Retired weapons do not add security. All they do is waste money to maintain them.

What this amendment says is do not prohibit the administration from dismantling already-retired weapons.

Now, talking about the threat from Russia, okay. There is a threat from Russia. I don't deny that. Modernization of nuclear weapons maybe should be a priority. That is a separate issue; but dismantling retired weapons doesn't weaken us versus Russia, doesn't help us—in fact, maybe it helps us by freeing up money for modernizing weapons. It is simply a waste of money to retain retired weapons.

If we should have more active weapons, that is a different question; but, once we have retired the weapon, it costs money to maintain it. It also is a potential target for a terrorist to grab it or get the plutonium out of it or whatever. Retired warheads should be dismantled, regardless of the threat elsewhere. The question is: How many active warheads do we need? That is a separate topic.

A retired warhead does not protect us. Dismantling a retired warhead just saves money. A retired warhead doesn't help us against the Russians or anybody else. It is simply a question of not wasting money.

If modernization is a priority, fine. I don't agree with that, but spend money on modernization. Why waste money on keeping retired warheads in the storage bins?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the vice chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

President Obama is doing something that much of the country, including myself and many of us on this side of the aisle, are really disturbed about, and that is using his pen and his phone to go around Congress and do things by executive order, or unilaterally, if you might agree with that.

To take that same approach with our nuclear stockpile, our strategic defense, is not a good idea. I totally want to resist this amendment. I urge everyone to vote ''no'' on it.

Secondly, as has been pointed out earlier this evening, the New START treaty is, I believe, flawed; but what it does is require us to reduce our stockpile and Russia to increase its stockpile. Countries like China are not even included in that treaty.

When we are already on a path to seriously reduce the number of our warheads and then to consider unilaterally even cutting them further, that is the height of folly, Mr. Chairman. We should resist this amendment and vote ''no.''

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), chairman of the full committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is in my district where this dismantlement occurs, and I think we are missing one key point, but Mr. ROGERS raised it earlier.

We have a limited number of facilities, a limited number of people, and a limited number of dollars. We can use them to take things apart, or we can use them to help modernize our existing stockpile so it can be more effective, so it can be safe, so it can be reliable in providing that nuclear deterrence that we depend upon.

The concern is, based on what Secretary Kerry said 2 weeks ago, that this administration is going to put more money and people and facilities into taking things apart than they should. They have got their priorities wrong. This amendment or the underlying provision of the gentleman from Alabama tries to set those priorities straight, and that is what is important.

We can't do everything. We have got to set priorities, and the priority ought to be defending the country, especially in light of what Russia and China continue to do: building nuclear weapons.

I think this amendment should be rejected and the underlying provision supported.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 114–112.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 77, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 334. ASSESSMENT OF OUTREACH FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN AND MINORITIES REQUIRED BEFORE CONVERSION OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS TO CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE.

No Department of Defense function that is performed by Department of Defense civilian employees and is tied to a certain military base may be converted to performance by a contractor until the Secretary of Defense conducts an assessment to determine if the Department of Defense has carried out sufficient outreach programs to assist small business concerns owned and controlled by women (as such term is defined in section 8(d)(3)(D) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(D))) and small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (as such term is defined in section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C))) that are located in the geographic area near the military base.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas; and the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington; and the manager who is managing, my dear friend from Rhode Island, for their leadership on many, many issues.

All of us have encountered the very energetic small business community. Included in that, of course, are women and minority-owned businesses. They are a vital part of our community.

In the State of Texas, we are very much engaged with our military bases. Over the years, we have had any number of them, very large facilities. In my own community, we have the Ellington base that we have retrofitted and improved and added a number of assets.

This amendment speaks to the compatibility between the Department of Defense and its needs and the small and minority and women-owned businesses and asks the Secretary of Defense to outreach to these minority and women and small businesses, as a way of ensuring the growth of their businesses and the utilization of their services for that of the DOD.

The Jackson Lee amendment will help the United States maintain the most talented, diverse, effective, and powerful workforce in an increasingly globalized economy.

Why? Because our small businesses located in our neighborhoods and our communities are there to create opportunity and to create jobs—as a practical matter, the Department of Defense has the discretion to choose whether a contract can be insourced or outsourced. We would ask that they look at the minority businesses in the area as they make those determinations.

Since March of 2009, it is understood that certain Federal contracts that were formerly completed by civilian contracts would be looked at in a different way. We ask that the assessment of the value of small businesses be considered and, in particular, be considered on how many jobs are created and also the importance of a healthy and diverse small business community.

I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment and just want to particularly say that, in my home city of Houston, Texas, it is home to more than 60,000 women-owned businesses and more than 60,000 African American-owned businesses and thousands upon thousands of Hispanic businesses.

In fact, just this past week, I visited two of my manufacturing companies, one of them a member of the Houston Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

I ask my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk; it is listed as #55 on the roster.

The Jackson Lee Amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct outreach for small business concerns owned and controlled by women and minorities prior to the outsourcing of military contracts related to local military bases.

I would like to thank both Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their dedication and hard work on this important piece of legislation which ensures that our men and women in uniform have the resources they need and deserve.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have sponsored legislation that promotes economic opportunity and inclusion for women, veterans, and minority businesses.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help the United States maintain the most talented, diverse, effective, and powerful workforce in an increasingly globalized economy.

The Jackson Lee Amendment requires the Department of Defense to consider the impact that changes to current outsourcing guidelines will have on small minority and women owned business by requiring them to engage with these businesses.

Promoting diversity is more than just an idea; it requires an understanding that there is a need to have a process that will ensure the inclusion of minorities and women in all areas of American life.

As a practical matter the Department of Defense has the discretion to choose whether a contract should be in-sourced or out-sourced.

Since March of 2009 it is understood that certain federal contracts that were formerly completed by civilian contractors would be returned to federal employees.

It is important to find balance between contracts that should be conducted by the federal government versus civilian contractors.

As it stands the policies implemented by the DOD has the unintended consequence of harming small minority and women owned businesses by taking away civilian contracts that are not inherently serving a federal government purpose such as janitorial services, painting buildings, mowing lawns and related activities.

These service contracts which tend to be the bread and butter for minority and women owned business are slowly being withdrawn and returned to the federal government.

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their potential.

That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs.

These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing.

My amendment would require the Department of Defense to utilize a similar outreach program prior to outsourcing.

Outreach is key to developing healthy and diverse small businesses.

There are approximately 6 million minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy.

According to the most recent available Census data, minority owned businesses employ nearly 6 million Americans and generate $1 trillion dollars in economic output.

Women owned businesses have increased 20% between 2002 and 2007, and currently total close to 8 million.

My home city of Houston, Texas is home to more than 60,000 women owned businesses, and more than 60,000 African American owned businesses.

The Department of Defense (DOD) estimates that during the Vietnam War, the ratio of contractors to soldiers was 1 in 10.

This rate increased to about 1 contractor for every soldier during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

These contracts generate billions of dollars in revenue for the companies to which they are awarded.

A mandatory DOD outreach program would make women and minority owned businesses aware of all of the contract opportunities available to them.

Small businesses deserve a fair shot at federal contracts.

They have a chance to compete for overseas contracts with the Department of Defense as well as access to international contracts with the United States Agency for International Development.

In addition, I believe that work needs to be done to modernize key contracting developmental programs designed to increase opportunities for women, minorities and low-income individuals.

Programs like the Outreach Program that I support through my amendment will reduce the current barriers and ensure small businesses have access to perform federal contracts.

This can save taxpayer dollars, because the increased competition for government contracts will lead to better prices and better quality.

The vibrancy of our economic prosperity depends on the ability of our nation's small business community to adapt to opportunities at home and aboard.

Outreach programs that are properly designed and implemented, strengthen the national community, promote its economic well-being, and maximize the benefits of our great diversity.

The Jackson Lee Amendment ensures that the Department of Defense reaches out to small minority and women owned business to hear their concerns and recognizes the important role they play in revitalizing our economy.

I urge all members to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the Chairman for his kindness.

May I ask the Chairman how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for bringing forth this amendment. This is tremendous talent and the entrepreneurial spirit across this country.

Mr. Chair, to ensure that we have the ability to take advantage of that great diversity, which is America's asset, it is so important to make sure that women entrepreneurs, minority entrepreneurs, are able to be in a position to supply and work with our United States military.

I am proud of the steps that the military, itself, has taken with regard to diversity, but we can do better on the entrepreneurial and business side.

As a former entrepreneur myself, I know how important it is to make sure that we develop the next great generation of American companies, American suppliers, that reflects not only the diversity of the military, but the diversity of the American people. That is the strength of our country, to make sure that women entrepreneurs, minority entrepreneurs, are empowered.

That is something that I know is a cause that the gentlewoman from Texas holds dear. It is a cause that I hold dear, and I hope that we can adopt this amendment to further that end.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by first thanking the gentleman from Colorado.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it evidences that the appreciation for small businesses reaches from States like Texas to New York to California to Missouri to Colorado and Florida and many other places. I would ask my colleagues to support this important amendment investing in our small businesses, women-owned and minority businesses of America.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by saying I want to also thank my colleagues for my amendment being in en bloc amendment No. 4, and I will later include a statement into the RECORD regarding amendment No. 75.

With that, I ask for support of amendment No. 52.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment and just mention to my colleagues that there are a number of provisions in the underlying bill that try to help encourage small businesses to participate with the Department of Defense because I completely agree with the statements that were made.

That is where much of the innovation occurs in this country, and the bureaucracy, the difficulty in our acquisition system makes it very hard sometimes—many times—for small businesses to contribute.

I think that idea and especially the small businesses targeted by the gentlewoman's amendment is appropriate.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that all Members, the supporters of this amendment and those who are concerned about small businesses having some greater opportunity to participate in Department of Defense procurement, will support not only this amendment, but also final passage of the bill because that is the only way that this amendment actually can become law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 58, 60, 61, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 79, 80, 81, and 82 printed in House Report No. 114–112, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. HURD OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. AVAILABILITY OF CYBER SECURITY AND IT CERTIFICATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL CRITICAL TO NETWORK DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''to obtain'' and inserting ''and when appropriate, other Department of Defense personnel, to obtain''; and

(B) by adding ''or industry recognized'' between ''professional'' and ''credentials''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) The authority under paragraph (1) may be used to pay the expenses of a member of the active Air Force, Army, Navy, Coast Guard, the reserve components, defense contractors, or civilians with access to information systems and identified as critical to network defense to obtain professional and industry recognized credentials related to information technology and cyber security functions.''.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.— No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the amendments made by this section, and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise made available for such purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle H of title V (page 234, after line 12), add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. POSTHUMOUS COMMISSION AS CAPTAIN IN THE REGULAR ARMY FOR MILTON HOLLAND.

(a) POSTHUMOUS COMMISSION.—Milton Holland, who, while sergeant major of the 5th Regiment, United States Colored Infantry,

was awarded the Medal of Honor in recognition of his action on September 29, 1864, during the Battle of Chapin's Farm, Virginia, when, as the citation for the medal states, he ''took command of Company C, after all the officers had been killed or wounded, and gallantly led it'', shall be deemed for all purposes to have held the grade of captain in the regular Army, effective as of that date and continuing until his separation from the Army.

(b) PROHIBITION OF BENEFITS.—Section 1523 of title 10, United States Code, applies in the case of the posthumous commission described in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 584. SENSE OF CONGRESS SUPPORTING THE DECISION OF THE ARMY TO POSTHUMOUSLY PROMOTE MASTER SERGEANT (RETIRED) NAOMI HORWITZ TO SERGEANT MAJOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Naomi Horwitz was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin in 1916.

(2) In 1942, Ms. Horwitz marched into the Army recruiters office and asked to join.

(3) Ms. Horwitz served with the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, the Women's Army Corps, and the Reserves.

(4) Ms. Horwitz served from 1942 until 1946 and reenlisted a few years later.

(5) On October 24, 1965, one of the proudest moments of her military career, Ms. Horwitz's was promoted to the rank of Sergeant Major in the U.S. Army Reserve.

(6) As women were only eligible to hold the rank of Sergeant Major since 1960, Ms. Horwitz was one of only a handful of women to hold such rank during that time period.

(7) Despite her promotion, Ms. Horwitz was not allowed to hold the rank of Sergeant Major.

(8) Ms. Horwitz retired from the military in 1976 at a lower rank.

(9) After her retirement from the military, Ms. Horwitz was a tireless veteran's advocate serving for decades with AMVETS Post 60, Jewish War Veterans, the American Legion Milwaukee Women's Post 448, the Allied Veterans Council of Milwaukee and the Veterans Day Parade Committee.

(10) Ms. Horwitz was named Veteran of the Year in Milwaukee County in 2004.

(11) In October 2014, Ms. Horwitz died at the age of 98.

(12) One of Ms. Horwitz's final wishes was that one of the proudest moment of her Army career be reflected on her gravestone.

(13) In March 2015, the Secretary of the Army corrected this injustice and approved a request to posthumously promote Sergeant Major Horwitz.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) joins the Army and our Nation in expressing our gratitude to Sergeant Major Naomi Horwitz for her 26 years of honorable military service and continued civilian service; and

(2) supports the decision of the Army to posthumously promote Master Sergeant (retired) Naomi Horwitz to Sergeant Major.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

Page 298, line 12, insert ''in the pilot program'' after ''beneficiaries''.

Page 298, beginning line 13, strike ''pursuant to section 1074g(f) of title 10, United States Code'' and insert ''through its Prime Vendor contracting process''.

Page 298, line 17, strike ''be comprised of small business pharmacies'' and insert ''include small business pharmacies (as defined by the Small Business Administration)''.

Page 298, line 19, insert before the semicolon the following: ''provided there are sufficient number of small business pharmacies willing to participate in the pilot program''.

Page 299, line 11, insert after ''(a)'' the following: ''and shall work with small business pharmacies to participate in the pilot program''.

Page 299, line 25, insert after ''Secretary'' the following: ''shall give preference to regions with high small business pharmacy participation rates and''.

Page 300, after line 21, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs):

(2) retail pharmacies;

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Page 302, after line 18, insert the following new section:

SEC. 723. PROVISION OF TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENT PATIENTS RELATING TO OBSTETRICAL ANESTHESIA SERVICES.

Section 1040(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (F).

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

Page 314, line 1 (in section 804), after ''any requirement under'' insert ''subsection (a)(3) or''.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. COLE OF OKLAHOMA

Page 359, line 8, strike ''regulations and practices'' and insert ''regulations, practices, and sustainment requirements''.

Page 359, line 14, insert before the period the following: ''and each Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence (described in section 2474 of title 10, United States Code)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 359, line 8, insert ''(1)'' before ''Department''.

Page 359, line 10, insert before the period the following: ''; and (2) Department of Defense practices related to the procurement, management, and use of intellectual property rights to facilitate competition in sustainment of weapon systems throughout their life-cycle''.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. BOST OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8___. ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS IN THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION; PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SIZE STANDARDS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS IN THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 634) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(A) OFFICE.—There is established in the Administration an Office of Hearings and Appeals—

''(i) to impartially decide matters relating to program decisions of the Administrator—

''(I) for which Congress requires a hearing on the record; or

''(II) that the Administrator designates for hearing by regulation; and

''(ii) which shall contain the office of the Administration that handles requests submitted pursuant to sections 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the 'Freedom of Information Act') and maintains records pursuant to section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the 'Privacy Act of 1974').

''(B) JURISDICTION.—The Office of Hearings and Appeals shall only hear appeals of matters as described in this Act, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), and title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

''(C) ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR.—The head of the Office of Hearings and Appeals shall be the Chief Hearing Officer appointed under section 4(b)(1), who shall be responsible to the Administrator.

''(2) CHIEF HEARING OFFICER DUTIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Hearing Officer shall—

''(i) be a career appointee in the Senior Executive Service and an attorney licensed by a State, commonwealth, territory or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia; and

''(ii) be responsible for the operation and management of the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

''(B) ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—The Chief Hearing Officer may assign a matter for mediation or other means of alternative dispute resolution.

''(3) HEARING OFFICERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Hearings and Appeals shall appoint Hearing Officers to carry out the duties described in paragraph (1)(A)(i).

''(B) CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT.—A Hearing Officer appointed under this paragraph—

''(i) shall serve in the excepted service as an employee of the Administration under section 2103 of title 5, United States Code, and under the supervision of the Chief Hearing Officer;

''(ii) shall be classified at a position to which section 5376 of title 5, United States Code, applies; and

''(iii) shall be compensated at a rate not exceeding the maximum rate payable under such section.

''(C) AUTHORITY; POWERS.—Notwithstanding section 556(b) of title 5, United States Code, a Hearing Officer—

''(i) shall have the authority to hear claims arising under section 554 of such title;

''(ii) shall have the powers described in section 556(c) of such title; and

''(iii) shall conduct hearings and issue decisions in the manner described under sections 555, 556, and 557 of such title, as applicable.

''(D) TREATMENT OF CURRENT PERSONNEL.—An individual serving as a Judge in the Office of Hearings and Appeals (as that position and office are designated in section 134.101 of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations) on the effective date of this subsection shall be considered as qualified to be, and redesignated as, a Hearing Officer.

''(4) HEARING OFFICER DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'Hearing Officer' means an individual appointed or redesignated under this subsection who is an attorney licensed by a State, commonwealth, territory or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia.''.

(2) ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR AS CHIEF HEARING OFFICER.—Section 4(b)(1) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 633(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''One such Associate Administrator shall be the Chief Hearing Officer, who shall administer the Office of Hearings and Appeals established under section 5(i).''.

(3) REPEAL OF REGULATION.—Section 134.102(t) of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 2015, (relating to types of hearings within the jurisdiction of the Office of Hearings and Appeals) shall have no force or effect.

(b) PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SIZE STANDARDS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—Section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SIZE STANDARDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A person may file a petition for reconsideration with the Office of Hearings and Appeals (as established under section 5(i)) of a size standard revised, modified, or established by the Administrator pursuant to this subsection.

''(B) TIME LIMIT.—A person filing a petition for reconsideration described in subparagraph (A) shall file such petition not later than 30 days after the publication in the Federal Register of the notice of final rule to revise, modify, or establish size standards described in paragraph (6).

''(C) PROCESS FOR AGENCY REVIEW.—The Office of Hearings and Appeals shall use the same process it uses to decide challenges to the size of a small business concern to decide a petition for review pursuant to this paragraph.

''(D) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The publication of a final rule in the Federal Register described in subparagraph (B) shall be considered final agency action for purposes of seeking judicial review. Filing a petition for reconsideration under subparagraph (A) shall not be a condition precedent to judicial review of any such size standard.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8___. LIMITATIONS ON REVERSE AUCTIONS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, when used appropriately, reverse auctions may improve the Federal Government's procurement of commercially available commodities by increasing competition, reducing prices, and improving opportunities for small businesses.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON REVERSE AUCTIONS.—The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 47 (15 U.S.C. 631 note) as section 48; and

(2) by inserting after section 46 the following new section:

''SEC. 47. LIMITATIONS ON REVERSE AUCTIONS.

''(a) PROHIBITION ON USING REVERSE AUCTIONS FOR COVERED CONTRACTS.—In the case of a covered contract described in subsection (c), a reverse auction may not be used if the award of the contract is to be made under—

''(1) section 8(a);

''(2) section 8(m);

''(3) section 15(a);

''(4) section 15(j);

''(5) section 31; or

''(6) section 36.

''(b) LIMITATIONS ON USING REVERSE AUCTIONS.—In the case of the award of a contract made under paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) that is not a covered contract, a reverse auction may be used for the award of such a contract, but only if the following requirements are met:

''(1) DECISIONS REGARDING USE OF A REVERSE AUCTION.—Subject to paragraph (2), the following decisions with respect to such a contract shall be made only by a contracting officer:

''(A) A decision to use a reverse auction as part of the competition for award of such a contract.

''(B) Any decision made after the decision described in subsection (A) regarding the appropriate evaluation criteria, the inclusion of vendors, the acceptability of vendor submissions (including decisions regarding timeliness), and the selection of the winner.

''(2) TRAINING REQUIRED.—Only a contracting officer who has received training on the appropriate use and supervision of reverse auctions may use or supervise a reverse auction for the award of such a contract. The training shall be provided by, or similar to the training provided by, the Defense Acquisition University as described in section 824 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. 'Buck' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

''(3) NUMBER OF OFFERS; REVISIONS TO BIDS.—A Federal agency may not award such a contract using a reverse auction if only one offer is received or if offerors do not have the ability to submit revised bids with lower prices throughout the course of the auction.

''(4) TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE OFFERS.—A Federal agency awarding such a contract using a reverse auction shall evaluate the technical acceptability of offers only as technically acceptable or unacceptable.

''(5) USE OF PRICE RANKINGS.—A Federal agency may not award such a contract using a reverse auction if at any time during the award process the Federal agency misinforms an offeror about the price ranking of the offeror's last offer submitted in relation to offers submitted by other offerors.

''(6) USE OF THIRD-PARTY AGENTS.—If a Federal agency uses a third party agent to assist with the award of such a contract using a reverse auction, the Federal agency shall ensure that—

''(A) inherently governmental functions (as such term is used in section 2303 of title 41, United States Code) are not performed by private contractors, including by the third party agent;

''(B) information on the past contract performance of offerors created by the third party agent and shared with the Federal agency is collected, maintained, and shared in compliance with section 1126 of title 41, United States Code;

''(C) information on whether an offeror is a responsible source (as defined in section 113 of title 41, United States Code) that is created by the third party agent and shared with the Federal agency is shared with the offeror and complies with section 8(b)(7) of this Act; and

''(D) disputes between the third party agent and an offeror may not be used to justify a determination that an offeror is not a responsible source (as defined in section 113 of title 41, United States Code) or to otherwise restrict the ability of an offeror to compete for the award of such a contract or task or delivery order.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONTRACTING OFFICER.—The term 'contracting officer' has the meaning given that term in section 2101(1) of title 41, United States Code.

''(2) COVERED CONTRACT.—The term 'covered contract' means a contract—

''(A) for design and construction services;

''(B) for goods purchased to protect Federal employees, members of the Armed Forces, or civilians from bodily harm; or

''(C) for goods or services other than those goods or services described in subparagraph (A) or (B)—

''(i) to be awarded based on factors other than price and technical responsibility; or

''(ii) if awarding the contract requires the contracting officer to conduct discussions with the offerors about their offer.

''(3) DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES.—The term 'design and construction services' means—

''(A) site planning and landscape design;

''(B) architectural and interior design;

''(C) engineering system design;

''(D) performance of construction work for facility, infrastructure, and environmental restoration projects;

''(E) delivery and supply of construction materials to construction sites;

''(F) construction, alteration, or repair, including painting and decorating, of public buildings and public works; and

''(G) architectural and engineering services as defined in section 1102 of title 40, United States Code.

''(4) REVERSE AUCTION.—The term 'reverse auction', with respect to procurement by an agency, means an auction between a group of offerors who compete against each other by submitting offers for a contract or task or delivery order with the ability to submit revised offers with lower prices throughout the course of the auction.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 384, line 8, strike ''; and'' and insert a semicolon.

Page 384, line 13, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 384, after line 13, insert the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) to evaluate commercial off-the-shelf business systems for security, resilience, reliability, interoperability, and integration with existing interrelated systems where such system integration and interoperability are essential to Department of Defense operations;

''(D) to work with commercial off-the-shelf business system developers and owners in adapting systems for Department of Defense use;

''(E) to work with commercial off-the-shelf business system developers and owners where necessary to evaluate the feasibility of making the necessary changes where needed to adapt systems for Department of Defense use;

''(F) to perform Department of Defense system audits to determine which systems are related to or rely upon the system to be replaced or integrated with commercial off-the-shelf business systems;

''(G) to include data mapping as a step in the testing of commercial off-the-shelf business systems prior to deployment; and

''(H) to perform full backup of systems that will be changed or replaced by the installation of commercial off-the-shelf business systems prior to installation and deployment to ensure reconstitution of the system to a functioning state should it become necessary.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of title VIII (page 400, after line 23), add the following new section:

SEC. 865. EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall prescribe a regulation making clear that agency acquisition personnel are permitted and encouraged to engage in responsible and constructive exchanges with industry, so long as

those exchanges are consistent with existing law and regulation and do not promote an unfair competitive advantage to particular firms.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of title VIII (page 400, after line 23), add the following new section:

SEC. 865. STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.

(a) PLAN ON STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.—Not later than 180 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a plan for improving management of IT programs and projects.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Creation of a specialized career path for program management.

(2) The development of a competency model for program management consistent with the IT project manager model.

(3) A career advancement model that requires appropriate expertise and experience for advancement.

(4) A career advancement model that is more competitive with the private sector and that recognizes both Government and private sector experience.

(c) COMBINATION WITH OTHER CADRES PLAN.—The Director may combine the plan required by subsection (a) with the acquisition human capital plans that were developed pursuant to the October 27, 2009, guidance issued by the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy in furtherance of section 1704(g) of title 41, United States Code (originally enacted as section 869 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4553)), to address how the agencies are meeting their human capital requirements to support the timely and effective acquisition of information technology.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

Page 400, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 8____. SYCHRONIZATION OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION CURRICULA.

Section 1746(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''The'' and inserting ''(1) The''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The President of such University shall also convene a review board annually with faculty representatives from relevant professional schools and degree-granting institutions of the Department of Defense and military departments, such as the service academies, the Naval Postgraduate School, and other similar schools and institutions, in order to review and synchronize defense acquisition curricula across the entire Department of Defense.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

Page 400, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 8___ RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION POLICY.

Section 1746(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) research and analysis of defense acquisition policy issues from academic institutions, such as the Naval Postgraduate School and other Department of Defense schools, that offer in-depth analysis of the entire defense acquisition decision support system from both a business and public policy perspective and from an operational and information sciences perspective.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at this point to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. I thank the chairman for yielding and this opportunity to offer my amendment.

Mr. Chair, when the Small Business Administration sets a size standard for a small business, it is determining whether that company can qualify for loans, Federal contracts, and other development assistance.

Unfortunately, there are times that the SBA sets an inappropriate size standard, wrongly classifying a small business as a large business, which can deny them critical access and assistance and contract opportunities.

□ 2100

My bipartisan amendment, offered with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), builds upon previous efforts to improve the SBA size standards process. This will empower America's job creators to appeal directly to the SBA when they believe they have received an inappropriate designation. This change will spare small businesses from having to engage in expensive and time-consuming lawsuits to make their voice heard.

Our amendment is supported by the National Small Business Association, the National Defense Industrial Association, and other small business organizations.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, again, let me offer my appreciation to the chairman and ranking member for including my amendment, No. 75, in en bloc amendment No. 4.

I want to thank, also, my good friend from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN). Both of us serve on the Committee on Homeland Security. He serves on the Armed Services Committee, but we see that there are overlapping issues.

My amendment simply makes an important contribution to the bill by ensuring that changes made to DOD computing systems using software bought and modified for agency operations will not result in the disruption of DOD operations.

I would like to offer this amendment in recognition of a great unsung hero of the modern computing age, Rear Admiral Grace Murray Hopper, who was one of the first programmers, who invented the first compiler for a computer programming language and was a visionary who worked to make machine-independent programming languages possible. Rear Admiral Grace Murray Hopper is not very well known outside of the world of computing, but I salute her work in advancing the science of advanced computing systems while she served as a member of the armed services.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The Jackson Lee amendment will provide the Department of Defense chief privacy officer with the tools it needs to plan and execute updates and changes to the DOD computer networks.

In this world of hacking and the importance of securing our infrastructure of cybersecurity, I believe that this amendment will contribute to the improvement of the DOD and protect against cyber attacks.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for including my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their work on this bill and their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces.

I also thank them for including in En Bloc Amendment #4 the Jackson Lee Amendment (No. 125), which makes an important contribution to the bill by ensuring that changes made to DOD computing systems using software bought and modified for agency operations will not result in the disruption of DOD operations.

I would like to offer this amendment in recognition of a great unsung hero of the modern computing age.

Rear Admiral Grace Murray Hopper who is one of the first programmers who invented the first compiler for a computer programming language, and was the visionary who worked to make machine-independent programming languages possible.

Rear Admiral Grace Murray Hopper is not very well known outside of the world of computing, but I salute her work in advancing the science advance computing systems while she served as a member of the armed services.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will provide the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer with the tools it needs to plan and execute updates and changes to DOD computer networks.

There is no entity like the Department of Defense so the agency will need all of the resources necessary to prepare to transition its computing networks using software and components purchased and modified for specialized purposes.

The importance of DOD functions for the security of our nation makes the importance of modernizing their computing systems of value to the nation and the demands they will face today and into the future.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 125 will ensure that changes made to DOD computing

systems using software bought and modified for agency use will not result in disruption of DOD operations.

I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for including this amendment in this En Bloc Amendment #4 and I encourage all Members to support it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, No. 58.

As chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on Information Technology, over the past 5 months, one thing has become painfully clear to me: the IT infrastructure of the Federal Government is behind the times, and those who maintain our already-outdated systems have a difficult job due to red tape and bureaucratic hurdles. Compounding this issue and making it worse is the fact that there is a shortage of high-skilled labor in IT security both in the public and private sectors.

My amendment would modify existing law to allow all personnel identified as critical to network defense within DOD and DHS who have received the appropriate training to take the necessary exams, backing their skills with certification.

A large number of these individuals receive the valuable training needed to protect our networks and defend cyber domains, but their skills are not always backed by certification. This not only means there is little accountability in the system, but also that those who choose to leave the Federal Government have a hard time explaining their qualifications to potential employers.

This amendment solves both of these issues by providing internationally recognized certification to individuals in critical roles. More importantly, this amendment would not seek any additional funding to implement this policy change.

This change will enhance U.S. national security, ensure value of taxpayer investments in IT training, and even help our veterans transition their hard-earned skills to civilian employment once their service has ended.

I thank the chairman for his support and commend him for his work on this bill.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, since there are no additional speakers on my side, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to note that there are 15 amendments in this en bloc package, 8 sponsored by Republicans and 7 by Democrats. There truly was bipartisan participation in formulating this package, and I hope all the sponsors of these 15 amendments will support this bill on final passage.

I urge adoption of the en bloc, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 5 consisting of amendment Nos. 62, 73, 74, 77, 78, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 93, 95, 97, 98, and 100 printed in House Report No. 114–112, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle I of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. PRELIMINARY MENTAL HEALTH SCREENINGS FOR INDIVIDUALS BECOMING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 520d. Preliminary mental health screenings

''(a) PROVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH SCREENING.—Before any individual enlists in an armed force or is commissioned as an officer in an armed force, the Secretary concerned shall provide the individual with a mental health screening.

''(b) USE OF SCREENING.—(1) The Secretary shall use the results of a mental screening conducted under subsection (a) as a baseline for any subsequent mental health examinations of the individual, including such examinations provided under sections 1074f and 1074m of this title.

''(2) The Secretary may not consider the results of a mental health screening conducted under subsection (a) in determining the promotion of a member of the armed forces.

''(c) APPLICATION OF PRIVACY LAWS.—With respect to applicable laws and regulations relating to the privacy of information, the Secretary shall treat a mental health screening conducted under subsection (a) in the same manner as the medical records of a member of the armed forces.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 520c the following new item:

''520d. Preliminary mental health screenings.''.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health shall submit to Congress and the Secretary of Defense a report on preliminary mental health screenings of members of the Armed Forces.

(B) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) Recommendations with respect to establishing a preliminary mental health screening of members of the Armed Forces to bring mental health screenings to parity with physical screenings of members.

(ii) Recommendations with respect to the composition of the mental health screening, evidenced-based best practices, and how to track changes in mental health screenings relating to traumatic brain injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other conditions.

(C) COORDINATION.—The National Institute of Mental Health shall carry out subparagraph (A) in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the surgeons general of the military departments, and other relevant experts.

(2) REPORTS ON EFFICACY OF SCREENINGS.—

(A) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Not later than one year after the date on which the Secretary of Defense begins providing preliminary mental health screenings under section 520d(a) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the efficacy of such preliminary mental health screenings.

(B) COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the submittal of the report under subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the efficacy of the preliminary mental health screenings described in such subparagraph.

(C) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The reports required by subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall include the following:

(i) An evaluation of the evidence-based best practices used by the Secretary in composing and conducting preliminary mental health screenings of members of the Armed Forces under such section 520d(a).

(ii) An evaluation of the evidence-based best practices used by the Secretary in tracking changes in mental health screenings relating to traumatic brain injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other conditions among members of the Armed Forces.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF PRELIMINARY MENTAL HEALTH SCREENING.—The Secretary of Defense may not provide a preliminary mental health screening under section 520d(a) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), until the Secretary receives and evaluates the initial report required by subsection (c)(1).

(e) REPORT ON EFFICACY OF PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UPON SEPARATION FROM ACTIVE DUTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the efficacy of the mental health components of the physical examinations provided under paragraph (5) of section 1145(a) of title 10, United States Code, to members of the Armed Forces who are separated from active duty as described in paragraph (2) of such section.

(2) EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include an evaluation of the effectiveness of the physical examinations described in such subsection in—

(A) identifying members of the Armed Forces with traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other mental health conditions; and

(B) ensuring that health care is provided for such members.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. RUSSELL OF OKLAHOMA

Page 376, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 844. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROCUREMENT OF FIRE HOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) The General Services Administration has historically procured specialized fire hoses designed for combating wildfires used by the Forest Service.

(2) A memorandum of agreement was signed on February 5, 2014, by the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency designating the Defense Logistics Agency as the integrated material manager and source of supply for such fire hoses.

(3) While the intent of this agreement was to secure efficiencies in procurement and cost savings for the Government, the transfer of procurement authority to the Department of Defense had the unintentional effect of requiring all suppliers of such fire hoses to comply with the domestic sourcing requirements of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, also known as the Berry Amendment.

(4) There is currently only one known provider of such fire hoses and that provider is not fully compliant with the domestic sourcing requirements of the Berry Amendment.

(5) As a result of the designation of the Defense Logistic Agency as the integrated material manager for the procurement of such fire hoses and the new requirement for compliance with the Berry Amendment, the Forest Service does not anticipate the ability to procure the necessary number of fire hoses before the fire season begins in early June and is currently facing a shortfall of 56,000 hoses out of the 93,000 required. According to the Chief of the Forest Service, this shortfall represents a critical risk to a number of States that are likely to experience a season of above average wildfire activity.

(6) During the period of May 1, 2014, through May 5, 2015, less than 9 percent of quantities of such hoses purchased by the Defense Logistics Agency were procured for the purposes of the Department of Defense.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Based on the findings in subsection (a), it is the sense of Congress that procurement authority for specialized fire hoses for the United States Forest Service should be reestablished as an activity of the General Services Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. MC GOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 379, after line 20, insert the following

(e) LIMITATION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a covered item as defined in subparagraphs of (B), (C), (D), or (E) of section 2533a(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of title VIII (page 400, after line 23), add the following new section:

SEC. 865. STANDARDS FOR OROCUREMENT OF SECURE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND CYBER SECURITY SYSTEMS.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment of the application of the Open Trusted Technology Provider Standard to Department of Defense procurements for information technology and cyber security acquisitions and provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment and briefing required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Assessment of the current Open Trusted Technology Provider Standard to determine what aspects might be adopted by the Department of Defense and where additional development of the standard may be required.

(2) Identification of the types or classes of programs where the standard might be applied most effectively, as well as identification of types or classes of programs that should specifically be excluded from consideration.

(3) Assessment of the impact on current acquisition regulations or policies of the adoption of the standard.

(4) Recommendations the Secretary may have related to the adoption of the standard or improvement in the standard to support Department acquisitions.

(5) Any other matters the Secretary may deem appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

At the end of title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8___. MODIFICATIONS TO THE JUSTIFICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS FOR CERTAIN SOLE-SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) REPEAL OF SIMPLIFIED JUSTIFICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—Section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2405; 41 U.S.C. 3304 note) is repealed.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR JUSTIFICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

(1) DEFENSE PROCUREMENTS.—Section 2304(f)(2)(D)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''if such procurement is for property or services in an amount less than $20,000,000'' before the semicolon at the end.

(2) CIVILIAN PROCUREMENTS.—Section 3304(e)(4) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''or section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)).'' and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) the procurement is for property or services in an amount less than $20,000,000 and is conducted under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO OF MISSISSIPPI

Strike section 1053 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 1053. LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF CERTAIN AH–64 APACHE HELICOPTERS FROM ARMY NATIONAL GUARD TO REGULAR ARMY AND RELATED PERSONNEL LEVELS.

Section 1712 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''March 31, 2016'' and inserting ''June 30, 2016''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking ''March 31, 2016'' and inserting ''June 30, 2016'' both places it appears.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MRS. ELLMERS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 474, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 1060. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO DEACTIVATE 440TH AIRLIFT WING.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be used to deactivate the 440th airlift wing, or to move the personnel or aircraft of the 440th airlift wing, or to otherwise degrade the capabilities of the 440th airlift wing until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the deactivation of the 440th airlift wing will not affect the military readiness for the airborne and special operations units stationed at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. KATKO OF NEW YORK

Page 485, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10___. REPORT ON OPTIONS TO ACCELERATE THE TRAINING OF REMOTELY PILOTED AIRCRAFT PILOTS.

Not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report addressing the immediate and critical training and operational needs of the remotely piloted aircraft community. The report shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the viability of using non-rated, civilian, contractor, or enlisted pilots to execute remotely piloted aircraft missions.

(2) An assessment of the availability and existing utilization of special use airspace available for remotely piloted aircraft training and a plan for accessing additional special use airspace in order to meet anticipated training requirements for remotely piloted aircraft.

(3) A comprehensive training plan aimed at increasing the throughput of undergraduate remotely piloted aircraft training without sacrificing quality and standards.

(4) Establishment of an optimum ratio for the mix of training airframes to operational airframes in the remotely piloted aircraft inventory necessary to achieve manning requirements for pilots and sensor operators and, to the extent practicable, a plan for fielding additional remotely piloted aircraft airframes at the formal training units in the active, National Guard, and reserve components in accordance with optimum ratios for MQ–9 and Global Hawk remotely piloted aircraft.

(5) Establishment of optimum and minimum crew ratios to combat air patrols taking into account all tasks remotely piloted aircraft units execute and, to the extent practicable, a plan for conducting missions in accordance with optimum ratios.

(6) Identification of any resource, legislative, or departmental policy challenges impeding the corrective action needed to reach a sustainable remotely piloted aircraft operations tempo.

(7) An assessment, to the extent practicable, of the direct and indirect impacts that the integration of remotely piloted aircraft into the national airspace system has on the ability to generate remotely piloted aircraft crews.

(8) Any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle F of title X (page 485, after line 2), add the following new section:

SEC. 1067. EXPEDITED MEETINGS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE ARMY.

Section 1702(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3665) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. I) shall not apply to a meeting of the Commission unless the meeting is attended by five or more members of the Commission.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

At the end of title V (page 247, after line 20), add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. REPORT REGARDING NEW RULEMAKING UNDER THE MILITARY LENDING ACT AND DEFENSE MANPOWER DATA CENTER REPORTS AND MEETINGS.

(a) REPORT ON NEW MILITARY LENDING ACT RULEMAKING.—After the issuance by the Secretary of Defense of the regulation issued with regard to section 987 of title 10, United States Code (commonly known as the Military Lending Act), and part of 232 of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations (its implementing regulation), but before the relevant compliance date for any provisions of such regulation that relate to the identification of a covered borrower under the Military Lending Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that discusses—

(1) the ability and reliability of the Defense Manpower Data Center in meeting real-time requests for accurate information needed to make a determination regarding whether a borrower is covered by the Military Lending Act; or

(2) an alternate mechanism or mechanisms for identifying such covered borrowers.

(b) DEFENSE MANPOWER DATA CENTER REPORTS AND MEETINGS.—

(1) REPORTS ON ACCURACY, RELIABILITY, AND INTEGRITY OF SYSTEMS.—The Director of the Defense Manpower Data Center shall submit to Congress reports on the accuracy, reliability, and integrity of the Defense Manpower Data Center systems used to identify covered borrowers and covered policyholders under military consumer protection laws. The first report is due six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and the Director shall submit additional reports every six months thereafter as necessary to show improvements in the accuracy, reliability, and integrity of such systems.

(2) REPORT ON PLAN TO STRENGTHEN CAPABILITIES.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Defense Manpower Data Center shall submit to Congress a report on plans to strengthen the capabilities of the Defense Manpower Data Center systems, including staffing levels and funding, in order to improve the identification of covered borrowers and covered policyholders under military consumer protection laws.

(3) MEETINGS WITH PRIVATE SECTOR USERS OF SYSTEMS.—The Director of the Defense Manpower Data Center shall meet regularly with private sector users of Defense Manpower Data Center systems used to identify covered borrowers and covered policyholders under military consumer protection laws to learn about issues facing such users and to develop ways of addressing such issues. The first meeting pursuant to this requirement shall take place with three months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD OF ARKANSAS

Page 528, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 1092. SITUATIONS INVOLVING BOMBINGS OF PLACES OF PUBLIC USE, GOVERNMENT FACILITIES, PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS, AND INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 18 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 383. Situations involving bombings of places of public use, Government facilities, public transportation systems, and infrastructure facilities

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The direct participation of members of the Armed Forces assigned to explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) units providing support to civilian law enforcement agencies does not involve search, seizure, arrest or other similar activity. Upon the request of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Defense may provide such assistance in Department of Justice activities related to the enforcement of section 2332f of title 18 during situations involving bombings of places of public use, Government facilities, public transportation systems, and infrastructure facilities.

''(b) MUTUAL AID AGREEMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, through mutual aid agreement with the Attorney General shall, in the interest of public safety, waive reimbursement on military EOD support of Department of Justice activities related to the enforcement of section 2332f of title 18 for situations involving bombings of places of public use, Government facilities, public transportation systems, and infrastructure facilities.

''(c) RENDERING-SAFE SUPPORT.—Military EOD units providing rendering-safe support to Department of Justice activities relating to the enforcement of section 175, 229, or 2332a of title 18 emergency situations involving weapons of mass destruction shall be consistent with the provisions of section 382 of this title.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'explosive ordnance'—

''(A) means—

''(i) bombs and warheads;

''(ii) guided and ballistic missiles;

''(iii) artillery, mortar, rocket, and small arms ammunition;

''(iv) all mines, torpedoes, and depth charges;

''(v) grenades demolition charges;

''(vi) pyrotechnics;

''(vii) clusters and dispensers;

''(viii) cartridge- and propellant– actuated devices;

''(ix) electroexplosives devices;

''(x) clandestine and improvised explosive devices (IEDs); and

''(xi) all similar or related items or components explosive in nature; and

''(B) includes all munitions containing explosives, propellants, nuclear fission or fusion materials, and biological and chemical agents.

''(2) The term 'explosive ordnance disposal procedures' means those particular courses or modes of action for access to, recovery, rendering–safe, and final disposal of explosive ordnance or any hazardous material associated with an EOD incident, including—

''(A) access procedures;

''(B) recovery procedures;

''(C) render-safe procedures; and

''(D) final disposal procedures.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''383. Situations involving bombings of places of public use, Government facilities, public transportation systems, and infrastructure facilities.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO OF OREGON

Page 528, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 1092. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

It is the sense of Congress that a technical correction to the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3881) should be enacted in order to expeditiously carry out the intent of such section 3095.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS

In division A, at the end of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1092. OBSERVANCE OF VETERANS DAY.

(a) TWO MINUTES OF SILENCE.—Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 145. Veterans Day

''The President shall issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe two minutes of silence on Veterans Day in honor of the service and sacrifice of veterans throughout the history of the Nation, beginning at—

''(1) 3:11 pm Atlantic standard time;

''(2) 2:11 pm eastern standard time;

''(3) 1:11 pm central standard time;

''(4) 12:11 pm mountain standard time;

''(5) 11:11 am Pacific standard time;

''(6) 10:11 am Alaska standard time; and

''(7) 9:11 am Hawaii-Aleutian standard time.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''145. Veterans Day.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle A of title XII (page 544, after line 16), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act to carry out sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code, up to 5 percent of such amounts may be made available to conduct monitoring and evaluation of programs conducted pursuant to such authorities during fiscal year 2016.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on mechanisms to evaluate the programs conducted pursuant to the authorities listed in subsection (a). The briefing shall include the following:

(1) A description of how the Department of Defense evaluates program and project outcomes and impact, including cost effectiveness and extent to which programs meet designated goals.

(2) An analysis of steps taken to implement the recommendations from the following reports:

(A) The Government Accountability Office's Report entitled ''Project Evaluations and Better Information Sharing Needed to Manage the Military's Efforts''.

(B) The Department of Defense Inspector General Report numbered ''DODIG–2012–119''.

(C) The RAND Corporation's Report prepared for the Office of the Secretary of Defense entitled ''Developing a Prototype Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating Department of Defense Humanitarian Assistance Projects''.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of subtitle B of title XII (page 550, after line 26), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO ENGAGE UNITED STATES MANUFACTURERS IN PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITIES RELATED TO EQUIPPING THE AFGHAN NATIONAL SECURITY FORCES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report on efforts of the Secretaries to engage United States manufacturers in procurement opportunities related to equipping the Afghan National Security Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA OF ARIZONA

Page 557, after line 3, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent provisions accordingly):

(6) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with Secretary of State, shall continue to pursue efforts to shut down ISIL's illicit oil revenues;

Page 559, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent provisions accordingly):

(F) A detailed description of the resources required by the Secretary of Defense to counter ISIL's illicit oil revenues

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON

In the section heading for section 1216, strike ''**SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING**'' (and conform the table of contents accordingly).

In section 1216, strike ''It is the sense of Congress'' and insert the following:

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress

At the end of section 1216, add the following:

(b) SPECIAL IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN AFGHANS.—Section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii)(II), by striking ''International Security Assistance Force'' each place such term appears and inserting ''International Security Assistance Force, the Resolute Support Mission, or any successor organization'';

(2) in paragraph (3)(F)(i), by striking ''September 30, 2015;'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015;''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(15) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State jointly shall submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate containing the following:

''(A) The number of citizens or nationals of Afghanistan employed in Afghanistan by, or on behalf of, entities or organizations described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii).

''(B) A prediction of the number of such individuals who will be so employed on the date that is 2 years after the date used for the count under subparagraph (A).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), a colleague on the Armed Services Committee who is also vice chair of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, while I will support this en bloc package, I stand in opposition to the provision to delay the transfer of Apaches from the National Guard to the Active Army.

In committee, Chairman WILSON of South Carolina and I worked very closely to authorize a congressional review, no less than 60 days, following the Commission's report release. The gentleman from Mississippi's (Mr. PALAZZO) provision would scratch this and limit our review time.

More importantly, this amendment would have devastating impacts on the Army's combat aviation brigades and on States like New York, Kansas, Hawaii, Arizona, and California.

As the Representative of Fort Drum, home of the 10th Mountain Division, any delay would cause this high operational tempo unit to be left without an aviation brigade. Let me be clear. Any Apache delay will have grave consequences on Army's readiness, deployment schedule, and dwell time.

And to clarify, in exchange for the Apaches, the National Guard is set to receive fully modernized Blackhawks. However, derailing, delaying, or limiting Apache transfers would halt Blackhawk modernization and would, consequently, inhibit lift and rescue operations, which are critical to a State's emergency response.

Mr. Chairman, while I will not vote against this package, I will continue to fight for an on-time transfer of the Apaches from the National Guard to the Army.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I want to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his bipartisan cooperation in arriving at this en bloc package.

I have no speakers at this point, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, since its establishment, the National Guard has persistently answered the call to defend our Nation and respond in times of national crises.

After September 11, 2001, the National Guard was, once again, called on to stand to post, deploying for months on end, leaving loved ones behind.

Unfortunately, the Army's Aviation Restructuring Initiative, or ARI, is set to have a devastating impact not only on the National Guard in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, but on the entire National Guard, leaving the force less combat capable and less able to provide operational depth.

Last year, Congress wisely created the National Commission on the Future of the Army to offer a deliberate approach to addressing force structure issues and ARI. We need to allow the Commission to do its work and ensure that Congress has sufficient time to consider the Commission's report and recommendations before the Army takes any further harmful and irreversible actions.

The amendment I have offered Representatives PALAZZO and WALZ will ensure that Congress has that opportunity, and I would urge your support.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and the committee staff for continuing to work with me on issues facing Fort Bragg, including the deactivation of the 440th Airlift Wing.

My amendment is simple. I am demanding accountability for what I believe to be a terribly misguided and shortsighted decision. The airborne and special operations units the 440th supports are unique because there are paratroopers within the Global Response Force who are on call 24/7, packed and ready to deploy anywhere in the world within hours. It is safe to say that the level of readiness required for these forces is unparalleled.

In the midst of global uncertainty, the idea of deactivating such a vital element is simply baffling to me. I see this as dangerous to our paratroopers, and I demand accountability for this ill-advised decision. As the Representative of Fort Bragg, I will not stand idly by when I see a decision that negatively impacts the brave men and women serving our country.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO).

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 86 to bring awareness to an issue that greatly affects the future of our Air Force, and it can be boiled down to one specific fact: we need more remotely piloted aircraft pilots.

As many of you know, the military has increasingly emphasized the use of unmanned aerial systems to support military operations around the world. We should continue providing the assets necessary to protect and enable our servicemembers to do their job.

Air Force leadership has recently made several remarks, stating the need for 300 annually trained RPA pilots. However, we can only muster a fraction of that number at this time.

I stand before this body today to ask support for a report to Congress that

requests clarification on how the Department of Defense—specifically, the Air Force—plans on solving this problem.

I ask my colleagues to not restrict the operational needs of our Air Force and ask for strong support of this amendment.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for his time, and I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at this point to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment on behalf of our Nation's servicemembers. This amendment is verbatim to a bill that the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman TIM RYAN, and I introduced earlier this year, H.R. 1465, the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act of 2015. This amendment will help the military identify behavioral health issues and improve suicide prevention by instituting a mental health assessment for all incoming military recruits.

A recent Army study confirmed the need to address mental health issues in a timely manner, finding that ''nearly one in five Army soldiers enter the service with a psychiatric disorder, and nearly half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting.''

The amendment is respective of servicemembers' privacy, and the mental evaluation cannot be used in determining promotion. This amendment will simply ensure that we have a better baseline for the mental health of a servicemember during his or her military career.

These brave men and women put their lives on the line every day in the service of our Nation, and it is our responsibility to offer everything in our power to guarantee they return home safely, both physically and mentally.

This amendment has strong bipartisan support and the support of a large number of military and mental health advocacy groups which understand our troops deserve as much support as we can provide them.

Mr. Chairman, 108 of our military took their own lives between October and December of 2014 by suicide. Let's stop this tragedy.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MICA. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding and also for entering into this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in concern to a potential Air Force determination under section 2667 of title 10, referencing an enhanced used lease agreement offered by the Canaveral Port Authority for use of Department of Defense lands directly adjacent to the Canaveral Harbor's deepwater port.

As you know, the Canaveral Port Authority is, in fact, an independent governmental agency established by the Florida Legislature back in 1939. Therefore, the Canaveral Port Authority is a public organization. And under section 2667 of title 10, it could be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force that public interest would be served as a result of the enhanced use leave agreement that is being offered and that competitive procedures are not compatible with the public benefit served by this public interest.

Thusly, it is in the public interest to deal with a public entity. The competitive procedures for selection of leases under this section should allow the Air Force to negotiate solely with the Canaveral Port Authority.

□ 2115

Mr. THORNBERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I fully agree that section 2667 of title 10 provides the Secretary of the Air Force the flexibility to enter into a lease with the Canaveral Port Authority. I further understand that such lease would be at full market value. So along with the gentleman, I look forward to hearing from the Secretary of the Air Force as to her determination on this particular case.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no speakers on my side, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time just to mention that in this en bloc package there are amendments from nine Republicans and eight Democrats. We have heard discussed over the last two en bloc packages a number of important issues such as cybersecurity and about equipping and training our National Guard. Again, Members from both sides have contributed to this product. But to make their contributions count, this bill is going to have to pass, and I hope that all the Members who offered these 17 amendments of this en bloc and the other packages will support the final passage not only of this en bloc package but the final of the entire bill.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee for including the Lynch-Boustany Amendment in this en bloc amendment.

This amendment would add the text of the bill, H.R. 995, the ''Veterans Day Moment of Silence Act'' to the NDAA. Last year, this language was incorporated into the House-passed FY 15 NDAA. Unfortunately, it was not included in the final Defense Authorization Conference Report.

Mr. Chair, this amendment calls for the national observation of two minutes of silence every Veterans Day in honor of all our veterans, past and present. It sets a time where all Americans can pause, come together, and reflect on the service of generations of brave American men and women in uniform.

Our nation is facing difficult challenges and we have strong disagreements over how to address them. However despite such differences, support for, and gratitude to, our veterans is something that we can all agree on. This silent tribute lets us set aside our differences, and come together as one nation, to say to our veterans that we appreciate everything they have done and sacrificed to keep us safe.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Mr. BOUSTANY, for cosponsoring this amendment with me, and for being an original cosponsor of H.R. 995.

Mr. Chair, again I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee for their cooperation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I thank the Ranking Member for yielding me this time and for his leadership on so many national security and defense issues. I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for supporting my efforts to bring this amendment to the floor for debate and making it part of this en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chair, this amendment will maintain the current simplified acquisition threshold—or SAT—for a wide variety of items, including textiles, tents, tarpaulins, flags, clothing, apparel, footwear, head gear, a wide variety of cotton, wool, silk and synthetic yarns, and the list goes on.

But most importantly, this amendment ensures that small and medium-sized American companies, with American workers, using American-made content will continue to have the opportunity to do business with the Pentagon and provide textiles, clothing, apparel and other such materials to our service men and women at good prices.

In Dorchester, Massachusetts, AbilityOne provides employment opportunities for people who are blind or who have significant disabilities. They manufacture Berry-compliant items, including uniforms, chemical protective garments, tents, tarpaulins, hats, caps and other clothing and textile items. This amendment protects their jobs and their relationship with the DOD. It means textile, footwear and apparel manufacturers in North Brookfield, Fall River and elsewhere in Massachusetts can continue to support our troops with their high quality products and materials.

The current language in the NDAA would raise the SAT from $150,000 to $500,000. My amendment simply maintains the $150,000 threshold. Now the difference between $150 and $500,000 might not sound like much. But

if that threshold had been raised in FY 2014, then 6,813 contracts totaling over $337 million in textile and clothing alone would have been exempt from the Berry amendment. This amendment keeps the Berry Amendment strong, and it keeps America strong.

Mr. Chair, this amendment is a compromise. The original amendment that I submitted to the House Rules Committee would have also maintained the current SAT on food and on specialty metals, hand tools, measuring tools, and so forth. Chairman THORNBERRY did not support maintaining the current SAT on those items, and in the spirit of compromise we narrowed the scope of the amendment to textiles, clothing, apparel and related materials. I hope as the NDAA moves through the legislative process that the scope of my original amendment will be reinstated.

This amendment is supported by a broad array of national textile and manufacturing organizations, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the en bloc amendments in total.

MAY 14, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The undersigned nine trade associations ask for your vote in support of McGovern Amendment #74 under the rule (see H. Res. 260). It will be in order during consideration of FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 1735) today.

Offered by Cong. Jim McGovern Amendment #74 fixes a provision in Section 854 of H.R. 1735 that would seriously harm the U.S. textile, apparel, and footwear industry.

As written, Section 854 would increase the Simplified Acquisition Procedure threshold (SAT) from $150,000 to $500,000. This change would exempt contracts up to $500,000 from compliance with both the Berry Amendment and the Kissell Amendment.

An increase of this magnitude will cause significant strain on the U.S. textile, apparel, and footwear supply chain by reducing contracting opportunities for manufacturers, large and small, covered under the Berry Amendment. Analysis of DOD-funded contracts under the SAP attached as Addendum 1 on page 4.

McGovern Amendment #74 solves this problem by lowering SAT back down to $150,000 for fiber, textile, apparel, footwear, and other textile products covered by the Berry Amendment at 10 USC 2533a.

With fierce competition for contracts, the Berry Amendment has spurred substantial innovation in the area of military textiles, apparel, and footwear by domestic manufacturers. Weight-saving carbon fibers, ballistic-resistant fabrics used in personal protective equipment, fire resistant fabrics, medical fabrics, and collapsible fuel bladders are among the thousands of products developed for the military that also have commercial applications. These innovations have helped America's textile manufacturers stay at the forefront of technical textiles, enhancing safety and boosting employment and exports.

Substantial capital investment, including a $500 million ballistic-resistant fiber plant built in South Carolina within the last five years, illustrates the industry's commitment to the technical fiber/fabric industrial base. Thanks to the U.S. government's longstanding policy with respect to military procurement encompassed in the Berry Amendment, that plant had a ready-made market, an important factor in calculating the risk when deciding to make that investment.

Also, it is important to note that some textiles used by the military do not have a commercial market. For national security reasons, DOD does not allow certain textile technologies to be exported. Classified dyeing and finishing techniques used to reduce heat signatures or to create a secure environment for electronic communication are just two examples of U.S. investments made to develop military-specific textile products exclusively for DOD use.

Congress enacted the Berry Amendment in 1941 (USC, Title 10, Section 2533a) to ensure that a strong U.S. defense industrial base is always ready to meet the needs of the troops. It requires the Department of Defense (DOD) to procure certain products such as food, specialty metals, hand measuring tools, and textiles made with 100 percent U.S. content and labor. Since then, Congress has reaffirmed its support for the Berry Amendment by strengthening its provisions, recognizing that textiles and clothing are indispensable to our warfighter's safety and ability to execute their missions.

Understanding the need for periodic adjustments in the SAP, Congress enacted Public Law 108–375 which allowed for inflation adjustments to the SAP every five years.

However, further increase in the SAT beyond what is currently proscribed by Public Law 108–375 will seriously erode the U.S. textile, apparel, and footwear industry's ability to supply the defense industrial base, compromise U.S. investment in textile manufacturing operations, put at risk highly skilled and good paying textile jobs, and inhibit the domestic industry's competitive advantage in commercial markets.

As the House works on this important legislation, we urge that McGovern Amendment #74 be adopted so that the FY 2016 NDAA does not erode the important value that the Berry Amendment brings to the U.S. textile, apparel, and footwear industry and our warfighters.

Again, please ensure that America continues to strength its domestic textile, clothing, and footwear supply chain. Vote for McGovern Amendment #74.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

Auggie Tantillo, President, National Council of Textile Organizations; Gifford Del Grande, Chairman, Narrow Fabrics Institute; Juanita D. Duggan, President & CEO, American Apparel and Footwear Association; Sarah Y. Freidman, Executive Director, SEAMS, the National Association for the Sewn Products Industry; Marc Fleischaker, Rubber & Plastic Footwear Manufacturers Association; Paul O'Day, President, American Fiber Manufacturers Association; Bret Kelley, Chairman, United States Industrial Fabrics Institute; Tom Dobbins, President, American Composites Manufacturers Association; Gary Adams, President/CEO, National Cotton Council.

ANALYSIS OF DOD-FUNDED CONTRACTS UNDER THE SAP

Below is an analysis of DOD-funded contracts for FY 2014 from USASpending.gov with respect to Federal Supply Classification 83 (textiles, tents, flags, etc.) and Federal Supply Classification (FSC) 84 (clothing and individual equipment etc.) as pertaining to the Simplified Acquisition Procedure (SAP) threshold.

The current SAP threshold is $150,000. Language in the chairman's FY 2016 NDAA mark in Section 844 proposes to raise that figure to $500,000. Contracts less than the threshold are not subject to the Berry Amendment's domestic sourcing requirements.

KEY POINTS

Dollar amount exempted from Berry would almost double.

Almost one dollar in five would be exempt from Berry.

Almost 92 percent of contracts would be open to imports; hurts small businesses.

If the threshold would have been $500,000 in FY 2014, 6,813 contracts would have been subject to the SAP totaling $337,086,946;

DOD-FUNDED PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS FOR FSC 83 & 84 IN FY 2014

[Rounded to nearest million or percentage]

Category	$ in Millions	% of Dollars	Contracts Awarded (Actual)	% Contracts
All	1,804	100	7,438	100
More than $500k	1,467	81	625	8
$150k to $500k	157	9	549	7
Less than $150K	180	10	6,264	84

APRIL 29, 2015.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY AND RANKING MEMBER SMITH: On behalf of the Warrior Protection and Readiness Coalition (WPRC), I write to express our concerns regarding a provision to raise the simplified acquisition threshold from the current level of $150,000 to $500,000. This substantial change would have an immediate negative impact on the domestic industrial base that comprises WPRC membership.

The WPRC is an industry association of leading manufacturers and distributors of Berry Amendment-compliant protective gear, tactical equipment and clothing. Leading American manufacturers and suppliers to the U.S. military represent an industrial base capability critical to national security delivering superior equipment, apparel, armor, and technology to the modem warfighter and peacekeeper.

Section 844 of the FY2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) Chairman's Mark

would create a significant challenge and irreparable harm to WPRC member companies. Increasing the simplified acquisition threshold to $500,000 would not only create unintended contracting confusion but also exempt contracts up to $500,000 from compliance with the Berry Amendment.

WPRC members are, in many cases, the final remaining domestic manufacturers of critical components for safety and survival products for our servicemen and women. Over the past five years, declining resources and commodity based procurement practices have jeopardized efforts to modernize and innovate our industry. This proposal creates another unnecessary obstacle to our member companies and significantly limits the number of fair and open competitions they can compete for.

While we applaud your efforts to review significant defense acquisition reform, Section 844 creates unintended consequences for the domestic industrial base this effort was designed to assist. The Berry Amendment was adopted to promote the purchase of American-made goods and to sustain a warm industrial base ready to meet the immediate needs of the U.S. military.

By removing the requirement for Berry Amendment-compliance for contracts under $500,000, the Committee is jeopardizing the future of the domestic military industrial base and inviting the introduction of low quality, inconsistent products to our Armed Forces. I respectfully request that the Committee reconsider Section 844 and the true impact of this action on our member companies.

Thank you for your consideration and for your continued service on behalf of our military.

DAVID COSTELLO,
Executive Director,
Warrior Protection and Readiness Coalition.

MAY 12, 2015.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member, House Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY AND RANKING MEMBER SMITH: On behalf of the Alliance for American Manufacturing (AAM), I write to express our concerns with Section 854 of the House FY16 National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 1735), which would increase the threshold for applicability of certain domestic content preferences applicable to Pentagon spending, including the Berry Amendment and the Specialty Metals Amendment. We strongly urge the removal of Section 854 from the NDAA.

Section 854 would increase the Simplified Acquisition Procedure (SAP) threshold from $150,000 to $500,000, thus exempting a large number of contracts from compliance with domestic content preferences that ensure a strong supply chain of U.S. producers to equip our military. Making this change will increase the Pentagon's reliance on foreign nations for the goods needed to defend the American people and ensure mission readiness. Potential political or military conflicts with foreign supplier nations that have no duty to our national defense priorities can disrupt the timely delivery of goods needed to keep our service men and women safe at home and on the battlefield.

A healthy U.S. manufacturing sector and a robust defense industrial base are essential to our national security. Preferences for the procurement of American-made goods by our military bolster the strength and long-term viability of countless companies whose mission is to produce high-quality goods to defend the American people and our Soldiers. It is with great regard for our preparedness and national security that we urge the removal of Section 854 from the NDAA.

Sincerely,

SCOTT N. PAUL,
President.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, thank you Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for your leadership on national security and for accepting my amendment.

Terrorism is an undeniable threat to our country's security and global stability. Terrorist networks constantly develop new ways to finance their deadly operations and threaten America.

To keep our country safe, we must be one step ahead of them, cutting off their funding and stopping their efforts.

The Islamic State (I–S) is one of the world's most violent, dangerous and well financed terrorist groups. In 2014, ISIL generated approximately $1 million per day, predominantly through the sale of smuggled oil.

My amendment directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury and other agencies involved in this effort, to pursue efforts to shut down ISIL's oil revenues and report on resources needed for these efforts.

As a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, I'm working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to keep money out of the hands of terrorists and find solutions, like this amendment, that strengthen America's security.

Again, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for your leadership and support.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in House Report 114–112.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 426, after line 6, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1004. REPORT ON AUDITABLE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report ranking all military departments and Defense Agencies in order of how advanced they are in achieving auditable financial statements as required by law. The report should not include information otherwise available in other reports to Congress.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the recognition. My amendment today reflects the frustration that many in Congress have felt for some time over the Department of Defense's lack of real progress on being able to produce a full accounting of where the money that has been given to them over the years has been spent.

In 1990, Congress passed the Chief Financial Officers Act requiring every department and every agency in the Federal Government to produce verifiable financial statements which could be fully audited. To date, each major agency has been able to complete this task except one—the Department of Defense—and Congress has allowed the Department of Defense to continue to not comply with this law for now going on 25 years. It is time for that to end.

While the Department of Defense might claim it has taken steps toward completing an audit, purportedly to be accomplished by 2017, Congress has little verifiable proof that this will actually occur.

The amendment that I offer today with BARBARA LEE of California asks the Department of Defense to rank—in order from most ready to be audited to least ready to be audited—every entity within the Department which is required to provide financial statements for the overall efforts of the departmentwide audit. Congress needs to know which offices within the Department of Defense are making significant strides toward this goal and which offices are not.

The amendment requires no additional analysis, no additional explanation, simply a list. If Congress is serious about exercising its oversight role through the power of the purse, then this is the least we should expect the Department to provide to Congress, a pulse-check to show Members where the audit truly stands.

Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and I are not the only ones who have been concerned about the Pentagon's lack of progress in this arena. In 2013, the Government Accountability Office—Congress' eyes and ears on the ground for keeping the Federal Government accountable—stated that it could not complete an audit of the entire Federal Government because the Department of Defense could not produce verifiable documents. The GAO stated at the time: ''The main obstacles to a GAO opinion on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements were: serious financial management problems at the Department of Defense that made its financial statements unauditable.'' A GAO source was reported to have stated that the Pentagon routinely postponed meetings at the last minute with GAO pertaining to the audit. This

is unacceptable, and the body should not accept it.

Besides being necessary for the proper separation of powers role that Congress continues to assert in overseeing how taxpayer money is spent, this amendment represents good governance. It is for this reason that our amendment today is endorsed by the Americans for Tax Reform, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and the National Taxpayers Union.

Mr. Chairman, Congress must stand up for taxpayers and tell the Pentagon that it must justify how it spends every dollar that it is given. Congress has been complacent for too long on this issue. With today's vote perhaps that will end.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and his staff for working with my office on this. I look forward to working on this issue as the deadline approaches, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. First, let me thank Mr. BURGESS for his very diligent and hard work on this amendment. It is a pleasure to work with the gentleman to bring transparency and accountability to Pentagon spending so taxpayers know where their hard-earned dollars are going. I also want to thank Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY for her support and work on this very important amendment. I am pleased to be working with Congressman BURGESS and Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY to build upon the work that we are doing with our bipartisan Audit the Pentagon Act, H.R. 942.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered an Audit the Pentagon amendment since 2011, and this work continues now with Representatives BURGESS and SCHAKOWSKY. This is a commonsense amendment to ensure audit-readiness at the Pentagon, something that Congress mandated I think it was 25 years ago; yet two-plus decades later, Pentagon officials continue to tell Congress that audit-readiness is still years away. This is simply unacceptable.

So our amendment is simple. It would require a report ranking all military departments and Defense agencies in order of how advanced they are in achieving audit-readiness. Taxpayers deserve to know how and where their hard-earned dollars are being spent.

Pentagon spending accounts for more than half of Federal discretionary spending and totals more than half a trillion dollars. The fact that any part of the government cannot pass an audit is unacceptable, let alone a department that spends more than $600 billion annually. That is, frankly, outrageous. I bet you the Department of Housing and Urban Development can't get away with this.

Now, I am a former small-business owner, 11 years, and I can tell you one thing. I know the importance of having one's books in order. Whether it is in the private sector or the public sector, it is critical to success. In fact, we all demand that all individuals, families, organizations, and companies be able to pass an audit. Why in the world should the Pentagon be any different?

Taxpayers deserve better than black-box budgeting and two decades of ''we will get on with this'' rhetoric, and they keep postponing and saying ''we will get to it later.'' That is unacceptable when it comes to ending waste, fraud, and abuse. I remember several years ago there were reports from The New York Times, and subsequently these reports were substantiated, that taxpayer dollars—cash money—in suitcases were being passed out in Afghanistan. What in the world are we doing? We have no clue where that money went or how much it was. It was cash money.

So we need to take this action, and I thank Mr. BURGESS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY for this. If you ask me, I think we need to take bolder actions to address the Pentagon's failure to achieve audit-ready status and somehow at some point penalize them if they don't do that because we all would be penalized if in fact our books were not in order. So this amendment, I just have to say, is a major step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, the American people deserve to know how the Pentagon is spending their hard-earned tax dollars. We must end waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon. We need to achieve audit-readiness. Once again, none of us could get away with this, none, no Federal agency could get away with this. So we must begin this process for accountability and transparency. It is important that the public know exactly how their money is being spent. There is no way the Pentagon should get away with this.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment because unauditable is unacceptable. I thank Mr. BURGESS, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I rise just to make two points. Number one, unfortunately, there are a lot of Federal agencies that can't pass an audit, and I hope that all the other committees of the Congress are as diligent as our committee is about making sure they get their agencies to where they can.

Our committee in particular, led by CPA Mr. CONAWAY of Texas, we have pushed this issue, held many oversight hearings, and will continue to push this issue. I think the gentleman's amendment helps that effort. But I want to be really clear that this is a high priority of the committee, and it needs to be a high priority for the other departments besides the Department of Defense as well.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, at this point I am prepared to yield back, but I do want to thank the chairman of the full committee for hearing our amendment this evening. I also want to thank him for what I know is a significant amount of work and challenge to get this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to its speedy passage tomorrow, and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2135

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

TRIBUTE TO NEVADA SENATOR HOWARD CANNON

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Nevada Senator Howard Cannon.

In 1982, I served as Senator Cannon's faculty intern; and every day, in my district office, I have the privilege of sitting behind his personal desk, loaned

to me by his daughter Nancy Downey. It serves as a constant reminder of his many heroic acts. From delivering paratroopers in the lead plane on D-Day to passionately advocating for Nevada's interests on the Senate floor, Howard Cannon's valor and courage are truly unmatched.

This June, Nancy will travel to France to cut the ribbon on the new extension of the D-Day Paratrooper Historical Center, which features her father's restored C–47, the ''Stoy Hora,'' among other artifacts from the invasion. It is a fitting tribute to Senator Cannon and the brave men and women who risked or lost their lives so we can live in a safer world today.

The legacy of Howard Cannon cannot be summed up in 1 minute, Mr. Speaker, so I will now submit for the RECORD an article from the Las Vegas Review-Journal, titled: ''Humble'' Air Warrior Had Crucial D-Day Job: France to honor late Sen. Cannon.

[From the Las Vegas Review Journal: May 12, 2015]

''HUMBLE'' AIR WARRIOR HAD CRUCIAL D-DAY JOB, FRANCE TO HONOR LATE SEN. CANNON, OTHERS FOR WWII ROLES

(By Keith Rogers)

Among the accomplishments of Nevada's late-Sen. Howard Cannon, from his 33-year political career to his Air Force Reserve service as a major general, his biggest achievement arguably was his role in delivering paratroopers in the lead plane during the June 6, 1944, D-Day invasion of Normandy, France.

With mental toughness and steady hands, then-Maj. Cannon, co-pilot of the C–47 Skytrain ''Stoy Hora,'' and pilot Col. Frank Krebs, commander of the 440th Troop Carrier Group, spearheaded the assault to free France from the grip of Nazi Germany's forces.

Had their plane and others in the 45-ship formation not made it to the drop zone near St. Mere Eglise, the soldiers of the 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment might never have been able to provide the cover and distraction for the massive troop landings on the Normandy coast that marked a turning point in World War II.

For that, the grand opening of the extension at the D-Day Paratroopers Historical Center featuring the restored C–47 ''Stoy Hora,'' the pilot's log book and other artifacts will be held June 12 in Normandy's Saint-Come-du-Mont. A flight simulator with special effects will treat visitors to a simulated 7-minute flight inside the aircraft.

Cannon's daughter, Nancy Downey of Genoa, and Krebs' daughter, Christine Goyer, will cut the ribbon with Ethan Wolverton, great-grandson of Lt. Col. Robert Wolverton, commander of the 3rd Battalion's stick of paratroopers, who was killed by Germany machinegun fire while he dangled in his harness after his parachute caught on a tree.

''In our region, we feel that the pilots and crews have not been significantly recognized for their action on D-Day, and we are attempting to not forget them in our museum extension,'' event coordinator Michel de Trez wrote in Downey's invitation. ''It is also our way to honor those who fought and died on the sector where we are located.''

In a telephone interview from Minden last week, Downey said she is looking forward to seeing the C–47 her father flew 71 years ago.

''I think it's a great honor to be a pilot of something that's living history, to be a memorial to people like my dad who risked their lives and lost lives to help, not only France, but the world be a safer place,'' she said, reflecting on her famous father, who died in 2002 at age 90.

''He was very humble and unassuming. He's been a tremendous inspiration to me my whole life,'' she said.

Clark County, too, has assembled some of Cannon's photographs and memorabilia for its Cannon Aviation Museum.

''Had we not had the paratroopers, it was highly likely the invasion would not have been successful,'' said Mark Hall-Patton, administrator of the Clark County Museum on Boulder Highway in Henderson.

''And to have somebody who later was the local DA and Nevada senator who was co-pilot of the lead plane is huge,'' he said.

''He was the one who, among other things, deregulated the airlines and played a key role in passage of the Civil Rights Act. He was a Democrat who was able to bring the Republicans in and get that passed for (President Lyndon B.) Johnson,'' Hall-Patton said.

After his death in 2002, a Review-Journal editorial recognized his political savvy. ''The senator would never tell what deal President Lyndon Johnson offered him for his role in ending the Southern filibuster which would otherwise have prevented the Civil Rights Act from coming to a vote in 1964.''

Cannon served 24 years as one of Nevada's U.S. senators, from 1959 to 1983. As a member of the Armed Services and Commerce, Science and Transportation committees and chairman of the Tactical Air Power, Military Construction and Stockpiles subcommittees, he helped secure funding and upgrades for Nellis Air Force Base.

Born in St. George, Utah, in 1912, he became intrigued by the budding aviation industry while attending Dixie Junior College in the 1930s.

''I admit I was more than just a little impressed by the glamour of flying in those days,'' he said in an interview for the December 1971 edition of Air Line Pilot magazine. ''Lindbergh had recently made his epic ocean-crossing flight, and that added to the pilot mystique that dominated that era.''

As a second lieutenant in the Utah National Guard, he was called to active duty in 1941 and promoted to first lieutenant in charge of a combat engineers unit. He was assigned to the 40th Division in San Luis Obispo, Calif., when Japanese warplanes attacked Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941. Responding to the need for experienced pilots, he joined the Army Air Corps and graduated from light aircraft and glider school in New Mexico as a captain.

In his biography that Downey helped him write, Cannon described the historic D-Day flight. ''Anti-aircraft fire at us as we passed the Channel Islands but we were too low and out of range from them. . . . As we approached the target, we let down through the stuff and broke out at 700 feet over the green fields of France.''

He saw one of the U.S. planes explode as his C–47 powered toward the drop zone. ''Many positions firing tracers,'' he wrote. ''Many of them had me flinching. Over target—green light—there go the troops. Time 0140 (1:40 a.m.) 6 June 1944.''

His awards and decorations included a Purple Heart, a Distinguished Flying Cross, a presidential citation, and the French Croix de Guerre.

On Sept. 17, 1944, Cannon and Krebs were again flying paratroopers behind enemy lines. This time it was for the allied invasion of the Netherlands for Operation Market Garden. After they had dropped the troops, their plane was hit by anti-aircraft flak, forcing them to bail out. What followed was a 42-day odyssey during which they evaded their captors with the help of Dutch civilians.

''When I parachuted into Holland, I felt I was nothing—someone small and unimportant—a speck in the universe leaving a disabled plane,'' he told Air Line Pilot magazine. ''When I left Holland, I sensed I had accomplished far more than our original mission. I had learned from the 'defeated' the true meaning of freedom and how we must never give up fighting for it.''

AMTRAK

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a member for 22 years on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and supporter of rail, my heart goes out to the families and individuals who suffered in the wake of the Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia.

The Republican leadership in Washington continues its long-term failure to adequately fund transportation infrastructure in this country, and starving Amtrak from the funds that it truly needs to operate a national system is one example of the failure of this House. It is sad that the Republicans, on the day that seven or eight people died and 200 were injured, voted to cut funding for Amtrak.

It is a shame that in the people's House—the people's House—that the people who represent the people are stuck on stupid. We need a comprehensive transportation system, and we need to stop starving Amtrak.

It is amazing that this House voted the day of the accident to cut Amtrak. It is unacceptable. This is the people's House, and the people should be in charge. To whom God has given much, much is expected, and they expect more from the people's House than what happened yesterday in this House of Representatives.

[From the New York Times, May 13, 2015]

AMTRAK CRASH AND AMERICA'S DECLINING CONSTRUCTION SPENDING

(By David Leonhardt)

Investigators into the Amtrak crash in Philadelphia are focusing on excess speed, but there is a related issue: the overall condition of Amtrak and the nation's infrastructure. One of the reasons that American trains should not travel 100 miles an hour in many places is that the state of our rail system—like the state of our bridges, highways and airports—is not good.

Many airports here look dilapidated relative to those in Asia and Europe. Roads are choked with traffic. The fastest train from Boston to Washington takes about six and a half hours. The fastest train from Paris to Marseille—a slightly longer distance—takes just over three hours.

The train that derailed on Tuesday was thought to be traveling at least 100 miles an

hour—twice the speed limit on that section of track. That is about half the French train's average speed on the trip from Paris to Marseille. (Reuters has also reported that the section of the track where the crash occurred lacked advanced braking technology designed to prevent derailments.)

Much of the problem of crumbling infrastructure has existed for years. There is, however, a new development that has made things worse. The combined money that federal, state and local governments spend on construction has dropped significantly, relative to the size of the economy, in the last five years. And only part of the decline stems from the end of the stimulus program, which temporarily lifted infrastructure spending.

Such spending now represents about 1.5 percent of total economic activity, down from about 1.8 percent on average from 1993 through 2008. It's at its lowest level in at least 22 years. (A hat-tip to Joe Weisenthal, of Business Insider, who calculated this statistic in 2013, after the collapse of a bridge near Seattle.)

Lawrence Summers, the former Treasury secretary and Harvard president, sent an email to us today making an argument similar to Mr. Weisenthal's. More infrastructure spending would both make accidents less likely and bring economic benefits.

''Projections for the first half of this year now almost universally suggest the U.S. economy will have grown at an annual rate of well under 1 percent,'' Mr. Summers wrote. ''If this isn't stagnation, I wonder what would be.''

He added: ''A major infrastructure investment program would reduce long-run deferred maintenance liabilities, raise demand and G.D.P., put construction workers back to work and raise investment. Interest rates may not always be as low as they are now, so it's high time to get started.''

Other Democrats have begun making similar arguments today. Many congressional Republicans have historically supported infrastructure spending as well, but have been more reluctant recently.

The Upshot provides news, analysis and graphics about politics, policy and everyday life. Follow us on Facebook and Twitter. Sign up for our weekly newsletter.

[From the New York Times, May 13, 2015]

ONE DAY AFTER WRECK, INCREASED FUNDING FOR AMTRAK FAILS IN A HOUSE PANEL

(By Michael D. Shear and Jad Mouawad)

WASHINGTON.—The bodies had not yet been fully recovered from the Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia before Capitol Hill erupted hours later into its usual partisan clash over how much money to spend on the long-struggling national rail service.

As investigators picked through the rubble on Wednesday morning, Democratic lawmakers in Washington angrily demanded an increase in Amtrak funding, calling Tuesday night's accident a result of congressional failure to support the rail system. Republicans refused, defeating the request in a morning committee hearing and accusing Democrats of using a tragedy for political reasons.

''It was beneath you,'' Representative Mike Simpson, Republican of Idaho, snapped at a Democratic colleague after the funding increase was defeated in a 30-to-21 vote.

The scene in the hearing room was a replay of the swirling politics that have threatened to consume Amtrak in the four decades since it was nationalized by the United States government. Like the rest of the country's crumbling public infrastructure, its aging rail beds and decades-old trains are sagging under increased use, especially in the Northeast, where nearly three-quarters of all travel takes place on the trains, not on planes.

And the immediate political rancor foreshadowed another fight to come soon: whether Congress will delay a mandate to install equipment that would have automatically reduced the speed of Northeast Regional train No. 188. The deadline for installing the system, called positive train control, is the end of 2015, but Congress is considering extending the deadline to 2020 at the urging of freight and passenger rail systems that say the costs could rise to $10 billion.

Senator Richard Blumenthal, Democrat of Connecticut, said in a statement on Wednesday that delaying the technology ''only leads to preventable and predictable tragedy.''

Investigators said they were examining the speed of the derailed Amtrak train, which they said was going 106 miles an hour on a stretch of track where the speed limit was half that. But they said no firm conclusion had been reached on what caused the derailment.

Edward G. Rendell, the Democratic former governor of Pennsylvania, lashed out at Republican lawmakers on Wednesday for refusing to increase Amtrak funding. He said the requested increase of $251 million over the Republican budget of $1.14 billion could significantly improve safety by upgrading tracks and installing positive train control systems in the busiest part of the system. ''It is absolutely stunning to me,'' Mr. Rendell said of the funding vote. ''It shows that ideology trumps reality, and it shows that cowardice reigns in Washington. The callousness and disregard was shockingly contemporaneous.''

Representative Steve Israel, Democrat of New York, also criticized his Republican colleagues, saying they should have used the aftermath of the Amtrak accident ''as an opportunity to do the right thing, instead of sticking to their ideology.''

The Northeast Corridor is the nation's busiest rail corridor and accounts for more than a third of Amtrak's ridership. It is also the most profitable part of its national network. But some bridges, like the Portal Bridge near New York, for instance, are more than a century old and in desperate need of replacement. Trains come to a crawl when they travel through Baltimore's 100-year-old tunnel. Some parts of the tracks still have wooden ties.

Meanwhile, the Acela—Amtrak's high-speed train that runs between Washington and Boston—can reach its top speed only in a handful of places. On a 30-mile stretch near Cranston, R.I., for example, the Acela speeds up to 150 m.p.h. About five minutes later, it needs to slow down.

''These trains have to be thought of as a national asset,'' said Rosabeth Moss Kanter, a professor at the Harvard Business School. ''Amtrak is a political whipping boy for Congress. But how much is it going to take to wake up Congress that this stuff has to be invested in? It is aging, it is not properly maintained.''

Amtrak has its passionate supporters, including Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr., who often joins many lawmakers who race to Union Station for a quick trip home. But the rail system also has many detractors, who say its annual losses are a drain on the public treasury. Many argue that privatization of the rail lines would improve service, cut costs and create innovation that could rival the gleaming train systems in Japan, China and across Europe.

Representative John L. Mica, Republican of Florida, is pushing a plan to privatize the improvement of Amtrak's system in the Northeast region. He said that the rail system needed money for improvements, but that lawmakers did not trust Amtrak to spend it well.

''What they own is poorly maintained and outdated infrastructure,'' Mr. Mica said. But he added, ''They don't have the trust of Congress to get substantial money because they've not spent the money well that they've gotten.''

''When you give them money, they squander it,'' he said.

In the meantime, however, Amtrak's funding is failing to catch up to its ridership, which peaked at 32 million last year, up nearly 50 percent since 2000. In 2014, its latest fiscal year, Amtrak lost $1 billion with revenue of $3.2 billion.

''Amtrak has really suffered from congressional schizophrenia over funding levels,'' said Ray LaHood, the Republican former member of Congress who served as President Obama's first secretary of transportation.

Mr. LaHood said much of the blame rested with lawmakers who came to Washington from states where Amtrak does not run. ''They think Amtrak is just the easy place to cut,'' he said, adding that he had little optimism that anything would change without pressure from voters during election time.

''All Americans should be concerned that there is no vision,'' Mr. LaHood said. ''There is no plan. There is no courage for taking up what needs to be done in terms of fully funding infrastructure. We are limping along.''

Since the passage of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, as Amtrak is officially called, is the only provider of national passenger rail service in the country.

Successive Amtrak chief executives—there have been six since 2002—contend with a dual mandate: to provide a public service while also trying to make money, which has proved an impossible task, Ms. Kanter said. Her latest book, ''Move: Putting America's Infrastructure Back in the Lead,'' addresses the importance of investing in transportation infrastructure.

''We have to do something big instead of just repairing. We need to repair, of course, but we have to reinvent, too, because the whole model is broken,'' she said. ''We don't want to be stuck with the same crummy, shabby system after we fix Philadelphia. We have to do something more, and better.''

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been quite an eventful week. We have taken up many things, and I couldn't be more proud of my friend from Texas, Chairman THORNBERRY.

He has done tremendous work on the National Defense Authorization and is to be applauded for trying to prevent the military from being weakened further than the sequester has already made it.

One of the bills that we took up and passed today was the Iran Nuclear

Agreement Review Act, and I am anal enough I will get these bills and read them, so that is what I did.

Amazingly, the first paragraph—of course, this bill came to us from the Senate as the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, and many of us had concerns about it, but I didn't realize that the actual title of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act was—and this is the opening paragraph of the bill:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives, H.R. 1191, entitled ''An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act,'' do pass with the following.

That is what it is. It is an IRS bill to adjust the Affordable Care Act, and it is hard for me to use those words ''Affordable Care Act'' because it is anything but affordable. It has cost people their insurance, their doctors, their health, their health insurance. It is laughable to call it affordable.

Nonetheless, this is a bill to attempt to amend the Affordable Care Act; and, Mr. Speaker, you might wonder, wait a minute, I thought you said this was the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act—well, exactly. It is an IRS bill to fix this exception for emergency services volunteers that they not be considered under the Affordable Care Act.

Then we go to the Senate bill. This is like the Affordable Care Act because they take a House bill that is intended for one purpose, delete, beginning with line 1, page 1, delete everything in it, and then make it the Iran Nuclear Review Act—talk about democracy in action, really impressive. They strip out everything to do with making the ObamaCare bill better and, instead, replace it with the Iran Nuclear Review Act.

There were a few dozen of us that had major concerns about it. First of all, we had already heard that this bill was going to turn the Constitution upside down. The constitutional requirements for a treaty—what is a treaty? It is an agreement between one country and another. The President has authority to negotiate those agreements.

Then, under the Constitution, if we still care about the Constitution, then that treaty has to go before the Senate and get two-thirds of the votes of the Senators; otherwise, that treaty means nothing, and it is not binding.

It doesn't matter what the President or the executive branch or the Secretary of State call that agreement, that treaty; it is a treaty between one country and another. For purposes of the Constitution, it should go before the Senate for ratification.

But Congress has gotten so used to this President just ignoring it, so used to the Justice Department saying: We don't care what you are requesting. We are not going to give you any of those documents or any of the information.

We have gotten so used to that, we said, okay, we will pass a bill that will force the administration to let Congress know what is going on, even though we are going to flip the Constitution upside down and go from requiring, as the Constitution does, a vote of 67 Senators in order to ratify a treaty, or agreement, with a foreign country, and we are going to go with requiring 67 Senators to vote it down, completely reversing the constitutional requirement, but we will make it better because we will add a requirement that the House has to have two-thirds vote, get 290 votes, to vote it down, but at least this way, Congress gets to be a player and gets to know what is going on.

What is it that is in this bill that will teach the executive branch a lesson about why you don't mess with Congress? It is in here, and it is actually at page 8. It is entitled—number 5, on page 8—''Limitation on actions during congressional reconsideration of a joint resolution of disapproval.''

So here we are, the President supposedly under this bill will send the agreement that he wants Congress to see, kind of like the trade act that they classified and we hadn't gotten all of it, but we are going to vote on it anyway, it makes no sense; but for those of us that are anal enough to want to read these things before we pass them, this has got to have enough teeth that it will teach the President a lesson if he dares to betray us and not give us what we need in order to make a proper determination.

The structure is both the House and Senate under this bill, this Affordable Care Act bill—now Iran Nuclear Review Act—we get the chance to strike that down if we can come up with two-thirds votes in both the House and the Senate.

What happens, what is the meat, what is the real teeth in this bill that will teach the President and the entire State Department a lesson if they mess with us and we vote in the House and the Senate two-thirds to disapprove it?

Well, here it is. If a joint resolution of disapproval passes both Houses of Congress and the President vetoes such joint resolution—wow, people forgot that even though we are going to give ourselves the opportunity to vote with two-thirds to strike it down, if he vetoes that, here is the real punishing aspect for the President who many of us believe has been violating the law by loosening sanctions that were put in place by Congress.

You are not supposed to be able to change the law unilaterally when Congress and another President has passed and signed law into being, but the sanctions are there, duly passed, signed into law.

Well, this says, here it is, this will teach him a lesson. If the disapproval passes both Houses of Congress and the President vetoes such joint resolution—here it is, ''the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a)''—here it is—for a period of 10 days.

If the President has been violating the law, as some of us believe, by lifting sanctions that he doesn't have authority to lift and we come along and the House and Senate disapprove the treaty with Iran and he vetoes that treaty—here is the lesson—he can't illegally lift sanctions against Iran for 10 whole days—10 calendar days. It says 10 calendar days.

□ 2145

Man, that is going to teach him a lesson. This is a powerful bill that will teach the President that you don't mess with Congress. If you loosen the sanctions that the law put in place, why, we will pass another bill that says you can't do it for 10 whole days, and that is what we did here.

Now, on page 9, we have got ''the effect of congressional action with respect to nuclear agreements with Iran.'' It is a sense of Congress.

B says: ''It is a sense of Congress that these negotiations are a critically important matter of national security and foreign policy for the United States and its closest allies.''

Then C: ''This section does not require a vote by Congress for the agreement to commence.'' That is helpful.

Anyway, that ''these negotiations are a critically important matter of national security and foreign policy for the United States and its closest allies'' is interesting. I don't really agree with that because the way I see this agreement, Mr. Speaker, is it has been drug out for months and, apparently, for years. I know friends at Judicial Watch have tried to get what are supposed to be public documents—those are the travel logs for Valerie Jarrett—so we can find out when she first started flying over to Iran to start negotiations and open up the dialogue with Iran. It would be nice to know.

Most of us on both sides of the aisle staunchly agree that Israel is a very dear friend and ally. What this negotiation has meant is that—and Israel understands this—if President Obama and John Kerry and Wendy Sherman, who is the lady who gave North Korea nukes, are negotiating with Iran and are telling the world, ''Oh, we have got a deal. We are nearly at a deal. We have almost got one worked out'' and Iran is saying, ''We have got no deal. We haven't agreed to any of that. That is not true,'' then it doesn't matter what Iran is saying. If the United States' leaders are saying, ''We are getting close to a deal, and we have almost got a deal,'' if Israel does the

right thing by Israel and attacks Iran's nuclear capability and takes it out as best they can without our best bunker buster and without our best planes to deliver it—they would probably need two or three sorties to take out four—if they actually do the self-defense process of hitting Iran, then this administration would be able to unite the world against Israel—call them warmongers, call them all kinds of things—because, ''Oh, gee, we almost had a deal with Iran. Yes, they have been dragging this out for 2 years or so, but we nearly had a deal. Oh, don't pay any attention to Iran's saying we didn't have a deal. We were so close to having a deal. Therefore, Israel is a bunch of warmongers. Therefore, the whole world and the U.N. should punish them.''

That is what Israel, I believe, understands that this deal means regardless of whether a deal is ever reached, and I wouldn't put it past this administration to agree to keep dragging it out and dragging it out for the rest of this President's administration. It is, certainly, in Iran's interests because they are continuing to enrich uranium, and nothing has slowed them down. As we know now, they are not even letting anybody at the IAEA examine all of their facilities. Forget the openness that this administration says they are going to get.

I think the bottom line of this bill that we passed today and that the Senate passed also is that we are going to ignore the President's and the executive branch's illegal actions in lifting the sanctions they are not entitled to lift if he will be kind enough to allow Congress to think about the sanctions some more and if he will give us information on how things are going in Iran. I mean, there is a requirement here for 30 days within which they have got to give us notice unless they think that is not enough time, and then they would give us 60-days notice. They have to give us a semiannual report. Every 6 months, we will find out what is going on.

The thing that concerns me, of course—one of many things—is that I have been asking for the documents that the Justice Department gave to people who were convicted of supporting terrorism in the Holy Land Foundation trial. The conviction occurred in November 2008. As part of the discovery in that prosecution, they were given massive numbers of documents from the FBI and from the Justice Department that they had obtained about radical Islam here in the United States. They gave it to the convicted terrorists. We now know they are convicted of supporting terrorism, and they got all of those documents.

When Eric Holder tells me in a hearing, basically, that there may be some classification issues, you gave them to terrorists, for heaven's sake. Don't you think you can afford to give them to Members of Congress so we can see what the evidence was that you had? For heaven's sake. They have not given us the information on that. They have obfuscated about the Fast and Furious evidence. They have covered up evidence in the administration about the IRS conspiracy to prevent conservative groups from raising money like the liberal groups were so that the Republicans would have a better chance in the 2012 election.

Now, this bill says we haven't been able to trust them on any of these other things, but we are going to trust them on this. We are going to trust Iran to let us have a full review of everything they are doing even though they have never done that before, and we are going to trust this administration for the first time in 6½ years to start giving us full information about what is going on. Some might think that is a little foolhardy, and I would be one of those.

Here at the bottom of page 17: ''If the President, in his own determination, decides he is able to make the certification required,'' then he will do that.

Nice. Real nice.

Page 18 is another sense of Congress: ''The United States sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place'' under an agreement.

Of course, that is unless the President wants to ignore this like he has been ignoring the sanctions already; but you can't forget that language on page 8. By golly, if he vetoes a bill, disapproving and if he can't lift sanctions, he has got to quit doing that illegal stuff for 10 full days.

Now, it does say at the bottom of page 18: ''The President should determine the agreement in no way compromises the commitment of the United States to Israel's security.'' It says he ''should'' do that, but it doesn't say he ''shall'' or he ''must.''

The good news is on page 19: Expedited Consideration of Legislation. ''In the event,'' as it says here, ''the President does not submit a certification with all of the information that is required,'' like he has ignored on lots of other things we have requested or at least the executive branch has, then we are going to introduce legislation—it says right here—''within 60 calendar days'' of his not following the law.

It is going to go quickly to the House floor and the Senate floor. That is on page 21. We are going to get it to the floor quickly.

Page 22: ''Qualifying legislation shall be considered as read.''

So we are going to get here quickly, and we are going to waive points of order against whatever legislation it might be. It may be that, if we really get our spines stiffened and we pass legislation that extends that 10-day period where he can't lift sanctions like he has been doing, maybe we will extend that to 20 days and really show him that he can't mess with Congress.

Yes, for the liberals who might someday read the transcript of this, Mr. Speaker, I am being sarcastic. Liberals have trouble understanding sarcasm sometimes, but this is a very, very deadly serious issue.

Iran has shown they can't be trusted about anything. The Ayatollah cannot be trusted. For heaven's sake, Jimmy Carter decided the other Ayatollah—the first Ayatollah Khomeini—was a man of peace. He welcomed him for the first time in a century or so—well, not quite a century—to let a radical Islamist take over a country's military, and as a result, Americans have died in the last 35 years, 36 years, and I am afraid more will.

It is ridiculous to play footsie with Iran. They only know one thing, and that is power. I read the statements by one of the Iranian military leaders who said they welcome war with America, and it clicked. I remember somebody in the Saddam Hussein regime saying the same thing and that, if we tried to do anything, it would be the mother of all wars. It was amazing because we moved faster and further than any military has ever moved in the history of the world. Mistakes were made, absolutely, but the American military could put Iran in its place very quickly—and should—before they get nuclear weapons and hundreds or thousands or millions of people die.

There is one thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, before time runs out. We took up this week the USA FREEDOM Act. Actually, there are some very good things in here. Again, I just felt I have to read the bill. Sorry if that bothers some of my friends.

For example, one of the things that was heralded as a great accomplishment, we found out from Snowden that the FISA courts had just not really issued constitutional orders or warrants—no specificity—just an order saying, for example: Verizon, give the government every record on every caller you have in your records. Give it all to the government.

I would submit that is unconstitutional, and when we found out the FISA court did it, it was outrageous to me. That is not probable caution. That is not specificity. There are all kinds of problems there, and this bill was going to try to address that.

On page 35, one of the things that was heralded was—and it is a good idea—to create amicus curiae, which is a group of lawyers who will represent those people who have records that are being sought even though those people don't know that their records are being sought.

It says in title IV, section 401, that the judges shall designate not fewer than five individuals to be eligible to serve as amicus curiae—or friends of the court—to represent those interests.

The trouble is—it says down here at the bottom of page 35—that the court shall appoint these lawyers and individuals who serve as amicus curiae to assist in any application if, in the opinion of the court, the government is presenting a novel or a significant interpretation of the law.

That means they are not going to be there to protect the civil rights of people whose records are being obtained, as they were under the FISA orders previously, unconstitutionally, because the court can just decide, no, this is not a novel interpretation, so we are not going to take it up. Then, even if it is a novel or a significant interpretation, it says: ''unless the court issues a written finding that such appropriation is not appropriate.''

If you just look over at page 40, it tells you the government can discuss on an ex parte basis—that is without the other side's being present—to the court. So they can tell the court we don't want the amicus curiae here on this issue. That is just one of so many major, major loopholes.

We found out in the summer of 2007 there were perhaps 3,000 cases with the national security letters—the IG determined this—where FBI agents just sent out national security letters, demanding records. There was no case; there was no probable cause; and it was a crime if the people from whom the records were sought revealed that to friends.

We thought that would be tightened up a little bit. It still says in here that the only people who can authorize what basically is a warrant is the FBI Director himself or herself, or he can designate his deputy, but nobody lower than that other than any special agent in charge anywhere in the country, which was the problem that we ran into in 2007 with all of the abuses.

There is still a lot of reason not to feel comfortable that people's rights are going to be protected in the FISA courts. I am not comfortable with the FISA courts anymore, but, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time to point this out.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 665. An act to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 112. An act to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 15, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1469. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Homeownership Counseling Organizations Lists and High-Cost Mortgage Counseling Interpretive Rule (RIN: 3170-AA52) received April 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1470. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on the authorization and construction of the Jacksonville Harbor Project in Duval County, Florida, for the purpose of deep draft navigation, pursuant to Public Law 113-121, Sec. 7002(1)8; (H. Doc. No. 114—37); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. Supplemental report on H.R. 1806. A bill to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–107, Pt. 2).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; with an amendment (Rept. 114–113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1907. A bill to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 114–114, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Homeland Security, Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1907 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2315. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2316. A bill to generate dependable economic activity for counties and local governments containing National Forest System land by establishing a demonstration program for local, sustainable forest management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2317. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a lifetime income disclosure; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 2318. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2319. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MULVANEY (for himself, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 2320. A bill to provide access to and use of information by Federal agencies in order to reduce improper payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2321. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for innovative teacher retention programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2322. A bill to reduce costs of Federal real estate, improve building security, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 2323. A bill to enhance the missions, objectives, and effectiveness of United States international communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 2324. A bill to provide for the conveyance of small parcels of National Forest System land and small parcels of public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management to private landowners, State, county, and local governments, or Indian tribes whose lands share a boundary with the National Forest System land or public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 2325. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a pharmaceutical and technology ombudsman under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2326. A bill to provide for oversight of, and place restrictions on, Federal programs that provide equipment to law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. COOK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 2327. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BLUM, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 2328. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act relating to lead-based paint renovation and remodeling activities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2329. A bill to ensure appropriate judicial review of Federal Government actions by amending the prohibition on the exercise of jurisdiction by the United States Court of Federal Claims of certain claims pending in other courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2330. A bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BUCK, Mr. COOK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 2331. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to prohibit the use of benefits to purchase marijuana products, to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to prohibit assistance provided under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families from being accessed through the use of an electronic benefit transfer card at any store that offers marijuana for sale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2332. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a transformational infrastructure competitive grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2333. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2334. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require individuals to include their social security numbers on the income tax return as a condition of claiming the refundable portion of the child tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2335. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to incentivize the development of abuse-deterrent drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2336. A bill to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, relating to protective orders, sealing of cases, disclosures of discovery information in civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2337. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize priority review for breakthrough devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2338. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the development and use of patient experience data to enhance the structured risk-benefit assessment framework, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2339. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the treatment of lottery winnings and other lump sum income for purposes of income eligibility under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2340. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to remove regulatory barriers to the re-exportation of controlled substances among members of the European Economic Area; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. DOLD, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2341. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide that the President's annual budget submission to Congress list the current fiscal year spending level for each proposed program and a separate amount for any proposed spending increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2342. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2343. A bill to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to modify a high priority project in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 2344. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the vocational rehabilitation programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2345. A bill to extend the date after which interest earned on obligations held in the wildlife restoration fund may be available for apportionment; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2346. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BERA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr.

DENT, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HAHN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LANCE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HONDA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.J. Res. 52. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures with respect to Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. TROTT):

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution recognizing the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the establishment of Fort Michilimackinac on the Straits of Mackinac, and its importance to the people of Michigan and the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PITTS:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the National Institutes of Health should encourage a global pediatric clinical trial network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 262. A resolution supporting the practice of community-oriented policing and encouraging diversity hiring and retention in law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FARR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 263. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 264. A resolution expressing support for Lunchtime Music on the Mall in the Nation's capital to benefit the District of Columbia and regional residents as well as visitors and honor the public service of the performers and partners; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan:

H.R. 2315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 2320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to ''make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper'' to provide for the ''general Welfare'' of Americans. In the Department of Education Organization Act (P.L. 96–88), Congress declared that ''the establishment of a Department of Education is in the public interest, will promote the general welfare of the United States, will help ensure that education issues receive proper treatment at the Fedral level, and will enable the Federal Government to coordinate its educatioon activities more effectively.''

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and clause 17 (relating to authority over the district as the seat of government), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. ROYCE:
H.R. 2323.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. AMODEI:
H.R. 2324.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).
By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:
H.R. 2325.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States
By Mr. CLAY:
H.R. 2326.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Commerce Clause Article I, section 8
By Mr. COSTA:
H.R. 2327.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. CRAMER:
H.R. 2328.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. DESANTIS:
H.R. 2329.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in article I, section 8, clause 9; article III, section 1, clause 1; and article III, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.
By Mr. DEUTCH:
H.R. 2330.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 2331.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This legislation is constitutionally appropriate pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 (the Spending Clause). The Supreme Court, in South Dakota v. Dole (1987), reasoned that conditions and limitations on funds were constitutional and within the power of Congress under the Spending Clause. Thus, conditioning receipt of federal funds in order to direct appropriate spending goals and purposes are constitutionally permissible. As long as the spending is on ''the general welfare'' (i.e. national in scope) and the condition is clear, and related to the program being funded, the limitation is constitutional.
By Mr. HIGGINS:
H.R. 2332.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:
H.R. 2333.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).
By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:
H.R. 2334.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. KEATING:
H.R. 2335.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. NADLER:
H.R. 2336.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clauses 9 and 18 of section 8 of article I and section 1 of article III of the Constitution.
By Mr. PITTS:
H.R. 2337.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. PITTS:
H.R. 2338.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. PITTS:
H.R. 2339.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. PITTS:
H.R. 2340.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. SCHRADER:
H.R. 2341.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. 1, §1; and
U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 18.
By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 2342.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:
H.R. 2343.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and
Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. WENSTRUP:
H.R. 2344.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. WITTMAN:
H.R. 2345.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.
By Mr. WITTMAN:
H.R. 2346.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.
By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.J. Res. 52.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article V—Amendment. The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.
By Mr. YARMUTH:
H.J. Res. 53.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article V of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 91: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BARTON, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 140: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 221: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 224: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 225: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 226: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 249: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 271: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROSS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 313: Mr. KILMER and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 343: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 451: Mr. CARTER of Texas and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 467: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 472: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 539: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WILSON

of Florida, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 556: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 572: Mr. PETERS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 577: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 578: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 588: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 602: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 649: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 654: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 662: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 667: Mr. BEYER and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 699: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 721: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 746: Ms. ESTY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 750: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 767: Mr. PERRY, Mr. LONG, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 774: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 775: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 776: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 784: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 793: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 828: Mr. KIND, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 836: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BABIN, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 845: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 910: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 920: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 927: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 942: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 986: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 999: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1002: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. Roby, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TROTT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1062: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BABIN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1069: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1133: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1174: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1185: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1202: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1218: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1220: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BABIN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1247: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1266: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1300: Mr. KEATING, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1301: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 1312: Mr. WALZ, Mr. POLIS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. BERA, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1338: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1342: Mr. KILMER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MIMES, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1369: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1371: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1375: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1378: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 1413: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, M. RIBBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1415: Mr. HASTINGS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1427: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1434: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1439: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1475: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 1476: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1496: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1517: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1528: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1546: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1555: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1559: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1567: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1587: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1600: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1602: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1603: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1604: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1610: Ms. GRAHAM and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 1635: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1655: Mr. KIND, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1674: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1677: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1684: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1706: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1714: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1718: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1728: Mr. SARBANES and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1734: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1737: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. OLSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1743: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1752: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1763: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1773: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1779: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1784: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1789: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1818: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1832: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1834: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1846: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1853: Ms. FOXX, Mr. COOK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PERRY, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1855: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1858: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1882: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1901: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1919: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1924: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1932: Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1943: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1974: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1977: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1981: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1992: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 2017: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 2025: Mr. HASTINGS and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2031: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2050: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2058: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 2061: Mr. JOYCE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2076: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2100: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2114: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2126: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 2137: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2138: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2149: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2156: Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2186: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2189: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2192: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2193: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2205: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 2215: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2226: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2233: Mr. AMASH, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BUCK, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 2237: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 2238: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2240: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2257: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2259: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2272: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2274: Mr. NEAL and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2277: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2280: Mr. KIND and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2297: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Ms. MENG, Mr. COOK, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 2298: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2300: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2302: Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2305: Mr. GOWDY.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.J. Res. 51: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 12: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. BOST.

H. Res. 54: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H. Res. 56: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 128: Mr. PITTENGER.

H. Res. 193: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H. Res. 216: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H. Res. 228: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 246: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 251: Mr. VEASEY.

H. Res. 261: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SERRANO.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I voted against this re-vamped version of H.R. 36, the ''Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.'' This act is both dangerous and unconstitutional and violates the rights of women to an abortion. By allowing this act to become law, we are limiting the reproductive rights for all women in this nation.

H.R. 36 is blatantly unconstitutional, as it bans abortions after the twenty week mark. This bill is in clear violation of more than 40 years of Supreme Court precedent that protect women's access to abortion prior to viability—that is prior to twenty-four NOT twenty weeks.

This bill provides fake fixes that make it worse than the first version of this bill. This bill requires sexual assault victims seeking abortion services after twenty weeks to provide written proof that they obtained counseling or medical treatment for their sexual assault. This bill also requires a minor, who is an incest victim and who seeks abortion services after twenty weeks, to provide written proof that the crime was reported to law enforcement or a government agency.

Forcing sexual assault victims and minor incest victims to report their rape is bad enough, but this bill gets even more dangerous because it requires doctors who provide abortion services after twenty weeks to publicly disclose, to the government, the location of where care was provided. In light of Americans' easy access to guns and explosive materials, this provision would endanger many lives. This is a nightmare waiting to happen—a nightmare that I refuse to take part in supporting.

We cannot allow a woman's right to choose to be infringed upon by a minority of people in this nation. We cannot let them bully the rest of the country into accepting their worldview. I stand with women, which is why I opposed H.R. 36.

WATER SAFETY AWARENESS MONTH

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the month of May is Water Safety Awareness Month. Swimming and other water recreational activities are very popular among Americans of all ages. As the warm summer months approach, we should work to ensure the public is educated on the most up-to-date water safety practices so that these activities remain a safe way to exercise and enjoy recreation.

A local chapter of the Independent Pool and Spa Service Association is hosting a safe swimming event in San Antonio, Texas, on May 16, 2015. This event will serve to educate 4th grade students at Baskin Elementary School on the importance of water safety and to teach them safe swimming practices. I want to recognize their efforts and encourage all Texans to learn about and follow proper water safety measures.

RECOGNIZING SOUTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM FOR ITS 50TH YEAR OF HELPING COMBAT POVERTY IN PENNSYLVANIA

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the South Central Community Action Program (SCCAP) on the occasion of their 50th year of service to communities in Franklin and Adams counties in Pennsylvania.

Community Action Agencies, which were created to carry out the Community Action Program that was established by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, have been important assets in helping reduce the effects of poverty felt around the United States. First called the Adams County Community Action Agency, SCCAP has played a critical role in bringing these support services to the underserved community members of Franklin and Adams counties.

From its beginnings as an organization run out of a two-room office, the hard-working SCCAP staff and volunteers have earned federal grant funding and organized the communities they serve to enable them to better support those in need. Later expanded to provide services to Franklin County residents, SCCAP has undergone an impressive transformation as it has continued to aid countless handicapped and underprivileged citizens in its 50 years. Despite challenges and its many changes, one thing has always stayed the same: SCCAP has been committed to helping families and underserved individuals move out of poverty since its creation.

I am privileged to not only congratulate the South Central Community Action Program, an organization that serves more than 11,000 families in Franklin County, on its 50th anniversary, but also thank the tireless SCCAP staff and volunteers for their selfless and unrelenting commitment to making the communities in their region a better place.

EMS WEEK

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand before you today to recognize emergency medical services (EMS) providers across the nation as we celebrate the week of May 17 to 23, in recognition of their significant and heroic work. During EMS week, we show our gratitude to the EMS practitioners who aid our families, friends, and neighbors in their moments of need. For their unyielding dedication to serving their communities, EMS employees are to be commended.

In recognition of this week, numerous agencies throughout the community of Northwest Indiana have come together to establish the inaugural Regional EMS Conference, presented by Prompt Ambulance Service, which will take place on May 18, 2015. The goal of this conference is to encourage collaboration among EMS providers throughout the region in order to further the development of essential skills in the EMS community.

At this time, I would like to acknowledge several individuals who have dedicated their time and efforts to make this conference possible for the advancement of the medical community. I would like to recognize Ron Donahue—Prompt Ambulance Service; Jeff Zielinski—Prompt Ambulance Service; Christina Lopez—Methodist Hospital; Janene Gumz-Pulaski—Franciscan Alliance, Michigan City; Kelley Holdren—University of Chicago Aeromedical Network; Jake Messing—Saint Catherine Behavioral Health Services; Aaron Kochar—Porter Starke Services; Joseph Ferrandino—Indiana University Northwest; Thomas Bettenhausen—Community Hospital, District 1; Craig Felty—Indiana University Health; Tom Fentress—Methodist Hospital; David Cummins—Porter Regional Hospital; and Jana Marie Szostek—Indiana University Northwest, Indiana EMS Educator Workgroup.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring our EMS providers who dedicate their lives each day to ensuring the well-being and safety of our neighborhoods. Each member of the EMS family makes every effort to provide exceptional service by doing what is right for their patients, colleagues, and communities. Through their service to so many in need throughout Northwest Indiana and across the nation, EMS providers serve as an inspiration to us all, and they are worthy of the highest praise.

TRIBUTE TO SENIOR MASTER SERGEANT ANITA MARIE SULLIVAN

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Senior Master Sergeant Anita Marie Sullivan, a native of East Syracuse, New York and currently a resident of Oneida, New York. Sergeant Sullivan has more than 38 years of military service with the United States Air Force and the New York Air National Guard. She has been decorated with numerous medals, awards, and service distinctions and will retire from military service on 1 July 2015. It is my honor to recognize such a distinguished citizen and airman.

Sergeant Sullivan was born Anita M. Mozo on 29 August 1957. She is a 1975 graduate of East Syracuse-Minoa High School. After graduating from high school, she worked full-time at the Syracuse School of Automation and subsequently the Syracuse University Department of Geology as a receptionist.

Sergeant Sullivan began her military career in the United States Air Force in January 1977, enlisting in the New York Air National Guard, and left for Basic Military Training to Lackland Air Force Base, Texas on 1 April 1977. After graduating from Basic Military Training, she began her Air Force Technical Training as an Air Passenger Specialist at Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas. Upon graduation from technical training in July 1977, she returned to Hancock Field Air National Guard Base as a Drill Status Guardsman in the Traffic Management Office, where she worked during monthly Unit Training Assembly weekends and also performed additional annual training to achieve her 3-skill level and 5-skill level as an Air Passenger Specialist, becoming the ''go to'' person on base for all airline reservations. While assigned to Hancock Field she met Master Sergeant William E. Dardis and married on 30 September 1978, becoming Sergeant Anita M. Dardis. In June 1979, she applied for and was subsequently hired as a full-time Air Technician as a GS–04 Clerk-Typist in the Supply Squadron.

In December 1979, then Sergeant Dardis was hired as a full-time Air Technician as a GS–05 Air Operations Specialist assigned to the 174th Operations Group, and began career field cross-training into the Airfield Management career field and received her 7-skill level in Air Force Specialty Codes 27171 and 27172. During her tenure in the 174th Operations Group, she participated in several unit deployments to include a two week Coronet Sail deployment as part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Checkered Flag Exercise program to Lechfeld Air Base, Germany in 1981; two deployed Operational Readiness Inspections to Savannah, Georgia in 1982 and Volk Field, Wisconsin in 1986; and also participated in unit deployments to Patrick Air Force Base, Florida in 1983 and Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona in 1982.

In 1982, Sergeant Dardis was assigned a position as the GS–07 Standardization/Evaluation Technician, and in 1983 began an Active Duty Title 32 tour as the Wing Standardization/Evaluation NCO. In 1989, Sergeant Dardis left her Active Duty position and transferred into the 174th Fighter Wing Safety Office as the Administrative NCO as a Duty Status Guardsman, which allowed her to spend more time at home with her two young children. In 1992 Sergeant Dardis attended the 7-level in-residence technical school for the 3A071 Air Force Specialty Course at Keesler AFB, Mississippi, and earned the distinction of being named the class leader. She maintained her position in the Wing Safety Office until 1995. Sergeant Dardis performed additional duty at Hancock Field Air National Guard Base in 1990 and 1991 when the 174th Fighter Wing was called to Federal Active Service in support of Operation DESERT SHIELD and Operation DESERT STORM, backfilling various positions in the 174th Operations Group for NCO's who deployed with the aircrew package in support of the Persian Gulf War.

In Nov 1995, Sergeant Dardis was asked by the acting Wing and Vice Commanders to take the position of the Commander's Executive Assistant as a temporary technician. In March 1996, she was hired into the position as a permanent GS–06 Air Technician. In April 1999, the position was upgraded to a GS–07 and advertised as an Active Guard/Reserve active duty position which she applied for and was hired for as the Executive Assistant to the Wing Commander. She served in this position working directly for Wing Commanders Colonel Robert A. Knauff from 1996 to 2003; Colonel Anthony Basile from 2003–2008; Colonel Kevin Bradley from 2008–2012; and for Colonel Greg Semmel from 2008 until her retirement on 1 July 2015.

In June 2006, Sergeant Dardis became a widow when her husband, Master Sergeant (Retired) William E. Dardis passed away unexpectedly. In January 2009, she remarried to Master Sergeant (Retired) John D. Sullivan and became Master Sergeant Anita M. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan retired from the 174th in 2003 and is currently employed at Hancock Field as a New York State employee as the Base Carpenter.

In 2007, Sergeant Sullivan completed the Senior Noncommissioned Officer Academy Course. In 2010 she was reassigned to the military position of the Cyber Systems Superintendent and promoted to the rank of Senior Master Sergeant. That same year she attended the Air Force Protocol Fundamentals Course at Maxwell AFB, Mississippi and was assigned the high profile additional duty as the 174th Fighter Wing Protocol Coordinator for high ranking distinguished visitor arrivals and numerous protocol events for the 174th Fighter Wing. During her tenure in this position, Sergeant Sullivan played an integral part in the planning and execution of countless high level Distinguished Visitor visits, numerous Change of Command Ceremonies, Wing Commander Farewell Receptions, Retirement Ceremonies, F–16 aircraft Farewell, F–86 aircraft static display dedication, Military Funerals, unit re-designation ceremony, as well as numerous community events involving the Salvation Army, American Red Cross, and various Veteran's Service Organizations, and various other community organizations.

Sergeant Sullivan's military Decorations include the Meritorious Service Medal; the Air Force Commendation Medal; and Air Force Achievement Medal. Her military service awards include the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with five oak leaf clusters; the Air Reserve Forces Meritorious Service Medal with eleven oak leaf clusters; the National Defense Service Medal with one bronze service star; the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; the Air Force Longevity Service Ribbon with eight oak leaf clusters; the Armed Forces Reserve Medal with gold hourglass and mobilization ''M'' device; and the Air Force Training Ribbon.

Sergeant Sullivan also holds the following New York State awards and decorations: New York State Long and Faithful Service Award, with one gold and one silver device; the New York State Defense of Liberty Medal; New York State Medal for Merit with one silver shield device; New York State Recruiting Medal; New York State Exercise Support Ribbon; and the New York State Physical Fitness Ribbon with two silver shield devices.

In addition to the previously mentioned awards and decorations, Sergeant Sullivan was also named the 174th Fighter Wing's Outstanding Noncommissioned Officer of the Quarter in December 1984, and the 174th Fighter Wing's Outstanding Unit Career Advisor of the Quarter in July 1985.

Sergeant Sullivan was promoted to Airman in 1977; Airman First Class in 1978; Sergeant in 1979; Staff Sergeant in 1980; Technical Sergeant in 1982; Master Sergeant in 1996; and her current rank of Senior Master Sergeant in 2010.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Sullivan is a very special person. She willingly served her nation, exuding loyalty and pride. For her unrelenting service and dedication to duty, Sergeant Sullivan can retire knowing she has earned such a status. I would like to wish Sergeant Sullivan well in her retirement years as she will now be able to spend more free time with her husband John, daughter Katelin Dardis, son and daughter-in-law Christopher and Amy Dardis, stepsons Daniel, Ryan, and Evan Sullivan, and granddaughter Ryleigh Dardis. Your late father Casper Mozo and your mother Margery (Burbank) Mozo can be proud of your service and accomplishments. Sergeant Sullivan, thank you for all your years of hard work, dedication and service to our country.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR FRED BROUSSARD

HON. GWEN GRAHAM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Major Fred Broussard upon the occasion of his retirement after 29 years of honorable service to our great Nation in the United States Air Force and Air Force Reserve.

Major Broussard began his career in 1986, upon graduation of Basic Personnel School, as a Distinguished Graduate. He was then assigned to Hurlburt Field, where in 1990, as a recognized expert in the Personnel career field, he was selected to facilitate the stand-up

of the Headquarters Squadron Section for Headquarters Air Force Special Operations Command (HQ AFSOC) and was nominated and selected as the Military Personnel Technician of the Year for 1990 and 1991; and deployed as the sole SOF representative of the Personnel Support for Contingency Operations team during OPERATION DESERT STORM. He was selected as a member of the USAF ''Thunderbird'' Team in 1993, where he served as the Assignments NCO until his separation from active duty in 1995.

After leaving active duty, he immediately entered the Air Force Reserve where he served as a Traditional Reservist and Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) in a variety of assignments. After nearly 15-years in the enlisted ranks, he earned his commission as an officer in April 2001. He was brought to Washington D.C. at the U.S. Air Force Headquarters, Pentagon in 2006 where he has served in three directorates filling numerous positions.

Throughout his myriad of assignments in the Pentagon, Major Broussard's ceaseless efforts and devotion to duty resulted in several accomplishments to include; successful articulation of the Air Force Reserve in the crafting of the Department of Defense policy on Active Duty for Operational Support and the Department of the Air Force policy for the Post Deployment-Mobilization Respite Absence; crafting the first ever game plan for the creation of the Air Force Reserve General Officer Vacancy Promotion Board, leading the nomination process, whereby shortening the timeline from nomination to Senate confirmation; building the foundation and ensuring the implementation of consolidated Full-Time support guidance; crafting revised promotion processes encompassing all three components of the Air Force in keeping with the implementation of the Under Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs initiative to consolidate personnel programs; pioneering the institutionalizing statute-required process for release of promotion results, which were adopted by the Chief of Air Force Reserve, Chief of the Air National Guard and the General Counsel for the Secretary of the Air Force.

Major Broussard's final role began in July 2012, as the AFR Program Manager for Legislative proposals, Office of Reserve Policy Integration, in direct support of the Chief of Air Force Reserve. In this position, Major Broussard played an integral role in proactively engaging Congress as he developed and defended legislation required to enact needed policy changes.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress and a grateful Nation, I extend our deepest appreciation of Major Joseph Fred Broussard for his many years of dedicated service. There is no question that the Air Force, Department of Defense, and the United States benefitted greatly from Major Broussard's visionary leadership, planning, and foresight, and we wish him and his wife, Elaine the very best.

HONORING J'MYIAH SMITH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a goal oriented student at Quitman County Middle School.

J'Myiah Smith is the daughter of Ms. Teresa Smith of Sledge, MS. She is a very intelligent individual, and she is an outstanding student because she continues to strive to maintain a spot on the Superintendent's List. Among her outstanding grades, J'Myiah was also elected as Miss Seventh Grade 2014–2015 by her peers. She is an active member of the Quitman County Middle School Student Council, Newspaper Committee, and QCMS S.T.E.F. Ambassador Society.

J'Myiah is active in her community as well. On this past year, she participated in the ''I Support the Bond'' meetings and marches. She has collected clothes and donated them to the needy. She is also a member of her church's youth choir. J'Myiah plans to attend Jackson State University and later attend medical school.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing J'Myiah Smith as a student who is goal oriented and making a difference in her community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 2015, I traveled to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to be with the health care providers, first responders, and volunteers working to restore peace and safety to the scene of Amtrak Northeast Regional Train 188's derailment. For this reason, unfortunately, I missed some important votes on the floor of the House of Representatives, including H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act. If I were present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall 224.

PEGGY PICKENS—TEACHER, COUNSELOR AND COMMUNITY WARRIOR

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Peggy Pickens has served as a pillar of the greater Humble/Kingwood community for over thirty-five years, devoting herself to her family, church, and school communities. A native Houstonian, Mrs. Pickens graduated from Phyllis Wheatley High School in the historic Fifth Ward, going on to earn a degree in education from the University of Houston in 1974 and a Master's Degree in Counseling from Prairie View A&M University. She then began her career in education as a teacher in the Aldine Independent School District at Teague Middle School, Nimitz High School, and MacArthur High School. In 1987, Mrs. Pickens joined the Counseling team at Kingwood High School, serving with true distinction until her retirement from public education in 2002.

Immediately following her first retirement, Mrs. Pickens began developing the Counseling program at Northeast Christian Academy.

During her successful tenure at NCA, Mrs. Pickens has assisted over three hundred graduating seniors earn acceptance into some of the most prestigious colleges and universities in our nation. Through the guidance of Mrs. Pickens, NCA graduates have successfully attended such schools as Stanford University, Duke, Vanderbilt, West Point, the United States Air Force Academy, Rice University, the University of Texas at Austin and Texas A&M University. Her love of students and commitment to their lifelong success has been the hallmark of her distinguished career.

Yet, not only has Mrs. Pickens invested herself into the lives of countless students, but she has faithfully served her church community at Second Baptist Church North Campus in Kingwood for over a decade. Through the teaching of various Bible studies, the mentoring of others, as well as numerous public speaking engagements, Mrs. Pickens has modeled for others the life of a servant leader in all she has done. Her influence and impact on the lives of others has been a living testimony to the work of Christ and His gospel in and through her.

Peggy Pickens and her husband Al have five children and twelve grandchildren, each of whom have continued their legacy of service to Christ, their families, our nation, and their communities. She we will be greatly missed, yet the seeds that she has sown throughout her tenure at NCA will continue to bear great fruit in the lives of the future graduates of Northeast Christian Academy.

As the husband and father of school teachers, I know that educators, like Peggy, are the backbone of our communities.

Thanks for the work you've done Peggy, best of luck in newest chapter of your life.

And that's just the way it is.

IN RECOGNITION OF OCA—ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN ADVOCATES, SACRAMENTO CHAPTER

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates, Sacramento Chapter and the distinguished leaders who are being honored at their 2015 Dragon Boat Festival and 20th anniversary gala. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring OCA Sacramento and these fine Sacramentans.

Dedicated to advancing the social, political, and economic well-being of Asian Pacific Islander Americans, OCA's Sacramento chapter

is an active advocate for all Asian Pacific Islander Americans and works diligently to develop strong leadership, community involvement and civic participation. OCA Sacramento also fosters cultural heritage by hosting a variety of annual events celebrating traditional Chinese holidays and festivals, such as the Dragon Boat Festival. The events bring together the Asian Pacific Islander American community, while also educating and sharing its heritage with our entire community. OCA Sacramento promotes education and leadership for young people by offering essay contests and scholarships, as well as internship opportunities. It is clear to me and so many others that OCA Sacramento's deep involvement and commitment to improving Sacramento is exemplary.

In keeping with their theme of ''Honoring the Past, Celebrating the Future,'' being recognized at this year's Dragon Boat Festival are past Chapter Presidents Dwanchen Hsu, Tom Bhe, Ph.D., Felix Chen, Ph.D., RungFong Hsu, Sam Ong, Linda Ng, Joyce Eng, Michael Head, and David Low. These community leaders have all dedicated their lives to improving Sacramento through their work with OCA Sacramento. All that has been accomplished by the organization would not be possible without these individuals at the forefront of their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, as the members of OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates, Sacramento Chapter gather at the Dragon Boat Festival to celebrate their 20th anniversary, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring them for their unwavering commitment to the Sacramento region.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 2015, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''YEA'' on #216. I would have voted ''NAY'' on #217 and 218. I would have voted ''YEA'' on #219 and 220.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE BRUCE REYNOLDS ALGER

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of an outstanding citizen and public servant, my former congressman, Bruce Reynolds Alger. He recently passed away in Palm Bay, Florida at the age of 96.

The Honorable Bruce Alger served the 5th District of Texas in the House of Representatives from 1955 to 1965. Congressman Alger served in a very significant time in Texas history with President Lyndon B. Johnson and Speaker Samuel T. Rayburn, both of the Lone Star State, leading the country during his tenure. He was a pioneer of his time by being the only Republican Congressman in the Texas delegation for eight years. It wasn't until his final term in Congress that he could hold a Republican meeting of Texas Representatives with more than just himself. Congressman Ed Foreman from Odessa, Texas was elected in 1963 to double the size of the Texas GOP delegation.

Congressman Alger was one of the earliest Republican members of the Texas Delegation in the mid-20th Century and the first Republican Representative from Dallas County. He fought and spoke for limited government, balanced budget, flat income tax, and many other ideals that became the basis for conservative principles for years to come. He was the eleventh Texan to be appointed to the Ways and Means committee, which I sit upon today.

Prior to being elected to Congress, he was also a distinguished veteran. Like many of the greatest generation, he answered the call to service. He served during World War II in the United States Army from 1941–1945. As a pilot, he received the Distinguished Flying Cross and attained the rank of Captain. He devoted much of his life to public service and did what he could to better our country. Congressman Alger's endless energy benefited so many who he served.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to celebrate the life of the Honorable Bruce Reynolds Alger. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating our former House colleague's remarkable life and service in Congress and to our country.

HONORING MIKE WOLF, NAPA VALLEY GROWER OF THE YEAR

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mike Wolf upon being named the Napa Valley 2015 Grower of the Year.

For more than 35 years, Mr. Wolf has been involved with developing and managing California vineyards. Michael Wolf Vineyard Services was founded in 1997, and oversees all phases of the vineyard development process for many of Napa Valley's leading independent growers, and premium and ultra-premium wineries. Mr. Wolf currently farms over 800 acres across Napa County.

Throughout his career, Mr. Wolf has been committed to innovation and the advancement of viticultural best practices in the Napa Valley. Never afraid of new ideas, he has researched and applied new technologies to continually improve the quality of the grapes that he grows. Also widely respected for his humble leadership, Mr. Wolf has graciously contributed his approach to farming and extensive experience in viticulture to the mentorship of the next generation of Napa Valley's grapegrowers.

Mr. Wolf has been a consistent and committed benefactor to his community through his patronage and support of innumerable causes and events in Napa County from the annual NVG Pruning Contest, Harvest STOMP, and the Napa Valley Farmworker Foundation to his ongoing sponsorship for the County Crop Report. As part of his contributions to the Napa Valley grape-growing community, he has served in a number of posts including Board Trustee of the California Grower Foundation since 1987, a member of the Napa Valley Viticultural Technical Group's Executive Committee, and as a professional member of the American Society of Enology and Viticulture.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor Mike Wolf for his professional and philanthropic contributions to Napa Valley. He is an invaluable asset to our district and the grape-growing community of California.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,152,446,693,102.28. We've added $7,525,569,644,189.20 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING MR. CEDRIC GARDNER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Cedric Gardner is a John F. Kennedy 9th grade student of Mound Bayou, Mississippi and is a very diligent young student who is committed to learning and being an outstanding athlete.

Prior to joining the Hornets football, baseball, basketball, cross country and track athletic programs, Cedric participated in numerous community athletic activities. Starting in 2006, he played in the Mound Bayou Mississippi Little League and Cleveland Mississippi Park Commission athletic programs.

He was selected to be included in the 2011 edition of the United States Specialty Sports Association baseball. In 2012 he was one to be selected to participate in the Down Under Sports for Cross Country Runners and participated in the World Series for youth in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Even with facing prejudice, Cedric helped lead the John F. Kennedy's Cross Country team in winning their 1 A Title in 2014.

Besides being an athlete, Cedric is also a member of The Future Business Leaders of America, Wander's Home Baptist Choir and Sunday School Records Clerk, as well as playing the drums.

Cedric is exciting, loveable and down to earth and loves to teach young youth athletics. He will always greet you with a handshake, hug or a smile. He made it his life's mission to continue the legacy of his late cousin, Coach Sank Powe, help others and encourage them that you can do anything you set your mind to.

Cedric has decided, when he graduates from high school in 2018, he will continue his education at The University of Oregon. He plans on becoming a professional Baseball Player or Coach/ Teacher.

Cedric is the son of Tabithia Gardner and his motto is: ''Stay positive and always believe in yourself.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing student.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been forty-three years since Congress passed the Equal Rights Amendment (also known as the Women's Equality Amendment). This historic amendment is intended to enshrine in our United States Constitution fundamental equality based on sex in all areas of society.

In 1972, Congress passed the ERA with a measure that it had to be ratified by the necessary number of states (38) within 7 years. The deadline was ultimately extended an additional three years, but with this narrow and arbitrary time limit, the ERA fell just three states shy of full ratification when the deadline passed. Other constitutional amendments have been afforded much longer for ratification. One example is the 27th amendment, concerning Congressional pay raises, which was accepted after a 203-year ratification period.

This Congress, I am joined by my colleague Representative CYNTHIA LUMMIS in this important bipartisan effort to finally add women to the Constitution. It is time for our nation to definitively declare that we will not tolerate discrimination against half the population. While we have made cracks in the glass ceiling throughout history, we have yet to shatter it. We believe that this amendment is far more than a symbolic demonstration of equality, but rather would provide protections that are vital to the wellbeing and prosperity of women and their families.

The ERA will ensure all citizens have the opportunity to reach their full potential. Women and men must have equal rights for a democracy to thrive.

The ERA will put women on equal footing in the legal systems of all 50 states, particularly in areas where women have historically been treated as second-class citizens, including in cases of public education, divorce, child custody, domestic violence, and sexual assault.

Passing the ERA will put the full weight of the U.S. Constitution behind employment laws relating to the prevention of sex discrimination in hiring, firing, promotions, and benefits—especially in the public sector.

Pregnancy discrimination continues to be prevalent in the workforce. The ERA can protect women from being harmed by a policy simply because she is a woman.

The 14th amendment is not enough. Only the ERA would provide for gender equity and offer an ''overriding guarantee'' of equal protection for women.

The ERA would protect the progress made on women's rights from any shifting political trends.

The ERA will ensure that the rights of American women and girls will not be diminished by any Congress or any political trend, but instead be preserved as basic rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

Over the past several decades, legislative efforts have aimed to advance the rights of women—but this progress is not irreversible. Without the ERA, women have often been denied the ability to seek justice when they have experienced discrimination. We have seen that constitutional ambiguity on women's rights can have negative consequences when cases that affect the lives of women are brought before the Supreme Court. Until women's equality is clearly acknowledged in our Constitution, half of our population will continue to be without constitutionally guaranteed equality. The time is now to make women's equality a constitutional reality.

Our democracy rests on the principle of ''liberty and justice for all.'' We need the ERA to ensure that this concept applies equally to all.

I am pleased to introduce this bill with 171 of my bipartisan colleagues. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to join in support.

OFFICER BENJAMIN DEEN

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bravery, fortitude, and sacrifice demonstrated by Officer Benjamin J. Deen, a member of the Hattiesburg Police Department, who was tragically slain in the line of duty on Saturday, the ninth day of May in the year two thousand and fifteen.

Officer Benjamin J. Deen, known as ''B. J.'', was thirty-four years old, a resident of Sumrall, Mississippi, and a graduate of Sumrall High School. He was a loving husband to his wife, Robin, and devoted father to his son Walker and daughter Melah. Prior to becoming a police officer, B. J. attended the Mississippi Fire Training Academy and served his community as a firefighter. He later attended the Hattiesburg Police Training Academy and became a patrolman with Hattiesburg Police Force. Deen soon after trained to become a K–9 officer and bonded with Tommy, his K–9 counterpart, who also became a beloved member of the family.

Together, B. J. and Tommy successfully apprehended and arrested numerous drug-related offenders. Officer Deen was not only an exceptional citizen and neighbor, but he chose to live a life of service, stepping into harm's way daily in order to protect his community.

An exceptional member of the force, Deen was named Hattiesburg Police Department's 2012 Officer of the Year. He was an outstanding and respectable man and a valuable asset to the Hattiesburg Police Department, even earning perfect attendance during two of his nearly six years on the force.

The City of Hattiesburg and the Great State of Mississippi have suffered the loss of one of our own: a family member and a protector and defender of our Constitution and laws. Every citizen deeply and sincerely feels the loss of such a devoted law enforcement officer, and his service, heroism, and sacrifice will not be forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF NORMAND DRAPEAU FOR BEING AWARDED THE CHEVALIER OF THE FRENCH LEGION OF HONOR

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize Normand Drapeau for being awarded the chevalier (knighthood) of the French Legion of Honor by the French Government for his courageous actions while serving in the United States Navy during World War II.

Normand was born on May 1, 1925 in Holyoke, Massachusetts into a large Catholic family as the oldest boy of twelve children. He attended the Immaculate Conception School for his primary education as well as spent a year at LaSalette Seminary in New Hampshire before ultimately deciding to work as a butcher at his family's business, Drapeau's Market. In 1942 on Holy Thursday when he was only seventeen, Normand enlisted in the United States Navy and was shipped off to boot camp the next day on Good Friday. After he completed amphibious training in Little Creek, Virginia and Fort Pierce, Florida, he was sent off to Dartmouth, England in preparation for the invasion of France.

However, Normand did not have to wait until D-Day to see some action. On April 27, 1944, German gunboats attacked Normand's flotilla while they were on an exercise in the English Channel. One of the blasts threw Normand into the channel but he was not seriously injured. A month later, when General Eisenhower postponed the invasion of Normandy due to poor weather conditions, Normand's Landing Craft Mechanized (LCM) flotilla decided to embark across the 120-mile channel when their tow got cancelled. Once the flotilla reached Omaha Beach, Normand faced the brutal fighting and harsh reality that the beach is infamous for in order to liberate France. Normand was slightly injured during the battle but was able to be treated on the battlefield.

On June 16, 1944, Normand was hit by a landmine and was seriously wounded. This led to a difficult and dangerous journey back to the United States. He was put on a Landing Ship Tank (LST) to be brought back to a hospital in England. While on board, the ship was hit by a German torpedo and was disabled, forcing it to be towed back to England. Once

in the hospital in England receiving treatment, he still had to deal with a series of German attacks. The hospital was hit by German V1 and V2 rockets, causing severe damage to the building. Normand was then moved to Scotland to await a cargo plane to take him back to the U.S. His original plane was overbooked, forcing him to fly to Newfoundland first. This last minute change ended up saving Normand's life because his original plane was shot down. He eventually got back to the United States and was treated at a naval hospital. Normand was discharged from the Navy in June 1945 and received two Purple Hearts for being wounded on the battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, Normand Drapeau is the epitome for our quiet American heroes. This very humble man does not seek any recognition or special attention for his bravery. He simply wanted to serve his country and to defend the enduring cause for freedom around the world. As the French government awards Normand with one of its highest honors, I want to take a moment to thank Normand on behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the American people for his service to our nation and congratulate him on receiving this prestigious honor.

REMEMBERING HARVEY MILLER

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to note the passing of one of this nation's preeminent bankruptcy attorneys, Harvey R. Miller. Harvey was a giant of the profession, having played a leading role in some of the most significant cases of the last half century. These cases included Texaco Inc., Drexel Burnham Lambert Group Inc., Eastern Airlines Corp., Continental Airlines, R. H. Macy, WorldCom, Global Crossing, Enron, Lehman Brothers, and General Motors, just to name a few.

Harvey was also a mentor to some of this nation's top practitioners, and an outstanding law professor. He even took the time to help me understand the Bankruptcy Code and many complex legal issues arising from it when this House considered a rewrite of the Code a decade ago.

Speaking to the New York Times in 2007, he said, ''Life should be an adventure. My practice at Weil was and still is exactly that. By working on reorganizations and restructuring work in so many different businesses—such as energy, retail, manufacturing and even satellites—that's the glory of the practice and that's what I love about it. I've always said that about restructuring practice. It is probably the last area of the generalist.''

As a member of the National Bankruptcy Conference, Harvey worked with his colleagues in the profession to advise Congress on changes to the Bankruptcy Code, advice that was both scholarly and informed by the real world experience of the nation's top practitioners. That advice was too often ignored by this institution and the state of the law is the poorer for it.

Harvey was a consummate New Yorker. He would note with satisfaction that his office in the General Motors building on Fifth Avenue was ''across from Bergdorf's men's shop and close to Barneys.'' He was also a great lover of the opera, and served as an Advisory Director of the Metropolitan Opera.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to count Harvey Miller, a fellow son of Brooklyn, as a friend. He was greatly admired by all who knew him. His contributions to the profession, and to the development of bankruptcy law in the United States, are incalculable. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and work of this great legal scholar and practitioner, and to join me in extending to his wife, Ruth, our deepest sympathies.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, as I was summoned to serve on jury duty in my district, I was unable to be present for votes on the House floor on May 12, 2015. Below is an explanation of how I would have voted and why.

I would have voted for H.R. 606, the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act, which excludes benefits paid to survivors of public safety officers killed in the line of duty from federal income tax. While such federal survivor benefits are generally exempt from taxation, this bill would ensure that the grieving families of brave officers who give their life in the line of duty do not also bear an unexpected income tax burden.

I would have voted for Rep. Edwards's amendment to H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, which aims to address criticisms of the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) proposed rule defining ''Waters of the United States.'' This amendment would have clarified that the new definition does not expand the scope of EPA's authority under the Clean Water Act, and provided specific exemptions that help prevent spikes in the cost of water in our desert communities.

However, I would have voted against final passage of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, which would prevent the EPA from finalizing a proposed rule clarifying which bodies of water are subject to the Clean Water Act. This bill would undermine the EPA's ability to safeguard our water supply, and invalidates the thousands of public comments submitted on the proposed rule without even seeing the final product.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF SOUTHLAKE MAYOR JOHN TERRELL

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the Honorable John Terrell, who is retiring from the Southlake City Council after six years of service as Mayor and five years as Councilmember of Place 3.

Mayor Terrell was elected Mayor of Southlake in 2009 after serving two terms as a councilmember. He has been an instrumental leader in the successful growth of Southlake. Throughout his tenure, the City of Southlake has developed into a premiere location where families want to live, businesses want to operate, and people want to visit.

Mayor Terrell has served on a number of Southlake committees that address transportation and taxes. Among these groups are the Audit Committee (2008–present), Tax Increment Reinvestment Zone No. 1 (2004–present), and Southlake 2030 Committee (2009–present). Additionally, he has served on community boards addressing development and energy, such as the Super Bowl Planning Committee (2009–2011), Oil and Gas Drilling Task Force (2007–2008), Joint Utilization Committee (2004–2009), Southlake 2025 Committee (2002–2004), Planning and Zoning Commission–Chairman (2000–2004), and Zoning Board of Adjustment (1999–2000).

Furthermore, Mayor Terrell has been an active member of regional organizations committed to enhancing the quality of life for North Texans. These groups include the International Council of Shopping Centers, Urban Land Institute, Metroport Transit Authority, Northeast Leadership Forum, Southlake Executive Forum, Southlake Sister Cities, Texas Regional Transportation Commission, and Vision North Texas.

As a leader, Mayor Terrell's impact on the City of Southlake and North Texas area has been acknowledged throughout his years of service. The accolades he has achieved include the 2013 Southlake Chamber of Commerce's Citizen of the Year, 2008 Southlake Chamber of Commerce's Leadership Southlake Alumni of the Year, 2008 Industrial Asset Management Council's Corporate Real Estate Executive of the Year, and City of Southlake Department of Public Safety's Life Saving Award. Additionally, he has been recognized by the Dallas Business Journal for the 2005 Best New Industrial Development, 2002 Best New Development Retail/Hospitality, and 2000 Best Development Deal. He has also been distinguished as the 2011 Best of the Best Government Official selected through the readers of the Southlake Journal, Grapevine Courier, and Colleyville Courier.

Outside of his duties as a public servant, Mayor Terrell works for Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport as the Vice President of Commercial Development. He has been a Southlake resident for more than 17 years where he has lived with his wife, Joanne, and their two children.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking the Honorable John Terrell for his years of service on the Southlake City Council.

HONORING RAVEYN NICOLE JACKSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a goal oriented student at Quitman County Middle School.

Raveyn Nicole Jackson is the daughter of Ronnie and Bonnie Jackson of Marks, MS. She earned numerous academic awards at Quitman County Elementary School. She was the 2013–2014 Miss Quitman County Elementary School. While attending QCES, she received numerous awards in reading and math. She transitions on to Quitman County Middle School, where she continues to earn academic awards of achievement in Reading and Math.

Raveyn is loved and respected by her classmates, community members, and parents. She is a member of the New St. John M.B. Church under the leadership of Pastor Jimmy Jones where she is very active in the choir.

Raveyn plans to graduate from Madison Shannon Palmer High School and go on to a college of her choice majoring in Nursing or Education. She also plans to pursue and acquire her Master's Degree. Upon completion of her program of study, Raveyn plans to give back to her local community as a teacher or nurse.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Raveyn Nicole Jackson as a student who is goal oriented and making a difference in her community.

CELEBRATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE HONORABLE NANCY F. MUÑOZ

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the public service of the Honorable Nancy F. Muñoz, Assemblywoman for New Jersey's 21st Legislative District, as she is honored by the Somerset County Federation of Republican Women as the recipient of its Millicent Fenwick Award for Outstanding Public Service.

Nancy's career as a dedicated public servant started with her interest in public health. She was graduated from Skidmore College with a bachelor's degree in nursing and later earned a master's degree from Hunter College as a clinical nurse specialist. She worked as a nurse in surgical intensive care at Yale-New Haven Hospital and also worked at Massachusetts General, Lenox Hill Hospital Emergency Room and Memorial-Sloan Kettering Cancer Center.

Nancy took an important role in the public school system of Summit, New Jersey where her five children, Wills, Eric, Alex, Elizabeth and Max were educated. Nancy was active in the Parent Teacher Associations at Summit's elementary, middle and high school. Her late husband, Eric, was a renowned trauma surgeon, member of the Summit Common Council and member of the New Jersey General Assembly.

In 2009 Nancy was elected to complete Eric's unexpired term in the General Assembly following his passing. Nancy is an outstanding legislator, championing causes important to Eric and forging ahead on new endeavors of significance to her and the 21st Legislative District. Her expertise as a health care professional has led to Nancy's service on the Assembly Health and Senior Services Committee. She also sits on the Assembly Commerce and Economic Development Committee as well as the Assembly Committee on Women and Children.

Nancy is a defender of those who cannot defend themselves. One of her most significant accomplishments was her work in securing passage of the Jessica Lunsford Act, which increased penalties on sexual offenders and the people who harbor them. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, the Honorable Stuart Rabner, has also appointed Nancy to the Supreme Court Ad Hoc Committee on Domestic Violence Resources. Her accomplishments and dedication have been recognized by her Assembly colleagues who have selected Nancy as the Deputy Republican Leader.

The Millicent Fenwick Award for Outstanding Public Service is awarded to a role model for women who serve in the tradition of the late Congresswoman Fenwick: never compromise your principles, do what was in the best interests of your constituents and be of service to those in need. I congratulate Assemblywoman Nancy F. Muñoz on this well-deserved recognition.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID DeLUCIA

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of David DeLucia. Mr. DeLucia has bravely served the 24th District of New York for over 30 years in the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) field. It is my honor to recognize such a distinguished citizen and civil servant.

Mr. DeLucia has served the greater Central New York area in many capacities, within and outside of the EMS field, including at the Onondaga County Medical Examiner's Office and St. Joseph's Hospital.

In addition to his exceptional work as a first responder in Central New York, Mr. DeLucia has been a leading force in the development of EMS services in Jamaica. Since 2008, he has served as the Jamaica Project Coordinator for the Medical Relief Foundation. Mr. DeLucia has assisted in the advancement of Jamaica's EMS system, training EMTs in the country and facilitating the receipt of necessary medical equipment.

Mr. DeLucia has received a number of commendation awards for emergency medical situations including the rescue of a patient from a ravine in Cayuga County, multiple citations for field excellence, and he was named the ALS Provider of the Year for Central New York and New York State in 2013.

Mr. DeLucia holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from the State University of New York at Oswego and has completed graduate coursework at the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry. Additionally, he holds provider and instructor certifications in ACLS, BLS, and PALS.

As a provider, educator, and humanitarian, Mr. DeLucia goes beyond the call of duty of a first responder. He has proudly served Central New York and nobly assisted the developing country of Jamaica. I am honored to thank Mr. DeLucia for his service to the 24th District, our nation, and the international community.

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS—50 YEARS OF SUCCESS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give thanks to all the community health centers in America and especially those in my district in California. These clinics are the workhorses of health care. Whether it be in the rural community of San Benito County, the downtown environs of Seaside on the Monterey Peninsula, the ag community of Watsonville or the streetscape of Santa Cruz, community health clinics provide expert health care to whomever needs it. These clinics increasingly are significant sources of regular, primary health services and not just drop-in-as-a-last-resort centers. In addition to providing on-the-spot health care they also run education programs on wellness, nutrition, diabetes and pre-natal care. All this is done at little or no charge to the patient with costs picked up by federal health programs, partnerships with other public and private entities and charitable donations.

The first community health centers were established in the U.S. in 1965 and May 15, 2015 marks 50 years since their introduction. Since then they've serviced over 62 million persons, including 13 million new patients since the advent of the Affordable Care Act. In a district like mine which includes an agriculture workforce that is often on the margins of health care the community health clinics are a godsend to keeping this workforce healthy and industrious.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say for all America to hear: I am very proud of the community health clinics in my district. I am sure my House colleagues have similar good stories to tell about the community health clinics in their districts, too. I hope they will join me in saying 'thank you' and 'good job' to these clinics and wish them well as they embark on the next 50 years of service.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF YEVHEN ''EUGENE'' KOSTIUCHENKO

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to pay tribute to Deputy Sheriff Yevhen ''Eugene'' Kostiuchenko, an 11-year veteran of the Ventura County Sheriff's Office, who was tragically killed in the line of duty on October 28th, 2014.

Deputy Kostiuchenko was born in Kiev, Ukraine, where he attended secondary school and later attended the Military University of Defense of Russian Federation in Moscow. Deputy Kostiuchenko served in the Ukrainian Armed Forces and as a liaison between the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration, and Central Intelligence Agency. He also held the prestigious position of serving as the adjutant to the General of the Ukrainian Army.

While Deputy Kostiuchenko's homeland was near to his heart, he loved America. He especially loved serving his community. In April of 2003, Eugene began his distinguished career with the County of Ventura. He initially worked with the Sheriff's Office of Emergency Services (OES), where he assisted with training and response plans for the County's Terrorism Working Group. While working in OES, Eugene received his United States citizenship in 2006, which was a proud moment in his life as he began working toward his ultimate goal of becoming a deputy sheriff.

Through discipline and dedication and a remarkable work ethic, Eugene successfully completed the rigors of training and was sworn in as a deputy sheriff on November 29, 2007.

Those who knew Deputy Kostiuchenko remember him fondly as a kind, compassionate, and caring officer. Eugene enforced the law with great distinction and it was his steadfast commitment to serving his community that made for a particularly noteworthy career.

Above all else, Deputy Kostiuchenko is remembered as a loyal friend and family man. Deputy Kostiuchenko is survived by his wife of 13 years, Maura Kelley, and his two sons, Tristan and Justin. He is also survived by his parents, Anatoly and Nadiia, and his brother Oleksandra.

Deputy Kostiuchenko's dedicated and courageous service will never be forgotten. On behalf of the people of Ventura County, who he so bravely served and protected, I express my sincere condolences to his family and friends, and to all who knew him. He will be remembered as a husband, friend, and hero.

TRIBUTE TO NOBIS DAIRY FARM IN ST. JOHNS, MICHIGAN

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Nobis Dairy Farm in St. Johns, Michigan. I congratulate the Nobis Farm on receiving the 2015 U.S. Dairy Sustainability Award. Since 2011, the Innovation Center for U.S. Dairy has presented this annual award to farms around the country that exhibit outstanding economic and environmental practices.

In Michigan, brothers Ken and Larry Nobis manage their multi-generational dairy farm that was started by their father, Paul, in 1946. Employing 23 people, Nobis Dairy Farm has expanded from its original 180 dairy cattle to 1,050, producing over 31 million pounds of milk annually. In 1974, Ken and Larry transitioned to sand bedding, which increases the comfort and health of the cattle in their care. Nobis Dairy Farm, in conjunction with Michigan State University and the McLanahan Corporation, developed an environmentally sound technique that would solve the problem of sand-laden manure while eliminating the excessive use of fresh water.

Dairy producers are a vital part of Michigan's economy. The innovative practices pioneered by Nobis Dairy Farm will benefit the entire industry. They also keep Michigan's economy strong and preserve a clean environment for all residents to enjoy. On behalf of Michigan's Fourth Congressional District, I congratulate Nobis Dairy Farm for this achievement and wish it continued success.

HONORING SANDRA LEVEQUE

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sandra Leveque upon her retirement as Principal and Director of the Napa County Office of Education Juvenile Court and Community Schools. Sandra has served as Principal and Director for 23 years, and this June she will end a forty year career as an educator and school administrator throughout our district. This month, Ms. Leveque's career and retirement will be honored by the Juvenile Court, Community and Alternative School Administrators of California at their Annual Conference in Napa.

Over the past forty years, Ms. Leveque has been a dedicated educator and advocate for special needs students, working in classrooms for the deaf, autistic, and profoundly mentally handicapped. Her devotion to helping those with special needs extends beyond the classroom and includes work as a member and Chair of the Kiwanis Club of Napa's Special Olympics and as an interpreter for the deaf at Hillside Christian Center. She has also served as treasurer for the local Organization for School Administrators.

Upon her retirement, Ms. Leveque's colleagues recall her as a tireless advocate for her students who worked nonstop, was always available to help others, and who treated her students like her own children. In fact, Sandra has three children of her own—Jeremy, Jessica, and Jonathan—and four grandchildren, Emmy, Peyton, Liam, and Will.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we honor Sandra Leveque at this time. Her commitment to serving students, and particularly those with special needs, has made our schools and community stronger and her level of dedication will not be easily replaced.

RECOGNIZING WHITE CASTLE

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize White Castle, which is headquartered in my district, for their long history of contributing to the Central Ohio Community. White Castle has recently announced the creation of ''National Slider Day'' to celebrate little ideas that make a big difference.

In 1921, White Castle was founded with the idea of small, bite-sized sandwiches. Nearly 100 years later, this small business idea has grown into a nationwide business creating thousands of jobs for our country.

White Castle will sell over half a billion sliders to millions of people during the month of May alone. With 10,000 employees across the country and over 2,000 employees in Ohio, the company serves as a job creator in communities throughout America.

White Castle has also found great ways to give back to the community. To recognize ''National Slider Day,'' White Castle will be handing out 10,000 sliders in Columbus to friends and charity partners around the city. White Castle sliders have also been made available on military bases around the world to help our brave men and women in uniform enjoy a ''taste of home'' while protecting our freedom abroad.

I wish White Castle all the best as they launch ''National Slider Day'' and as they continue taking little ideas to make a big difference.

KEEP THE PROMISE ACT

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have been actively involved in a troubling off-reservation gaming issue in my home state of Arizona involving the Tohono O'odham Nation. The tribe has been attempting to move from their ancestral lands in Tucson, into another tribe's former reservation in the Phoenix metro area, for the sole purpose of building a Las Vegas style casino.

This comes after Tohono O'odham and 16 other Arizona tribes adopted a compact, approved by Arizona voters, which expressly promised there would be no additional casinos or gaming in the Phoenix metro area until 2027. In exchange for this promise, the voters granted the tribes a statewide monopoly on gaming and other tribes gave up significant rights.

H.R. 308 was introduced to ensure that the promise of no additional casinos in the Phoenix area is kept until the existing tribal-state

gaming compacts expire, without interfering in the trust acquisition itself

Let me explain how this legislation came to be and why it must be enacted into law. In return for exclusivity in Arizona, the tribes agreed to a cap on the number of casinos in the state and in the Phoenix metro area, to restrict the number of machines in the state and to share machine revenue with rural non-gaming tribes so they could benefit from the compact.

Every urban tribe, except for Tohono O'odham, agreed to this limitation. Tohono refused, citing the need for a new casino in Tucson or on the rural part of the tribe's reservation. The state and other tribes finally agreed to the restrictions on gaming being pushed by Arizona's Governor and others, but also yielded to Tohono's stated need.

After the agreement was reached, the tribes and state promoted their model compact by saturating the airwaves and newspapers with the clear message that under the compact there will be no additional casinos in Phoenix and only the possibility for Tohono O'odham to build one more facility in the Tucson area. Tohono O'odham alone spent $1.8 million dollars urging Arizona voters to rely on this limitation.

Tohono had begun efforts to find land in the Phoenix area to open their fourth casino.

The voters approved the tribal state compact in November 2002 and rejected two competing propositions. The first would have allowed unrestricted tribal gaming without any revenue sharing for rural non-gaming tribes; the second would have allowed for full commercial gaming without restriction.

Shockingly, a few months after the voters approved the compact, Tohono finalized a multiyear effort to purchase land in Glendale for a casino and used a shell corporation to conceal its identity.

Tohono's dismissal of their promise to build no additional casinos in Phoenix is not something that Congress can ignore when the result will be so harmful to what had been a national model.

Furthermore, Tohono has falsely been claiming a victory in court relative to their less-than-honest dealings with other tribes and the State of Arizona.

This sentiment is factually wrong and morally indefensible. The Tohono ''won'' nothing based on the merits. Rather, the case was dismissed on the draconian doctrine of sovereign immunity. In other words, the court ruled that the tribe cannot be sued in court because . . . It can't be sued in court.

In fact, the Court made a statement that it would have likely ruled against Tohono had it not been for sovereign immunity. Mr. Speaker, I submit evidence obtained from underlying litigation discovery in State of Arizona v. Tohono O'odham in order to supplement the record on H.R. 308. The opponents of this bill falsely claim that the Tohono O'odham Nation (Tohono O'odham, TO or the Nation) ''won'' in court relative to TO's less-than-honest dealings with other tribes and the State of Arizona. Indeed, one Member of the House publicly stated that the bill circumvents a court ruling.

This sentiment is factually wrong and morally indefensible. The TO ''won'' nothing on the merits. Rather, the case was dismissed on the draconian doctrine of sovereign immunity. In other words, the court ruled that the tribe cannot be sued in court because . . . It can't be sued in court. That circular logic is pretty much the extent of the victory. The merits of the case were never addressed, and that is why Congress' oversight in these matters is so important.

As it turned out, discovery in State of Arizona v. Tohono O'odham revealed that the TO Nation was secretly looking to purchase land in the Phoenix metropolitan area during the last 18 months of the compact negotiations and during the entire referendum process when the tribes were actively seeking support from Arizona voters on the basis that the model compact would not permit additional casinos in the Phoenix area. Evidence of these secret plans were primarily obtained from Vikam Doag Industries (VDI), a Tohono O'odham chartered and owned corporation. Below are quotations from meeting transcripts and minutes:

5/18/01: VDI meeting notes including a description of a presentation delivered by Mark Curry, Tohono O'odham's lead negotiator in compact negotiations. The notes reflect ''107th Avenue-Stadium,'' ''gaming compact-unsure what will happen,'' ''put in a shell company-need to keep it quiet especially when negotiations of compact at stake''

6/26/01: VDI meeting with Tohono O'odham's San Lucy District Council. ''We are also looking at another project . . . based on discussions we had and continue to have about a casino on the west end of Phoenix. And part of that discussion that we've had was that—we didn't want to publicize that because of the confidentiality in terms of that issue . . . Now, in the meeting we had last summer—with the task force and Jim had met with the casino people in their—in their environment. And the understanding is that it is a good opportunity again depending on what happens with the big compact. . . You have a situation with a confidentiality issue. And that's how we're holding it, as confidential, because we don't want, you know, people to know we are seriously considering this. Because if you do, I'm sure that there's going to be a lot of resistance from, you know, the general public.'' p. 25:5–20.

8/26/01: San Lucy District Meeting: ''[Male Voice]—but that is why the Buckeye property has been identified as a casino-feasible area. And that's really why we focused on that. There—there is some county islands closer in to Phoenix that we have looked at.'' p. 24:10–15.

8/22/02: VDI meeting transcript discussing the West Phoenix casino project, whether Governor Hull's successor would also opposed additional Phoenix area casinos, and the importance is confidentiality ahead of the vote on Proposition 202. ''Max: Because if that's going to be the position of the State, they don't want any more casinos around the Phoenix area, then they're going to fight it, whoever the new governor is, (inaudible), if he's going to go along—he or she go along with Jane Hull regarding taking a position. Jim: Which is why we really want to wait until the initiative passes before its gets out.'' TON0116093–94.

9/19/02: VDI meeting transcript discussing a possible leak of information related to the West Phoenix project. ''Jim: So there is some type of information going out or a leak or—they didn't Jonathan and Mark [two in-house Tohono O'odham attorneys] didn't seem too concerned, is what they had got it wasn't up at the governor's level or at the negotiating level . . . but it's still a concern out there, especially prior to the propositions coming up for election. . . . So, we just need to be careful about, you know, things getting out and spoiling it'' p. 14:18–15:6.

10/25/02: VDI meeting transcript discussing the upcoming Prop 202 vote. ''Male Voice: We are . . . a week and a half, two weeks away from the vote. And that's going to clarify a lot also on what we can do. And, you know, assuming that it is 202 that passes, then, you know, we'll proceed in how we need to make that project develop.'' p. 2:7–3:24.

This evidence, attached hereto, establishes the fraudulent intent by the TO to deceive the state, the public and other tribes. Proposition 202, which authorized the existing tribal-state compacts, was approved by voters on November 5, 2002, less than two weeks after VDI discussed waiting for voter approval before moving forward with the West Phoenix casino plans.

In addition to the above, additional transcripts underscore the same double-dealing after the vote:

2/10/03: VDI meeting transcript discussing VDI's meetings with the Tohono O'odham Gaming Authority. ''And I think that's coming about because the agreement has been signed, the compact has been signed, and so there are no more real concerns that might jeopardize our chances on this discussion. So I think they're ready to move forward.'' p. 3:2–4:5.

2/23/03: VDI meeting transcript discussing the Glendale plan. ''Through 99–503 [Gila Bend Act] we could have a casino built, it allows it, but politically we might have problems. If we decide to, we need to put it in escrow and it needs to be kept confidential for the time being.'' p. 17:22–18:14.

2/23/03: VDI meeting transcript discussing potential political problems with the proposal. ''Male Voice: I just hope that . . . in terms of the political (inaudible) that's going to be coming (inaudible), that some of the metro tribes over there don't come back and jump on us too. . . . Male Voice: Might Gila River and Salt River indicate that it's a violation of the 202 (inaudible) metro area? Male Voice: Well, that's what I said in terms of political impact, is that even—even those metro tribes, particularly those three that are right there, might—might say something. But that's a big question mark. That's all.'' p. 48:21–50:23.

In March 2013, Tohono O'odham created Rainer Resources, Inc. and incorporated the company in Delaware as an attempt to keep the land purchase confidential. Rainer Resources then purchased the Glendale parcel in August 2013. Rainer Resources and Tohono O'odham kept their plan secret until April 2009, when the Nation submitted its fee-to-trust application to the Department of the Interior and finally disclosed its scheme to its sister tribes.

These statements were uncovered during discovery in State of Arizona v. Tohono O'odham and revealed the depth of Tohono O'odham's conscious effort to mislead and defraud voters, as well as its State and tribal partners. Unfortunately, the U.S. District Court dismissed the State of Arizona's fraud and misrepresentation claims not on the merits, but because Tohono O'odham refused to waive its sovereign immunity from suit. With regard to the State of Arizona's ''promissory

estoppel'' claim, which alleged that Tohono O'odham made false promises that induced the parties to enter into the compact to their disadvantage thus creating an enforceable promise, the court found on May 7, 2013, that the evidence supported the claim but that Tohono O'odham's sovereign immunity nevertheless barred its review of those allegations. Although Congress, through IGRA, waived tribal sovereign immunity for claims arising from executed compacts, the court determined Congress had not done so with regard to actions that preceded a compact's execution such as those that gave rise to the fraud, misrepresentation, and promissory estoppel claims in State of Arizona v. Tohono O'odham. The legal conclusion is dubious as it promotes fraud and sharp dealings long since rejected in modern commerce and illegal in many contexts.

H.R 308, the Keep the Promise Act, is narrowly crafted to address those claims that are shielded by Tohono O'odham's assertion of sovereign immunity.

I believe it is important for the truth to be known. The tribe acted immorally and covertly against its fellow tribes, the State and the general public. This incident and breach of trust has proven that TO cannot be trusted in the future relative to business dealings, tribal matters and commercial relations. I urge Congress to resolve this issue and reaffirm its authority by providing proper oversight of commerce amongst tribes.

An identical bill, H.R. 1410, passed overwhelmingly out of the Natural Resources passed the House last Congress by voice vote on September 17, 2013. This legislation has already passed the full Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent in the 114th Congress.

I urge immediate adoption of this commonsense legislation once again by the House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMPRISONMENT OF THE SEVEN BAHA'I LEADERS IN IRAN

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in this country, we often take for granted our ability to worship whatever faith we want without fear of government persecution. Yet, for those of the Baha'i faith in Iran, this basic human right does not exist. Simply being Baha'i in Iran makes you a target for frequent discrimination. The Iranian regime's appalling human rights record is full of cases of horrific treatment of anyone who stands up for their religious beliefs.

Take the case of Saeid Rezaei, the Baha'i prisoner of conscience I adopted a few years ago as part of the Defending Freedoms Project. Arrested on false charges, he remains imprisoned on a 20 year sentence that would see him only released when the teenage son he left outside has already turned 31 years old. Rarely is outrage as justified as it is in this case of state-sponsored discrimination against members of the Baha'i faith.

Today, on the seventh anniversary of the imprisonment of the seven Baha'i leaders in Iran, let us join together to highlight the ongoing injustices rampant throughout the actions of the Iranian regime and continue to stand up for the freedom of religion and beliefs across the world.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD C. ''DANNY'' DANIELSON

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, as you know the words spoken on the Floor of this House in many ways become the official record of our great Nation, as each word spoken here is made part of the official House RECORD.

As such, I rise today to honor a great American, philanthropist, my Sigma Chi brother and good friend, Donald Danielson. Danny was widely known for his nearly 40-year career at City Securities, one of Indianapolis' oldest investment firms. He was the former president of New Castle-based Modernfold, the company whose accordion-fold door helped change the way businesses, schools and churches utilized interior space.

As a Sigma Chi, Danny was devoted to the ideals of the White Cross we wear. To all he came to know, his friendship was enduring; his generosities were large; and his life was an inspiration. He loved his Fraternity, but he knew that its helpfulness and sympathies were meant to broaden more than the bounds of an organization. To that end, his loyalty was grounded in the faith that fraternalism stands for better citizenship, for a more noble civilization, and for the higher ideals of life in its service to man and reverence to God. And in that, Mr. Speaker, we have found in Mr. Danielson not only the ideals of Sigma Chi, but the essence of America.

He was accepted to Indiana University on a baseball scholarship, graduated and became one of the longest-serving trustees on record at the University, serving as its president for 11 of his 22 years of service. He helped create IU's Wells Scholar program and in 1994 was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree.

After graduation, Danny served his Country in the U.S. Navy in both the Pacific and Atlantic theaters of World War II being discharged in 1946 with a rank of Lieutenant. He married his wife Patricia in 1947 and though being signed to play professional baseball by the Brooklyn Dodgers, decided to take a job at the IU Alumni Association instead.

In 2009, Danielson received the Sachem award, the highest honor given by the state of Indiana. He received several Sagamore of the Wabash awards from Indiana Governors, and in 2014, the Indiana Historical Society named him a Living Legend. He was inducted into the Junior Achievement of Central Indiana Business Hall of Fame in 2010, and was appointed by President George H.W. Bush to the Credit Standards Advisory Committee.

Preceded in death by his beloved wife Patti, Danny leaves three daughters, Mary, Susie and Amy, eight cherished grandchildren and 13 great-grandchildren. On behalf of many Hoosiers, I offer to all of them, their extended families, and all those who share the grief of his loss, my sincerest condolences.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONOR FLIGHT OF EASTERN AND PORTLAND OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 48 World War II veterans from Oregon who will be visiting their memorial this Friday in Washington, D.C. through Bend Heroes Foundation. On behalf of a grateful state and country, we welcome these heroes to our nation's capital.

The veterans on this flight from Oregon are: Joe DeMarsh, Army; Harry Galloway, Army; Donald Hoyt, Army; Robert Hughley, Army; Shige Imai, Army; Fred Krieger, Army; Steve Lund, Army; Roger Mockford, Army; Andy Riener, Army; Bud Simonis, Army; Jim Starr, Army; Bill Stewart, Army; Jack Tavenner, Army; Rodger Barber, Army Air Force; Les Barnhart, Army Air Force; Don Bennett, Army Air Force; Tom Bessonette, Army Air Force; Ralph Butterworth, Army Air Force; Nick Cassinelli, Army Air Force; Dick Ford, Army Air Force; Fred Forsythe, Army Air Force; Ed Miller, Army Air Force; Jim Murphy, Army Air Force; Sandy Porter, Army Air Force; Kenny Arnold, Navy; Betty Ashford, Navy; Don Bower, Navy; Gib Branstetter, Navy; Mike Brant, Navy; Frankie Carling, Navy; Paul Clayton, Navy; Dalton Fox, Navy; Bob Grills, Navy; Carroll Heckenlively, Navy; Cal Husbands, Navy; Royce Irby, Navy; Vern Kube, Navy; Harry Kuhlmann, Navy; Ken Larsen, Navy; Ernie McCabe, Navy; Donald McLaughlin, Navy; Lloyd McNary, Navy; Alice Tatone, Navy; Al Walters, Navy; Fred Warner, Navy; George Griffith, Marine Corps; Irv Kaplan, Marine Corps; Ted Carlson, USCG Merchant Marine.

These 48 heroes join more than 138,000 veterans from across the country who, since 2005, have journeyed from their home states to Washington, D.C. to reflect at the memorials built in honor of our nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, each of us is humbled by the courage of these brave Americans who put themselves in harm's way for our country and way of life. As a nation, we can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to them for their honor, commitment, and sacrifice in defense of the freedoms we have today.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans of Honor Flight of Eastern and Portland Oregon for their exemplary dedication and service to this great country. I especially want to recognize Bend Heroes Foundation Chairman Dick Tobiason, and Trip Leaders Erik Tobiason and Pam Kelsay. Their tireless work will result in over 450 World War II veterans from Honor Flight of Eastern and Portland Oregon visiting the memorials and U.S. Capitol.

HONORING HAROLD DAUM

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Harold Daum, an exceptional individual who has worked tirelessly to ensure vulnerable seniors receive essential legal services.

It is with fond recollection that I remember my time working alongside Harold during the Legal Resources for the Elderly Program (LREP)'s infancy. His persona struck me instantly; Harold had this vibrant personality, determined fervor and you could sense that anything he undertook would feel the full weight of his energy.

For over 27 years, as a retiree, Harold has committed himself to LREP. When seniors would call to inquire about the program Harold was the first to answer—he took in their concerns, assuaged their worries, and was instrumental in our commitment to guaranteeing seniors quality legal representation.

Those at LREP will tell you that his vitality is endless, and his charismatic smile is a pleasant welcome for anyone coming into the office. Harold is a truly remarkable person and deeply loves his country and community. He can often be found sharing an exciting story about his service as a United States Navy medic during World War II.

As Harold enters his retirement and we celebrate his contributions, we are reminded of the joy that he brings all of us. It is through Harold that we recognize the profound impact one individual can have on an entire community. I am honored to have had the opportunity to work with Harold—he is an inspiration to us all.

HONORING U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. STACEY E. PLASKETT

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate National Police Week, I solemnly rise to honor and salute the sacrifice of our law enforcement officers around the country and in my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Law enforcement officers risk their lives every day to ensure the safety and security of our communities. With endless dedication they bear a great responsibility, as their family and friends share their sacrifices. I know that sacrifice first-hand as my father was an NYPD officer for 30 years and my grandfather was the Virgin Islands Deputy Police Commissioner.

While we should honor their acts of valor and memorialize the sacrifice of the fallen daily, National Police Week affords us the opportunity to join together as a nation to honor their courage and salute their sacrifice. I ask that the members of the 114th Congress join me in saluting the sacrifices of the Virgin Islands Police Officers who have died in the line of duty. They are:

Patrolman Leopold E. Fredericks; Patrolman Leroy Alvaro Swan; Patrolman Rudel Albert Parrott; Patrolman Allan Williams; Patrolman Patrick Emmanuel Sweeney; Patrolman Wilbur Horatio Francis; Officer Dexter L. Mardenborough; Officer Steven Hodge; Officer Cuthbert Ezekiel Chapman; Officer Ariel Anton Frett; Officer Akeem Basil Newton and Officer Colvin Terrance Georges, Sr.

HONORING MIKE GRGICH AND GRGICH HILLS ESTATE

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Miljenko ''Mike'' Grgich and Grgich Hills Estate Winery as they celebrate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the ''Great Chicago Chardonnay Showdown.'' At a tasting of more than 200 wines thirty-five years ago this month, Grgich Hills Chardonnay was recognized as the best chardonnay in the world.

In the spring of 1980, Craig Goldwyn, the wine columnist for the Chicago Tribune, organized a tasting that went on to be known as the Great Chicago Chardonnay Showdown. Chardonnays from across the world, from France to California, and even Bulgaria were collected for an historic first, the largest blind tasting of one single varietal. Grgich Hills Estate's very first vintage was announced the winner, just a few short years after Mike Grgich won the Judgement of Paris wine competition with his Chateau Montelena chardonnay. The Chicago tasting is credited for helping to make chardonnay the most popular varietal in the United States.

In his native Croatia, winemaking was a family passion, and Mr. Grgich continued the tradition through his studies at Zagreb University. Inspired by the stories of a better life abroad, he made his way across the Atlantic, and in a true demonstration of the American dream, went on to found his own winery. According to Grgich, ''There is no scientific formula for making great wines. You make wines with your heart. You pour your love into them and nurture them like children, and transmit to them the richness of your spirit.''

Currently, Grgich Hills produces 70,000 cases of wine each year using exclusively their own organically-grown grapes, and much of the winery is run by solar power. Methods that have become standard practice in the wine industry can trace their roots to Grgich. His influence has even spread back to his native Croatia where he opened a winery and introduced these modern techniques to the industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor Mike Grgich for his lifetime of success and influence in the wine industry, both at home and abroad.

THE WUNSCHE BROTHERS CAFÉ AND SALOON

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, located just off the railroad tracks in Old Town Spring, Texas, sits a quaint café. But this is no ordinary joint. The Wunsche Brothers Café and Saloon has been around since 1902. The café fries up great American classics like burgers, fries, onion rings, chicken-fried steak, basically all the makings for a post-lunch nap.

It originally opened its doors as a hotel and saloon, but the café has stayed in business for over 100 years.

Wunsche Café has morphed into a community icon and is somewhat of a local legend. It even attracts out-of-towners, why? Because it's haunted.

It's said that the original owner, Charlie Wunsche, roams the restaurant, pranking workers. A little mischievous, but good natured, the spirit of Charlie hides items, messes with electronics and employees and is even said to have been spotted.

Charlie, I'm sure, is just watching over his business, wanting to make sure it serves its customers well, who can blame him?

Sadly the century old café suffered a mishap recently. The newest addition to the Wunsche Brother's Café burst into flames in the early morning hours. The flames engulfed the café, however thankfully there were no injuries reported.

But here is where the story gets interesting, or maybe a little spooky, the original wooden, 1900's structure only sustained smoke damage (that's the part that is haunted). The new additions, put into place around the mid 80's, suffered the most destruction. The historic foundation still stands strong, showing the community that amongst the piles of soot and insulation, there is hope.

The café's new owner, Nathan Lavaige, has remained firm in his promise that they will rebuild. It will keep on standing, making delicious meals for Texans and tourists from all over. Haunted or not, someone was watching over the café in those early morning hours. I am more inclined to think it was Charlie, but we will never know.

Thanks to the Wunsche Brothers Café for 113 years of serving up comfort food to hungry customers and here's to the next 113 years. Best wishes in the rebuild. The Houston community cannot wait until the café reopens.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING IRWIN STOVROFF

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor Mr. Irwin Stovroff of Boca Raton for receiving his honorary doctorate from Florida Atlantic University on April 30th at age 92. Irwin was an Air

Force 2nd Lieutenant and bombardier who flew over Normandy in the D-Day invasion during World War II.

Florida Atlantic University (FAU) awards the Honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters degree on a very selective basis to recognize achievements in the arts or high distinction in public service. With his golden retriever Cash by his side, Irwin addressed a group of 2,400 graduates and their families explaining his experience as a Prisoner of War after being captured by a Nazi soldier.

After returning home, Irwin did what so many from the Greatest Generation did. He married, started a family, and went on to a successful business career. After retiring at age 75, he continued to serve his community and volunteered at our local Veteran's Administration Hospital in Riviera Beach. During his time at the VA Hospital, he spoke to many veterans and realized that they needed additional emotional support, so he founded "Vets Helping Heroes". His organization has raised over $4.5 million dollars to provide service dogs to wounded service members.

In honor of his continued service to our country during World War II and still now, I am pleased to recognize Mr. Irwin Stovroff and congratulate him on the receipt of an honorary doctorate degree from Florida Atlantic University. I am proud to represent him in our great district.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep sympathy and sorrow for the countless deaths and injuries caused by the derailment of Amtrak Northeast Regional Train 188 in Philadelphia. My thoughts and prayers are with the victims and their families. Due to this tragedy, the scale of which is unprecedented over the last decade, last night I decided to be with the grieving families, law enforcement officers, emergency responders, health care professionals, and all those working in my district to preserve life, help the injured, and otherwise recover from the derailment in Philadelphia. For this reason, unfortunately, I missed some important votes on the floor of the House of Representatives. I hope my colleagues understand the imperative nature of my travelling to Philadelphia to be there for my constituents working to recover in the aftermath of this horrific disaster.

I did not make this decision lightly. Serving my constituents is my highest honor and responsibility as a Member of Congress. Of course, my voting decisions are also of highest importance. Yet, after careful deliberation and with a heavy heart, I felt compelled to be on the scene of the Amtrak tragedy as we work as a community—local, state and federal governmental entities working hand-in-hand—to bring peace to impacted families and a sense of order to the scene.

In light of these circumstances, and my sincere opposition to one particular bill on the House floor last night, I submit some of the many reasons why I so strongly oppose H.R. 36, the so-called Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and state that I would have in fact voted against this misguided, unconstitutional legislation. This dangerous legislation is another alarming attempt by the Republican Party to deny women their constitutional right to family planning. The Supreme Court has spoken on the issue. This is settled law.

This legislation is out of touch with the rights and health care needs of women. The bill's inadequate rape exception and overly burdensome reporting requirements continue to shame victims of rape and are particularly offensive. It is irresponsible for Members of Congress to continue to undermine and play politics with the rights of women and families throughout America. Moreover, this bill has no meaningful exceptions to protect women's health, and criminalizes physicians for providing necessary and constitutionally-protected care.

For these reasons, I continue to strongly oppose and, had I been present, would in no uncertain terms have voted "no" on rollcall 223, H.R. 36 final passage, and "yes" on rollcall 222, the Motion to Recommit H.R. 36. However, again, in light of the tragic events in Philadelphia, I felt compelled to be there with the health care providers, first responders, and volunteers working to restore peace and safety to the scene. Once again, I'd like to express my condolences to the families and loved ones of the victims of Amtrak Train 188's derailment. I hope my colleagues and constituents will understand my absence despite the importance of this vote.

HONORING THE EBONETTE SOCIAL & CIVICS CLUB

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a group of ladies who have shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to serve their community, the Ebonette Social & Civics Club. The Ebonette Social & Civics Club has served as an informational vehicle to citizens of Sharkey & Issaquena Counties.

The Ebonette Social and Civics Club was established in 1968 with local ladies from Sharkey and Issaquena Counties. The mission and vision of the organization is for civic improvement and social entertainment. The Ebonette Social & Civics Club also provides and supports activities, services, programs and opportunities for the benefit of youth excellence and moral character; and to promote community and economic development.

The Ebonettes give yearly scholarships to students from both South Delta High School and Sharkey Issaquena Academy. To date over $25,000 has been given. The scholarships given are not discriminated based on race or any ethnic background.

The ladies also provide Christmas gifts to needy families, support Breast Cancer Organizations, provided support for burned out victims, provide meals for senior citizens and worked with the Hwy 14 clean-up and numerous of other community activities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Ebonette Social & Civics Club for its dedication to serving others and giving back to the community.

HONORING NEW MEXICO CIVIL WAR SITES

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the landmark locations in New Mexico where thousands of Spanish speaking New Mexico Hispanos fought valiantly during the Civil War.

When the U.S. Territorial Governor issued a call for service in 1861, 4,000 men aged 18 to 45 from Las Vegas, Santa Fe, Taos, Mora, Chaperito and other surrounding villages answered the call and were organized into five regiments known as the New Mexico Volunteers.

Brigadier General Henry Hopkins Sibley led Confederate troops into New Mexico in an attempt to capture Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Fort Union and the Santa Fe Trail so his army could take control of the gold and silver mines in Colorado. His plan was to eventually arrive at the coast of California in order to replenish the South's depleted funds.

The Battle at Valverde took place on February 20th and 21st, 1862, near Fort Craig in southern New Mexico with the Union Army under the command of Colonel Edward Canby. Union forces blocked the passage of Confederates at the river ford until reinforcements arrived and a fierce battle ensued. During the engagement 68 Union soldiers and 36 Confederate soldiers were killed with over 300 wounded. In the end, the battle was a victory for the South.

Union forces returned to Fort Union and the Confederate forces captured Albuquerque and Santa Fe before also moving on towards Fort Union over Glorieta Pass, where the armies were destined to collide.

The Battle of Glorieta Pass took place March 26th through March 28th, 1862, in Apache Canyon with the bulk of Union forces in head-to-head combat with Confederate troops. During the battle, a group of New Mexico Volunteer scouts under the command of Lt. Colonel Manuel Chavez, and Captain Rafael Chacon, Corporal Albino Garcia, Innocencio Arellanes, and Anastasio Duran detected the Confederate supply train near Johnson's Ranch and destroyed eighty supply wagons and drove off 500 horses and mules.

At the end of the Battle of Glorieta Pass the Union lost 51 soldiers with 78 wounded, and the Confederates lost 50 soldiers with 80 wounded. Although Confederates won the battle on the field, the loss of supplies and livestock completely crippled them and they were forced to make their way back to Texas in defeat.

In 1993, the Congressional Civil War Sites Advisory Commission was tasked with identifying the nation's historically significant battle

sites and the Battle of Glorieta Pass received a Priority 1, Class A, as one of the principle strategic operations having a direct impact on the course of the war—Gettysburg and Antietam received the same distinction.

Portions of the Glorieta Pass Battlefield have become a part of the National Park System and it is also designated as a National Historic Landmark. It is fitting and proper to erect a memorial at the site of the Battle of Glorieta, honoring the Hispanic Civil War Veterans who lost their lives and those that fought with courage and honor for their country.

CELEBRATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 2015, students, faculty, and staff will gather in historic St. Mary's City, Maryland, to celebrate the St. Mary's College of Maryland Class of 2015 Commencement. They—along with many others across Maryland and our country—will also be marking the 175th anniversary of the College's founding.

Since its humble beginnings in 1840 as a female seminary, St. Mary's College of Maryland has been a center of learning and educational empowerment. Set along the St. Mary's River, where Leonard Calvert and the first English settlers disembarked from the Ark and Dove in 1634 to found the colony of Maryland, it expanded in the early twentieth century to become the State's first junior college and became co-educational. In the 1960's, the school transitioned into a four-year college and granted its first undergraduate degrees in 1971. Recognizing its tradition of excellence in liberal arts education, its high standards, and its unique history, the Maryland General Assembly formalized St. Mary's College of Maryland as the state's only public honors college in 1992. Today, it continues to graduate some of Maryland's best and brightest students from thirty-one academic programs and ranks among the best public liberal arts colleges in the nation.

I am proud to represent the students, faculty, and staff of St. Mary's College of Maryland in Congress as well as to have served as a member of its Board of Trustees since 1995. Alumni of the College run businesses, contribute to the arts and athletics, conduct research in marine biology and the environment, report the news through national outlets, and serve in government—including in my Congressional office. They are continuing their alma mater's tradition of preparing graduates to make a difference wherever they live and work throughout Maryland and across our country.

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the entire St. Mary's College of Maryland community, led by its dynamic new President, Tuajuanda Jordan, on reaching its 175th year of serving as a living memorial to those first Maryland colonists' commitment to religious freedom, tolerance, and opportunity.

RECOGNIZING OPERATION THANK YOU

HON. GWEN GRAHAM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, I'd like to recognize Operation Thank You, an annual event honoring veterans and active-duty service members in Leon County.

As we mark the 65th anniversary of our nation's entry in the Korean War, the 2015 Operation Thank You will honor Korean War veterans and their families at the Florida Korean War Memorial in Tallahassee on Saturday, May 16th.

The event will include a presentation of colors by the Godby High School JROTC Color Guard, a performance of the national anthem by the Lawton Chiles High School Choir, and remarks by Korean War veterans—along with a pancake breakfast.

Leon County has a long tradition of supporting local veterans and making sure they receive the care they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I extend our deepest appreciation to all of those working to make this year's Operation Thank You a success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICK W. ALLEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I missed a vote on the Motion to Recommit for H.R. 2029 on April 30, 2015. Listed below is how I would have voted if I had been present.

Roll Call Vote 192—Motion to Recommit H.R. 2029—Nay.

OFFICER LIQUORI TATE

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bravery and sacrifice demonstrated by Officer Liquori Tate, a recently commissioned member of the Hattiesburg Police Department, who was tragically slain in the line of duty on Saturday, the ninth day of May in the year two thousand and fifteen.

Officer Liquori Tate was twenty-five years old, a resident of Hattiesburg, and a graduate of South Pike High School near McComb. He was the son of Youlander Ross of Jackson and Ronald Tate of Georgia and brother to thirteen siblings. He had a passion for the Miami Heat, the Atlanta Falcons, and good blues music.

Tate graduated from the Hattiesburg Police Training Academy and became a patrolman with Hattiesburg Police Force in 2014. During his training, Liquori was challenged in every way possible but, according to one of his training officers, he was the only recruit who refused to consider failure or withdrawal as an option.

Tate's lifelong ambition was to serve his community in a policeman's uniform. He was an exceptional young man who chose a life of service, placing himself in danger each day in order to protect the citizens of Hattiesburg.

Officer Tate had a passion for the siren, and could often be heard sounding his own while on patrol. He was excited about being a policeman and loved going to work each day. Those who served with him knew he was 'all smiles,' and he was a valuable member of the Hattiesburg Police Force.

The City of Hattiesburg and the Great State of Mississippi have suffered the loss of one of our own: a family member and a protector and defender of our constitution and laws. Every citizen deeply and sincerely feels the loss of Officer Liquori Tate, and his service, heroism, and sacrifice will not be forgotten.

HONORING THE BI-NATIONAL HEALTH ALLIANCE OF NAPA COUNTY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the Bi-National Health Alliance of Napa County's dedication to improving the health and well-being of our underserved Latino community. Bi-National Health Alliance of Napa County strives to improve the quality of life, promote positive physical and mental health, provide opportunities to access resources in a culturally sensitive environment, and encourage empowerment and growth.

Ten years ago, Catalina Chavez-Tapia and Queen of the Valley Medical Center founded the Napa County Bi-National Health Week Task Force, which transitioned into a year-round effort: the Bi-National Health Alliance of Napa County. By increasing awareness of risk factors affecting health and providing information on available health services and resources, the Bi-National Health Alliance of Napa County brings together existing community resources to empower local Latinos to live healthier lifestyles.

The Bi-National Health Alliance of Napa County also organizes a number of events to encourage the Latino community to become more engaged locally. This includes the Napa Valley Latina Women's Conference, which is held to empower Latina women to engage in their community through cultural, mental health, and educational workshops along with free health screenings, educational information, and follow-up care. Since the conference's inception, over 1,120 professional and newly immigrated, low-income, and disenfranchised Latina women have attended and been provided a forum to identify and address the cultural barriers to the advancement of Latina women locally.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we recognize the Bi-National Health Alliance of Napa County's dedication to the best ideals of

public service as they host their 11th Annual Napa Valley Latina Women's Conference on May 14th, 2015. On behalf of a grateful community, we honor and thank the Bi-National Health Alliance of Napa County for their many years of service, and hope for many more.

HONORING FAATIN KHALEELAH MUHAMMAD

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a goal oriented student, Faatin Khaleelah Muhammad.

Faatin Khaleelah Muhammad is the 17 year old daughter of James and Latonya Muhammad and is a member of Pilgrim Missionary Baptist Church located in Natchez, Mississippi.

Faatin has managed to maintain a 3.5 GPA for 4 years, at Jefferson County High School and throughout her life, excelled in school and sports: she has been a member of the Jefferson County High School Track team since 2012; she has received multiple plaques, ribbons, and metals for her performances; and she has served 2 years as a high school cheerleader. Faatin is currently president of FCCLA where she completed many community services and projects. She is also a member of FBLA, TSA, TATU and the Senior Transition Program. She has been in the Jefferson County High School Marching Band since the 9th grade.

Upon graduation, Faatin will attend Alcorn State University located in Lorman, Mississippi. She will major in Animal Science with hopes to become an Animal doctor in Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Faatin Khaleelah Muhammad, as a student who is goal oriented and making a difference in her community.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH WIRTZ

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ralph Wirtz in recognition of his many contributions to Michigan's 4th District as the editor of the Midland Daily News.

Ralph Wirtz dedicated over forty years of his life to the Midland Daily News starting as a sports writer and, because of his outstanding journalistic abilities, accepted increased responsibility until his appointment as managing editor in 1989.

Ralph did not originally plan on a career in journalism but discovered a passion for sports writing while serving in the United States Navy in the 1970's. He has won numerous awards over the course of his career, including Agriculture Communicator of the Year in 1998, first place in editorial writing by the Associated Press in 2008, the 2008 Journalist of the Year award by the Press Association Society of America and the Midland Community Voices Rosemary Byers Award in 2009. Ralph has been the person that the community has turned to whenever they needed a trusted voice for their news and information.

Ralph Wirtz has set the standard for journalistic excellence in Michigan and his tireless work on behalf of his community is worthy of recognition from this Congress. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize Ralph Wirtz in gratitude for his forty years of service to the Midland Daily News and the Midland Community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, I missed a Roll Call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on #221.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Police Week, which was first established by a joint resolution of Congress in 1962. National Police Week was initially created to coincide with the National Peace Officer Memorial Day established by President Kennedy in the same year. This week, we give special recognition to those law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

I want to express my personal gratitude for the hard work and dedication that law enforcement officers selflessly give to their communities all over the country. I also wish to thank the family members of those officers who have paid the ultimate sacrifice for the safety and protection of others. They deserve our nation's highest respect and admiration.

On behalf of the residents in the 30th Congressional District of Texas, I want to thank every officer in the Balch Springs, Cedar Hill, Dallas, Desoto, Duncanville, Glenn Heights, Grand Prairie, Hutchins, Lancaster, Mesquite, Ovilla and Wilmer Police Departments. I am thankful for the leadership of our capable police chiefs and sheriffs, who are working hard to implement major reforms within their departments to decrease the instances of police related violence. I look forward to continuing our positive working relationship.

Now more than ever, there is a great need to build trust in our communities between police and the people that they pledge to serve and protect. I understand that what we ask of our police officers is a dangerous, difficult, and sometimes thankless job. Far too frequently, the actions of a few individuals overshadow the dedication and service of the hundreds of thousands of law enforcement officers who perform their duty with the utmost courtesy and integrity. I am thankful for their courage, their professionalism, and their daily sacrifice to protect and serve our communities across the country.

7TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INCARCERATION OF SEVERAL PROMINENT MEMBERS OF THE BAHA'I COMMUNITY BY THE IRANIAN REGIME

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 7th anniversary of the incarceration of several prominent members of the Baha'i community by the Iranian regime.

The 9th District of Illinois is home to the Baha'i House of Worship—which I just visited last week—and many members of the Baha'i faith. I have heard many stories about the Iranian government's mistreatment of the Baha'i community, and those stories are truly heartbreaking. Members of the Baha'i community face the constant risk of violence, arrest or worse, and suffer significant discrimination as they go about their daily lives.

The arrest and conviction of these Baha'i leaders is but one example of a much larger problem of human rights abuses. I call on the Iranian government to release the seven Baha'i leaders who have been in their custody for so long and to change the way it treats religious minorities—including members of the Baha'i community.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, May 15, 2015*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given.

The issues of these days and in coming months remain complicated and potentially divisive. Endow each Member with wisdom and equanimity, that productive policies and solutions might be reached for the benefit of our Nation.

Please send Your spirit of peace upon those areas of our world where violence and conflict endure, and threaten to multiply. May all Your children learn to live in peace.

And, may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOLD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING SCOUTMASTER CHIP ANDERSON

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, Chip Anderson has been an integral part of Kenilworth Scouting—more specifically, Troop 13—for the last 8 years. He has provided outstanding leadership and support to the young men of Kenilworth, Illinois, as first the troop quartermaster, and then as the troop Scoutmaster. He is moving to Atlanta with his family for career reasons and resigning his active leadership position with Troop 13, but will always remain a vital part of Troop 13 and its legacy.

During his tenure, the troop has been very active with weekly meetings, community service projects, and monthly camping and overnight trips, including the annual Boundary Waters High Adventure for the rising seventh-grade boys.

Advancement is one, but not the only, measure of success, and during his tenure Troop 13 has had 45 young men attain the rank of Eagle, Scouting's highest rank. Chip has directly supported each of these young men, as well as all the young men in the troop. Most have called him a mentor and friend in the notes they have written to express their thanks.

We are thankful for his outstanding contribution, and as a community we feel very fortunate to have had his leadership and dedication to the Scouting program and to the development of young men in the village.

It is an honor to recognize Chip today. It is an honor to call him my friend.

LONG-TERM HIGHWAY TRUST FUND REAUTHORIZATION

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a long-term reauthorization of the highway trust fund.

Just this week, Mayor Dumas from Attleboro, Massachusetts, came to Washington to tell me how another stopgap bill would negatively impact projects in his city.

The bridges in my home State are some of the oldest in our country. Of the over 5,000 bridges in our Commonwealth, more than half are considered deficient.

Every single day, cars, trucks, and schoolbuses cross our structurally compromised bridges nearly 10 million times. Those numbers underscore the urgency for our government to provide the critical, long-term investments in infrastructure that our constituents demand and deserve.

Each time we approve a short-term patch of the highway trust fund, we are continuing the uncertainty and doubt that prevents States and municipalities from moving forward on projects that not only create jobs but keep all of us safe.

Our refusal to even consider a lasting transportation plan is hindering our ability to maintain the infrastructure we already have, when we should be instead focused on new projects that increase our modern economy in communities across our country.

It is time to fix this problem. It is time to invest in our country. It is time to pass this bill.

TEACHER APPRECIATION MONTH

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, recently, South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley designated May as Teacher Appreciation Month.

As the husband of a retired teacher, I know firsthand the time, resources, support, and guidance our dedicated educators give to their students. While I regularly take the opportunity to visit schools and honor educators throughout the year, I am grateful for the opportunity to give special recognition and thanks to our hard-working educators this month.

I would especially like to honor my constituent, Daniel Oddo, from Dreher High School, who was a finalist for the South Carolina Teacher of the Year. Staff member Drew Kennedy is a Dreher graduate.

I am grateful for the Palmetto State Teachers Association, led by executive director Kathy Maness, for their tireless work on behalf of teachers across

the State. The success of our teachers is amplified by the leadership of State Superintendent of Education Molly Spearman, who is dedicated to recruiting and retaining quality teachers in the Palmetto State.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

FUNDING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of long-term investments in our Nation's critical transportation infrastructure.

Across this Nation, our roads and bridges are crumbling, and communities are in need of updated transit systems. Investments in critical infrastructure are necessary to ensure our roads, bridges, and transit systems are in good working condition and updated with the newest technologies to ensure our safety. Jobs hang in the balance. The safety of our constituents hang in the balance.

In North Carolina alone, there are more than 5,000 bridges in need of repair. More than 700 of those are in my district. We must make sure that critical road and infrastructure projects are not put on hold and that jobs are not placed in jeopardy.

My colleagues, I urge you to make the smart decision for our Nation and support a long-term solution to funding our transportation infrastructure.

SUPPORT PASSAGE OF FY16 NDAA

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my fellow Republicans and other Members to support the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

My colleagues and I on the Armed Services Committee came together in a bipartisan fashion to pass this legislation out of committee with a vote of 60–2. That seems pretty bipartisan to me. And it should be. Our Nation's security should not be a partisan issue.

The committee had a goal of implementing some lasting reforms to ensure that our military is better prepared for the challenges that we face.

Part of facing these challenges is ensuring that our military has the very best training and weapons systems for the fight. This legislation recognizes that need by preserving the A–10, which is the best close air support aircraft, and flown out of Moody Air Force Base.

This bill also invests in the future replacement of the JSTARS, an important ISR platform that flies out of Robins Air Force Base.

It is as honor to serve as a voice for Robins and Moody in Congress, and I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation for our Nation's warfighters who bravely serve so that we may remain the land of the free.

FUTURE FARMERS, AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker: ''Learning to do, doing to learn, earning to live, living to serve.'' Those 12 short words comprise the motto of the Future Farmers of America Organization, founded in 1928 by 33 students from 18 different States who came together with a shared mission to develop as the future farmers of this country.

Agriculture is the cornerstone of our economy, supporting more than 23 million jobs in our country. But it is also an industry that requires more than just skills and knowledge that might be learned in the classroom, skills that are necessary to feed our country and to connect with the changing marketplace and consumers.

FAA has succeeded in fulfilling this gap by expanding not only agricultural education in our schools but also in teaching students to be confident participants and leaders, to be honest and fair, and to show respect for others and our land's resources. These lifelong skills are vital not just for farmers but in all aspects of agriculture, whether it is marketing, management, research, communications, or engineering.

I rise today to recognize this organization and the millions of Future Farmers of America, both current and past, and express my gratitude for your dedication, leadership, and commitment to strengthening our towns.

It is that spirit and love for this country that truly represents the heart of rural America.

IRAN REVIEW ACT

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Ms. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with concern over the President's ongoing nuclear negotiations with Iran, and I rise in support of the legislation that the House passed yesterday, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no guarantee that any final agreement negotiated by Secretary Kerry and President Obama will be a good deal. There is no guarantee this agreement will be good for the security of the United States, good for the stability of the Middle East, and good for the security of our close ally, Israel.

By passing H.R. 1191, we are empowering Congress to review the final agreement and block any bad deal negotiated by the President.

Mr. Speaker, June 30, the deadline for the negotiations, is nearing quickly. When, and if, the President is able to arrive at a deal, I encourage my colleagues to take a strong, thorough look at all of the details. There is too much at stake in the world to get this wrong.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to House Resolution 260 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1735.

Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) kindly take the chair.

□ 0912

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, May 14, 2015, amendment No. 83 printed in House Report 114–112, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), had been disposed of.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 6 consisting of amendment Nos. 90, 91, 96, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, and 118 printed in House Report No. 114–112, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. HILL OF ARKANSAS

Page 528, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 1092. BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS OF DECISION TO MAINTAIN C130J AIRCRAFT AT KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall conduct a business case analysis of the decision to maintain 10 C-130J aircraft at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi. Such analysis shall include consideration of—

(1) any efficiencies or cost savings that would be achieved by transferring such aircraft to Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas;

(2) any effects of such decision on the operation of the air mobility command; and

(3) the short-term and long-term costs of maintaining such aircraft at Keesler Air Force Base.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 528, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 1092. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CYBER RESILIENCY OF NATIONAL GUARD NETWORKS AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) National Guard personnel need to have situational awareness and reliable communications in the event of an emergency, terrorist attack, or natural or man-made disaster;

(2) in the event of such an emergency, attack, or disaster, the ability of the National Guard personnel to communicate and coordinate response is vital;

(3) current communications and networking systems for the National Guard, including commercial wireless solutions, such as mobile wireless kinetic mesh and other systems that are interoperable with the systems of civilian first responders, should provide the necessary robustness, interoperability, reliability, and resilience to extend needed situational awareness and communications to all users and under all operating conditions, including in degraded communications environments where infrastructure is damaged, destroyed, or under cyber attack or disruption; and

(4) the National Guard should be constantly seeking ways to improve and expand its communications and networking capabilities to provide for enhanced performance and resilience in the face of cyber attacks or disruptions, as well as other instances of degradation.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title XII (page 550, after line 26), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT ON ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN TO AUDIT THE USE OF FUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN.

Not later than December 31, 2016, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction shall submit to Congress a report on the extent to which the Office of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction has adequate access to financial records of the Government of Afghanistan to audit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for assistance for Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Page 559, after line 11, add the following:

(H) An assessment of United States' efforts to disrupt and prevent foreign fighters traveling to Syria and Iraq and disrupt and prevent foreign fighters in Syria and Iraq traveling to the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1234. LIMITATION ON MILITARY-TO-MILITARY EXCHANGES AND CONTACTS WITH IRAN.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not authorize any military-to-military exchange or contact described in subsection (b) to be conducted by the Armed Forces or Department of Defense civilians with representatives of the military or paramilitary forces (including the IRGC) of the Islamic Republic of Iran until the Secretary certifies that Iran—

(1) has ended its ballistic missile program;

(2) is no longer listed by the Secretary of State as a state sponsor of terrorism; and

(3) has recognized the Israel as a Jewish state.

(b) COVERED EXCHANGES AND CONTACTS.—Subsection (a) applies to any military-to-military exchange or contact that includes inappropriate exposure to any of the following:

(1) Force projection operations.

(2) Nuclear operations.

(3) Advanced combined-arms and joint combat operations.

(4) Advanced logistical operations.

(5) Chemical and biological defense and other capabilities related to weapons of mass destruction.

(6) Surveillance and reconnaissance operations.

(7) Joint warfighting experiments.

(8) Military space operations.

(9) Other advanced capabilities of the Armed Forces.

(10) Arms sales or military-related technology transfers.

(11) Release of classified or restricted information.

(12) Access to a Department of Defense laboratory or base.

(13) Military operations or exercises with allies and partners.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) does not apply to any search-and-rescue or humanitarian operation or exercise.

(d) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary of Defense shall, without delegation, submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, not later than December 31 each year, a certification in writing as to whether or not any military-to-military exchange or contact during that calendar year was conducted in violation of subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI OF INDIANA

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1234. SECURITY GUARANTEES ASSOCIATED WITH IRAN'S NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide the appropriate congressional committees a copy of any security agreement or commitment provided by the United States to any country in the Middle East, including the member countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council, associated with Iran's nuclear weapons program.

(b) ANALYSIS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff shall provide the Secretary of Defense with a detailed analysis of the United States military force structure and posture, as well as the estimated costs associated with such force structure and posture, required to meet any security agreement or commitment in the Middle East, including member countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council. The Secretary shall provide such analysis, without change, along with any additional views the Secretary may offer, when the Secretary submits the materials required under subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN EXPENDITURES.—The Secretary of Defense may not obligate or expend any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 for meeting any security agreements or commitments described in this section unless the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Secretary has provided a copy of such agreement as required under subsection (a).

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON OF MINNESOTA

At the end of subtitle D of title XII (page 576, after line 2), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of force against Iran.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the end of subtitle F of title XII (page 604, after line 16), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICY REGARDING FOREIGN DISCLOSURE OR TECHNOLOGY RELEASE OF AEGIS ASHORE CAPABILITY TO ALLIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that a decision by the Government of Japan to purchase Aegis Ashore for its self-defense, given that it already possesses sea-based Aegis weapons system-equipped naval vessels, could create a significant opportunity for promoting interoperability and integration of air- and missile defense capability with close allies, could provide for force multiplication benefits, and could potentially alleviate force posture requirements on multi-mission assets.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT POLICY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a copy of the Department of Defense policy regarding foreign disclosure or technology release of Aegis Ashore capability to allies, including Japan, that possess sea-based Aegis weapons system-equipped naval vessels.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle F of title XII (page 604, after line 16), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REQUIREMENT TO INVITE THE MILITARY FORCES OF TAIWAN TO PARTICIPATE IN RIMPAC EXERCISES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall invite the military forces of Taiwan to participate in any maritime exercise known as the Rim of the Pacific Exercise if the Secretary has invited the military forces of the People's Republic of China to participate in such maritime exercise.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to any maritime exercise described in subsection (a) that begins on or after such date of enactment.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE ARMS TRADE TREATY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to fund a Secretariat or any other international organization established to support the implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty, to sustain domestic prosecutions based on any charge related to the Treaty, or to implement the Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty and implementing legislation for the Treaty has been enacted into law.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the Department of Defense from assisting foreign countries in bringing their laws, regulations, and practices related to export control up to United States standards.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of subtitle G of title XII (page 622, after line 22), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. ASSESSMENT OF THE MILITARY CAPABILITY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the military capability of the Republic of Cyprus to defend against threats to its national security, including threats posed by hostile foreign governments and international terrorist groups.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of the effect on the national security of Cyprus of the United States policy to deny applications for licenses and other approvals for the export of defense articles and defense services to the armed forces of Cyprus.

(2) An analysis of the extent to which such United States policy is consistent with overall United States security and policy objectives in the region.

(3) An assessment of the potential impact of lifting such United States policy.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY OF NEW YORK

Page 622, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 1269. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DEFENSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States has an upgraded, strategic-plus relationship with India based on regional cooperation, space science cooperation, and defense cooperation.

(2) The defense relationship between the United States and the Republic of India is strengthened by the common commitment of both countries to democracy.

(3) The United States and the Republic of India share a common and long-standing commitment to civilian control of the military.

(4) The United States and the Republic of India have increasingly worked together on defense cooperation across a range of activities, exercises, initiatives, and research.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to expand defense cooperation with the Republic of India;

(2) welcome the role of the Republic of India in providing security and stability in the Indo-Pacific region and beyond;

(3) work cooperatively with the Republic of India on matters relating to our common defense;

(4) vigorously support the implementation of the United States-India Defense Framework Agreement; and

(3) support the India Defense Trade and Technology Initiative.

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1269. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EVACUATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND NATIONALS FROM YEMEN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The ongoing conflict in Yemen, including airstrikes conducted by Saudi Arabia and a no-fly zone imposed over Yemen by Saudi Arabia, has made it difficult for Yemeni-Americans to depart Yemen.

(2) United States citizen Jamal al-Labani of Hayward, California, was killed in Yemen after the closure of the United States Embassy while attempting to bring his pregnant wife and 2-year-daughter back to the United States.

(3) Over 550 Yemeni-Americans have registered as being unable to leave Yemen after the closure of the United States Embassy in Yemen in February 2015.

(4) In 2006, the Department of Defense helped the Department of State remove 15,000 Americans from Lebanon during Hezbollah's war against Israel.

(5) Many other nations, including China, Ethiopia, India, and Russia are evacuating or have evacuated their citizens from Yemen.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should exercise all available authorities as expeditiously as possible to evacuate United States citizens and nationals from Yemen.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle G of title XII (page 622, after line 22), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT ON IMPACT OF ANY SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN UNITED STATES TROOP LEVELS OR MATERIEL IN EUROPE ON NATO'S ABILITY TO CREDIBLY ADDRESS EXTERNAL THREATS TO ANY NATO MEMBER STATE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) in order to demonstrate United States commitment to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, especially those NATO allies under pressure on the Eastern flank of the Alliance, and to enhance the United States deterrent presence and resolve to countering threats to NATO's collective security, United States Armed Forces stationed and deployed in Europe should be increased in number and combat power; and

(2) the ''current and foreseeable security environment'', as referenced in paragraph 12 of Section IV on Political-Military Matters of the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation (NATO-Russia Founding Act), has changed significantly since the signing of such Act in 1997 and thus such Act should not be read, interpreted, or implemented so as to constrain or in any way limit additional permanent stationing of substantial combat forces anywhere on the territory of any NATO member State in furtherance of NATO's core mission of collective defense and other missions.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to ensure that the United States contribution to NATO's core mission of collective defense remains robust and ready to meet any future challenges, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the impact of any significant reduction in United States troop levels or materiel in Europe on NATO's ability to credibly deter, resist, and, if necessary, repel external threats to any NATO member State.

(2) DEADLINE.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted not later than 30 days prior to the date on which any significant reduction described in paragraph (1) is scheduled to take place.

(3) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States.

(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. VELA OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1269. REPORT ON VIOLENCE AND CARTEL ACTIVITY IN MEXICO.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on violence and cartel activity in Mexico and the impact of such on United States national security.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

Page 628, after line 8, insert the following:

''(3) If the Secretary furloughs any employee referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress, by no later than 30 days before initiating the furlough, notice of the furlough that includes a certification that, as a result of the proposed furlough, none of the work performed by any employee of the Department of Defense will be shifted to any Department of Defense civilian employee, contractor, or member of the Armed Forces.''.

Page 628, line 9, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(4)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF MINNESOTA

In section 1504, page 632, line 20, insert ''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—'' before ''Funds''.

At the end of section 1504, page 633, line 1, add the following new subsection:

(b) CONDITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR IRAQ AND SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP PROGRAMS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated by

this section for the Syria and Iraq Train and Equip programs, as specified in the funding table in section 4302, may not be provided to any recipient that the Secretary of Defense has reported, pursuant to a quarterly progress report submitted pursuant to section 1209 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3541), as having misused provided training and equipment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, this en bloc package consists of 17 total amendments. Nine of them have been offered by Republicans, eight of them have been offered by Democrats. They cover a variety of very important topics for our national security, including cooperation with India, evacuation of U.S. persons from Yemen, the impact of U.S. troop levels on NATO, and violence in Mexico.

I believe these are important subjects and important additions to our bill. I hope Members will support this en bloc package. And I hope that all Members who make these contributions will support the final version so that their contribution has a chance to become law.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

□ 0915

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman for the efforts put forth by himself and the committee on necessary legislation that, indeed, should pass.

Mr. Chairman, America has given 14 years, nearly $1 trillion, and thousands of lives to help build a stable Afghanistan. While most of our troops have come home, Congress has still obligated billions of dollars to be spent on reconstruction efforts.

As we transfer oversight authority to Afghan officials, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction has identified serious deficiencies in our ability to ensure the proper use of these American taxpayer dollars, as the Afghan Ministries currently lack the capacity to effectively manage and account for U.S.-funded assistance.

My amendment would require SIGAR to certify it has sufficient access to Afghan accounts to guarantee effective audits. We must ensure that every dollar is spent effectively. I appreciate that this amendment has been added en bloc, and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation and this amendment.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask Members to support this en bloc package, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for comments on en bloc No. 6.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, as Mr. WALBERG just pointed out, we have spent literally trillions of dollars in the Middle East in what many would describe as wars of choice and nation building.

I want to applaud the committee for this underlying legislation to ensure some accountability of how that money goes. All too often, the moneys have made a mockery of our good intentions and ended up in the wrong hands and, in many cases, used against us.

The underlying legislation requires the Defense Department now to require them to give us a list of who money has been given to in Syria and Iraq to fight ISIL, and my legislation says that, when they find evidence that those funds have been misused by any one of those parties, they can no longer be recipients of our funding and our intentions in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment and the bloc as well.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my colleague from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I want the chairman to know that I support the amendment en bloc, and I support the bill as well.

Mr. Chair, the number of foreign fighters traveling to Syria and Iraq to join ISIS is increasing at an alarming, dramatic rate. The Director of the National Counterterrorism Center said that more foreign fighters have joined ISIS in the last 2 years than those who went to Afghanistan or Iraq in the last 20 years. More than 180 of these fighters are from the United States.

These killers are not just going to fight and die on the battlefields of Iraq and Syria. Many return home to their home countries as trained, battle-hardened Islamic radicals.

Before Moner Mohammad Abusalha became the first American to carry out a suicide bomb in Syria, he had already been to Syria and back to the United States as a trained suicide killer. The United States Government didn't even know this.

We need a comprehensive strategy to reduce the flow of foreign fighters from ISIS to the United States and foreign fighters going to train with ISIS. This amendment requires such a strategy.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I rise in support of my amendment, No. 103, contained in this bloc, which expresses the sense of Congress that the President should exercise all available authority to evacuate U.S. citizens from Yemen as soon as possible.

My district is home to the highest concentration of Yemeni Americans in the United States. Since hostilities began in Yemen, my office hears daily from Yemeni Americans who are terrified, frustrated, desperate, and have no idea how to exit the country. These are United States citizens in Yemen, with nowhere to turn.

This week, NPR told the story of Rhonia Aladashi, a 16-year-old girl from my hometown of Dearborn, Michigan. She had traveled to Yemen to visit her father when the hostilities began, and she tried multiple options to escape.

She tried to cross the border at Saudi Arabia and got turned back into hostile areas because she did not have a man traveling with her. Ultimately, she ended up on a private fishing boat, going with no food or water on board.

My constituents and their families stuck in Yemen need hope, and they need to know that American citizens are not being forgotten. We do not in any way want to put American military in danger, but we need to tell Americans there is hope.

I thank Mr. LARSEN and Chairman THORNBERRY.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my gratitude for the hard work and dedication put forth by Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, and their colleagues on the Armed Services Committee in drafting the National Defense Authorization Act of 2016.

I would like to thank the Rules Committee, Chairman SESSIONS, and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for their efforts in ensuring Members on both sides of the aisle had an avenue to voice their opinion.

We recently finished 10 townhalls in 10 counties, and the number one thing from our constituents is making sure that Washington is held accountable. These efforts help restore our constituents' faith in this body and the process of lawmaking.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Washington, my good friend Mr. LARSEN, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the effort to expand U.S.-India relations has always been and continues to be a bipartisan effort, and I want to thank both sides of the aisle in acceptance of the amendment that I put forward.

Over the past two decades, we have seen the relationship between the United States and India flourish and blossom under both—I should say starting with President Clinton's Presidency, followed by President George Bush's Presidency, and we have seen how advanced it has become under the Presidency of Barack Obama.

I had the opportunity to travel with the President earlier this year to India, and the incredible reception that the President and the delegation received was like no other experience I have ever had in India, and this relationship continues to grow.

This is the first time we have had an opportunity to express the support of the House and of the Congress of this burgeoning relationship, especially as it pertains to mil-to-mil cooperation, and I believe that this is the most critical relationship that we will have this decade in the world.

India and the United States, we have shared values of civilian control of the military. It is a very important aspect when you consider the part of the world we are talking about. We share that same value with India.

India's quest for securing peace not only within her region, but around the world as well, is something that we share with her. India's commitment to democracy and rule of law is something we also share with India and, overall, using democracy and the quest for peace, trying to bring stability throughout the world.

I also want to thank the Indian diaspora in helping with this effort. This is truly, as I said earlier, I believe, the most important alliance the United States will have this century.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

I rise in strong support of my amendment to renew a 1-year ban on the Obama administration from using any Department of Defense funds to implement the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. This amendment updates and strengthens the language of my amendments that were entered into law in previous NDAAs.

Why? Because this amendment—we must always uphold our fundamental individual right to keep and to bear arms, which is enshrined in our Constitution. We also must uphold the sovereignty of the United States over our arms export control system, which is the gold standard of the world.

Now, how do we do this?

First, the amendment explicitly forbids the use of DOD funds to facilitate domestic prosecutions of individual Americans. This is a real danger because the Obama administration has already engaged in domestic prosecutions of individuals using treaties. This is totally unacceptable.

Second, my amendment specifically bans the use of DOD funds for an ATT secretariat, created for ''effectively implementing'' the ATT, according to the treaty's supporters.

Appallingly and equally unacceptable, ATT backers seek to put the U.S. on the hook to fund the activities of a treaty to which it is not a party.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for including this amendment in the en bloc amendments. I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of the Second Amendment, our Nation's sovereignty, and vote in support of this amendment to renew the annual ban on the funding of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Castor amendment, which is an amendment in support of military families across the country. It expresses the sense of Congress that, when it comes to housing military members, the Pentagon should factor in the commuting times for base personnel and the land available for on-base housing.

On-base housing is a critical readiness issue. Having our servicemembers as close to their assignments as possible is vital. DOD must ensure that the decisions relating to base housing take into account relevant factors, and each base is different.

For example, at MacDill Air Force Base in my hometown in Tampa, Florida, it is home to the 6th Air Mobility Wing, United States Special Operations Command, and United States Central Command.

The recent expansion of on-base housing for military families has been a great success. Pursuant to a public-private partnership that was authorized in 2007, 572 homes have been constructed on the base. This has been a godsend for the families at MacDill, and here is why: the neighborhoods closest to the base are expensive and out of reach for many military families, so servicemembers oftentimes buy homes about 30 miles away and then commute to the base.

This recent public-private partnership at MacDill has been a win-win for the military and the families who serve. In fact, one top Pentagon official who oversees installations noted that the MacDill Air Force Base housing initiative was one of her favorites, forcewide, and was exceptional.

Think about the difference it makes to that military family when they can live close to where they work and where their children attend school.

Now, until recently, the Air Force and the housing contractor were discussing the next phase of on-base housing. MacDill has over 330 families on a waiting list. Unfortunately, despite the long waiting list, the obvious demand, the Air Force has inexplicably terminated discussions.

If this is happening in my community, it could be happening in yours, and with scarce Federal dollars, we must continue to encourage fruitful public-private partnerships and the best interests of our brave men and women in the service.

I thank Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, and Mr. LARSEN for their support of the amendment, and I urge adoption.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I support the en bloc. I hope all Members will, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support the Crowley-Engel-Holding-Bera-Royce amendment to the 2016 NDAA.

As Co-Chair of the House India Caucus, I am privileged to spend time highlighting the robust and growing relationship between the United States and India to my colleagues and to my constituents.

With the emerging challenges our two nations face in the Indo-Pacific region, we must place an emphasis on increasing the collaboration between our two defense departments and defense industries.

In January to move this collaboration forward, the United States and India signed the ''Joint Strategic Vision for the Asia Pacific and Indian Ocean Region'' laying out our shared principles and views for security in the region.

Our two nations also agreed to renew—and upgrade—our ten year defense framework well before its expiration date which truly shows our commitment to working together.

The United States and India are on the same page and through the diligent work of the Defense Technology and Trade Initiative along with the Department of Defense's India Rapid Reaction Cell, defense cooperation between our two nations is on the right trajectory.

But more can, should, and will be done to bring us closer together on defense.

Mr. Chair, India has a vital role to play in the Indo-Pacific by becoming a regional security provider and the United States should continue to work lockstep with our counterparts in New Delhi to achieve this.

And Mr. Chair, that is precisely what our amendment supports.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 7 consisting of amendment Nos. 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 119, 120, 121, 125, 126, and 127 printed in House Report No. 114–112, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT ON ACTIONS TO ENSURE QATAR IS PREVENTING TERRORIST LEADERS AND FINANCIERS FROM OPERATING IN ITS COUNTRY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Qatar is an important partner in the region and has played a significant role in fighting ISIS;

(2) Qatar has provided significant enablers to the United States in its wars in Iraq and Afghanistan by hosting United States forces;

(3) Qatar has unfortunately allowed the leaders of Hamas, a United States-designated foreign terrorist organization, to operate freely in its country;

(4) Qatar has also allowed United States-designated terrorist financiers to operate in its country; and

(5) the United States should do everything in its power to encourage Qatar to crack down on terrorist leaders and financiers who are operating in its country.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on actions taken by the United States Government to ensure that Qatar is preventing terrorist leaders and financiers from operating in its country.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12xx. UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR JORDAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan remains a steadfast partner and the armed forces of Jordan are among the United States' strongest military partners.

(2) Jordan's civil and military leadership continue to provide a positive example of professionalism and moderation.

(3) The Colorado National Guard's relationship with the Jordanian military provides a significant benefit to both the United States and Jordan.

(4) The armed forces of Jordan fought alongside United States forces in Afghanistan and are currently flying combat sorties as part of the counter-ISIL Coalition.

(5) Jordan continues to provide critical basing support for Operation Inherent Resolve missions.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Jordan is one of our most important allies in the region and the United States should support Jordan's military efforts to the greatest extent possible, including by providing military equipment and training; and

(2) the President should make every effort to ensure rapid responses to any military requests for assistance from Jordan.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title XII (page 622, after line 22), add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT ON UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO COMBAT BOKO HARAM AND SUPPORT REGIONAL ALLIES AND OTHER PARTNERS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) combating Boko Haram is in the national security interest of the United States;

(2) the United States should support regional partners, including the African Union-authorized Multinational Joint Task Force, through training and advice and the provision of key enablers to strengthen operations against Boko Haram; and

(3) United States support for these regional efforts should be integrated into a comprehensive strategy to support security and stability in the region.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the following:

(A) An assessment of the threat of Boko Haram to United States national security interests.

(B) A description of United States efforts to combat Boko Haram, including the authorities to carry out such efforts and the roles and missions of the Department of Defense and Department of State.

(C) An assessment of the capabilities, shortfalls, and progress made by United States-supported regional partners, including the African Union-authorized Multinational Joint Task Force, to combat Boko Haram.

(D) A description of military equipment, supplies, training, and other defense articles and services, including by type, quantity, and prioritization of such items, required to combat Boko Haram effectively and the gaps within regional allies to engage in the mission to combat Boko Haram.

(E) A description of military equipment, supplies, training, and other defense articles and services, including by type, quantity, and actual or estimated delivery date, that the United States Government has provided, is providing, and plans to provide to regional allies and other partners to combat Boko Haram.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified in form, but may contain a classified annex.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR TUNISIA.

It is the sense of Congress that it is a national security priority of the United States to support the Republic of Tunisia and to cooperate with Tunisia by providing assistance to combat the growing terrorist threat from the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) or other terrorist organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FUTURE OF NATO AND ENLARGEMENT INITIATIVES.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress declares that—

(1) the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security cooperation and an enduring instrument for promoting stability in Europe and around the world for over 65 years;

(2) the incorporation of the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Albania, and Croatia has been essential to the success of NATO in this modern era;

(3) these countries have over time added to and strengthened the list of key European allies of the United States;

(4) since joining NATO, these member states have remained committed to the collective defense of the Alliance and have demonstrated their will and ability to contribute to transatlantic solidarity and assume increasingly more responsibility for international peace and security;

(5) since joining the Alliance, these NATO members states have contributed to numerous NATO-led peace, security, and stability operations, including participation in the International Security Assistance Force's (ISAF) mission in Afghanistan;

(6) these NATO member states have become reliable partners and supporters of aspiring members and the United States recognizes their continued efforts to aid in further enlargement initiatives;

(7) at the 2014 Summit in Wales, NATO declared that ''The Open Door Policy under Article 10 of the Washington Treaty is one of the Alliance's great successes.''; and

(8) at the 2014 Summit in Wales, NATO declared that ''NATO's door will remain open to all European democracies which share the values of our Alliance, which are willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, which are in a position to further the principles of the Treaty, and whose inclusion will contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area.''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should—

(A) continue to work with aspirant countries to prepare such countries for entry into NATO;

(B) seek NATO membership for Montenegro;

(C) continue supporting a Membership Action Plan (MAP) for Georgia;

(D) encourage the leaders of Macedonia and Greece to find a mutually agreeable solution to the name dispute between the two countries;

(E) seek a Dayton II agreement to resolve the constitutional issues of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(F) work with the Republic of Kosovo to prepare the country for entrance into the Partnership for Peace (PfP) program;

(G) take a leading role in working with NATO member states to identify, through consensus, the current and future security threats facing the Alliance; and

(H) take a leading role to work with NATO allies to ensure the Alliance maintains the required capabilities, including the gains in interoperability from combat in Afghanistan, necessary to meet the security threats to the Alliance;

(2) NATO member states should review defense spending to ensure sufficient funding is obligated to meet NATO responsibilities; and

(3) the United States should remain committed to maintaining a military presence in

Europe as a means of promoting allied interoperability and providing visible assurance to NATO allies in the region.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

Page 700, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 1657. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF NUCLEAR ENTERPRISE REVIEWS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should submit to Congress a plan on how the Secretary plans to implement the full recommendations of the two nuclear enterprise reviews, conducted and then validated by the Air Force, one of which was conducted by Assistant Secretary Madelyn Creedon and Rear Admiral Peter Fanta and one of which was conducted by General Walsh and Admiral Harvey. The plan submitted under this section should include a timeline for when each recommendation shall be implemented and how the additional manpower recommendations shall be allocated.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI (page 700, after line 25), add the following new section:

SEC. 1657. REPORT ON THE NUMBER OF PLANNED NUCLEAR-ARMED CRUISE MISSILES.

Not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the justification of the number of planned nuclear-armed cruise missiles, known as the Long Range Standoff Weapon, to the U.S. arsenal. The report shall include—

(1) the rationale for procuring the expected number of cruise missiles;

(2) how the number of planned missiles aligns with U.S. nuclear employment strategy;

(3) an estimate of the annual and total cost for research, development, test, and evaluation and procurement for the total number of planned cruise missiles; and

(4) an estimate of the proportional annual cost of the cruise missiles as compared to the annual cost of nuclear triad and annual defense spending.

AMENDMENT NO. 121 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

Page 715, line 25, strike ''terms,'' and all that follows through ''2015'' on page 716, line 1, and insert ''terms and conditions''.

Page 716, line 5, after ''2014'' insert '', subject to an amended agreement for coproduction for radar components''.

Page 718, line 18, insert after ''agreements'' the following: ''that inform a production decision''.

Page 718, line 25, insert before the semicolon the following: ''or in an amount that meets best efforts, as mutually agreed by the United States and Israel''.

Page 720, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

(c) WAIVER.—The Director may waive the requirements of subsection (b) to carry out subparagraphs (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) if the Under Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Under Secretary has sufficient data from the Government of Israel to demonstrate the following:

(1) Such subparagraphs will be carried out solely for funding procurement of long-lead components in accordance with a production plan, including a funding profile detailing Israeli contributions for production of either David's Sling or Arrow 3.

(2) Such long-lead components have completed the research and development technology development phase.

(3) The long-lead procurement will be conducted in a manner that maximizes co-production in the United States without incurring additional non-recurring engineering activity or cost.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

Page 775, after line 19, insert the following:

SEC. 2804. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BASE HOUSING PROJECTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should take into consideration, when prioritizing base housing projects, commuting times for base personnel and land available for development on the base.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK OF IOWA

Add at the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII the following new section:

SEC. 28___. ARSENAL INSTALLATION REUTILIZATION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (h), (i), and (j) as subsections (i), (j), and (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

''(h) ARSENAL INSTALLATION REUTILIZATION AUTHORITY.—(1) In the case of a military manufacturing arsenal, the Secretary concerned may authorize leases and contracts for a term of up to 25 years, notwithstanding subsection (b)(1), if the Secretary determines that a lease or contract of that duration will promote the national defense or be in the public interest for the purpose of—

''(A) helping to maintain the viability of the military manufacturing arsenal and any military installations on which it is located;

''(B) eliminating, or at least reducing, the cost of Government ownership of the military manufacturing arsenal, including the costs of operations and maintenance, the costs of environmental remediation, and other costs; and

''(C) leveraging private investment at the military manufacturing arsenal through long-term facility use contracts, property management contracts, leases, or other agreements that support and advance the preceding purposes.

''(2)(A) The Secretary concerned my delegate the authority provided by this subsection to the commander of the military manufacturing arsenal or, if part of a larger military installation, the installation commander.

''(B) The delegated authority does not include the authority to enter into a lease or contract under this section to carry out any activity covered by section 4544(b) of this title related to—

''(i) the sale of articles manufactured by a military manufacturing arsenal;

''(ii) the sale of services performed by a military manufacturing arsenal; or

''(iii) the performance of manufacturing work at the military manufacturing arsenal.

''(3) In this subsection, the term 'military manufacturing arsenal' means a Government-owned, Government-operated defense plant of the Department of the Defense that manufactures weapons, weapon components, or both.''.

(b) CROSS REFERENCES.—(1) Section 2662(b)(3)(E) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2667(h)(2)'' and inserting ''2667(i)(2)''.

(2) Section 6981(a)(2) of such title is amended by striking ''2667(h)(2)'' and inserting ''2667(i)(2)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE OF LOUISIANA

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII (page 795, after line 2), add the following new section:

SEC. 2834. RELEASE OF PROPERTY INTERESTS RETAINED IN CONNECTION WITH LAND CONVEYANCE, CAMP VILLERE, LOUISIANA.

(a) RELEASE OF RETAINED INTERESTS.—With respect to a parcel of real property at Camp Villere, Louisiana, consisting of approximately 48.04 acres and conveyed by quitclaim deed for National Guard purposes by the United States to the State of Louisiana pursuant to section 616 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1975 (titles I through VI of Public Law 93–553; 88 Stat. 1768), the Secretary of the Army may release the terms and conditions imposed by the United States under subsection (b) of such section and the reversionary interest retained by the United States under subsection (c) of such section. The release of such terms and conditions and retained interests with respect to any portion of that parcel shall not be construed to alter the rights or interests retained by the United States with respect to the remainder of the real property conveyed to the State under such section.

(b) CONDITION OF RELEASE.—The release authorized by subsection (a) of terms and conditions and retained interests shall be subject to the condition that the State of Louisiana—

(1) transfer the parcel of real property described in such subsection from the Louisiana Military Department to the Louisiana Agricultural Finance Authority for the purpose of permitting the Louisiana Agricultural Finance Authority to use the parcel for any purposes allowed by State law; and

(2) make available to the Louisiana Military Department real property to replace the transferred parcel that is suitable for use for National Guard training and operational support for emergency management and homeland defense activities.

(c) INSTRUMENT OF RELEASE AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The Secretary of the Army may execute and file in the appropriate office a deed of release, amended deed, or other appropriate instrument reflecting the release of terms and conditions and retained interests under subsection (a). The exact acreage and legal description of the property described in such subsection shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army.

(d) PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army may require the State of Louisiana to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the release of retained interests under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs related to environmental documentation, and other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts paid to the Secretary in advance exceed the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the State.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received under paragraph (1) as reimbursement for costs incurred by the Secretary to carry out the release of retained interests under subsection (a) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in

carrying out the release of retained interests. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the release of retained interests under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman this en bloc package consists of 11 amendments. They touch such important subjects as the nuclear enterprise review, the long-range standoff weapon, military manufacturing arsenals, and a variety of other very important topics.

They are sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats. Four of these amendments are sponsored by Democrats. I believe they deserve the support of the whole House, but I also believe the full bill deserves the support of the whole House so that these important amendments have a chance to become law.

I hope all Members will support not only the package, but final passage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the distinguished vice chair of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

□ 0930

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, No. 108, which is included in this en bloc package. My amendment adds a sense of Congress provision regarding our support for the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Jordan is one of our most important allies in the region, and I believe that the United States should support Jordan's military efforts to the greatest extent possible.

The Jordanians are on the front lines in the fight against ISIS and have suffered the consequences of the President's policy failures regarding Syria. Jordan is under fire from those who wish to do it harm, and we must stand by a country that has been a force for good in the region.

In Colorado, we have a unique interest in this relationship, as the Colorado National Guard is partnered with the Jordanian military through the State Partnership Program. Colorado guardsmen are helping train Jordanian servicemembers. This is just one of the ways that we can help stand with our friends in Jordan.

I thank the chairman for including this amendment in the en bloc package, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to echo the comments of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) about en bloc No. 7 and its bipartisan nature. I would encourage Members to support it.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to thank the ranking member for yielding and the chairman and his staff for working with me on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the National Defense Authorization Act tasks the Missile Defense Agency with developing a concept for a space-based missile defense system. There is no doubt that missile defense—if technologically feasible, militarily robust, and economically justifiable—would be an important priority for our national security. But as a scientist, I think that we need to do our homework before we begin investing hundreds of billions of dollars into developing this system, and that is why I am introducing this amendment to require a preliminary cost estimate for this project.

A 2012 report by the National Academy of Sciences estimated that even to provide limited coverage, hundreds of interceptors would be required to stop an incoming ballistic missile. Because of the cost to launch, maintain, operate, and replenish the interceptors, even a limited system would cost a minimum of $200 billion.

We must do our due diligence before investing billions of taxpayer dollars into any project. So I urge my colleagues to join me and vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate Chairman THORNBERRY and the Armed Services Committee for working collaboratively on this important amendment.

In speaking on behalf of this Royce-Maloney amendment, I want to recognize the leadership of Representative CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, who has been dedicated in the fight against Boko Haram and dedicated in terms of trying to raise awareness on this.

Many have seen on television the continued kidnappings of Boko Haram, the pillaging of villages, the taking of women and children as captives. I just want to tell you the story that we heard last year in our committee from one young girl, a survivor from Chibok, that touched the hearts of, I think, many people there that day.

She gave this brave narration of what happened when Boko Haram broke in and, before her very eyes, killed her father and killed her 14-year-old brother. She is one of the few from her village who survived.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

So I just want to say this: Nigeria and its neighbors—Chad, Niger, Cameroon—have been making headway in the fight against Boko Haram. They have cleared a number of northern Nigerian towns. Now we have an opportunity with the African Union force—but it lacks equipment; it lacks capacity—for a protracted fight there.

This amendment expresses support for robust security assistance, training, equipment, the capacity building they need so that the African troops that are fighting against Boko Haram can continue to advance on the field.

The amendment also requires the Department of Defense and the State Department to produce a report to make sure the Congress is fully aware of the nature of the assistance being provided.

We need to support Nigeria and the African Union authorized force with all appropriate means. It is the best chance we have to eliminate Boko Haram, to eliminate this terror so that other young girls are not snatched and their lives destroyed. The region's stability, by the way, depends upon it.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the ranking member for yielding and for his strong leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment I have cosponsored with the gentleman from California, Representative ROYCE, and I thank him for his outstanding leadership not only on this issue, but on so many of them.

This particular amendment expresses U.S. support for the defeat of the terrorist organization Boko Haram. Combating Boko Haram is in our national interest and is certainly in the interest of security in the region, and the United States should support the regional allies in their operations against Boko Haram, which are making significant progress in combating them.

We just marked the 1-year anniversary of the kidnapping of 270 young schoolgirls from Nigeria. This horror raised the awareness of the world to the terror of Boko Haram and what it has unleashed on Nigerians for years.

The amendment clearly affirms that Boko Haram represents a threat not just to our Nation, but to the world, and certainly to stability in the region. The amendment calls for United States support—which may be in the form of

equipment, training, technical support—for a coordinated military response in Africa to combat Boko Haram.

Since its formation, the coalition has made significant gains against this terrorist threat and has started to improve stability in the region. Many of the young girls have escaped and have come here to speak to us in Congress.

The amendment also calls for reports to Congress on the progress of the mission and an accounting of U.S. support.

Combating Boko Haram is and should remain a national security interest, and we must remain vigilant in fighting this enemy. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Again, I thank Chairman ROYCE for his attention, strong leadership, and for really saving lives in this region. He is securing stability in the region and for America, too.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to show my appreciation for the work of Chairman ROYCE and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York on this issue with Boko Haram.

I noticed in the headlines of this morning's paper, Boko Haram has a new offensive against a military base in Nigeria.

The contribution they have made with this amendment to the bill is very important so that the Nigerians and others in the region are better able to fight these terrorists. And there is no other word for them.

There are also provisions in this bill to help the Ukrainians fight the aggression that they are undergoing, there are provisions in this bill to help fight ISIS, which is all part of the reason I believe this bill deserves the support of all Members.

I appreciate the contributions of both Members on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in the legislation today, there is a clause that would cause us to think about what to do in the High Arctic. The Arctic Ocean is melting. There will be a Northwest Passage. We are going to need a new heavy icebreaker to provide the support for the Navy as well as for commercial.

Yesterday during a hearing, we hit upon the notion of creating a special fund similar to what exists for the strategic missile submarines. We would like, therefore, to begin the discussion of a national strategic high-latitude icebreaking fund. That discussion could then merge into a way of funding about $1 billion for a new icebreaker, absolutely essential for the U.S. Navy, absolutely essential for the commerce in the Arctic Ocean as well as for providing us with the ability to compete with Russia. I would like to propose that that be discussed and part of the process as we move the NDAA through the committees and the two Houses.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage folks to vote for en bloc 7, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I encourage Members to do the same thing, as well as on final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 8 consisting of amendment Nos. 122, 123, 124, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, and 135 printed in House Report No. 114–112, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

Page 728, line 21, insert before the semicolon the following: '', including estimates of the appropriate identifiable costs of each such potential program of record''.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16___. DESIGNATION OF PREFERRED LOCATION OF ADDITIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE SITE IN THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense publishes the draft environmental impact statements pursuant to section 227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1678), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in consultation with the Commander of the United States Northern Command, shall designate the preferred location in the United States for the potential future deployment of a missile defense site.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI (page 732, after line 10), add the following new section:

SEC. 1678. REPORT RELATING TO THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH EXTENDING THE LIFE OF THE MINUTEMAN III INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE.

Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a report examining the costs associated with extending the life of the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile compared to the costs associated with procuring a new ground based strategic deterrent.

AMENDMENT NO. 128 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28___. LAND CONVEYANCE, CAMPION AIR FORCE RADAR STATION, GALENA, ALASKA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Interior may convey, without consideration, to the Town of Galena, Alaska (in this section referred to as the ''Town''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to public land, including improvements thereon, at the former Campion Air Force Station, Alaska, as further described in subsection (b), for the purpose of permitting the Town to use the conveyed land for public purposes.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed under subsection (a) consists of approximately 1290 acres of the approximately 1613 acres of public land withdrawn by the Secretary of the Interior under Public Land Order 843 for use by the Secretary of the Air Force as the former Campion Air Force Station. The portions of the former Air Force Station that are not authorized to be conveyed under subsection (a) are those portions that are subject to environmental land use restrictions or are currently undergoing environmental remediation by the Secretary of the Air Force.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall consult with the Secretary of the Air Force on the exact acreage and legal description of the public land to be conveyed under subsection (a) and conditions to be included in the conveyance that are necessary to protect human health and the environment.

(d) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Interior shall require the Town to cover costs (except costs for environmental remediation of the property) to be incurred by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Air Force, or to reimburse the appropriate Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under this section, including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected in advance of the Secretary of Interior or Secretary of the Air Force incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the appropriate Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the Town.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—

(A) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Amounts received by the Secretary of the Interior as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited, at the option of the Secretary, to the appropriation, fund, or account from which the expenses were paid, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available to the Secretary for the purposes for which the expenses were paid. Amounts so credited shall be merged with funds in such appropriation, fund, or account and shall be available for the same purposes and subject to the same limitations as the funds with which merged.

(B) SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.—Amounts received by the Secretary of the Air Force as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited, at the option of the Secretary, to the appropriation, fund, or account from which the expenses were paid, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available to the Secretary for the purposes for which the expenses were paid. Amounts so credited shall be merged with funds in such appropriation, fund, or account and shall be available for the same purposes and subject to the same limitations as the funds with which merged.

(e) CONVEYANCE AGREEMENT.—The conveyance of public land under this section shall be accomplished using a quit claim deed or other legal instrument and upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, after consulting with the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Town, including such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior, after consulting with the Secretary of the Air Force, considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 31___. LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAMS COVERED BY SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS.

Section 4217 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2537) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN SYSTEMS.—For purposes of this section, an existing nuclear weapon system is deemed to be undergoing life extension if the expected total cost of the associated activities, including activities considered alterations, will exceed $1,000,000,000.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle C of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 31___. ESTABLISHMENT OF MICROLAB PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of national laboratories, may establish a microlab pilot program under which the Secretary establishes a microlab that is located in close proximity to a national laboratory and that is accessible to the public for the purposes of—

(1) enhancing collaboration with regional research groups, such as institutions of higher education and industry groups; and

(2) accelerating technology transfer from national laboratories to the marketplace.

(3) promoting regional workforce development through science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) instruction and training.

(b) CRITERIA.—In determining the placement of a microlab under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the commitment of a national laboratory to establishing a microlab;

(2) the existence of a joint research institute or a new facility that—

(A) is not on the main site of a national laboratory;

(B) is in close proximity to a national laboratory; and

(C) has the capability to house a microlab;

(3) whether employees of a national laboratory and persons from academia, industry, and government are available to be assigned to the microlab; and

(4) cost-sharing or in-kind contributions from State and local governments and private industry.

(c) TIMING.—If the Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of national laboratories, elects to establish a microlab pilot program under this section, the Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of national laboratories, shall—

(1) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, begin the process of determining the placement of the microlab under subsection (a); and

(2) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, implement the microlab pilot program under this section.

(d) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of implementation of the microlab pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report that provides an update on the implementation of the microlab pilot program under subsection (a).

(e) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of implementation of the microlab pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the microlab pilot program under subsection (a), including findings and recommendations of the Secretary.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''microlab'' means a small laboratory established by the Secretary under section 3.

(2) The term ''national laboratory'' means a national security laboratory, as defined in section 3281 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2471).

(3) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title XXXV (page 885, after line 19) add the following:

SEC. 35___. PAYMENT FOR MARITIME SECURITY FLEET VESSELS.

(a) PER-VESSEL AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding section 53106(a)(1)(C) of title 46, United States Code, and subject to the availability of appropriations, there is authorized to be paid to each contractor for an operating agreement (as those terms are used in that section) for fiscal year 2016, $3,500,000 for each vessel that is covered by the operating agreement.

(b) REPEAL OF OTHER AUTHORIZATION.—Section 53111(3) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2016,''.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) FUNDING INCREASE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 3501(5) for expenses to maintain and preserve a United States-flag merchant marine to serve the national security needs of the United States under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code, is hereby increased by $24,000,000.

(2) FUNDING OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101 for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, Auxiliaries, Craft and Prior Yr Program Cost, Outfitting (Line 020) is hereby reduced by $24,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 132 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of title XXXV (page 885, after line 19) add the following:

SEC. ___. MELVILLE HALL OF UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.

(a) GIFT TO THE MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.—The Maritime Administrator may accept a gift of money from the Foundation under section 51315 of title 46, United States Code, for the purpose of renovating Melville Hall on the campus of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(b) COVERED GIFTS.—A gift described in this subsection is a gift under subsection (a) that the Maritime Administrator determines exceeds the sum of—

(1) the minimum amount that is sufficient to ensure the renovation of Melville Hall in accordance with the capital improvement plan of the United States Merchant Marine Academy that was in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) 25 percent of the amount described in paragraph (1).

(c) OPERATION CONTRACTS.—Subject to subsection (d), in the case that the Maritime Administrator accepts a gift of money described in subsection (b), the Maritime Administrator may enter into a contract with the Foundation for the operation of Melville Hall to make available facilities for, among other possible uses, official academy functions, third-party catering functions, and industry events and conferences.

(d) CONTRACT TERMS.—The contract described in subsection (c) shall be for such period and on such terms as the Maritime Administrator considers appropriate, including a provision, mutually agreeable to the Maritime Administrator and the Foundation, that—

(1) requires the Foundation—

(A) at the expense solely of the Foundation through the term of the contract to maintain Melville Hall in a condition that is as good as or better than the condition Melville Hall was in on the later of—

(i) the date that the renovation of Melville Hall was completed; or

(ii) the date that the Foundation accepted Melville Hall after it was tendered to the Foundation by the Maritime Administrator; and

(B) to deposit all proceeds from the operation of Melville Hall, after expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of Melville Hall, into the account of the Regimental Affairs Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality or successor entity, to be used solely for the morale and welfare of the cadets of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

(2) prohibits the use of Melville Hall as lodging or an office by any person for more than 4 days in any calendar year other than—

(A) by the United States; or

(B) for the administration and operation of Melville Hall.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term ''contract'' includes any modification, extension, or renewal of the contract.

(2) FOUNDATION.—In this section, the term ''Foundation'' means the United States Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association and Foundation, Inc.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed under section 3105 of title 41, United States Code, as requiring the Maritime Administrator to award a contract for the operation of Melville Hall to the Foundation.

AMENDMENT NO. 133 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle D of title V (page 179, after line 21), add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCESS BY WHICH MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES MAY CARRY A CONCEALED PERSONAL FIREARM ON A MILITARY INSTALLATION.

(a) PROCESS REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, taking into consideration the views

of senior leadership of military installations in the United States, shall establish a process by which the commander of a military installation in the United States may authorize a member of the Armed Forces who is assigned to duty at the installation to carry a concealed personal firearm on the installation if the commander determines it to be necessary as a personal- or force-protection measure.

(b) RELATION TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW.—In establishing the process under subsection (a) for a military installation, the commander of the installation shall consult with elected officials of the State and local jurisdictions in which the installation is located and take into consideration the law of the State and such jurisdictions regarding carrying a concealed personal firearm.

(c) MEMBER QUALIFICATIONS.—To be eligible to be authorized to carry a concealed personal firearm on a military installation pursuant to the process established under subsection (a), a member of the Armed Forces—

(1) must complete any training and certification required by any State in which the installation is located that would permit the member to carry concealed in that State;

(2) must not be subject to disciplinary action under the Uniform Code of Military Justice for any offense that could result in incarceration or separation from the Armed Forces;

(3) must not be prohibited from possessing a firearm because of conviction of a crime of domestic violence; and

(4) must meet such service-related qualification requirements for the use of firearms, as established by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(d) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''State'' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 10___. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PAID-FOR PATRIOTISM.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) while recruitment and advertising in support of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard and Reserves, is appropriate, the taxpayer should not have to pay any organization to honor the service of members of the Armed Forces;

(2) instead of being paid by the Department of Defense to honor the service of members of the Armed Forces, these organizations should be motivated by patriotism to honor the service of members of the Armed Forces out of their own free will; and

(3) any funds that the Department of Defense would have used for purposes described in paragraph (1) should be redirected toward post-traumatic stress disorder research and treatment for members of the Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 135 OFFERED BY MR. NUNES OF CALIFORNIA

Page 754, line 10, insert ''United States'' before ''operational requirements''.

Page 754, line 10, after ''operational requirements,'' insert the following: ''not including the requirements of any other organization or country,''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, this en bloc package consists of 11 amendments. Generally, they are on the issues related to our strategic deterrence: our nuclear weapons, our ICBMs, missile defense against those sorts of weapons from other countries; in other words, they touch on very important issues that are central to our country's security.

They have been sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats, and I hope Members of this House will support this en bloc package.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I, too, support this en bloc package. I hope that the Members will vote for it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers at this point, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to once again say that I want to, first of all, thank the chairman. I want to thank all of the members of the committee and the staff for the hard work that they do and have done on this bill.

Every year, this is a very, very difficult process, starting with the committee markup, which, this year, I think—we probably didn't set a record. We set a record for my time in terms of one day going until 4:45 in the morning.

But I just want to take one brief moment to recognize the staff that does just an unbelievable amount of work throughout this process. We see the amendments both in committee and on the floor that survive that process. The staff has to sift through literally hundreds more to try to boil them down, to try to find compromises, to basically try to work out whatever they can work out. I don't think there are too many members of the staff on either side that have slept more than 2 or 3 hours a night here for the last few weeks. So I thank them for their hard work, and I thank the committee members for their hard work as well.

It is the largest committee in Congress. We have excellent members on it. During the course of the debate and during the course of putting together this bill, every one of those members contributed greatly to the product.

As I have said before, there are a lot of good things in this bill. The reform package that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) has made of particular priority I think is a very good first step towards trying to get more efficiency out of the military in a variety in different places. And of course we fund a lot of very necessary programs.

But we have one overarching problem that we have had since 2011, starting with the fact that we couldn't pass the appropriations bills for 2011. And most have forgotten this, but at the end of March of 2011, we were looking at a government shutdown. We had a marathon 4-day, every amendment you can imagine on the appropriations bill, and, actually, I think it did go past the moment when the government was supposed to shut down before passing a CR, which pushed us then up against the debt ceiling in 2011, which wasn't going to be raised. We were facing a situation where chunks of the government would shut downs in ways we couldn't even predict, and I want everyone to understand the impact that this has on the Department of Defense.

□ 0945

I vividly remember a dinner that I had in March of 2011 with then-Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, Pete Chiarelli, and I was asking him about how all of this budget uncertainty impacts the Department of Defense. He said: Well, we have got several hundred programs, and every day we try to figure out which ones we are allowed to fund, which ones we are not allowed to fund, where we can get the money, what we can do, and how we can move it around. They didn't know.

For the last 4 years plus, that is what the Department of Defense has had to do. We have gone from CR to government shutdown to occasionally getting a spending bill to living with sequestration and the budget caps. The one thing that this bill doesn't do is it doesn't resolve that issue. It goes to the overseas contingency operation fund while leaving the budget caps in place.

As Secretary Carter has said, the overseas contingency operations fund is no way to fund the military and does very, very little to remove that uncertainty that I just described. So I want everyone to understand when I talk about the fact that I am opposing this bill because of its impact on the overall budget, that is also very much about the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense is left in that uncertainty and also stuck with OCO funding, which is unpredictable, 1-year money that makes it very difficult for them to plan. So this bill's reliance on the OCO funding is a problem for the Department of Defense. Leaving those budget caps in place is something that I am opposed to. So it is an issue directly related to the Department of Defense.

Now, it is also related to the rest of the budget. We have caps that impact the Department of Homeland Security, that impact the Department of Justice, that impact those other areas that, by the way, are very important. I have had some folks mention ISIL and our fight against them. Those departments

are incredibly important to that fight. They are still under the budget caps, which are, I believe, jeopardizing our national security. And then there are other issues, infrastructure being the biggest one that those budget caps continue to hamper and continue, I believe, to make our country less safe.

So the fact that this bill locks in place and keeps the budget caps, relies on the overseas contingency operations fund, and, most importantly, does not lift the budget cap for defense is the reason I am opposing it and urging other Democrats and Republicans as well to oppose it. It doesn't lift the budget caps. I believe that is harmful to the Department of Defense. So this is a defense issue.

Mr. Chairman, I also point out for my conservative colleagues who are so concerned about keeping those budget caps that the OCO goes right around them. I wouldn't think that a conservative who wants to keep government spending under control would encourage the government deciding that they can create free money. The OCO doesn't count against the budget caps. So it is like the money isn't really being spent, only, of course, the money is being spent. It is $38 billion that we are just choosing not to count. It doesn't fix the problem.

Lastly, the President has promised to veto all of the appropriations bills and the defense bill that are based on this flawed approach to the budget. So what we are doing here is ultimately not going to be successful until we come up with a better long-term solution to dealing with the budget caps, and I will simply emphasize one more time that has a profoundly negative effect on the Department of Defense, on our obligation to, I believe, properly fund and properly support the men and women who serve in our military. So, Mr. Chairman, while there is a lot of good in this bill, the ongoing budget uncertainty that it continues, I believe, is the fatal flaw in this bill. So I urge people to vote ''no.''

I do appreciate all the work and the effort that went into it. I also emphasize that this is but one step in the process. We have got a long way to go, and I am completely confident by the time we get to the end of it, we will have a National Defense Authorization Act. It will be difficult. We have to work with the President, we have to work with the Senate, and people have a lot of different opinions, but this is but the first step in the process.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge us to continue working to hopefully get a better product that can get the support of the House, the Senate, and the President and fulfill our duty to pass this bill and support our troops.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me start with where the gentleman from Washington left off, that this is one step in the process. That is kind of what I have been saying all along. Earlier the gentleman said he is opposed to this bill because it locks in this OCO approach. No, it doesn't lock anything in. If there is a better way to deal with our budget issues in the appropriation bills, then there is lots of time this year to do that. But the question here for the House is: Will we vote against a defense authorization bill—not an appropriation bill—but a defense authorization bill and prevent it from moving a step ahead?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I hope all Members had a chance to read the editorial in this morning's Washington Post. Let me just read the last sentence of it: ''Far better for him''—by which it means the President—''and his party's leadership in Congress to help an adequate defense budget keep moving through Congress rather than perpetuate a fight all Americans, whether Republican or Democrat, may later regret.''

That is what we are asking here today: keep this adequate defense budget moving by voting for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that doesn't solve all the problems. The gentleman is exactly right. There are all sorts of appropriation bills and other things to come in this process. But to try to use this important bill and the authorities it gives as political leverage to somehow make that happen, I think, is not fair to the men and women who serve or to our country's security.

Mr. Chairman, there are lots of things that affect the military that this bill does not solve. I admit it. I don't try to solve all of them. When you try to solve all the problems, you usually end up making a mess. But that should not take away from the good that is in this bill. So I want to just emphasize the good that is in this bill has come from both sides of the aisle, and I am incredibly grateful for the contributions the Democratic members of the committee made. Something like 110 provisions in the underlying mark were requested by Democrats. In the committee 96 amendments offered by Democrats were adopted into the mark. We have had 57 amendments offered by Democrats made in order under the rule.

We don't know how they are all going to come out yet, but the point is, a substantial part of this measure has been written and contributed to by Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, as well as Members on the Republican side of the aisle. The truth is it is a better product as a result, and the truth is that it is consistent with the bipartisan tradition of this committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to end, actually, where Mr. SMITH started, and that is to express appreciation to him for being a terrific partner to work with in formulating this bill and dealing with very complex, rapidly changing subjects as the world is swirling around us. As he pointed out, we are the largest committee in Congress—63 members. But each of those members on both sides of the aisle have made important contributions to this bill.

I would, like him, also want to appreciate the staff. I think we are unique in the Congress. We have an integrated staff where I can grab someone on the Democratic side or a Democratic member can grab someone who works on the Republican side. They are all integrated, working on the same issues. I think that makes us stronger as a committee. So there is an important bipartisan tradition of this committee, and it is because national security is so important.

Let me go back to The Washington Post editorial and read the first sentence: ''There isn't much bipartisan governance left in Washington, but if anything still fits that description, it is probably the annual defense authorization act.'' I am pleased about that. I think that is what the American people want to hear because national security is so important. So for the suggestion to come that we are going to put national security on the back burner while we try to solve all the budget problems of all the agencies and all the government, that is discouraging.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that Members will not agree with that tactic, that they will listen to the better angels of their nature as far as supporting this bill because it is a bipartisan bill that is so important for our troops and national security. I hope they will support this en bloc amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Carter-Rigell-McCaul-Gohmert Amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2016 and in defense of our servicemembers' Second Amendment rights.

Twice my home State of Texas has mourned the loss of our soldiers and civilians after shootings at Fort Hood just north of my district. In 2009, Nidal Hassan walked into Fort Hood's Soldier Readiness Center, shouted ''Allahu Akbar'', and opened fire, killing 13 and wounding 42 others in the most horrific terrorist attack on U.S. soil since 9/11.

Five years later, another shooter opened fire on the base, killing four and wounding sixteen others. This is on top of other deadly attacks on military installations, such as the Navy Yard shooting in 2013, and the 2009 shooting at a recruiting center in Little Rock, Arkansas, where another Islamist radical killed one and wounded another.

In each case, one has to wonder if something could have been done to stop the shooting sooner and to prevent more lives from being lost. For years, DOD has had a stringent policy which prevents well-trained soldiers from carrying personal firearms on base in compliance with state and local laws. The

Carter-Rigell-McCaul-Gohmert Amendment will responsibly adjust this policy and allow members of the Armed Forces to carry a concealed personal firearm if their commander determines it to be necessary as a personal or force protection measure.

This is especially important at a time when threats to our soldiers and military bases is growing. In March, ISIS published a ''kill list'' of the names, photos and addresses of American soldiers. Since then, the threat level at U.S. military bases increased to ''Force Protection Bravo,'' in response to the increased threat of terrorism.

Mr. Chair, we must give our base commanders more discretion and our soldiers more protection. Thousands of my constituents in Texas already exercise this right responsibly. It is time for our servicemembers to be allowed to do the same.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–112 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. ROHRABACHER of California.

Amendment No. 27 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 413, noes 1, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

AYES—413

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—1

Ruppersberger

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Lofgren
McDermott

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta
Bass
Black
Capps
Cleaver
Doyle, Michael F.
Gosar
Long
Mulvaney
Payne
Perlmutter
Ribble
Scalise
Sinema
Stivers
Wilson (FL)

□ 1019

Mesdames LAWRENCE, KIRKPATRICK, Messrs. TED LIEU of California, AMASH, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mses. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, SPEIER, and Mr. KENNEDY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 233 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 182, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

AYES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—182

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta
Bass
Black
Capps
Cleaver
Doyle, Michael F.
Gosar
LaMalfa
Long
Mulvaney
Payne
Ribble
Rush
Scalise
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1023

Mr. DOLD changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on May 14th and 15th, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote 225, ''yes'' on rollcall vote 226, ''yes'' on rollcall vote 227, ''no'' on rollcall vote 228, ''no'' on rollcall vote 229, ''no'' on rollcall vote 230, ''yes'' on rollcall vote 231, ''no'' on rollcall vote 232, ''yes'' on rollcall vote 233, and ''no'' on rollcall vote 234.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 43, noes 375, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

AYES—43

Amash
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Capuano
Cárdenas
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cohen
Conyers
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Huelskamp
Huffman
Johnson, E. B.
Kind
Lee
Lewis
Lowey
Meng
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Polis
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rush
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Speier
Velázquez
Visclosky
Welch

NOES—375

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa

Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—14

Barletta
Bass
Bilirakis
Black
Capps
Doyle, Michael F.
Gosar
Long
Maloney, Carolyn
Mulvaney
Payne
Ribble
Scalise
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1027

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 235 I mistakenly voted "yea." I intended to vote "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 190, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

AYES—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
Lamborn
Latta
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—190

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta
Bass
Black
Capps
Doyle, Michael F.
Gosar
LaMalfa
Long
Mulvaney
Payne
Ribble
Scalise
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1030

Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 236 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 242, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

AYES—178

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Bass
Black
Capps
Doyle, Michael F.
Gosar
Long
Mulvaney
Payne
Ribble
Scalise
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1034

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 260, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GALLEGO. Yes, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gallego moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1735 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following new section:

SEC. 6___. GUARANTEEING A PAY INCREASE FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES AND NO LAPSE IN PAY CAUSED BY A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN.

(a) INCREASE IN BASIC PAY.—As provided in section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, and effective on January 1, 2016, the increase for fiscal year 2016 in the rates of monthly basic pay authorized for members of the uniformed services shall be 2.3 percent.

(b) RESPONSE TO LAPSE IN APPROPRIATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall take all steps necessary to ensure that members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps continue to receive compensation for their service in defense of the United States despite any lapse in appropriations after September 30, 2015.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not delay the bill, kill the bill, or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage, as amended.

As Members of Congress, we must always honor our promises to the men and women who serve in our military. Unfortunately, I know firsthand what happens when Washington fails our troops on the battlefield and when we come home. I fought the Iraq war on the ground. I was shot at and experienced IED attacks, but because Congress didn't follow through on its promises, our vehicles didn't have the proper armor they needed. This failure cost my friends their lives. Later, when I got home, my friends and I suffered needlessly.

When my friends and I got home, we suffered needlessly because of a veterans healthcare system that was shortchanged and mismanaged. These failures of leadership are what encouraged me to run for office, to ensure that my generation of leaders takes better care of our troops than we were taken care of.

That is why I am offering this amendment. It is to make good on Congress' promise to give our military men and women a raise. The amendment will lock in a 2.3 percent increase for all of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. Last year, one in four members of our military had to rely on food pantries and other charities just to make ends meet. That is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, our troops deserve a raise. My amendment does something else that is just as important. It ensures that even if Congress shuts down the Federal Government, all of our brave men and women in uniform will still get paid. Why should our servicemen and -women miss their paychecks just because we can't do our jobs?

Why am I offering this amendment now? Because Republicans don't appear to have learned the lessons of the chaos and confusion they caused by shutting down the government in 2013. Today, my Republican friends are risking another government shutdown by resorting to budget gimmicks, relying on war funding to pay for more routine operations and maintenance. That is completely irresponsible.

My Republican friends are fond of comparing the Federal budget to a family budget. Mr. Speaker, working families, military families can't rely on a special slush fund to pay for their daily expenses, and Congress should not either. We must protect our troops from the consequences of this Republican leadership's refusal to confront the realities of sequestration. That is why this amendment is so critical.

Yesterday, Speaker BOEHNER said voting against this bill would be shameful and that we would be turning our back on our troops. As a marine and a combat veteran, I can tell you that the Speaker is wrong. There is no shame in voting against a bill that creates uncertainty for our military and risks another dangerous government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, the real shame would be to vote against the amendment that gives our men and women the raise and certainty they deserve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying I very much appreciate the service of Mr. GALLEGO and all the veterans on both sides of the aisle who have served our Nation. I appreciate all of the contributions Mr. GALLEGO and all the other 62 members of the committee have made into producing this National Defense Authorization Act. It has been a bipartisan product in the tradition of this committee.

You know, if you think about it, for 53 straight years Congresses of both parties have passed and Presidents of both parties have signed into law a Defense Authorization Act, and that has been true through Vietnam and the cold war and 9/11. It has been true through Watergate and race riots, and economic recessions and bitter political feuds.

□ 1045

And yet, through all those things, somehow the parties could come together to do what was needed for our troops and for our country's security. I think that that strong tradition of bipartisanship is something that we should not walk away from lightly.

We have heard some discussion—complaints, really—on both sides of the aisle about using OCO to get up to the President's level.

If you look at this chart, this is the President's budget, and this is the congressional budget, which this bill is compliant with. There is a little difference in where the light blue and the dark blue start and stop. But the net effect, when you add it all together, is exactly the same: $612 billion. That is what the President asked for. That is what this bill provides. There is no difference between the two.

I agree that we ought to find a better way to have fiscal discipline without the arbitrary caps and sequestration that are in the Budget Control Act, but this bill can't do that. This bill is a defense authorization bill. It is not a budget bill. It is not an immigration bill. It is not even a defense appropriation bill. So if this bill fails, how does that get us closer to fixing our budget problems?

The truth is we could all find an excuse to vote against every bill, every day, for what is not in it, but that doesn't make a lot of sense. What is important is what is in it. And what is in it is really important for our troops and for our national security.

As much as I appreciate Congressman GALLEGO's service, I find it ironic that he would offer an amendment that tries to make sure our troops get paid, even in the event of a government shutdown; and yet, by voting against this bill, the troops don't get paid. How does that fit together?

Let me just mention two of the things that are in this bill for our troops. One is a new retirement system for people who sign up for the military. Right now, 83 percent of the people who serve come away with no retirement. Under this bill, they can put some money aside, the government will match it, and they can have a nest egg. If you vote against that bill, that doesn't happen.

One of the complaints we have all heard so many times is that the transition from Active Duty to the VA is problematic because you can't stay on the same drugs. One of the things this bill does is say that they have got to have a joint formulary so you stay on the same drugs and you can take better care of the people as they transition. Doesn't that make sense?

I hope all Members had a chance to read The Washington Post editorial today. Let me just read the last sentence:

> Far better for the President and his party's leadership in Congress to help an adequate defense budget keep moving through Congress rather than perpetuate a fight all Americans, whether Republican or Democrat, may later regret.

I think that is the bottom line. This doesn't solve all the problems. It doesn't try to solve all the problems. I know we have got more debate, more discussion to come, but this is a step on what has been a very bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, here is the bottom line. We are incredibly privileged to have these jobs, to live in this country, but those privileges only come because brave men and women are willing to volunteer to serve and sacrifice for our country.

Now, we can never match their courage and dedication and sacrifice, but

surely to goodness we can do better than use them as pawns for some sort of attempt to apply political pressure on issues that have nothing to do with this bill. Surely we can do better than that. And the way to do better than that is to vote against this motion and for final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed 5-minutes votes on passage of H.R. 1735, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 234, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

AYES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—14

Barletta
Bass
Black
Capps
Doyle, Michael F.
Gosar
Hoyer
Long
Mulvaney
Payne
Ribble
Rouzer
Scalise
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1054

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 238 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 269, noes 151, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

AYES—269

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack

Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Takai
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—151

Adams
Amash
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Labrador
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Bass
Black
Capps
Doyle, Michael F.
Gosar
Long
Mulvaney
Payne
Ribble
Scalise
Stivers

□ 1101

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 239 on H.R. 1735, I mistakenly recorded my vote as ''no'' when I should have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes on May 14, 2015 and May 15, 2015 and would like to reflect that I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 228: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 229: ''no,'' rollcall No. 230: ''no,'' rollcall No. 231: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 232: ''no,'' rollcall No. 233: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 234: ''no,'' rollcall No. 235: ''no,'' rollcall No. 236: ''no,'' rollcall No. 237: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 238: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 239: ''no.''

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1735, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to the table of contents and short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1247

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as cosponsor from H.R. 1247.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 15, 2015, TO MONDAY, MAY 18, 2015

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, May 18, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. FRANKS, Arizona
Mr. PITTENGER, North Carolina
Mr. HULTGREN, Illinois

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. ADERHOLT, Alabama
Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania
Mr. HULTGREN, Illinois
Mr. BURGESS, Texas

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, with this being National Infrastructure Week, I want to call attention to the crisis facing the Federal highway trust fund.

In my home State of Arkansas, the highway and transportation department has canceled several projects due

to the depletion of the trust fund. It is vital that we find a solution to this crisis that finances the trust fund for the long term and keeps our roads and highways safe for travel and commerce.

This is why, next week, I plan to file legislation to plug the $15 billion deficit in the trust fund without raising taxes. It will be commonsense legislation that Members on both sides of the aisle should get behind in order to prioritize funding for our critical infrastructure construction and maintenance and to avoid these crisis deadlines in the future.

INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK AND INVESTMENTS

(Ms. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, once among the world leaders in quality infrastructure, now, we rank just 16th, according to the World Economic Forum. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, the overall assessment of our Nation's infrastructure ranks the United States at a whopping D-plus.

We have just 4 legislative days until the highway trust fund expires. As we wait for the majority party to end their dysfunction and come to some—any—kind of agreement on extending the highway trust fund, 660,000 jobs hang in the balance.

I know now that in Maryland, 5,305 bridges are in complete disrepair. That is nearly 27 percent of the bridges in our State. Just a few months ago, a woman was driving down the highway, minding her own business, when a chunk of cement fell down because it is in disrepair.

I am not really sure how many lives the majority party is prepared to lose to dysfunctional and underfunded infrastructure. I am not sure how much economic insecurity we are willing to cause the American people, but it is time for us to invest in our Nation's infrastructure, create good-paying jobs, $1 billion, 35,000 jobs all across the economy.

Let's get moving. Extend the highway trust fund. Invest in our infrastructure, our long-term infrastructure. Create jobs for the 21st century.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE NEWSOME HIGH SCHOOL SOFTBALL TEAM

(Mr. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Newsome High School softball team, from Lithia, Florida, for winning the Class 8A State championship title. With a 5–1 victory over Coral Reef on Saturday, the Wolves secured their first State title in the history of Newsome High.

In the championship game, the Wolves were led by lockdown pitching and power hitting from Cassidy Davis, a clutch performance in relief from Claire Feldman, and runs from Maddy Lyn, Hannah Pridemore, and Livia Chandler.

The Wolves worked hard all year, playing a tough schedule in Hillsborough County. That helped them prepare for the playoffs, and it showed them and their opponents that they had what it takes to win it all.

I am proud to represent these great student athletes in Florida, and I look forward to watching them repeat again next year.

Congratulations.

EXPIRATION OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mr. AGUILAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, we have just 4 legislative days until the highway and transit trust fund expires on May 31. Once again, we have been pushed to the brink because of Republican leadership choosing to continue small, short-term patches, rather than a comprehensive and decisive planning document.

We cannot gamble with our infrastructure and transportation network. Our streets, our roads, our bridges, our railways are crumbling and aren't up to par. We can't afford to wait any longer for a long-term plan.

The highway trust fund supports critical projects in our communities. In my district in San Bernardino County, it would help fund the Devore Interchange, one of three routes in and out of southern California, improving transportation and increasing efficiency for channeling goods in and out of the region.

The American people deserve better. They deserve safe streets and roads, dependable transit to get to and from work, and the opportunity for local businesses to grow and expand. Without a long-term plan, Congress is part of the problem, not part of the solution.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF COEUR D'ALENE POLICE SERGEANT GREG MOORE

(Mr. LABRADOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today on Peace Officers Memorial Day to acknowledge and honor the life and service of Coeur d'Alene Police Sergeant Greg Moore. Sergeant Moore was shot and killed in the line of duty on May 5, 2015.

Sergeant Moore's 12-year-old son Dylon wrote these words to honor his father:

My dad was the best. He would tell me anything and was always there for me. All the times I was sad or lonely, he would be right by my side to comfort me.

Dad would also reassure me that he was okay going to work by telling me he was Batman because he worked at night, had lots of gadgets, was skilled and charming.

Also, wherever we went, he would know someone that was there. I would always wonder how and why he knew those people.

Dad's favorite place to eat was Qdoba. It ended up being my favorite place as well.

He was a Boston fan, and he has gone to a couple of games, but I know he would have liked to see more.

Every day, though, almost like tradition, we would wrestle on the ground and try to beat each other. I've only won once, but I have learned so many things from him.

I love him so much because he was a good dad, always helping people, and I want everyone to know that he is the best.

He was the best.

Sergeant Moore, rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to day on Peace Officers Memorial Day to acknowledge and honor the life and service of Coeur d'Alene Police Sergeant Greg Moore. Sergeant Moore was shot and killed in the line of duty May 5, 2015.

Gregory King Moore was born in Walla Walla, Washington; he attended Walla Walla High School and Walla Walla Community College before moving to Idaho to attend the University of Idaho. After graduating from the University of Idaho he joined the Asotin County Sheriff's Department before transferring to the Coeur d'Alene Police Department.

During his tenure at the Coeur d'Alene Police Department he served as a Patrol Officer, Field Training Officer, and School Resource Officer.

I did not have the pleasure of knowing Sergeant Moore personally. But the outpouring of support from his community tells me much about his character and service. More than 4,000 people attended his funeral, including officers from across Idaho, as well as Washington, Montana and Canada. This outpouring of support warmed my heart and reminded me of the goodness of the people of Idaho. I hope this public support was comforting to Sergeant Moore's family.

Sergeant Moore's 12-year-old son Dylon wrote these words to honor his father.

"My dad was the best. He would tell me anything, and was always there for me. All the times I was sad or lonely, he would be right by my side to comfort me. Dad would also reassure me that he was OK going to work by telling me he was Batman, because he worked at night, had lots of gadgets, was skilled and charming. Also, wherever we went, he would know someone that was there. I would always wonder how and why he knew those people. Dad's favorite place to eat was Qdoba. It ended up being my favorite place as well. He was a Boston fan and he has gone to a couple of games, but I know he would have liked to see more. Every day, though, almost like tradition, we would wrestle on the ground, and try to beat each other. I've only won once, but I have learned so many things

from him. I love him so much because he was a good dad, always helping people. And I want everyone to know that he is the best.''

Coeur d'Alene Police Chief Lee White said ''Greg was part of a proud profession, and an even prouder police department. Greg did things right. He was a leader, he was a supervisor, and he was not satisfied sitting at a desk. In the end, and the reason we're here today, is that he personified the oath that we take when we raise our right hand and we're sworn in. Greg was killed protecting the life and property and way of life of the citizens of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. He will never be forgotten.''

Throughout Idaho hundreds of vehicles are now displaying a decal that reads K27 in honor of Sergeant Moore's call number. I would like to add my voice to those that honored Sergeant Moore by closing with phrase that had passed over the lips of those thousands who have honored Sergeant Moore over the past week.

K27 rest in peace.

HONORING FALLEN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on this day that we honor the fallen, who have been given the duty and obligation to protect and serve, the Nation's law enforcement officers, I also stand here to mourn those marines and those Nepal rescue workers who died on the side of a Nepal mountain, attempting to bring help and food and opportunity and survival to those who have been struck by this horrific earthquake and one that has followed.

Many have died, and it is only the kind of integrity of Americans that, wherever there is need, we answer the call.

The same today, as thousands of law enforcement officers gather on the west steps, we know that throughout our communities, where there is a need, they will come.

Earlier this week, I submitted into the RECORD the numbers of Houston police officers who died in the line of duty. I honor them, and I honor those who have fallen and those who serve.

As I end this 1 minute, I end it with a moment of silence.

In honor of all of those who have fallen, our soldiers and our law enforcement officers, we thank you for your service.

God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

□ 1115

DODD-FRANK REGULATIONS ARE CRUSHING SMALL COMMUNITY BANKS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on an issue that I hear more and more about each and every day, that is, how regulations are actually crushing and harming our small community banks.

Just a week ago, I met with a group of small independent and community bankers who shared some pretty striking stories. A set of regulations issued as a result of the Dodd-Frank financial reform law have now led to a more than 100 percent increase in the length of the quarterly financial status report that they must file each quarter.

One banker said that it took his CFO 4 full working days just to finish the report this year, and this is a CPA with multiple advanced degrees. Another said he has to pay the accountant now $25,000 just to review the reports for its accuracy.

Mr. Speaker, these crushing Dodd-Frank regulations are having the direct opposite effect of their intention. They are hurting small community banks that are vital to providing capital to the small businesses that keep our economy healthy.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as was referenced on the floor of the House, in 4 legislative days, funding expires for transportation. I could actually give my speech from last summer that predicted we would be exactly in this spot—nothing changed, more delay.

There are three things that we can do to fix it:

Number one, the President ought to issue an absolute deadline that he will not sign any extension that passes September 30; 4½ months is enough time for Congress to do its work.

Second, the Ways and Means Committee should get down to work with a series of hearings involving the people who actually do this out in the real world—contractors, business, unions, local governments. For the first time in 55 months, let's have those hearings.

And finally, let's have action on legislation that I have introduced, a gas tax increase for the first time in 22 years, similar to what has happened in Georgia, Utah, Idaho, Iowa, South Dakota—Republican red States. If they can step up and take their responsibility, maybe Congress can do that in the next 4½ months.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed, with overwhelming bipartisan support, H.R. 1191, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which will allow Congress to review any deal on Iran's nuclear program negotiated by the Obama administration.

As the world's leading sponsor of terrorism, a nuclear Iran would not only destabilize the Middle East, but it would have serious repercussions here in America and across the world for generations to come.

The United States must stand with Israel, our allies, and do everything in our power to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. And this legislation allows Congress to have approval and oversight over any agreement by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama should take a clear message from these overwhelmingly bipartisan votes in both the House and the Senate that, as negotiations move forward, the administration must listen to the American people and their representatives in Congress.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, in 4 days, our transportation fund will expire. This will be the 34th time in the past 6 years that Congress has failed to pass a long-term transportation funding bill.

We all know that our highways, our bridges, our airports, and our railroads are being neglected. We have got 20th century infrastructure with a 21st century economy. It is absolutely irresponsible for Republicans and Democrats—for the House of Representatives—to fail to pass a long-term transportation fund.

Potholes don't fix themselves, and we have got potholes in red States and in blue States. We also have, in all of our States, good, hard-working Americans who could be put to work if we would give that long-term funding.

You know, you can't build a bridge with 2-month funding increments. So in addition to a lack of money, there is a lack of certainty. It is not because there aren't solutions. We have got good proposals from Republicans. We have got good proposals from Democrats. But we need a decision.

We are not grasping for a new policy. And the thing that is unacceptable is for Congress not even to have a discussion about what will be the source of that funding. We should not extend another short-term highway fund. We should do our jobs and fully fund it.

TRIBUTE TO B.B. KING

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, ''The Thrill is Gone.'' Legendary iconic guitar player and performer B.B. King passed away last night.

B.B. King, born Riley B. King, born in the delta, lived a phenomenal life. He was born into poverty and was a sharecropper in Itta Bena, Mississippi.

He moved to Memphis and went on WDIA radio, the first African American-owned station in America, and became a disc jockey, Beale Street Blues Boy. That is where he got his B.B. name.

He went on to perform and learn on Beale Street, and he went on to be one of the great guitarists of all time. He taught a lot of guitarists how to play and was their mentor, somebody they looked up to.

Memphis was his adopted hometown. A club in his name is there on Beale Street, B.B. King Blues Club.

He was a very, very nice man and a talented individual who rose to get the Presidential Medal of Freedom and Kennedy Center Honors. His art will live on forever. He will be greatly missed.

AMERICAN PATENT SYSTEM IN DANGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), my very good friend.

REPEAL THE OIL EXPORT BAN

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

This may not be the topic that he is going to talk about here, but I appreciate the time to be able to talk to something that is important to the folks of west Texas and is actually important to all Americans. I rise today to bring attention to an important issue that is gathering nationwide support, that is, repealing the export ban on crude oil.

This week, I submitted an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act that would, in fact, repeal the ban. While the amendment did not ultimately make it into the final bill, I would like to take a moment to talk about the importance of lifting that ban.

First, let's remember why the export ban was placed into law to begin with. Because of the OPEC oil embargo of 1973, Congress enacted the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, directing the President to ban crude oil exports. At the time, the ban served a purpose: to keep our oil at home in order to reduce our exposure to the wildly fluctuating markets of that time.

Today, though, the ban has outlived its purpose. It is an antiquated policy that is now only serving to harm Americans and punish domestic production. For example, right now we allow Iran to export more oil from their country than we do from our own domestic producers. This is wrongheaded and is long overdue for a change. The ban should be lifted, while leaving in place the necessary authorities to allow the President to act in an emergency and while preserving our Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Some claim that gasoline prices would increase if the ban is lifted, but analysis shows that to be incorrect. It shows that prices will actually fall, reducing the cost of the product that American families rely on every single day, which is another reason to support lifting the ban.

In 2013, the United States was the number one oil producing nation in the world, surpassing Saudi Arabia and Russia, a fact that many thought impossible only a decade ago.

Taking advantage of our Nation's abundant resources by lifting the ban will, in fact, lower gasoline prices, create dependable, long-lasting jobs, and help expand our energy supply, making our Nation more energy independent.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the growing voice of the American people. It is time to lift the export ban on crude oil.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to warn my colleagues and the American people of several threats to their safety and their prosperity. These threats are observable from Washington, D.C., but may not be observable to the American people. So I ask my colleagues to pay attention, number one, to what we are doing here, but I also would ask the American people to pay attention to what we are doing here.

There are changes being maneuvered through our legislative branch and being mandated by executive orders from President Obama that will undermine the economic well-being of hard-working Americans and put us in jeopardy as a nation, both economically and in terms of our national security.

Those pursuing these egregious policy initiatives are fulfilling President Obama's pledge to change America. And what most Americans believed was a commitment to make our country better, to change America, was, in reality, an elitist and, I believe, an arrogant pledge to dramatically alter the basic and fundamental institutions and values that have been thought of by our patriots to be the essential elements defining our country and, of course, ensuring our freedom, security, and prosperity.

What are these threats that I talk about? What are these threats that we need to pay attention to?

They are not coming from one political party. They are not coming from the Republicans or the Democrats, as a party. You can see support across the board on both sides of the aisle on various sides of these issues. It is also not a threat just stemming from one person or one political leader, but it is, of course, what we are talking about.

This threat is coming from a very powerful coalition seeking profit for themselves, even if it impoverishes the people or diminishes, at least, the economic well-being of the people of the United States.

Ironically, people who are enjoying their freedom and people who are enjoying their relative prosperity don't pay attention to some of the very intricate matters that have come before us in Congress. But I can assure all of my fellow Americans, there are powerful interests who are paying attention, and they are doing what they best can do to manipulate the law in a way that will enhance their profits, even if it is being done at the expense of the well-being of the American people.

We can see this in dramatic changes that are being suggested in something that probably is very boring and tame to most Americans when they even hear that someone is going to even talk about patent law—patent law, which is the legal structure that enforces an inventor's right to own and control the product of his or her genius, labor, and investment for a given period of time.

So I say, of course, that sounds pretty mundane, patent law. Is it some detailed, intricate regulation and control of this area of economic life, of jobs, and things that we do in America?

Well, it is more than that. It may sound mundane; but, in reality, patent law and the patent rights of our people—the right of our people to own the technology they have created for a specific period of time—has been a significant determinant in our country's way of life, our country's quality of life, and the security of our Nation.

This intellectual property right, the right through a patent ownership of 17 years' control and—not only of 17 years of control, but also of profit from one's own inventions, has been vital to our well-being as a nation and an essential part of the American Dream.

Let's note that this was a right that was written into the Constitution by our Founding Fathers. People know about the Bill of Rights. But the word ''right'' was only used in the body of the Constitution once, and that was a section that guaranteed that Americans—that what Congress should do is to make sure that Americans were guaranteed the right to control their own creations, if they are inventors or writers, for a given period of time, to profit from it so that they would have incentives to come up and be the most creative people in the world.

□ 1130

Our Founding Fathers believed that technology and freedom would uplift

ordinary Americans and give all Americans a chance at a decent life. And they were right. They wrote that into the Constitution. It is right there. I believe it probably was under the influence of my favorite Founding Father, Benjamin Franklin. What we have to recognize is that over the years of our country, what has made us a great nation is our freedom and technology.

This is especially true for minority Americans and especially of Black Americans. Let me note that Black Americans, if you take a look at the history of our patent system, are disproportionately inventive. In the history of this country, actually, as a proportion of their population, our Black Americans have been more inventive than any other group in our country. Why is that? Because patent law and property law were considered a constitutional right, and this was in the one area in which Black Americans were not discriminated against once they were freed in 1860 to 1865, when our Black citizens were freed. After that we found that more patents proportionately went to that community because they needed an opportunity to uplift themselves free from outside forces beating down on them and denying their rights.

Mr. Speaker, our patent system and the patents granted by Washington thus respected the rights of all of our citizens, including our minority citizens. Thus, making sure that we have patent protection has been one of the great boons to our minority populations, who otherwise suffered great discrimination and suffered from a lack of rights, except for the property rights that come from inventions.

We see this has been good not just for minority Americans however. Let me note that we have, with technology, enhanced the ability of our people to work hard and get the job done and thus create wealth that was then owned by a large number of people rather than an elite. Of course, when people understand the importance of technology—and business has more and more come to the understanding that it is new technology that will give them leverage and control over wealth.

There has been an ongoing attempt in these last 20 years to dramatically diminish the patent protection enjoyed by Americans, the patent protection written right into our Constitution. The fact is that, for the last 20 years, I have been personally engaged along with a small group of people who believe that technology and freedom are essential to the well-being of our country. MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio and others have beat back many of these attempts to diminish the patent protection of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, America does have a patent system now. It is the strongest in the world. It is the strongest patent system in the world. We have always been proud of that. We have been proud that it has resulted in the fact that ordinary people have high standards of living here and they earn a good living from work because their work is enhanced by technological superiority over their competitors.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, people work hard all over the world. Everybody works hard. In all of these countries they work hard like our people work hard, but they don't have the technology that enhances their work and amplifies their energy and hard work so that more wealth is created. We have encouraged that since the day our Constitution was ratified. That is why our people, when they work hard, end up living better because it gives us a competitive edge over the slave and oppressed labor in other countries.

We, in fact, of course, know that the prosperity of average Americans to us and to our Founding Fathers was an important goal. It wasn't just we were going to have a country that worked, but it was going to be a system with respect for rights that would lead to a good and decent living for all of us, for all the people, and not just a small elite of businessmen.

Well, we have done this over the years, and it has worked well. We have not had to have our own people who do work hard having to compete in terms of muscular and use of their physiques in order to produce goods, services, and wealth. They had the technology that permitted them to outcompete those other countries.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it ensures we have a more secure country. Having a strong patent system where people are encouraged to invent new things and to be innovative has given us the edge over people who would do harm to our country. It has been important to our national security because we can't take on adversaries that don't respect human rights. If America was trying to secure itself from threats from groups of people around the world, leaders and gangsters who have no respect for human rights whatsoever, we lose because they are willing to lose all of their people, and they are willing for any amount of bloodshed to maintain control and power and, yes, to beat the United States and democratic countries.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, we have had technology at work helping defend our country, technology that would not have existed had we not had the patent protection that has been traditional to our country. Even look today what is happening. Without drones, where would we be? Without drones fighting the good fight against ISIL, we would have to have thousands of Americans there to fight that threat to mankind and the freedom of the world. Instead, we have joined with the forces in Erbil, which is the Kurds, in standing tough directly against this onslaught of radical Islam, and they are holding firm. But without our drones there to help them, they would be overrun.

So this idea of property ownership of technology, of your technological developments, has been heart and soul to a prosperous and secure America. So when I say there are changes being proposed here in Congress, they are trying to manipulate through the system that will affect the prosperity of the average American and the security of our Nation. The public and my fellow colleagues need to pay attention because we are again facing a major onslaught, an attack on this fundamental right of technology ownership by those who create that technology.

We are facing an onslaught that is being what? Being masterminded, being masterminded and being pushed by megamultinational corporations who are not operating in the interests of the people of the United States. They could care less about all of that. But they are operating after what they can do to enrich themselves, even if it is not in the interests of the people of the United States and the interests of our security. These megamultinational corporations have pumped millions upon millions of dollars into lobbying for changes in our patent system that diminish the rights of the inventor and enables these multinational corporations to steal the intellectual property of our inventors and use it without giving compensation to the owners. This is in direct contradiction to what the Constitution meant to guarantee and why it was written directly into the body of the Constitution that this was a right that Americans should be concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 20 years there has been a stealth attack on America's strong and effective patent system. Let us note that we have had the strongest and the most effective and recognized fair patent system in the world. All other patent systems have been judged against us, and now we have had these last 20 years an insidious undermining, and we are on the edge of a huge attack and perhaps successful destruction of fundamental patent rights that have been part of our people for many years.

For example, 20 years ago, shortly after I came here, I found that in the GATT—that is a trade treaty that we have—there were provisions that were snuck into the GATT implementation legislation. That is legislation we passed here in Congress in order to implement a trade agreement. These big corporate interests had put into the GATT implementation legislation without telling anybody two provisions that would have dramatically hurt the small inventors in this country.

Up until now, the Constitution actually says that the inventors and the writers are guaranteed a specific time where they will control. They will be

granted a specific time where they will control their patent, the rights to their patent, and the rights of their creative genius. Well, it has traditionally been that once you file, as soon as the patent is actually granted to the inventor, then the clock starts ticking, and you get 17 years of protection. In different parts of the world, that is not what the law has been. In Japan and in Europe, it has been, oh, no, once you apply, after 20 years, even if it takes you 10 or 15 years to get your patent or 19 years, no, the clock is ticking then. You may not be granted your patent for 19 years, and then you have 1 year left, and that is no patent protection at all.

So now they are trying to foist that on us. By the way, that would give people, knowing the clock is ticking—those small inventors in other countries are faced by people who are trying to pressure them to accept lesser claims to the legitimacy of their patent in order to basically prevent these guys, men and women, from being compensated the way they would be if they had a guaranteed term, which is part of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the other provision that was there 20 years ago was the 18-month publication demand. That is, after 18 months, when someone applies for a patent—now, it is that once someone applies for a patent, that patent application is absolutely secret until that patent is granted. Unless you have a patent in your hand—then it is published for the world because their ownership has been established. Well, that has been traditionally what our Patent Office and our patent protection has been. Basically, you have a secret and you developed it, you give it to the Patent Office. In fact, if anybody leaked that information, up until this point it has been a felony for anybody to tell anyone else until that patent is actually granted to the inventor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they want to change this and say, if you haven't been granted your patent within 18 months, it will be published for the whole world. Think about that. Think about what I am saying. Before, for our entire country's history, we have made sure that an application is secret so that nobody can get ahead of the inventor himself and the inventor won't be put in a bad spot. We made sure that until the patent is granted it is secret. They want to change that so that after 18 months it is published. What if that patent takes 10 years to issue? That means the man or woman who invented this piece of technology, our competitors overseas will be able to use it for all of that time because they will know all about it, but the patent hasn't been granted to the inventor yet.

□ 1145

I called that the ''Steal American Technologies Act.'' That is what they were trying to do. That is what it would result in, and keep that in mind.

The large multinationals sought to weaken the ability of our inventors to enforce patent rights. Why? Why do they want these big companies here in the United States? Well, mostly, they are multinational companies now—they are big guys—and what they want to do is steal from the little guy—surprise, surprise.

The big guys would try to manipulate the creation of law here that will enable them to take something from some person who has less economic power than themselves. Our constitutional rights are supposed to protect the little guy's rights. We believe the newspaper should be able to be published, but little guys should be able to print a mimeographed piece of information themselves and distribute it or to gather.

Actually, what is hard for me to imagine is that, if these big guys were actually trying to diminish the rights of religion or speech in this country, or assembly, there would be an outcry; but, because it is the rights to own technology that you have created for a given period of time—it sounds too confusing, and they have let this feeling that maybe the people can't understand it, so they don't pay attention—they have let that lack of attention give them an opening to destroy and undermine the rights of Americans, and I think this right is every bit as important as those other rights of religion and speech, et cetera.

What they have set up in these last 20 years, it is an ongoing David versus Goliath because some of the biggest corporations in the world are behind the effort to change the patent law.

Well, we beat them back. As I say, there was a coalition of us—Democrat and Republican, MARCY KAPTUR. We had some very good support from the Black Caucus. I might add that, again, they recognized how important inventions have been to the Black community; but we beat them back.

It was a bipartisan coalition. We have had to, over the years, compromise and negotiate certain things, but they have not gotten their way; but every time they have tried—they have tried to overwhelm those of us who are preventing the diminishing of patent rights—they have had to use scare tactics, always claiming that there is a boogeyman, there is a boogeyman out there, and that is the reason why we have to attack the inventor, because there is something out there that is really threatening and it is sinister and it is a sinister force that has to be defeated, that is why we have to take away all of the rights of the inventors over here, because they have now tried to tell the story in a way.

It is the equivalent of saying we are going to take away the rights of every American to sue someone—or a company or anyone else who has caused them damage—because there are frivolous lawsuits. Yes, there are frivolous lawsuits. There are some people who misuse our legal system.

The last thing we want to do is eliminate the rights of all Americans to use the court system to protect their rights. That is basically what is going on here. Our own cherished patent rights to own what you have created—and this constitutional right that was given to Americans—is on the verge of being dramatically altered and diminished and destroyed.

By the way, the first boogeyman that was used in order to try to gain support for these very same two items that they snuck in the GATT, the boogeyman was called the submarine patentors.

Submarine patents—that is all you heard about before—as if a person who was filing for a patent was a submarine patentor. Everybody has got to lose their patent rights in order to get the submarine patentor.

What was the submarine patentor? A submarine patentor was—their definition—someone who files for a patent and then does everything they can to delay the patent from being issued; and then, after years and years, the patent is finally granted, and they have got all this leverage on all the people who have used the technology in the meantime.

Well, I am sorry; there were very few submarine patentors—there were some—but the fact is most inventors were struggling to get their patents issued to them as soon as possible because they needed the money, especially the little guys needed the money, and they were struggling, ''Please, give us the patent so we can move forward on this,'' but, no, they were being presented as if they were trying to slow down the process.

Well, we finally, after really fighting for 10 years on this, reached the compromise, which my chief of staff, Rick Dykema, and myself negotiated, along with MARCY KAPTUR, who negotiated this agreement with us, that if, indeed, there is a patent applicant who uses his abilities or uses various powers that he has in the bureaucratic process to delay the issue of the patent, well, if that happens, then, indeed, that patent, the time, the clock, has to start ticking against that guy, so he is using his own time when it has not been issued.

Well, that solved the problem—there it was—without diminishing the rights of those people who were struggling to get their patents out, but took 10 years or 15 years to get the patent issued.

That wasn't a hard thing to negotiate, a hard thing to do, but it was a hard thing to accomplish because the people who were pushing submarine patents were really trying to diminish the patent rights of all Americans so that they could steal from little guys and could take away their patent rights basically as soon as possible.

Well, now, the current boogeyman is the patent troll. Now, there are some people who misuse and have frivolous lawsuits who use the patent system. There is no doubt about it. I might add this idea that people will be sent a thing—you are violating my patent, you either give my $5,000, or I am going to sue you, and then small businesses go along with it—there have been court cases now that have taken care of that.

Obviously, that is a swindle and something we can't put up with; that was happening to a degree, but there is no excuse, as I say, to eliminate the rights of all Americans because somebody abuses a right. That is not what is acceptable.

The patent troll is being used as a straw man. We are going to have legislation that will get this guy who has these frivolous lawsuits and is creating such havoc among small-business men and ripping them off. Just like the submarine patents, that can be taken care of without eliminating the patent rights of our people.

What we have now is the straw man, the patent troll. When you hear a debate on this issue, all you will hear is patent troll, patent troll, patent troll, not recognizing that every provision in this bill diminishes—it is H.R. 9 that is before our Judiciary Committee now—every provision makes it more difficult for the small inventor to enforce his patent against infringement by future megacorporations.

Guess who is pushing this legislation? Huge megacorporations who want that little guy not to be able to sue a corporation that has stolen his intellectual property rights—this is basically—but they are going to say: Oh, no, it is the troll we are after, the troll.

Well, as I say, there have been frivolous lawsuits, and there have been changes made in the judicial system itself of how to handle that, but there is no excuse for a troll—for this word ''troll,'' a straw man—get him to be used to damage and destroy the rights of the 95 percent of the technology creators in our country, take away their rights to get this straw man.

Well, let me tell you how the word ''troll'' came about, the word ''patent troll.'' That is the reason you are hearing it. Every time you hear somebody say it, remember this. A group of corporate elitists got in a circle in a room—I know because one of the people who was in that meeting switched sides and came over and disclosed that these corporate executives said: What can we do to make it sound so sinister that we can get this passed? What words can we come up with that will just basically create such a bad feeling that the American people will not recognize that what we are really doing is trying to get the small inventor and make sure that the small inventor cannot sue us for things that we are using?

Okay. They went around the room. This friend, the fellow who told me about this meeting, said: I came up with the words ''patent pirate,'' and then, by the time it got around the circle, somebody came up with the words ''patent troll.''

They said: That is it. That sounds so horrible, we can distract everybody's attention using that, and that is good enough. That sounds so evil that we can make sure that we go into battle using that in front of us, instead of we want to diminish the patent rights of honest, hard-working inventors who deserve to have a profit from their creation of their technology.

That is just how cynical this debate has been. Every provision of H.R. 9—a bill now sitting in the Judiciary Committee—prevents—makes it more difficult for an inventor to actually enforce his rights and sue a company that is trying to steal, use his property rights, intellectual property rights, without compensating him.

Let me give you an example of something in the bill and the changes they are proposing. Now, they are changing to loser pays legal fees. If you have a small inventor and if he sues that company and it is a huge company, that is usually what he has created and making profit from it, if he sues them and he loses, he will have to pay the legal fees for that huge company.

Now, for the huge company, that is almost nothing. Taking on a case of one guy is nothing in their expense account because they have got 100 lawyers in a stable, waiting to help and being paid for. Well, if the inventor loses, that is it for him. That alone is wrong.

In this legislation, H.R. 9, they have added another little proviso to destroy the small inventor; and that is, if someone invests in his invention, if someone invests in the invention and he manages to be successful and comes up with a new piece of technology and he is granted the patent and some megacorporation comes along and incorporates it and uses it and refuses to give this guy even a small payment for using the technology that he created, his intellectual property rights, if someone has invested in that inventor to help him make the invention, let's say that, when that inventor goes up to battle Goliath in his megacorporation, and let's say, even though he is right, he loses—because that happens sometimes in our country many times, where some people with a great number of very sophisticated lawyers against the little guy, the little guy sometimes loses—well, what is going to happen now, according to this bill, is anyone who has invested in the inventor is going to have to be liable for the legal fees that come out of that suit.

Who is ever going to give an investment to an inventor if that may open them up to liability? It is a liability, I might add, to some megacorporation, megamultinational corporation.

Well, this provision just demonstrates what is the purpose of that provision. The provision is to beat down the little guy so that the big guys can steal, and that is evident, very evident; yet this bill is still moving forward.

It is H.R. 9. It is in the Judiciary Committee now. As I say, H.R. 9 is the equivalent of saying: Because there are frivolous lawsuits, we are going to do everything we can to diminish the power of ordinary citizens to use the law and legal lawsuits for compensation for damages done to them.

□ 1200

Every provision of the bill weakens the right of the inventor to enforce his or her own patents.

This bill actually passed the House last year. We struggled against it here in the House, but what happens is 90 percent of the people here in this body are just so busy that it is hard to pay attention to something that seems mundane like a patent law, and they just can't get themselves to focus on it. The American people also think that issues like this are so complicated that they can't get involved, but that leaves the whole playing field open to huge corporations that are out to enrich themselves by basically structuring law in a way that the power and the wealth will flow to them.

Supposedly, the system our Founding Fathers wanted was for the wealth to flow broadly across our country so that every American could benefit from new technologies and new wealth that was being created. Now they want to corral that wealth; they want to diminish our rights in order to enrich themselves. These companies are not companies that are loyal to the United States. They are being loyal to their own profits, and some of them are multinational corporations that have actually no ties, real ties, to the United States.

Let me just suggest that this bill did pass the House last year, but it was stopped in the Senate because, by then, we had made so much noise here. As I say, a bipartisan group, led by myself, MARCY KAPTUR from Ohio, Mr. MASSIE from Kentucky, and other very strong activists, got together, and we made so much noise that the American universities finally paid attention because that bill that lets people steal patent rights was a huge threat to our university system. Had it been signed into law, the value of patents would have gone down dramatically. Let me go back to how that works.

Remember, we were talking about a troll. What their definition of ''troll'' is is anybody who buys the patent rights from someone who has invented something and has a patent but who doesn't have the money to enforce it. Anybody who actually buys the patent rights but is not aiming at commercializing it

himself and is going to enforce that and make a profit from it, that is going to be what they are stamping out. The universities are not there to commercialize what they are doing. They are there to basically have new discoveries, and they realize they have got a lot of patents that they own as part of their portfolios and that the actual values of those patent collections by the universities would have dramatically gone down. As well, of course, the patent value of any American would have gone down at that point.

Also, other industries that are really important industries to our well-being—PhRMA and others, biotech industries—which struggle hard to come up with one patent that they then can sell in the market, are totally undermined by this effort to weaken our patent system. We managed to mobilize those people, and we stopped it the last time around; but the multinational corporations behind this legislation are so arrogant that this bill is now going to be shoved through again. This time, I think, with the American people, we can actually stop it here in the House, and we can certainly stop it in the Senate.

We need the American people to mobilize and to call their Congressmen and ask: How do you stand on this terrible patent bill, H.R. 9? We need people who are going to stand up for the little guy in America, not for some megacorporation that is trying to permit the theft of American intellectual property rights by multinational corporations.

Whether or not we succeed this time around is going to depend on, yes, the people here who understand the issue, fighting it out, being as aggressive as we can be, and the American people mobilizing to make sure we protect our sacred rights granted in the Constitution. One of the most important, I believe to be, is the right of technology ownership to people who create that technology.

As I say, there are powerful interest groups in this city and in our country and in the world that try to change policy and are manipulating government. That is clear. That is fine. We have a democratic process. We just need to make sure that we are all being held accountable—that all of the Members of the House and the Senate are accountable for their votes—and that we know and the public at least has the chance to know what we are voting on.

Actually, there is something happening right now where that is not true at all, and I sure hope the American people are paying attention to what is going on here in Washington concerning what they call TPP, the trade promotion pact, and then there is the TPA, which gives trade promotion authority to the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is a trade treaty with the nations around the Pacific. The sinister nature of this can be seen because this trade treaty with the Pacific nations is secret. It has been declared classified.

Right now, if I had gone down and read what now exists of this trade treaty and if I had announced it here on the floor, I would have been violating secrecy restrictions that they have declared—how about this?—in a policy about trade with major countries of the world, which will have an enormous impact on our well-being. It is being kept totally secret from the American people. How is that? Then they say Members of Congress can go down and look at it if they want to. Of course, as they have said, you can only do it within a certain time. They have regulated the time we can go down, and we are so busy that almost no Members of Congress will have gone down and read the actual documents that explain what that trade policy is that they are trying to foist on us.

Please, I hope the American people understand that Members of Congress should not be voting on things that, number one, they don't have access to, but we should not be voting on something if we have not permitted the American people to know what that is. You will remember the famous statement by Ms. PELOSI about ObamaCare, which was that we have to pass it in order to find out what is in it. That is totally unacceptable. In trade treaties, these things will now pass rules and regulations based on this treaty that will impact our way of life here.

Now, we have been briefed on it. I am on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and we were briefed on this the other day. The two main administration guys there—the people who had been Ambassadors and who are currently with the State Department—were briefing us. It is just like the boogey words over here, the scare words, in terms of patents. Now, this is all being used in just the opposite way with every glorious word—higher income for our people, more competitive for America, and all of the trade will come in our direction. Yet, when I asked these briefers, ''Hey, have you read this treaty?'' neither one of them had read it. So the people advocating for this treaty have not even read the treaty themselves.

I found a provision in the treaty, or at least I understand it is in there—I have not verified it yet because we have all of this trouble to go through to verify what we are being asked to support—that says that patents in the United States will basically have to be published after 18 months. If a patent application is made and if after 18 months the patent is not granted, the patent will be published for the whole world to see. Uh-huh. Does that sound familiar? They tried to put that over on us 20 years ago. We managed to thwart it then, and now they want to sneak it into a treaty, and the American people are not permitted to know what is in the treaty.

Will that hurt us in some way? It will only make all of our technological discoveries available for our competitors overseas to be using long before the patent is even granted to the American inventor. You see what type of sinister forces we are up against. Who can sit down here and say how wonderful this treaty is going to be when the American people aren't allowed to see it and when almost all of us have not read it and when our briefers who come here have not even read it?

I asked them yesterday, these briefers, ''Well, is this in the treaty?'' They didn't know. They didn't know whether or not this provision on patents was in there, which would undermine our rights to control our own creations here and have our opponents and our competitors overseas have all of the information about our technology even before the patent is granted. They didn't even know that was in there. They didn't know if it was or if it wasn't.

By the way, if I had gone down and had finally gotten through the maze and had read the actual wording in the treaty, I would have been required not to have mentioned it today on the House floor as we are being restricted because it has been declared secret from the American people. This is outrageous.

We don't need to have a trade promotion authority that will keep things from the American people, and we don't need to have a trade treaty with the Pacific and with all of these nations in Asia that will open us up to having our technology stolen, but also we don't know the other parts of it either.

We keep hearing of the great things that are in it that are going to benefit the American workers, but we know what has happened in China. As for China, we were told, if we opened up our trade with China, China would modernize, and they would become a liberal, democratic country over the years. I call it the ''hug a Nazi, make a liberal'' theory. Basically, we were told that China would become a benevolent force. As we know now, China is becoming a malevolent force. China is becoming a threat to world peace, and the American people have not benefited from China trade as our good-paying jobs have gone to China.

We don't want that for the rest of the world. We need to know what is in these trade treaties because they might have a major impact on bringing our working people's salaries down even more. Whether it is immigration or trade or patent law, our criteria should be what is in the interests of the people of the United States or whether it is in trade, where we have been basically having trade for the benefit of some mega-multinational

corporations or patent law for the same clique.

Guess what they also want? They want cheap labor, and that is why you see today this push to give 11 million people amnesty who have come here illegally. It is not 11 million. That is a 10-year-old figure. By the time they get done, they are going to bring 50 million people into our country who wouldn't be here otherwise. What is that going to do to our wage base? What is that going to do to Americans who are out looking for work right now? What is that going to do to our schools? to the money we have for our veterans' benefits? What is that going to do? We are undermining the well-being of the American people for the profits of some mega-multinational corporations. That is wrong.

I am a Republican—I believe in free enterprise; I believe in private property; I believe in the profit motive—but we have to have a Congress that is working for the benefit of and protecting the rights of the American people, and they need to mobilize to make sure we are doing that by supporting them to make sure that our communities are not overrun with illegal immigrants.

By the way, if you grant amnesty to 25 million illegals, there will be a huge surge of people from around the world who will know that all they have to do is outlast us, and they will get their amnesty. We need to make sure that these decisions, those things—immigration policy and trade policy and, yes, intellectual property protection policy—are done in a way that will benefit us and will not benefit our competitors.

□ 1215

When I say us, United States, it is us, U-S, us, the American people. That should be the basis of our criteria: what is going to be in the interests of the American people; not bring down their wages, not let people steal our technology and use it to compete against us.

I ask my colleagues, please pay attention to H.R. 9 and these issues. Join with me in supporting the cause of the American people, of us instead of the big corporations.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING DEREK ''CHIP'' ANDREW HANSEN

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, during National Police Week we honor those law enforcement officers who have lost their lives while protecting and providing for the safety and protection of our communities.

As an important part of these ceremonies that we see here today in Washington, D.C., we honor city of Wapato, Washington, police officer Derek ''Chip'' Andrew Hansen, an Army veteran who paid the ultimate sacrifice on March 8, 2014, when he passed away as a result of injuries sustained in the line of duty in 2011.

Over his 15-year career as a police officer, Officer Hansen demonstrated exemplary service. He acted as an instructor for Standard Field Sobriety Testing. He was a school crossing guard. He wrote numerous grants related to school safety. And he served as a volunteer in his community.

As Derek's name is added to the list of heroes we lost last year, we also recognize his family, especially his son Colt, for their loss.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Officer Derek ''Chip'' Andrew Hansen and his family for his dedicated service and for their sacrifice.

I yield back the balance of my time.

A MISSION OF MERCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am on a mission of mercy; a mission of mercy, Mr. Speaker, because a U.S. military helicopter has gone down in Nepal on Tuesday, May 12. They were on a mission of mercy. The United States of America always responds to those who are in need, those who are in harm's way. This was no exception.

Our very finest volunteer to serve in our military. Many of them will go to distant places, and some of them will not always return home the same way they left. Some will not return at all. I am honored to say that we should be proud of those who serve. Regardless as to how we feel about conflicts around the world, we ought to appreciate the service of those who are in our military, and we ought to want every one of them to return home safely. So today I stand in the well of the House on a mission of mercy for our military persons who have lost their lives in distant places, but more specifically in Nepal.

We are there for a reason, Mr. Speaker. We are there because Ruth Smeltzer is right:

Some measure their lives by days and years,
Others by heartthrobs, passions, and tears,
But the surest measure under God's Sun.
Is what for others in your lifetime have you done.

We, in the United States of America, are doing things for others in the lifetime of people in this country currently, and we do it in the lifetime of our Nation. We want it said that we were there to help those in time of need.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a time of need for those in Nepal. On April 25, a 7.8 magnitude earthquake hit Nepal; 7.8. Thereafter, on May 12, a 7.3 magnitude earthquake hit Nepal. These earthquakes have devastated this country. Lives have been lost, more than 8,000 lives. People have been injured, more than 17,000. Millions have been displaced, nearly 3 million. Millions have been affected, more than 8 million. Four Americans lost their lives.

The United States moved quickly. We committed the sum of approximately $10 million initially, but that has now grown to more than $32 million. The relief efforts from the United States are growing. Not only are we placing dollars into the relief effort, we are also placing our military equipment into these efforts. That is why the helicopter was there in Nepal, to help in this time of need.

So I am proud to say that we are there to help. The need is estimated to be approximately $415 million. The number could go up. But if it is that amount, we can do as much as we can, and we should do as much as we can to help the people of Nepal. I want you to know that the people of Nepal and the Nepalese community in the United States of America across the length and breadth of our country are pitching in.

In my district, the Ninth Congressional District of Houston, Texas, on May 2, 2015, we held a meeting. That meeting was to discuss how we can be of service, the congressional office, and how the community can come together to provide assistance for those in need in Nepal. At that meeting, I am proud to say we had a good many persons in attendance. It was a community meeting. In the true spirit of community, which has the word ''unity'' in it, there was unity within this community meeting. I am proud to say that the members of the Nepalese Association of Houston were present. The president, Mr. Ghimirey was there, and he gave a report. The secretary, Mr. Nepal, was there. He gave a report. The building that we were in was at the International Center owned by Mr. Wei Li, and we are honored that he opened the doors of his facility for this purpose.

But it is important to know that the community was in unity on the effort to help those in Nepal. Some of the members of the community in attendance: the Bhutanese community was there. The Taiwanese community was there. The Latino community was in attendance. The Burmese community was in attendance. The Pakistani community, the Vietnamese community, all in attendance. Asian realtors were there. The Southwest Management District was there. There were Venerables there, those who are of the Buddhist faith. The Filipino community was represented. The community activists of

all stripes, of different ethnicities were in attendance. The Jewish community was there, and a report was given in terms of how Israel has been involved. The Turkish community was there, the Indian community. The Lion's Club was represented. The Chinese community was in attendance. And the African American community was there, as well as a representative of the NAACP.

We had a cross-section of people all there for the purpose of becoming a part of the mission of mercy, for the purpose of making sure that we fulfill our obligation to help those in times of need, and I am proud to say that a goal of $100,000 was set for the purpose of aiding those in Nepal just from that meeting. There are many others who have other goals, some higher, some lower, but I believe this goal will be met because it was indicated at the meeting that approximately $60,000 had been committed. I am proud to know that the community, in the spirit of unity, has come together.

We announced at that meeting that our congressional office, working with other Members of Congress, we have filed a bill, H.R. 2033, to accord, to provide temporary protected status for the Nepalese community in Texas, in the United States of America, if you are a citizen of Nepal. If you are a citizen of Nepal, and you find yourself here on some sort of visa, if you are here lawfully in the country, temporary protected status would extend the stay for those who are lawfully in the country. It will not change the immigration status of a single person. It will simply extend the stay. This is the American way. It is not the first time we have done this. This is the American way.

When people are here and their visas expire, and they are subject to going back into harm's way or going back to their country, which would place them in harm's way, we have done the honorable thing, the right thing. We have on many occasions allowed them to stay here rather than send them into harm's way.

That is what this bill would do, H.R. 2033. It would permit them to stay in this country and not return to a country that has been devastated by not one, but two earthquakes, a 7.3 and a 7.8. These two earthquakes have left much damage across the length and breadth of the country. The country is recovering.

We need to make sure that we do all that we can to help the people of Nepal. This is why the bill was introduced, and I am proud to say that a good many persons have joined this mission of mercy. The Honorable MIKE HONDA is an original cosponsor, but there are others who are cosponsors, and in our tradition we like to thank people. It is a tradition of the House to thank people who are a part of a process that is helping someone.

When you have people of goodwill who have put their names on the line, you ought to acknowledge that they are doing it. So I am proud to acknowledge people of goodwill, members of the United States House of Representatives who are a part of this mission of mercy, who have signed on to H.R. 2033.

I want to mention each and every name. There are others who will sign on. This is not an all-inclusive list, but as of today: The Honorable MIKE HONDA, who was an original cosponsor; the Honorable RRAD ASHFORD—and by the way these are alphabetized—the Honorable KAREN BASS; the Honorable MIKE CAPUANO; the Honorable TONY CÁRDENAS; the Honorable JUDY CHU; the Honorable YVETTE CLARKE; the Honorable EMANUEL CLEAVER; the Honorable JAMES CLYBURN; the Honorable STEVE COHEN; the Honorable JOHN CONYERS.

For those of you who may just have joined us, these are the people who are on a mission of mercy. These are the people who are on H.R. 2033, a bill designed to help people stay in this country and not go back into harm's way to Nepal. By the way, this bill would impact about 10,000 to 25,000 people. It is very difficult to count, but this is a guesstimate at best, the number of people who might benefit by staying in this country.

I said the Honorable JOHN CONYERS is on this mission of mercy; the Honorable JOSEPH CROWLEY; the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR; the Honorable DANNY DAVIS; the Honorable JOHN DELANEY; the Honorable SUZAN DELBENE; the Honorable MARK DESAULNIER; the Honorable TAMMY DUCKWORTH; the Honorable KEITH ELLISON; the Honorable MARCIA FUDGE; the Honorable ALAN GRAYSON; the Honorable GENE GREEN; the Honorable RAÚL GRIJALVA.

As I continue with this list, let me make mention of this: This is not the first time, as I have indicated, that we have had temporary status granted to other countries.

□ 1230

It was done under the Clinton administration, and it was granted to Montserrat. It was done under the Clinton administration as well for Nicaragua, following a hurricane, as well as for the Honduras. It was done with the Bush administration for El Salvador. It was done for the Obama administration for those who suffered from an earthquake in Haiti.

So these are some of the people: the Honorable TAMMY DUCKWORTH, the Honorable KEITH ELLISON, the Honorable MARCIA FUDGE, the Honorable ALAN GRAYSON, the Honorable GENE GREEN, the Honorable RAÚL GRIJALVA, the Honorable LUIS GUTIÉRREZ, the Honorable DENNY HECK, the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the Honorable HAKEEM JEFFRIES, the Honorable EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, the Honorable HANK JOHNSON, the Honorable DANIEL KILDEE, the Honorable BARBARA LEE, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, the Honorable ZOE LOFGREN, the Honorable JIM MCDERMOTT, the Honorable GRACE MENG, the Honorable GWEN MOORE, the Honorable GRACE NAPOLITANO, the Honorable JARED POLIS, the Honorable CHARLES RANGEL, the Honorable CEDRIC RICHMOND, the Honorable BOBBY RUSH, the Honorable LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, the Honorable LORETTA SANCHEZ, the Honorable BOBBY SCOTT, the Honorable JOSÉ SERRANO, the Honorable BRAD SHERMAN, the Honorable CHRIS SMITH, the Honorable JACKIE SPEIER, the Honorable BENNIE THOMPSON, the Honorable CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, the Honorable MAXINE WATERS, and the Honorable BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN.

I might add that this is bipartisan. It is always a wonderful thing to have bipartisan legislation. This legislation is bipartisan in nature.

I want you to know that, in sponsoring this legislation, it is our hope that the United States House of Representatives will take it up and that it will come to the floor of the House for a vote, so that we can do more than say we support the people of Nepal.

This is a way for the Congress of the United States of America to go beyond endorsing aid. It is a way to provide aid because the people who are here will have an opportunity to continue to work. As they continue to work, they will be permitted to return funds to their home country.

This is a way for us to not only keep people out of harm's way, but to allow those who are here to send money to those who are in harm's way. They can send dollars back to Nepal to help their country in a time of need.

When we had the circumstance in Honduras that required temporary protective status, persons were allowed to stay. Since that occurred, approximately $31 billion has been sent back to Honduras from those who are in the diaspora.

With reference to Nicaragua, for those who are in the diaspora, I want to commend you because you have sent approximately $10 billion home. For those in El Salvador, I want to commend you because you have sent approximately $45 billion home. For those in Haiti, in the diaspora, you have sent approximately $6 billion home.

People in the diaspora from these various countries want to do what they can to be of assistance to their people at home. This is a way of providing them an opportunity to be of assistance to those that they love, those who find themselves in harm's way, those who are in their homelands.

Well, we hope that this piece of legislation will pass. If this piece of legislation passes, it will give those persons who are here the opportunity to continue to be a part of the mission of mercy by sending dollars to those who are in harm's way. It is nothing unique,

but it is something very much needed for those who are in Nepal.

I am proud to tell you that, as we go forward with this effort, we will extend the reach to the United States Senate. We will ask that the Senators please become a part of this. This is an effort that we all, in my opinion, can embrace. We can do this, and we can do it without it costing us—meaning the government—any money.

The Government of the United States of America is already sending tens of millions of dollars by way of aid and equipment, and we are doing a lot, but this is another way for the government to be of assistance without spending additional money to be of assistance to the people who are here by not putting them back in harm's way, but at the same time, to allow them—those who are here—to be of benefit to their country by sending dollars back in the form of remittances.

I believe that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America can get this done. I am going to ask my colleagues to please give consideration to H.R. 2033.

Let us join hands together, those in the House and Senate, and be on this mission of mercy to see if we can do something to provide aid and comfort for those who are in Nepal by passing legislation to allow those who are in this country to stay in the United States of America.

We also are on this mission of mercy because Dr. King is right—I mentioned Ruth Smeltzer—when he reminded us that life is an ''inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny.'' What impacts one directly impacts all indirectly, meaning what is happening to those in Nepal will have an impact on us.

It may not be a direct impact, but there will be an indirect impact. It will happen in ways that we may not be able to measure, but it will. It will impact because there are people who are going to try to migrate, people trying to get out of harm's way and try to get to other countries.

My hope is that we will do our share to help those who are trying to get out of harm's way and do our share to prevent those who are here from going back into harm's way.

Dr. King is right; life is an inescapable network of mutuality. We are bonded together. This is one island that we are all stranded on, the island that we know as Earth. If we are going to live together as brothers and sisters, we have to treat each other as such.

This is a time for us to be responsive to our brothers and sisters in Nepal because there is another comment I hear quite regularly when we hear of disasters like these. People will mention that: ''But for the grace of God, there go I.''

We have had our share of mishaps in the United States of America; and, when we have had our share of mishaps, people have always sent their best wishes and aid to us. People have been of assistance to us throughout the years, the decades, the century. People have been of assistance to us.

But for the grace of God, there go I.

I am so proud of the response that we had in this country after we suffered 9/11. There were people who showed us a great amount of sympathy and empathy, people who wanted to do all that they can to let us know that they cared and that they were concerned and that they did not, in fact, support—and, in fact, condemned—the dastardly deeds that were perpetrated.

It was a time for the world to come together. This is another such occasion, but not the same—no two unpleasant circumstances are the same—but this one in Nepal is one that we can embrace. This is a time for us to show the world that we understand that there are things that we can do and will do.

We are, by the way. We have sent millions of dollars. We have our aid in the form of the soft side of our military. Our heavy equipment and helicopters are there. As I mentioned earlier, we did lose a helicopter, and we lost some lives.

We are stepping up to the plate. The United States of America is doing its part. I want us to continue to do our part. I want us to do all that we can to make sure that every person knows where we stand.

In so doing, I want to mention that we in the United States have been blessed to have this melting pot of people who come from all over the world to be a part of this great American Dream, the great American ideal, and the people who have come here from the country of Nepal are no exception.

They are hard-working people. They have shown their desire to be a part of the fiber and fabric of the United States of America. They have been people of good will. I ask that we extend the hand of friendship to these people of good will, especially during this month, which is a month that we are to give honor and show respect to those of Asian heritage, if you will.

This is Asian and Pacific Islander Heritage Month. This is a great time for us, during this month, to show our concern for the Asian population that is in Nepal. We have the opportunity to pass H.R. 2033 and make a difference in the lives of a good many people in this country.

I do want to mention again, for fear that some may not have heard, the community in Houston is well organized. Immediately after the first earthquake hit, we had a meeting, and we had scores of people in attendance. These were Nepalese persons. They were there to show their unity with each other.

They also had a plan of action. Their plan of action included raising money so that they could send it to their homeland to be of assistance, and they want to send this money directly there themselves. I admire them for their lofty goals and their efforts. They want to send the money themselves to their homeland. They want to make sure that there is no question that they have done their part.

The beautiful thing about this effort is that it became infectious and other members of the community decided: If not but for the grace of God, there go I. Here is my opportunity to be of assistance. Here is my opportunity to unify.

It was an amazing sight to see, on May 2, when we had all of these various organizations and groups coming together, all of them pledging their support, all of them pledging their desire to be of assistance to the Nepalese community in Houston, Texas, across the length and breadth of this country, but also to those who are actually in Nepal in a time of need.

I am so honored that they have lofty goals that they, I believe, will meet—I plan to do my part—but I am also honored that they decided that this was something that we could all embrace. They have reached out to the entire community, and the community has responded.

I beg my friends across all sides of the aisle, this is not a Republican or a Democratic resolution—or bill, if you will. This is a bill, H.R. 2033, that already has bipartisan support. It is not about what part of the country you are from. It is not about how many people you happen to represent from a certain community. It is about helping somebody in a country that is in need of help.

I beg that my colleagues would sign on to H.R. 2033—those who have not, many have indicated they will—so that we can bring this bill to the floor of the United States House of Representatives. It is not going to cost us any additional money to bring it to the House of Representatives.

It will not in any way grant any status to persons that they don't already have. It will simply extend the period of time that they will be allowed to stay in this country without having to return to harm's way.

I am grateful for the time today, Mr. Speaker. I do believe that this is time that has been well spent, and I do want to, as I close, let those families who have friends and relatives who are serving in our military or who are in Nepal, especially those who have family members that were associated with the military and the loss related to that helicopter crash, but also those who are with USAID and those there with various other organizations that are in service and doing what they do to make a difference, thank all of them for being there on the ground.

I also heard someone representing our military this morning. When

speaking of those who are there as a part of that military effort and those who lost their lives, there was a request for prayers. There was a request that we would pray for those who are injured and those who have lost their lives.

I believe in prayer. I do believe that it has a positive impact. I believe it can make a difference. I believe that there are times when there are no answers available to people, when you cannot explain what has happened, when the inexplicable is confronting you. At those times, many people turn to prayer because prayer can provide what words cannot explain.

□ 1245

Prayer can give you the hope that you need to go forward. Prayer can give you the sense of I can, the belief that I will, the belief that I will go on and continue to make a difference, that it is expected that I go on sometimes. People think that there is no more hope, and they should just give up right here and right now.

Prayer can do marvelous things, so I am going to end with a prayer because I believe that the request should be honored from the military person who made the request. Without knowing the name, I want you to know that I appreciate that you indicated that we should pray for our people in harm's way.

I will give this prayer from my heart, not from my head. I have no paper that I will be reading when I present this prayer. It is a prayer that has been written across my heart for a time such as this, and I pray, as I give this prayer, that it will be received with the intentionality that I will send it.

It is a prayer for all. Those who would like to can join me in your tradition. However you pray is okay with me. I will lower my head to give this prayer, and I will close my eyes.

Most gracious Creator, we know You by many names, but we also know that, by any name, You are the creator of all that was, is, and ever shall be, and we know that we are Your children, and as Your children, You have given us the greatest gift that we could ever receive, the gift of life.

Regardless as to what we think of ourselves, we know, many of us in our hearts, that we are blessed beyond measure to simply have the gift of life.

We know that we are better than we deserve, simply because we have the gift of life, because we cannot earn the gift of life. There is nothing that we could have done to earn it or merit the gift of life. It is something that we get because of grace.

By Your grace, I stand here as Your servant, asking Your mercy for those who are in harm's way in the nation of Nepal. I ask Your mercy, I ask Your blessings for those who are reaching out and trying to do what they can to help someone in a time of need.

I ask that You please strengthen those who are there who, tonight, may find that they do not have shelter, but please give them some sense of belief that help is on the way.

Help them to believe that there are people in a distant place called the United States of America who are people of good will who are going to do what they can to make sure that they get the shelter they need.

Please help those who may be suffering the pains associated with having been a part of a tragic circumstance and having been hurt physically. Help those who are suffering to know that help is on the way, that we plan to make sure that they get the medical aid that they need and the treatment that they need because You have given us so much and those who have so much, as we, should do as much as we can to help people who have little.

I ask, gracious Creator, that You strengthen all of us in this House of Representatives so that we may continue to go forward to do Your will to make Your world a better place.

We were given the precious gift of the life for a reason. There are many reasons that may be cited, but I believe that we have been blessed with the gift of life so that we may be a blessing to others.

This is our opportunity to be a blessing to others, and I beg and I pray that we, who have received the precious gift of life, when we finally, 1 day, have the opportunity to look back upon all that our lives stand for, perhaps we will, at some point in time, have an opportunity to see the omniscient, the omnipresent, and the omnipotent, and we will have an opportunity to tell and go over the record of our lives.

On that day, I hope that we will be able to say that we did all that we could to help the people of Nepal.

We thank You for the gift of life, and we pray that we will use it wisely and well and make a difference in the lives of others.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. God bless you, Mr. Speaker, and God bless the United States of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING FALLEN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNIGHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and pleasure to follow my friend and fellow former judge from Texas when he talks about praying. I know him to be a praying man. I also know his heart to be a big heart.

We can disagree on issues, but he is a brother, as a Christian, and he is a very good friend, and I appreciate his perspective very much.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the friend from the great State of Texas. He and I happen to share more than being Members of Congress. We are Members of Congress from the same State.

I am honored that you have not only worked hard in Congress, but you have also been a part of activities outside of Congress, and I am honored to work with you on at least one project, and we hope to do some good for the great State of Texas on this project together.

I am grateful to you, and I am grateful for your kind words. Thank you so much.

Mr. GOHMERT. I would never question the heart or motivation of my friend AL GREEN. I know his heart to be bigger than most in Washington. It is just an honor to serve with you.

There is so much that has gone on this week. One of the things that has happened here in Washington and continues to happen today is a tribute, memorial to law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty—doing what?—serving and protecting.

After the horrors and evil of 9/11/2001, it was encouraging to me to see so many people, once again, come to appreciate that the vast majority of law enforcement, the vast majority of first responders, they are serving and trying to protect for the good of others and willing to lay down their lives.

As Jesus said:

No greater love is this than a man lay down his life for his friends.

We have seen that in the hundreds of people—I think 273 lost their lives over this past year. Over 40 have lost their lives this year in the line of duty.

Just like in any walk of life, there are bad apples, people who don't have the best motivation; but I would humbly submit, I believe with all my heart that, when it comes to law enforcement, the percentage of those who are not properly motivated is far, far less than in the general population.

We do owe them so much.

Some people say: Oh, well, we ought to just live and let live.

They say: I am a Christian. I believe in living and letting live.

If you note, if you believe the Bible, Jesus was commenting, of course, his ultimate point was that we will be judged for what is in our heart by our Father in heaven.

He said, if you say ''raca,'' which was an offense back in that day, then you will answer to the courts. He understood, in an orderly society, you need a government; you need governing officials to which people will be responsible if they violate the law.

That was also true in Romans 13, anticipating, in an orderly society, you

need a government with a sword to punish those who do evil. That is why 13:4 says: If you do you evil, be afraid, because God doesn't give the sword in vain.

I know some people in the country start freaking out when I quote the most quoted book in the history of the country, as quoted here in the House of Representatives and in the Senate floor. It is part of our history. The Bible is the most quoted book in congressional history—was, is, and I hope will be in the future.

We owe so much to the police who risk their lives.

Right out of law school, I was an assistant DA for three counties in east Texas. Very early on, I went with law enforcement to execute a warrant, and the individual, the subject of the warrant for arrest, had made clear that, when he saw any law enforcement officers, he was going to start shooting; he would kill any law enforcement officer that came out there.

I don't forget the feelings that all of us had, even though some were very seasoned law officers, when you are approaching a dangerous building—in this case, a home—where somebody in there is threatening to kill anybody like you, you do have a little hair stand up on the back of your neck.

You do realize you are putting your life at risk in trying to maintain order and civility by approaching somebody that is a threat to society. That was quite a lesson, that these law officers—whether they are new, whether they have been working for a long time—they are constantly in a situation where they don't know if, 10 minutes later, they may be dead in the service of their community, but they are serving anyway.

We do owe them so much for what they do and what they risk on our behalf, so we are just grateful to all law enforcement officers willing to serve and protect all of us.

We have a report here back in February, and this is an article from The Hill entitled: ''FBI investigating ISIS suspects in all 50 States.'' The article is quoting FBI Director James Comey, that he revealed Wednesday his agency is investigating suspected supporters of the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria in every State across the United States.

Down further in the article, it said, ''Earlier this month, Comey said the FBI was investigating ISIS supporters in every State except Alaska.''

At the time of this article, at the end of February, he was saying: We are investigating ISIS suspects in all 50 States.

Director Comey said: ''We have investigations of people in various stages of radicalization in all 50 States.''

He said: ''This isn't a New York phenomenon or a Washington phenomenon. This is in all 50 States and in ways that are very hard to see.''

He said: ''ISIL in particular is putting out a siren song with their slick propaganda through social media.''

He said: ''The message 'resonates with troubled souls, people seeking meaning in some horribly misguided way,''' and that ''those people exist in every State.''

His pronouncement in February should have been a siren song for Americans to understand there are people who live among us who want to destroy us and our way of life.

Then it was rather interesting—that was February 25. Less than 2 months later, there was an article put out, Judicial Watch indicated that an ISIS camp was just a few miles from Texas, that Mexican authorities confirmed that.

The article said: ''ISIS is operating a camp just a few miles from El Paso, Texas, according to Judicial Watch sources that include a Mexican Army field grade officer and a Mexican Federal Police Inspector.

□ 1300

''The exact location where the terrorist group has established its base is around 8 miles from the U.S. border in an area known an 'Anapra,' situated just west of Cuidad Juarez in the Mexican State of Chihuahua. Another ISIS cell to the west of Cuidad Juarez, in Puerto Palomas, targets the New Mexico towns of Columbus and Deming for easy access to the United States.''

So, anyway, after this article came out in April, I quoted from that, brought it up on the floor and—

Let's see. This article was 2 days later from FOX News: ''Islamic State fighters are operating training bases near the U.S. southern border and are being aided by violent drug cartels to smuggle terrorists into States like Texas, a report published Tuesday by a watchdog group claims.''

So, anyway, I brought that up. And this report seems to get even more legs after the Federal Government, though, denying that any such thing like that was occurring, apparently sent FBI officials to Mexico to meet with their counterterrorism experts, seemed to give some credence that there is something to be concerned about in the way of training of violent radical Islamists across our United States border. So the irony here is pretty profound.

People all across the United States of America just accepted when the FBI Director says, you know, there are ISIS suspects in every State in the Union. People said: Wow, that is amazing. Man, they are here?

I saw a headline of a survey just moments ago on FOX News saying, 6 out of 10 Americans believe that there are terrorists in their community. So how ironic that even the far left that turns a blind eye to radical Islam could be so accepting that, yes, there are radical Islamist terrorists in every State in the Union. And when Judicial Watch and LOUIE GOHMERT quote from their material, quote other things going on to point out that there is a report that there is an ISIS camp across our border, the left went nuts, saying how crazy Judicial Watch was, how crazy I am for even mentioning this. There couldn't possibly be an ISIS camp in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you see the irony here. They are saying, yes, we believe there are radical Islamist terrorists in every State in the United States, but there couldn't possibly be ISIS across the border where the drug cartels are.

And I haven't gotten a good explanation. Do they have so much faith and trust in the drug cartels' integrity that they would never associate with radical Islamists? Is that what they are saying by their cynicism about ISIS being in Mexico? Because it is a bit intriguing.

But then again, some on the far left are educated way beyond their means—their mental capacity, at least—and so they have information; they just can't process it effectively. Because anyone who can readily accept when the FBI Director says there is ISIS in every State in the Union and we are investigating in every State in the Union radical Islamists—he doesn't use those terms because this administration doesn't want to offend any radical Islamists that want to kill us. So we don't use that term if you are in this administration, but I use the term because it is accurate. They are radical Islamists.

So, anyway, it is just a great irony here.

Then this is an AP story from this week: ''Minnesota men accused of trying to join Islamic State ordered held, but may have other options.''

And that is because U.S. District Judge Michael Davis, who wears a dark robe to match his intellect—he is the same guy that previously—this is also a May 12 article by Patrick Poole. This is the same judge, Michael J. Davis, chief judge of the district of Minnesota—

This article from Patrick Poole says: ''A terror 'deradicalization' program—established in the 'Ground Zero' of terror recruitment, Minnesota's Twin Cities—has already failed after just a few months.

''The program was established after a Federal court released 19-year-old terror suspect Abdullahi Yusuf to a halfway house earlier this year. Federal prosecutors opposed Yusuf's release, but were overruled by'' this big-hearted, caring ''Federal judge''—at least big-hearted and caring about radical Islam, not so much about victims of radical Islam. But Michael J. Davis cares deeply about those who want to kill us.

So as the article says: ''Remarkably, Judge Davis said today in a separate

case of six men charged with trying to join the Islamic State that he would be willing to consider 'less restrictive options' than detaining the men—just a day after Yusuf's re-arrest.''

That is because he decided that he was smarter and more capable than anybody else in America. He could deradicalize people who want to kill Americans by just sending them through this program that he had helped with or proved: Gee, we are going to get you reading good material that really helps you see the wonder and glory of this country.

And then, of course, I, Judge Michael J. Davis, will be a hero to all of my leftist friends because I cared more for the criminal radical Islamists than I did for the victims. And the left loves that kind of thing.

''Last May, Yusuf was arrested in Minneapolis airport while on his way of Syria by way of Turkey to join the Islamic State. One of his accomplices, Abdi Nur, did make it to Syria, and he now serves as an effective recruiter for the terror group.

''Just last week, The Wall Street Journal reported on the program with an article titled, 'A Test Case for ''Deradicalization.'''

''The path of reform for Abdullahi Yusuf, a U.S. teenager who tried to become a radical Islamic soldier, passes through writings of Martin Luther King, Jr. readings of the U.S. Constitution, and discussions about life and literature with a fellow Somali-American named Ahmed Amin.

''Mr. Yusuf's attempt to travel to the Middle East last year helped lead authorities to six Minnesota men who were charged last month in connection with a plan to join Islamic State abroad. The 19-year-old has become a test case for whether Americans lured by Islamic extremism can be deradicalized.''

Oh, I think they can, but I sure wouldn't trust them to Judge Michael J. Davis, if that is what we want.

But see here again, this is once again pointing out the ingenuity of the Founders in creating three branches. We have the executive branch that is supposed to carry out the laws that the Congress, elected by the people, pass. We have two Houses of Congress to make it more difficult to pass laws. They wanted some obstacles and problems to passing legislation too quickly. And then we have the judicial branch that will handle criminal cases, handle civil cases, handle review of actions to ensure their constitutionality.

And then we also have this part of the judicial branch, like five of the Justices on the Supreme Court that decided that they wanted to micromanage enemy combatants at Guantanamo. I thought it would have been a good idea to let them live over at the Supreme Court if they want to micromanage them.

But then, also, this judge like Michael J. Davis in Minnesota who decides, actually, he is not just judiciary; he is clairvoyant. He is a rehabilitative agent. He is everything to everybody, just the kind of judge you want. God in a robe.

So, anyway, he put Mr. Yusuf through these reading materials. And I wonder, though, if he was a bit surprised when Yusuf was arrested because he is not following the program, and he is not reformed. But even that does not prevent God in a robe from saying: You know what? But these new terrorists that you have arrested, they are just a little misguided. I hate to have them in jail because if they are in jail, then the American people will be protected, but they won't be able to come to see how wonderful people like I am. So I want them to develop warm and loving, fuzzy feelings for people on the left, like me. So I want to find some way we don't have to keep them in jail.

Anyway, there is another article about that.

But it is just amazing to me when people exceed the bounds of their job in government because they think they are wiser than the Founders. They think they are wiser than anyone that has gone on before. We hear people in recent days on the issue of marriage talking in terms of how much smarter and how much more we know today than the ignoramuses of the past. And the ignorance that displays is pretty astounding.

Solomon, for those who believe the Bible, Solomon, considered to be—until he got sidetracked by having too many wives and concubines—was considered to be the wisest man in the world. And Solomon, credited for writing some of the things in the Old Testament—the Old Testament, as we call it—but in what we call Ecclesiastes, he points out, there is nothing new under the Sun.

You think socialism, communism is a new idea? It is not new. It has been around forever. And every time it has been tried, it leads to totalitarianism. It leads to the loss of freedom, and then it fails because, as Margaret Thatcher once said, eventually you find out—well, you run out of other people's money to spend. It doesn't work. It won't work.

Now, that is different from socialized medicine, like ObamaCare is taking us toward, government control. I have friends on the Republican side of the aisle who say, LOUIE, we won't have to worry. ObamaCare is going to fall of its own weight. The problem is government health care, socialized medicine, it never falls of its own weight. Socialism does. It can't survive because when you are paying people to not work the same amount you are paying people to work, eventually you destroy the society. And we are in the process of doing that here in America, paying people to do things that are destructive to their well-being. We ought to be incentivizing good conduct, not rewarding conduct destructive to the individual and to the Nation.

But we continue down this path that has not been working for 50 years, so hopefully people are going to eventually get the message.

But amidst this, this same week, I have a Wall Street Journal article, ''Deadly Mexican Cartel Rises as New Threat.''

It should be noted—Carlos the Jackal, probably the most notorious, famous assassin—had commented that he believed the only way to really bring down the United States would be for socialists and Islamists to join forces, and that could be the successful force to bring down the United States. Interesting observation from an anarchist like Carlos the Jackal. Interesting.

□ 1315

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, this article talks about the rise of the Mexican cartel and it says this in the second page of the article: ''The New Generation cartel is perhaps Mexico's most audacious and vicious criminal enterprise, after the government captured or killed most leaders of the Zetas gang based in northeastern Mexico, say officials and security analysts. Like the Zetas, originally formed by Army deserters, the New Generation gang favors paramilitary methods and has received tactical training from Mexican and foreign mercenaries, these people say, including the use of rocket-propelled grenades against the helicopter.''

So, let's see, Mr. Speaker, this columnist said the helicopter incident was a declaration of war. The coming months are going to be very hard in Jalisco.

You have got violence building on our southern border, but don't worry. Our Justice Department has been very helpful. We can't get documents because the Justice Department becomes an Injustice Department quite often in obfuscating—hiding documents, hiding the truth, preventing people from getting at the truth—and won't provide the documents to me that they provided to convicted terrorism supporters in the Holy Land Foundation trial.

Oh, they sent me a couple Web sites I could visit. That was very nice and gracious of them. But basically they were covering up their tracks, being the most muddy—not transparent—Justice Department in my lifetime. That includes going back to the lack of transparency under J. Edgar Hoover when he became too enthralled with his power and began using FBI agents to investigate people not for information to introduce in court but just to use, apparently, to persuade them to do what the FBI director wanted. Information like that is dangerous, and the Founders knew that.

Then there is another Wall Street article from May 14: ''FBI Says Texas Man Lied About Links to Syria.'' Imagine that, Mr. Speaker. They catch somebody who they have evidence to show he has got links to terrorism in Syria, and, lo and behold, they found out not only does he have links to terrorism but he may have actually lied to the FBI. Imagine that. The article points out that ''Bilal Abood, 37 years old, of Mesquite, Texas, was arrested Thursday after a 2-year game of cat and mouse with Federal agents, who questioned him repeatedly before and after he allegedly traveled to Syria in 2013.''

But anyway let's see. It says: ''A week later, agents interviewed him again and he admitted he planned to go to Syria to fight with the Free Syrian Army, according to the complaint. Unlike terror groups, such as Islamic State and the Nusra Front, the moderate FSA''—Free Syrian Army—''has received backing from the United States.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, they received backing from this administration is what the bottom line is, not from all of us here because some of us have been saying that this administration is providing weapons to the Islamic State. They were providing weapons to the so-called vetted moderate Free Syrian Army. Remarkably weapons that the Obama administration was providing to the vetted moderate Syrian Army kept ending up in Islamic State hands. And they were, Oh, gee, they raided, they took this stuff, they took the weapons, send us more. Well, the Obama administration wised up about 4 months. They suspended weapons shipment to the vetted moderate Free Syrian Army. But then, not to worry, they eventually started back sending weapons to the vetted moderate Free Syrian Army even after their leaders were saying, Yeah, we may disagree with the Islamic State on the leader, Assad, the leader in Syria, but we are brothers, and we do line up on most issues.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note terrorism is alive and well in the world, and this administration has done very little to stop it, has turned a blind eye to it, and we have got to do all we can to help them wake up and smell the gunpowder coming from radical Islamists.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family reasons.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 606. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

H.R. 1191. An act to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 18, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Pete Aguilar, Rick W. Allen, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Brad Ashford, Brian Babin, Lou Barletta, Andy Barr, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Gus M. Bilirakis, Mike Bishop, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Rod Blum, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike Bost, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Brendan F. Boyle, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Ken Buck, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cárdenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Earl L. ''Buddy'' Carter, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, Barbara Comstock, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Ryan A. Costello, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Carlos Curbelo, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Mark DeSaulnier, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Daniel M. Donovan, Jr., Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Tom Emmer, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Ruben Gallego, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Gwen Graham, Kay Granger, Garret Graves, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Glenn Grothman, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Richard L. Hanna, Cresent Hardy, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Jody B. Hice, Brian Higgins, J. French Hill, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Will Hurd, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Evan H. Jenkins, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, John Katko, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy, III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Stephen Knight, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Robert E. Latta, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Barry Loudermilk, Mia B. Love, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Thomas MacArthur, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Thomas Massie, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Martha McSally, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Candice S. Miller, Jeff Miller, John R. Moolenaar, Alexander X. Mooney, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Dan Newhouse, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee*, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Gary J. Palmer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Bruce Poliquin, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Amata Coleman Radewagen, Charles B. Rangel, John Ratcliffe, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Kathleen M. Rice, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, David Rouzer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Steve Russell, Paul

Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Aaron Schock*, Kurt Schrader, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason Smith, Lamar Smith, Jackie Speier, Elise M. Stefanik, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, David A. Trott, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Mark Walker, Jackie Walorski, Mimi Walters, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Bruce Westerman, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, David Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young, Lee M. Zeldin, Ryan K. Zinke.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1471. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Exemptions from Preparation Pursuant to an Unsuspended and Unrevoked License [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0048] (RIN: 0579-AD66) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1472. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Edgecombe County, NC, and Incorporated Areas) [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1473. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1474. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's notice of final determination — Final Affordability Determination — Energy Efficiency Standards [HUD FR-5647-N-02] (RIN: 2501-ZA01) received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1475. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia; 2011 Base Year Emissions Inventories for the Washington DC-MD-VA Nonattainment Area for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0759; FRL-9927-70-Region 3] received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1476. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions From Storage Tanks and Transport Vessels [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0079; FRL-9927-59-Region 6] received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1477. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Utah County — Trading of Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets for PM10 Transportation Conformity [EPA-R08-OAR-2015-0227; FRL-9927-68-Region 8] received May 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1478. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-031; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1479. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-021; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1480. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-139; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1481. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-103; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1482. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notice of a drawdown in support of French operations in Mali, Chad, and Niger, pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, Sec. 506(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1483. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification for FY 2015 that no United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization that promotes, condones, or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, pursuant to Sec. 102(g) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (Pub. L. 103-236 as amended by Pub. L. 103-415); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1484. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report by the Department on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period of December 1, 2014 through January 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with Sec. 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1485. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1486. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting the 2014 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, pursuant to Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1487. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report ''What is Due Process in Federal Civil Service Employment?'', pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1488. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Annual Price Inflation Adjustments for Contribution Limitations Made to a Health Savings Account Pursuant to Section 223 of the Internal Revenue Code (Rev. Proc. 2015-30) received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1489. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2015-39] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1490. A letter from the Lead Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Cancer (Malignant Neoplastic Diseases) [Docket No.: SSA-2011-0098] (RIN: 0960-AH43) received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1987. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1335. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and

expand accountability within the Federal government, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 2347. A bill to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 2348. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to promote program integrity with respect to the enrollment of certain immigrants in State plans under Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2349. A bill to ensure receipt of all health insurance benefits to which a member of a union is entitled; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2350. A bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2351. A bill to amend the Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996 to provide additional safety standards for professional boxing; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 2352. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require making available to States affected by determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species all data that is the basis of such determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 2353. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURT of Virginia (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2354. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to review all its significant regulations to determine whether such regulations are necessary in the public interest or whether such regulations should be amended or rescinded; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 2355. A bill to provide for a national public outreach and education campaign to raise public awareness of women's preventive health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 2356. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 2357. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S-3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2358. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2359. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prevent disability fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2360. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the approval of certain programs of education for purposes of educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 2361. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority to provide work-study allowance for certain activities by individuals receiving educational assistance by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 2362. A bill to exclude from consumer credit reports certain medical debt that is less than 180 days delinquent or that has been in collection and has been fully paid or settled, to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to provide for a timetable for verification of medical debt and to increase the efficiency of credit markets with more perfect information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. FINCHER):

H.R. 2363. A bill to provide for the removal of default information from a borrower's credit report with respect to certain rehabilitated education loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2364. A bill to provide for institutional risk-sharing in the Federal student loan programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2365. A bill to authorize Department major medical facility construction projects for fiscal year 2015, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the administration of Department medical facility construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2366. A bill to provide for improvement of field emergency medical services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 2367. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize aliens who are covered by certain immigration policies and who otherwise satisfy the requirements for admission to a military service academy to be appointed to and attend a military service academy and, upon graduation, to be appointed as a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2368. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2369. A bill to lift the oil export ban and modernize Federal policies regarding the supply and distribution of energy in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2370. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to require disclosure of ownership and transfers of ownership of patents,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 2371. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to States that enact State laws that will make school attendance compulsory through the age of 17; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2372. A bill to include reasonable costs for high-speed Internet service in the utility allowances for families residing in public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2373. A bill to provide for the legitimate use of medicinal marijuana in accordance with the laws of the various States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 2374. A bill to combat illegal gun trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NEAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 2375. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to States for assistance in hiring additional school-based mental health and student service providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2376. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to post on the public Web site of the Department of Defense the cost to each American taxpayer of each of the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2377. A bill to affirm the religious freedom of taxpayers who are conscientiously opposed to participation in war, to provide that the income, estate, or gift tax payments of such taxpayers be used for nonmilitary purposes, to create the Religious Freedom Peace Tax Fund to receive such tax payments, to improve revenue collection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2378. A bill to establish an Office of Specialized Instructional Support in the Department of Education and to provide grants to State educational agencies to reduce barriers to learning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 2379. A bill to prohibit the transportation of certain volatile crude oil by rail; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2380. A bill to require criminal background checks on all firearms transactions occurring at gun shows; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2381. A bill to provide grants to States in order to prevent racial profiling; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize a parent to opt their child out of participation in certain assessments required under such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BLUM, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COOK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 2383. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to change the eligible foods allowed for purchase under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (commonly known as SNAP); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2384. A bill to prohibit any appropriation of funds for the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 2385. A bill to require certain large companies to submit to an independent annual audit of their supply chains to verify that their supply chains are free of child and forced labor; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2386. A bill to provide for the recognition of certain Native communities and the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2387. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for equitable allotment of land to Alaska Native veterans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2388. A bill to reverse the designation by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture of certain communities in the State of Alaska as nonrural; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 2389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a limitation on certain aliens from claiming the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. DOLD):

H. Res. 265. A resolution recognizing the importance of a continued commitment to ending pediatric AIDS worldwide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H. Res. 266. A resolution expressing support for the Nation's law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. DOLD):

H. Res. 267. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May as National Lacrosse Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. FUDGE):

H. Res. 268. A resolution Supporting the designation of July 2015 as Uterine Fibroids Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H. Res. 269. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need for investigation and prosecution of war crimes and crimes against humanity, whether committed by officials of the Government of Syria or other parties to the civil war in Syria, and calling on the President to direct the United States representative to the United Nations to use the voice and vote of the United States to immediately promote the establishment of a Syrian war crimes tribunal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 2348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 2353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (related to the general Welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes), and Clause 7 (related to establishment of Post Offices and Post Roads).

By Mr. HURT of Virginia:

H.R. 2354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 2355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 2356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 2357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 2358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among several States, and with the Indian Tribes;''

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among several States, and with the Indian Tribes;''

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among several States, and with the Indian Tribes;''

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 2367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 2369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution which give Congress the authority ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several states . . .'', and pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 2371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 2383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 2385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) to make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 2389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 91: Mr. COLE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 167: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 169: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 232: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 266: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 271: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 282: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 292: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENISHEK, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 381: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 556: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 592: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 616: Mr. KATKO, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 670: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 753: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 784: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 793: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 812: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 815: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 825: Mr. PITTS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. TROTT, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 828: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 842: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 868: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 879: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 893: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BERA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. ESTY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIND, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 909: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 921: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 928: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 985: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 997: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1002: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1061: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1086: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1112: Mr. NEAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1122: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1135: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1151: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1159: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1169: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1192: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1197: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1211: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1218: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1233: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1234: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1309: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1336: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1375: Ms. EDWARDS and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1387: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1388: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1391: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1399: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1411: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1427: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1431: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1432: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1464: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1468: Mr. RANGEL and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1475: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1479: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1504: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1530: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1537: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1551: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 1559: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1594: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1595: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1603: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1610: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 1624: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1650: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1654: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1655: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1674: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1701: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1736: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1737: Ms. TITUS, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1818: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1854: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1856: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1886: Mr. REICHERT and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1893: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1901: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1910: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1933: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1941: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 1942: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1969: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1982: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1987: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 2033: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2042: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BOST, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2061: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2109: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2132: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2150: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2169: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2170: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2213: Mr. HILL, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BARR, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2219: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 2265: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2272: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2292: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2300: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2302: Mr. RUSH and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2318: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2321: Mr. CONYERS.

H.J. Res. 23: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 147: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 209: Mr. BABIN and Ms. MCSALLY.

H. Res. 220: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 225: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 233: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DOLD, Mr.

BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BARR, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BRAT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. JONES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BERA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H. Res. 259: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. JOLLY, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1247: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Member added her name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Mr. HECK of Washington on H.R. 1031: Ms. Wasserman Schultz.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS IN NORTH CAROLINA'S 8TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the fine men and women who faithfully serve in North Carolina's 8th Congressional District as law enforcement officers.

Every year since 1962, when President John F. Kennedy declared May 15th as Peace Officers Memorial Day, our country observes National Police Week during the calendar week of May 15th. This is the day we pay our respects to those heroic officers who died in the line of duty and to their families.

National Police Week presents us with a unique opportunity to show support for these important public servants.

My district is fortunate to have brave men and women who dedicate and risk their lives daily for our well-being and security. Their commitment to the safety of others deserves our gratitude and appreciation, and their service is an example to the people of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me today to recognize and honor the law enforcement officers in North Carolina's 8th Congressional District.

THE 2015 AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION FLY-IN IN SALINAS, CALIFORNIA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, the Salinas Airport is a remarkable place. Earlier this week, my good friend at the Salinas Californian, Jeff Mitchell, captured the spirit of the airport best when he wrote on Thursday, May 14:

The Salinas airport—to the untrained eye—is a funny place. Most of the time it doesn't look like much is happening there. But take a closer look and you'll find some interesting things going on there . . .

The facility is the home airport for many of the corporate jets flown by our elite ag companies. It's also the home for a company—Cal Pacific Airmotive—that has gained a national reputation for the perfect restoration of the greatest World War II-era fighter ever made, the venerable P–51 Mustang. Finally, the Salinas airport is home to none other than Sean D. Tucker, a National Aerobatics Champion and U.S. Aviation Hall of Fame member.

Now through the hard work of the Salinas Valley aviation community and the airport staff, the national Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) has picked the Salinas Airport as one of the sites for its 2015 national fly in. Residents in my Congressional District will have the opportunity to participate in educational forums and hear from national aviation speakers, view top of the line manufacturers, and see aerobatic performances. With our own hometown aerobatic star, Sean Tucker, I know the crowds will have a wonderful family experience.

Americans have always been fascinated with flight, which propelled the Wright Brothers to aviation history by inventing the first three-axis control that enabled pilots, for the first time, to steer their aircraft and maintain equilibrium. As we enter our second hundred years of aviation advancement, space flight will become the norm and the United States will conquer new horizons.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the House of Representatives in congratulating the Salinas Airport and Brett Godown, the Salinas Municipal Airport Manager, for hosting APOA the 2015.

RECOGNIZING THE PYREX BRAND AND THOSE WHO MAKE IT FOR 100 YEARS OF CONTINUED SUCCESS

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Pyrex brand of glassware on the occasion of their 100th year of business.

Over the past century, the Pyrex brand of glassware products has become a staple of the American kitchen. It all started when a Corning Glass scientist gave his wife an improvised casserole pan made out of the cut-off bottoms of battery jars. After refining the product, the company capitalized on the glassware's potential and now, according to their parent company, World Kitchen, eight of every 10 homes in the United States have Pyrex products. The story behind the dependable Pyrex brand is a timeless testament to the innovative and hard-working nature of our country.

As the Pyrex brand marks its centennial, it is essential to also recognize the extraordinary employees that have made the milestone possible. A tradition almost as old as the Pyrex brand itself is the manufacturing of its glassware in Charleroi, Pennsylvania. Charleroi has been a glassmaking presence since the late 19th century and has been producing Pyrex products ever since Corning Glass bought the local glassmaking facility. The Mon Valley community has subsequently provided a skilled workforce as reliable as the products they make, and that very group can proudly say that they not only produce tens of millions of Pyrex pieces but they have helped make the company what it is today.

In addition to congratulating the Pyrex brand on its 100th anniversary, I am honored to highlight the hard-working Mon Valley community for its impressive efforts and continued commitment to making Pyrex successful.

IN RECOGNITION OF PREECLAMPSIA AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Preeclampsia Awareness Month and the importance of addressing maternal and infant health.

Preeclampsia is a serious and far too common complication of pregnancy and the postpartum period and is one of the leading causes of maternal deaths, illness, and premature birth. According to the Preeclampsia Foundation, the disease affects approximately 1 in 12 women, and can result in seizure, stroke, organ failure or death. Prenatal care is necessary if preeclampsia or risk of preeclampsia is to be identified and monitored to ensure the health of the mom and baby.

Unfortunately, too many people are unaware of this potentially fatal condition. The main indicator of preeclampsia is high blood pressure. Additional symptoms of preeclampsia are common to pregnancy such as headaches, abdominal pain, shortness of breath, vomiting, confusion, heightened state of anxiety or visual disturbances such as oversensitivity to light or blurred vision. That is why I support the Preeclampsia Foundation's efforts to educate women and their families to know the symptoms, respond to warning signs, and seek prenatal care.

So much more needs to be understood about this condition—why it occurs, how to cure it, and its long-term effect on a woman and her child's health. Research has demonstrated a possible direct link to the placenta. I understand that the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development at NIH has embarked on a new effort to understand diseases and conditions related to the placenta, and it is my hope that it leads to new discovery for preeclampsia and other conditions of pregnancy.

Together we must do all we can to eliminate preventable maternal and infant death and disability. I am hopeful for the promise of our research efforts, and I am grateful for the work of clinicians around this country and organizations like the Preeclampsia Foundation who work so tirelessly to advance maternal and infant health and well-being.

HONORING THE 21 CLUB INCORPORATED

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an organization who has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to serve their community, the 21 Club Incorporated. The 21 Club Incorporated has served as a support system to citizens of Yazoo County.

The 21 Club Incorporated is a non-profit organization founded in 1954 in Yazoo City Mississippi with the mission of rendering charitable and recreational services to its community. The club is one of the oldest in Yazoo City.

Beginning in 1965, the club has sponsored ''The Mr. and Miss 21 Club Scholarship Pageant'' with the goal of providing scholarships to deserving young girls and boys in the community to assist them in pursuing a higher education. In conjunction with the American Legion, they sponsor local boys and girls attending Boys and Girls State, a program where students from across the state learn about state government.

The 21 Club partner with local emergency management agencies in the event of natural disasters in Yazoo County. They offered assistance during Hurricane Katrina and the massive tornado that hit Yazoo County a few years ago. They also assist people when individual emergencies happen, such as, houses being burned and they often assist church youth groups when they travel.

They make an annual Christmas donation to the Yazoo County Department of Family and Human Services to help buy toys for less fortunate families at Christmas and an annual donation to the Boys and Girls Club of Yazoo City. The club also makes annual donations to elementary schools in the county to provide items such as: school uniforms, supplies, prizes and reward incentives, etc.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 21 Club Incorporated for its dedication to serving others and giving back to the community.

HONORING ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as our nation commemorates the 23rd anniversary of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, I am very pleased to join my friends in the APA community to celebrate their ongoing successes. As leaders in business, education, STEM, military, medicine and the arts, Asian Pacific Americans have made a significant impact on our nation's culture and prosperity. The story of the APA community is a testament to what is achievable in America.

This year's theme is Many Cultures, One Voice: Promote Equality and Inclusion. Many Asian Pacific Americans have overcome numerous obstacles including racial prejudice, language barriers and economic struggles. I am honored to represent a portion of the 1.1 million constituents living in New York City, which has the largest APA population in the United States. I have been impressed by their tremendous achievements, from serving in our Armed Forces and creating over 1.5 million small businesses today.

My Colleagues in the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus and I are dedicated to promoting the economic and social empowerment of the APA community as we work to secure comprehensive immigration reform and opportunities for all business owners. I am a proud co-sponsor of H. Res. 621, to recognize the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month. Let us honor the heritage of the APA community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, last night, I was absent from votes in the House, and therefore, missed rollcall votes 228 through 232. Had I been present, I would have voted:

1) ''aye'' on rollcall No. 228, the Polis Amendment, which would amend section 5062(b) of title 10, United States Code to reduce the minimum required number of operational aircraft carriers the U.S. Navy must have from eleven to ten;

2) ''nay'' on rollcall No. 229, the Brooks Amendment, which would strike section 538 of the underlying bill, related to a sense of the House of Representatives regarding the Secretary of Defense review of section 504 of title 10, United States Code, regarding the consideration of allowing ''DREAMers'' to enlist and serve in the Armed Forces;

3) ''nay'' on rollcall No. 230, the Walorski Amendment, which would extend prohibitions and further restrict the transfer of detainees located at the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba;

4) ''aye'' on rollcall No. 231, the Smith (WA) Amendment, which would provide a framework for closure of the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; and

5) ''nay'' on rollcall No. 232, the McCaul Amendment, which would amend section 2576a of title 10, United States Code to add border security activities to the list of activities deemed suitable for the Department of Defense to transfer excess property to federal and state agencies.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Police Week. We take this time to honor local, state and federal law enforcement officers for their tireless dedication. We also remember those who have been killed in the line of duty.

Every day, brave men and women across the country put on the uniform, pin on the badge, and place themselves in harm's way to serve and protect our communities.

I grew up in a small town outside of Temple, Texas. When I was 5 or 6 years old, my dad took me to watch a parade in Temple. I noticed a man standing at the curb who was not in the parade, just watching it and the people in the crowd. Of course, it was a local police officer.

When my dad saw me watching this individual, he told me something I never forgot, ''If you are ever in trouble, if you ever need help, go to the person who wears the badge because they are a cut above the rest of us.''

Those words were true then and are true today. When people are in trouble and need help, who do they go to?

Peace officers.

These peace officers serve as the barrier between the law and the lawless, and they are all that separate us from the criminals and bad guys.

Everyone remembers where they were on 9/11 when they learned of the terrorist attack. I was driving to the courthouse in Houston, listening to the radio when it was interrupted with news about the airplane that crashed into the World Trade Center. As I continued, I heard that a second plane had crashed into the Second Tower, then another plane crashed in Pennsylvania, and then a fourth plane crashed not far from here, into the Pentagon.

As thousands of people ran away from the terrorist attack in New York, a much smaller group ran in the opposite direction—towards the scene of the attack—to help. This group was comprised of emergency technicians, firefighters, and peace officers. Seventy-two peace officers gave their lives that day. They, along with other first responders, gave the ultimate sacrifice so that others could live.

This week we gather to honor peace officers from across the country for their service and sacrifice. We honor them because they truly are, as my dad said many years ago, ''a cut above the rest of us.'' My home state of Texas is home to some of America's finest lawmen.

During my 22 years as a judge, I had the distinct privilege of working alongside many of them. These peace officers put their lives on the line each and every day to protect us all.

But that protection comes at a price. Almost 60,000 lawmen each year are injured in the line of duty, and an average of 150 officers are killed in the line of duty each year. In 2014, 117 law enforcement officers were killed; 11 of these brave souls were from the great state of Texas:

Mark Uland Kelley of the Trinity University Police Department;

Detective Charles Dinwiddie of the Kileen Police Department;

Sergeant Paul A. Buckles of the Potter County Sheriff's Office;

Chief of Police Lee Dixon of the Little River-Academy Police Department;

Chief of Police Michael Pimentel of the Elmendorf Police Department;

Border Patrol Agent Tyler R. Robledo of the United States Department of Homeland Security—Customs and Boarder Protection—United States Border Patrol;

Senior Deputy Jessica Laura Hollis of the Travis County Sheriffs Office;

Sergeant Michael Lee Naylor of the Midland County Sheriffs Office;

Deputy Sheriff Jesse Valdez, III of the Harris County Sheriff's Office;

Constable Robert Parker White of the El Paso County Constable's Office—Precinct One; and

Sergeant Alejandro "Alex" Martinez of the Willacy County Sheriff's Office.

These 10 men and 1 woman represent all that is good and right in our country. This week we remember those brave Texas officers and all officers who have been killed or wounded in the line of duty. And we say "thank you" to the thousands of men and women who continue to serve.

And that's just the way it is.

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION 61ST ANNIVERSARY

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday marks the 61st anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education.

Since that decision, countless American children of color have benefited from increased access to opportunities in education.

However, we must continue to do more to address the opportunity gap in education.

Because I have dedicated my life to education and to being a champion for disadvantaged young men and boys of color, I know that we must continue to invest time and resources.

We must expand mentorship programs like my 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project and initiatives like the President's My Brother's Keeper so more boys and young men of color have the support and encouragement they need to succeed.

As we commemorate Brown v. Board of Education, let us remember that, while we have come far, we must do more to lift up and support our children.

HONORING JAQUON M. LOTT

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a goal oriented student at Quitman County Middle School.

JaQuon M. Lott is the son of Tiara Lott of Lambert, MS. He has been attending Quitman County Middle School for two years. He is active in many school activities such as football, basketball, track and field, student council, and choir. He also is an active hall monitor for Quitman County Middle School. Along with his many school and academic responsibilities, JaQuon also takes part in his community and participated in Support the Vote initiative that the Student Council sponsored in November.

JaQuon hopes to one day attend Mississippi State University or Alcorn State University to fulfill his dreams of one day playing in the NFL. A second part of his dream is to receive a Master's Degree in Engineering.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing JaQuon M. Lott as a student who is goal oriented and making a difference in his community.

RECOGNIZING FAVIL WEST, NEVADA SENIOR OF THE YEAR FOR 2015

HON. JOSEPH J. HECK

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to recognize and commend my constituent Favil West on being named Nevada Senior Citizen of the Year for 2015.

Favil is a resident of Henderson, Nevada, where he has lived with Pat, his wife of 54 years, since 2000.

A tireless advocate for southern Nevada's senior community, Favil co-founded The Foundation Assisting Seniors to improve the lives of seniors in his own community through programs designed to assist seniors in times of illness, recovery, confinement at home, and coping with loss of a loved one.

Among the most pressing challenges facing our senior communities are the health and safety risks that come with living alone.

Favil worked with the Foundation Assisting Seniors to develop a solution to this challenge.

Last fall, Favil developed the HowRU Program, an effort specifically designed to minimize risks of living alone by maintaining daily contact with their senior clients.

The program calls the subscriber daily at a designated time to see if they are doing okay.

Think of the peace of mind that daily contact brings not only the seniors who participate, but also their family members.

That peace of mind is the result of Favil's devotion to serving fellow senior citizens in his community. I congratulate Favil West on being named Nevada Senior Citizen of the Year for 2015.

HONORING JOHN GEORGE BEZANTAKOS-BAKER

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate John George Bezantakos-Baker of Boca Raton, Florida, who turned 100 years young on May 10th.

A native Washingtonian, John was born in D.C. on May 10, 1915. He has fond childhood memories of selling peanuts in his push cart to prominent figures like the 30th President of the United States Calvin Coolidge and then Secretary of State Herbert Hoover. In 1944, he received his law degree from New York University and then enlisted in the Army Air Corps. After being honorably discharged in 1946, John worked at MetLife Insurance Company until his retirement in 1976. John moved to Ft. Lauderdale post-retirement and became active in the South Florida Greek community as a lifetime member of the American Hellenic Education Progressive Association, the first Greek-American Neighborhood Commissioner for the Boy Scouts, and a trustee in his local Greek Orthodox Church. John was married 44 years to his late wife and has two children and three grandchildren.

John is an exceptional man, and one who I am proud to represent in Florida's 22nd District. I know I join with his family and friends in celebrating this wonderful occasion. I wish him good health and continued success in the coming year.

IN HONOR OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF PATROLMAN JOHN FRANCIS SMITH'S PASSING

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Francis Smith, a patrolman from Lynn, Massachusetts who died, as a result of injuries sustained in the line of duty, on August 19, 1934. Today being Peace Officers Memorial Day, I can think of no more fitting occasion to honor his commitment to his community and family.

Patrolman Smith was a sixteen year veteran of the Lynn Police Department at the time of his fateful incident. Though his initial violent confrontation did not prove fatal, the wounds sustained that day did prove to be grievous. Patrolman Smith was rushed into emergency surgery, which would prolong his life by an additional two years. Despite his life threatening wounds, John F. Smith eventually returned to active patrol duty, serving his community to the best of his ability. Sadly, the wounds suffered in 1932, eventually took his life on August 19th, 1934.

In addition to his dedicated service as a patrolman in the Lynn Police Department, John F. Smith was a loving husband, and father to nine children. His family has continued to grow and flourish in the eight decades since his untimely passing. In the five generations since his watch ended, public service has remained a very important component of the Smith family. Several of the descendants went on to serve in the Lynn Police Department, and others still got involved in municipal government. But, we can all be thankful for the precedent set by John Francis Smith's service to his community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor John Francis Smith on this day dedicated to the men and women who have fallen in the line of duty. I ask that my colleagues join me in commemorating his sacrifice in the pursuit of a more perfect community.

CELEBRATING 125 YEARS OF LOCAL 50 OF THE UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEYMEN PLUMBERS, STEAMFITTERS AND SERVICE MECHANICS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the men and women of Local 50 of the United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Steamfitters and Service Mechanics' 125th anniversary. I join in the union's celebration and add my congratulations to the chorus in recognizing this remarkable milestone event.

The union's original 37 members were granted a charter on December 1, 1890 after previous association with the International Association. Aggressive organizing efforts brought the city's pipe craftsmen together and the union grew to nearly 90 members by 1897. During this time the local worked not only to increase its membership, but also the wages of its members who had been earning on average 30 cents an hour in a sixty hour work week.

The Local's history reports that one of its first major construction projects was the Nasby Building, Toledo's first skyscraper at six stories tall. By the end of its first decade, Local 50 craftsmen also helped to build Toledo landmarks the Gardner Building, the Spitzer Building and the Lucas County Courthouse. During this time of its initial establishment and growth, the Local's history explains that its leadership was able to work with are contractors and business owners while adhering to its primary objective: ''Solidarity among workers for the benefit of all.''

As the new century dawned, there were rivalries between the UA and other unions which ultimately weakened the relationship between Local 50 and contractors and resulted in wage and overtime differentials among the crafts. However, these early power struggles eventually served to strengthen Local 50, which emerged from the battles a strong and powerful leader in Toledo's labor movement.

Through World War I, fears of Communist infiltration, tensions between management and labor, violent strikes, Prohibition and the Great Depression, Local 50 suffered, but survived. Then came the 1934 Electric Auto-Lite Strike. The Local 50 history notes, '' 'The outcome of the Auto-Lite Strike strengthened the Toledo Central Labor Union, its affiliate locals and the Lucas County Unemployed League, leading to further organizing activity in the city.' The strike also led to the creation of the Toledo Industrial Peace Board, which would go on to become a national model for strike resolution.''

President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal saved Local 50. Its members were employed by many of the public works building efforts the New Deal initiated, including the city's Collins Park Water Treatment Plant, completed in 1941 and still operating in testament to the members' skills. World War II brought increased work and technological and training improvements.

As the union grew, progressive changes were initiated for its membership. The Health and Welfare Fund was created in 1952 followed by pension, holiday and retirement plans. Beginning in the 1950s, the union's membership was kept busy with many new buildings going up along Toledo's downtown skyline and new buildings at the University of Toledo. In 1970, the members of Local 50 began the biggest project in its history: the building of the Davis-Besse nuclear power plant. The history reports that during the eight-year building project, ''Local 50 members dismantled and rebuilt components of nearly every piping system installed in the plant.''

Local 50 then joined with other unions in the Northwest Ohio Building Trades to strengthen further its efforts on behalf of its membership. This coalition was crucial to the unions during the economic downturn of the 1980s and the subsequent fallout of the challenges to working families brought by that economy. The Local's history explains the union was able to remain strong ''by 'drawing on the highest traditions of craft unionism and moral guidance provided by the hearts and minds of its membership.' The 1990s saw the centennial celebration of Local 50 as well as employment in large construction projects and a renewed emphasis on continual training. As the new century began, the jobs were still going strong. A new union hall and training center opened on August 12, 2003 with a state-of-the-art training center completed in 2009. Through the first years of the 21st Century, Local 50 members were again an integral part of major building efforts at universities, industries and public construction in our region.

The January 4, 2000 edition of ''The Pipe Line'' Voice of the Building Trades printed this truth which summarizes the U.S. labor movement and the journey of Local 50: ''When Local 50 was born, there were no pensions, no hospitalization, no scholarships, no picnics, no dinner dances, no apprenticeships, no Journeyman training and no credit union. Each of these benefits grew through struggle and dedication. 'We stand on the shoulders of those who came before.' I don't know who said this, but it is certainly true of Local 50 . . . Over the last 100 years, labor has changed the face of this nation. We have weekends, Social Security, living wages, Health and Welfare, pensions, 8 hour days, safety provisions, and other benefits which are a direct result of labor's struggles.''

I am reminded of labor leader Richard Trumka's statement that ''There is nothing stronger than the American labor movement. United, we cannot and we will not be turned aside. We'll work for it, sisters and brothers. We'll stand for it. Together. Each of us. To bring out the best in America. To bring out the best in ourselves, and each other.'' The brothers and sisters of Local 50 in Northwest Ohio have done just this for 125 years, helping to create the middle class and bringing out the best that is in us. United, its members have stood strong over three centuries. United, its members will stand strong and in solidarity in the centuries to come.

HONORING CADET COL GREGORY WILSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Cadet COL Gregory Wilson, a senior at Murrah High School who is the Jackson Public School JROTC Cadet of the Year for 2015.

While maintaining a 3.8 grade point average, Cadet Wilson has held several key leadership positions in the Battalion throughout his high school tenure. Cadet Wilson is a proud member of the National Honor Society and National Junior Classical League. He recently attended the American Legion Boys State where he was elected state treasurer.

Cadet Wilson has also been actively involved in a variety of community service projects including Stewpot Summer Enrichment and Stop Hunger Now. Currently, he serves as the Cadet Battalion Commander for the ''Mustang'' Battalion.

Cadet Wilson has been accepted to several colleges including the prestigious University of Mississippi Honors College. After graduating from Murrah with honors, Cadet Wilson will attend the University of Mississippi. He plans to attend medical school at an Army residency program. His vision is to become a pathologist for the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Cadet COL Gregory Wilson.

RECOGNIZING BECKY MUDD

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the accomplishments of my constituent, Ms. Becky Mudd. Becky ran a 263-mile course from Huntington Beach, California to the border of Arizona in nine days to raise public awareness of and funds for pediatric cancer research. Over the nine day period, Becky ran daily and dedicated parts of her journey to different forms of childhood cancer. She dedicated the first day of her run to Samuel Jeffers who at age 8 lost his life to brain cancer. The Jeffers family was Becky's support crew during her run.

As Becky neared the halfway point of her run in the city of Banning, California, the police chief rode alongside her on a bicycle. Becky made a brief stop at Banning City Hall to meet with families who had lost children to cancer. She surpassed her fundraising goal, raising more than $7,500 to support the Pediatric Cancer Research Foundation. Through her activism, Becky has touched the lives of families and children who have been affected by pediatric cancer.

Becky is supporting a tremendous effort to raise public awareness of a disease that this year is estimated by the American Cancer Society to affect 10,380 children in the United States under the age of 15. Her daily efforts

to bring pediatric cancer to the forefront honors the memory of her two sisters, Robin Ross and Rhonda Ross, both of whom lost their lives to cancer.

Becky was born and raised in Orange County, California. She is a resident of my 48th Congressional District in Laguna Beach, California and a longtime employee of the Orange County Water District. I commend and applaud her unstinting work to support pediatric cancer research. It is my honor to join with my colleagues in recognition of Becky Mudd.

HONORING HENRY JABLONSKI

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks to commemorate the life of my colleague and friend Henry Jablonski of Christiansburg, Virginia, who passed away on April 26, 2015.

Born in Wilmington, Delaware, Henry went on to attend the University of Delaware, where he studied physics. He went on to work for Hercules, Inc. in Salt Lake City, Utah, Princeton, New Jersey, and Radford, Virginia. He married fellow Wilmington native Norma while in Salt Lake City. The pair were married for 53 years before Norma passed away in 2012. In Princeton his son Neil was born, and his daughter Jennifer was born in Radford.

Henry truly was a rocket scientist, having worked in Utah to demonstrate the reliability of the Minute Man and Polaris missile stages. In 1967, Henry moved to Southwest Virginia in order to assist in designing a Hercules automated manufacturing facility for propellants.

After 36 years of service, Henry retired from Hercules Inc./Alliant Techsystems in 1995. Later, he returned to work at the Radford Army Ammunition Plant at Valentec Systems, Inc., where he provided engineering and management services for a manufacturing operation.

Additionally, Henry was very involved in public service. He was elected to the Montgomery County Board of Supervisors for four terms, and served from 1982–1997 as the county's District D representative. During that time, Henry was elected Chairman of the Board for three years and Vice Chairman for seven years.

From 1982–1997, Henry also served on the Montgomery County Public Service Authority (as Chairman for two years and as Vice Chairman for two years) and the New River Valley Planning District Commission (again as Chairman for two years and Vice Chairman for two years).

Additionally, Henry was active with the Montgomery County Regional Economic Development Commission (from 1988–1993), the New River Valley Development Corp. (from 1985–1997, Vice President and Board of Directors), the MBC (Montgomery County, Blacksburg, Christiansburg) Development Corp. (from 1990–1997, Board of Directors), the Montgomery County Planning Commission (from 1994–1996), the Montgomery County/Floyd County Regional Library—Main Branch Building Commission (from 1986–1987), the Montgomery County School Site Selection Committee (from 1996–1997), and the Riner Fire Station Building Committee (from 1984–1985, Chairman).

Henry served on the Boards of Directors of the Warm Hearth Village and the Montgomery Museum and Lewis Miller Regional Art Center. Henry was the chairman of and a writer for the museum's book project committee. This committee lead to the publication of the 772-page book Virginia's Montgomery County, which covers the history of the county.

Further, Henry served in the United States Air Force Reserves from 1958–1963, and graduated from the Aircraft and Engine Mechanics School at Sheppard Air Force Base in Texas.

Henry is survived by son, Neil Jablonski and wife, Dianna, of Spotsylvania, Virginia; daughter, Jennifer Jablonski, of Columbia, South Carolina; and sisters, Pat Allen, of Kansas City, Missouri; Nannette Cannon and husband, Jim, of Wilmington, Delaware, and Mary Julia Stachecki and husband, Chester, of Dover, Delaware. Henry was predeceased by cherished wife, Norma.

A man whose legacy and love for family, neighbors, and community will long be remembered, Henry will be greatly missed. I am honored to pay tribute to Henry's many contributions. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and loved ones.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GUN SHOW LOOPHOLE CLOSING ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to introduce today the Gun Show Loophole Closing Act—critical legislation to keep dangerous weapons away from criminals and other prohibited persons. First proposed by my friend and former colleague Rep. Carolyn McCarthy, I am humbled to continue her important effort to end gun violence, and this legislation would take an important step forward.

States across the country, including my home state of New York, have recognized the danger posed by this significant gap in our gun laws that allows complete strangers to buy and sell guns without the background check requirements Congress passed in the Brady Bill. I'm proud that there is momentum around the country to update our gun laws and ensure that weapons do not end up in the wrong hands—but the fact is that we need a federal solution to this national problem. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives has cited gun shows as a ''major trafficking channel'', and lax gun show regulations in one state can allow guns in the hands of criminals in communities many states away.

The Gun Show Loophole Closing Act will close this gap in existing law and give the ATF the resources and authority it needs to ensure that gun shows do not facilitate dangerous gun sales. The legislation will make sure that law enforcement knows the details about shows and that records are kept on firearm sales. These common-sense measures will bring consistent national standards to gun shows, help combat gun trafficking, and keep guns out of the wrong hands.

I hope my colleagues will join me to support this important effort.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RACIAL PROFILING PREVENTION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill, the Racial Profiling Prevention Act, to reestablish a federal grant program for states that desire to develop racial profiling laws, collect and maintain appropriate data, design programs to reduce racial profiling, and train law enforcement officers. We were successful in getting the program included in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU) in 2005. Although the program was just a small piece of the large SAFETEA–LU bill, nearly half of the states competed and ultimately participated in the program for multiple years. This experience speaks to state desires to deal with their own policing and profiling issues and to the usefulness of the program to states. Racial profiling is a form of racial discrimination that has been thrust back into the forefront of national concern by the tragic deaths of Black men by police and national demonstrations and disturbances, most recently in Baltimore, Maryland.

Racial profiling on roads built with federal funds is a violation of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, because it amounts to a government subsidy of discrimination. However, while racial profiling remains more widespread in our country than most other forms of discrimination, there is little experience in developing legislation in this sensitive area to address racial profiling while allowing for appropriate law enforcement. My bill would help states to better develop their racial profiling laws and help train law enforcement to avoid these problems.

My bill imposes no mandates on states. It simply authorizes a grant program, but does not require states to participate. However, it provides resources that many states and localities clearly need if they are to curb racial profiling.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN MUSIC LEGEND AND MISSISSIPPI NATIVE B.B. KING

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of one of Mississippi's favorite sons and one of the icons of American music, Riley B.

(''B.B.'') King. Born on a plantation between Indianola and Itta Bena, Mississippi, on September 16, 1925, B.B. King was raised in the Mississippi Delta and went on to become the unquestioned ''King of the Blues.''

Like many great musicians, B.B. King began his music career in church—singing in the choir of his grandmother's church in Kilmichael, Mississippi. Eventually, he went on to earn nickels and dimes for playing the guitar in the surrounding area. Mr. King was then introduced to Beale Street in Memphis and the Sonny Boy Williamson's Radio Show where he received his big break and gained his nickname ''Beale Street Blues Boy'' which was ultimately shortened to ''B.B.''

In the 1950's, B.B. King embarked on what would be a legendary touring career. This included a record-setting 342 appearances in 1956 with his band throughout the country in many venues ranging from those on the so-called ''Chit'lin Circuit'' to symphony concert halls. B.B. King often spent three hundred days out of the year performing on the road—even well into his 80's.

In one of the most unruly experiences he had on the road, he was playing a concert hall where a fight broke out, a kerosene lamp was knocked over and a fire was started in the hall. B.B. realized that in the rush, he left his beloved guitar in the hall and ran back in to get it. He later discovered that the fight broke out over a woman named Lucille and he decided to name his guitar after her as a reminder to never do anything that crazy again. To this day, his trademark, black Gibson guitars are called ''Lucille.''

B.B. King had one of the most identifiable and unique guitar styles in music history. He integrated complex string blends and his left hand vibrato which created an almost vocal-sounding guitar sound. This sound can be heard on his many hits including ''Three O'Clock Blues,'' ''The Thrill Is Gone,'' and ''Stormy Monday.''

B.B. King's awards and honors are almost countless. He was inducted into the Blues Hall of Fame in 1984 and into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in 1987. He has received the Grammy Lifetime Achievement Award, Kennedy Center Honors and the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his contribution to American music. Additionally, he has been bestowed honorary doctorates from Tougaloo College, Mississippi Valley State University, Rhodes College, Yale University and Brown University.

Although he had such immense success all over the world, B.B. King never lost touch with his Mississippi Delta roots and each year returned to his hometown of Indianola to give a concert at the B.B. King Homecoming Blues Festival. His iconic impact on music is a source of great pride for all Mississippians—especially those in the Delta.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in celebrating the life and legacy of B.B. King. His work ethic and talent were immeasurable and his impact on American music is undeniable. He was a great bluesman, a great Mississippian and a great American. The ''King'' may have died today but his music will live on forever.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE BROADENING OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH EDUCATION ACT

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, education is the key to building a workforce prepared to meet the needs and challenges of the 21st century global economy. However, every year more than 1.2 million students drop out of high schools across the United States.

Students who drop out of high school not only reduce their opportunity to learn, but also tend to earn less over the course of their life and are often less prepared to compete in the workforce. Adults who drop out of high school and do not receive their GED earn on average 41 percent less than their counterparts who completed high school.

In addition, reducing the high school dropout rate could provide a significant boost to our economy. A study by researchers at Columbia University estimates that the net economic benefit per student graduating high school is approximately $127,000.

Mr. Speaker, that is why today I reintroduced my Broadening Opportunities Through Education Act. This legislation provides additional resources to states that raise the age of compulsory school attendance through age 17. These resources are designed to ensure that students at risk of dropping out receive the support they need to reach their fullest potential. These funds would go towards establishing or expanding work-based programs that integrate academic and career-based skills through career and technical training and apprenticeships; implementing early warning systems to help high schools and middle schools to identify struggling students and implement evidence based interventions; and increasing support systems for students through activities such as student advising and one-to-one mentoring.

As Congress continues to work on strategies to address our deficit and grow our 21st century economy, we cannot forget that our greatest asset is the knowledge base of our workforce. I encourage my colleagues to co-sponsor the Broadening Opportunities Through Education Act and help me bring this program to fruition.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR. WILLIAM ''BILL'' CLEMENS

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. William ''Bill'' Clemens, who passed away peacefully on April 24, 2015. Bill was born to his loving parents Lewis and Ina Walker on May 5, 1925. He was raised in Southern Illinois where he attended a one-room schoolhouse, and while attending school he began working in his father's general merchandise store in Grantsburg, IL as well as his father's furniture store in Vienna, IL.

Bill was very successful in his schooling having graduated from Vienna Township High School in 1942, Northwestern University in 1945, and the Harvard Business School's Mid-Officer Certificate program for Navy Supply Corps Officers in 1945. Bill was very kind and hardworking but above all else, he loved his family and they were his most prized possession. For all who knew Bill, one of his proudest achievements in life had been serving as an Ensign in the U.S. Navy. He was stationed as Commissary Officer on Guam, until he was honorably discharged in 1946. Bill later dedicated over 32 years, working for General Electric (GE) in computer systems until finally retiring in 1988. Bill was passionate about cooking, photography, writing, and working with computers.

On January 16, 1955 Bill married Ms. Joyce (Harkins) Walker in northern Georgia and later the pair welcomed their son Jeffrey and daughter Nancy. After Joyce's passing, Bill married BettyAnn Walker in 1997. The pair lived in Naples, Florida until his passing this year. Bill is preceded in death by his father Lewis; mother Ina; wife Joyce; and his two brothers Newton and James. He leaves behind his wife BettyAnn; son Jeff; daughter Nancy; sister Elizabeth; and seven grandchildren. I would like to extend my deepest condolences to Bill's entire family. He was a great man whose legacy will continue to live on, and he will be missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HONORABLE ADOLPH McLENDON

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a devoted leader and outstanding public servant, the Honorable Adolph McLendon, who has served as the Mayor of Richland, Georgia since 1974. Under Mayor McLendon's leadership, Richland has become a prosperous economic hub and the ideal community in which to live. Mayor McLendon will be honored for his service by his staff, friends, supporters, and the citizens of Richland at a celebration on Monday, May 18, 2015 at noon at the Richland Hotel in Richland, Georgia.

A native of Soperton, Georgia, Mayor McLendon began devoting his time and talents to public service following his graduation from Soperton High School. He spent 36 years with Seaboard Railroad, and served our country honorably in the United States Army and Air Force National Guard.

Always seeking to improve and better his community, he served on the Lower Chattahoochee Area Planning and Development Committee, the Stewart County Water Board, the Board of Richland Banking Company, the Board of the Stewart Webster Hospital, and the Board of the Rural Health Clinic.

In 1974, Adolph McLendon was elected mayor of Richland, Georgia and during his 33 years of leadership, he has taken great pride

in improving and investing in the city of Richland. He has created a business-friendly setting, effectively generating sales tax revenue, he has championed the preservation of Richland's historic downtown Victorian storefronts through smart redevelopment, he has advanced ideas and initiatives to build a diverse tax digest, and he has built a political environment where equal opportunity is not a goal, but a reality.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: ''You make your living by what you get, you make your life by what you give.'' We are so grateful that Mayor McLendon has given so much of himself to the city of Richland, Georgia. A man of great integrity, he serves as an inspiration to other public officials in the city and surrounding areas, as well as to those who strive to better their own communities. The residents of Richland are truly blessed to have a leader who genuinely cares for each and every one of them and has their best interests at heart.

A man of deep and abiding faith, Mayor McLendon is an active member of Richland United Methodist Church, where he has served on and chaired the Board of Stewards for many years. He shares his life and accomplishments with his wife of 48 years, Margaret.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in honoring and recognizing Mayor Adolph McLendon on this special occasion for his significant contributions and enduring dedication to the city of Richland and Stewart County, Georgia.

IN RECOGNITION OF LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., FORMER GOVERNOR AND SENATOR OF CONNECTICUT

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., former Governor and Senator of Connecticut, on the dedication of the Lowell P. Weicker Building at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in Bethesda, Maryland.

Lowell Weicker served as the 85th Governor of Connecticut from 1991 to 1995, prior to which he represented Connecticut in the United States Senate from 1971 to 1989.

In 1981, when President Reagan submitted his first budget to Congress, he proposed significant cuts to domestic programs, including the NIH and services for the disabled and disadvantaged. Then-Senator Weicker led a band of Republicans to respond to these proposed cuts and worked with Democrats to craft a budget that restored funding for the NIH.

In 1983, Senator Weicker ascended to Chairman of the Labor, Health, and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee. From that post, Senator Weicker defended the NIH from proposed cuts to research on cancer and Alzheimer's, and he held the first hearings on HIV/AIDS research. In the early 1980s, few Americans understood what the AIDS virus was and how it was transmitted. Many held prejudices against those who were most initially affected by the disease.

Senator Weicker was ahead of his time in seeing HIV/AIDS as an emerging health crisis. While support for AIDS research was controversial, Senator Weicker stood firm in his support for science and the community, and preserved research from the threat of prejudice. Senator Weicker recognized the need for our government to fight the AIDS epidemic comprehensively, from research to treatment to public education. Senator Weicker implored his colleagues to change their attitudes on AIDS, asking them, ''When in America did we ask how you got sick before coming to your assistance?''

In 1986, Senator Weicker played a critical role in securing the first funding for clinical trials on AZT and treatment for 10,000 AIDS infected patients. AZT was a transformative and first in a line of drugs that helped turned the tide in treatment for HIV/AIDS. Weicker's support laid the groundwork for the approval of AZT as an effective treatment by the FDA in 1987.

As Chairman of the Labor-Health Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator Weicker did more than defend the NIH budget, he helped secure a 56 percent increase, translating into lifesaving research for millions of Americans. Moreover, Senator Weicker led the fight to grow federal funding to combat AIDS from $64 million in 1984 to $925 million in 1988.

He also worked for health and education programs for physically and developmentally disabled persons and the poor. Weicker sponsored the Protection and Advocacy for the Mentally Ill Act in 1985 and in 1988 introduced legislation that would become the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Even after his service in the U.S. Senate, he has continued to champion medical research, launching Research!America in 1989, and serving as President of the Board of Directors of Trust for America's Health, and as a Director of the National Library of Medicine of the National Institutes of Health since February 2003.

On Tuesday, May 5, the National Institutes of Health held a ceremony dedicating the newly-renovated Lowell P. Weicker Building, where scientists in the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases will conduct the lifesaving research then-Senator Weicker fought so hard to protect. Speakers at the ceremony included Dr. Francis Collins, Director of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Anthony Fauci, Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Research!America President Mary Woolley and former Senator Tom Harkin, a colleague of Senator Weicker who worked with him on a bipartisan basis to secure funding for the NIH. Each speaker highlighted Senator Weicker's achievements on health policy as a senator, especially with regard to NIH research on HIV/AIDS.

It was a fitting tribute at NIH for Lowell Weicker, worthy of the champion who fought bravely to protect its buildings and the irreplaceable research conducted inside them. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Governor Weicker on the dedication of the Lowell P. Weicker Building and for his lifelong dedication to disadvantaged Americans.

HONORING MISS QUANESHIA BAKER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a multi-talented young lady, Miss Quaneshia Baker. Miss Quaneshia Baker, a resident of Rolling Fork, MS, is the eldest of two, raised in a single parent home.

She is a 2015 Honors graduate of South Delta High School. Quaneshia plans to attend the University of Mississippi and pursue a degree in political science with the dream of becoming an attorney. Quaneshia, an all-around student, excelled in both academics and extracurricular activities. Quaneshia scored a perfect score on the Algebra I and Mathematical MCT exam. She scored in the highest category on the Algebra I, Biology I, English II, and World History state exams. She held the title of Miss South Delta twice, once in middle school and the other in high school for having the highest grade point average in school.

Quaneshia is a member and officer of various academic and extracurricular activities. She is the President of the class of 2015 and member of the 4H Club, Student Council, Peer Council, Jackson State University's Teen Drinking Prevention Council and the Mayor's Youth Council. Quaneshia is a member of the Future Farmers of America (FFA) organization, where she competed in eight different competitions: Parliamentary Procedure, Opening and Closing Ceremony demonstration, Floriculture, Nursery Landscape, and Horticulture. Also, she was the highest scoring silver coin individual on her team while competing in Kentucky at the National FFA competition.

Miss Baker has volunteered with the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality and the Legacy Village by conducting research and informing the community of environmental safety. Other community activities Quaneshia has been involved in include: landscaping the Vocational complex, mentoring 5th graders, adopting a senior citizen, directing the annual Delta Marathon, serve as tour leader during the Annual Deep Delta Beat Festival, reading to children at Ripley Blackwell head start and South Delta Elementary school and participating in a school supply giveaway.

Having achieved so much at a young age, Miss Baker strives every day to reach her goals while remembering this quote from Aristotle, which states, ''We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence, then, is not an act, but a habit.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Miss Quaneshia Baker for her hard work, dedication and a strong desire to achieve.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to correct the record and express my

support of Mr. KING's amendment to the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

In the midst of the appropriations amendment series for this bill, I was mistaken about which amendment was being considered and accidentally voted against Mr. KING's Davis-Bacon prohibition amendment on the floor.

When these types of amendments have come up in the past, I have always voted to prohibit the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements from applying to federally funded projects.

Last Congress, I voted in favor of Mr. KING's amendment in two different appropriations bills and in the 112th Congress, I voted in favor of eight different Davis-Bacon prohibition amendments in various appropriations and transportation bills.

The Depression-era Davis-Bacon Act is fundamentally flawed, continues to create inefficiencies and inflates the cost of our construction projects.

I want to make it clear that I am supportive of the King Amendment and it was my intention to vote ''aye'' both then and in the future.

RECOGNIZING STEVEN LUCYSHYN

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of a veteran and member of the Rochester community, Steven Lucyshyn.

Rochester is a vibrant city with a rich history including the members of its community who ranged from activists to philanthropists to technological pioneers, and the businesses that were the front-runners of their time in their respective fields. The contributions made by Rochesterians inspire their fellow community members on a daily basis. Steven is no exception. Born in 1919, Steven was a hard-working man who carried on the spirit of Rochester in his day-to-day life as a husband, father, and friend.

But he went well beyond that. In the midst of World War II, Steven answered the call to serve his country and joined the Armed Forces. On June 12, 1941, Steven enlisted as a Private and proudly served in the Warrant Officers branch of the U.S. Army. Steven displayed this immense bravery while fighting in the Battle of the Bulge. Serving one's country requires an immense amount of courage and valor that few of us are capable of displaying. It is without hesitation that we honor the life of Steven, his love for his family and the contributions that he made to this country and the Rochester community.

Steven was predeceased by his beloved wife of 66 years, Amelia, who together, raised two children, Michael Lucyshyn and Janice Schillaci; had two grandsons, Samuel J. (Becky) Lucyshyn and Michael J. Schillaci; and four great-grandchildren, Zoe, Dominic, Mia, and Jessica. As his family and friends mourn his passing, let this record celebrate his life and service to our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during the evening of Thursday, April 30 and on Friday, May 1, 2015, I took medical leave to make an appointment related to my recovery from a surgical procedure and was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 183 (on agreeing to the conference report for S. Con. Res. 11),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 184 (on agreeing to the Van Hollen Amendment to H.R. 2029),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 185 (on agreeing to the first Mulvaney Amendment to H.R. 2029),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 186 (on agreeing to the second Mulvaney Amendment to H.R. 2029),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 187 (on agreeing to the Nadler Amendment to H.R. 2029),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 188 (on agreeing to the Blumenauer Amendment to H.R. 2029),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 189 (on agreeing to the Pocan Amendment to H.R. 2029),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 190 (on agreeing to the Hice Amendment to H.R. 2029),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 191 (on agreeing to the King (IA) Amendment to H.R. 2029),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 192 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 2029, with instructions),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 193 (on passage of H.R. 2029),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 194 (on passage of H.J. Res. 43),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 195 (on agreeing to the first McClintock Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 196 (on agreeing to the Ruiz Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 197 (on agreeing to the Griffith Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 198 (on agreeing to the first Swalwell Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 199 (on agreeing to the Byrne Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 200 (on agreeing to the second McClintock Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 201 (on agreeing to the Ellison Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 202 (on agreeing to the second Swalwell Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 203 (on agreeing to the Quigley Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 204 (on agreeing to the Garamendi Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 205 (on agreeing to the Hudson Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 206 (on agreeing to the Sanford Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 207 (on agreeing to the Burgess Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 208 (on agreeing to the Rothfus Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 209 (on agreeing to the Gosar Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 210 (on agreeing to the Blackburn Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 211 (on agreeing to the McClintock Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 212 (on agreeing to the first LaMalfa Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 213 (on agreeing to the second LaMalfa Amendment to H.R. 2028),

''YES'' on rollcall vote No. 214 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 2028, with instructions),

''NO'' on rollcall vote No. 215 (on passage of H.R. 2028).

HONORING JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this May we celebrate Jewish American History Month, to recognize the social, political, and cultural history of America's Jewish community. I am pleased to recognize the myriad contributions Jewish Americans make every day to improve our City, State and Nation often in the face of unspeakable discrimination and adversity. America is blessed to have such a vibrant community that impacts so many lives through the spirit of tikkun olam, or repairing the world.

It is my great honor to represent the Upper Manhattan Congressional District and the Bronx, which is home to many distinguished institutions, such as The Jewish Theological Seminary, Yeshiva University, and Touro College, as well as almost thirty active synagogues of all denominations. I am proud that my dearly respected friend, Rabbi Arthur Schneier, who is world-renowned for his efforts to promote peace and justice, has been recently knighted by Pope Francis and made a member of the Papal Order of St. Sylvester at a ceremony in New York.

Over the years, I have worked closely with New York based institutional organizations like the Jewish Community Relations Council, Met Council of Jewish Poverty and the American Jewish Committee on a variety of issues. I have led past efforts to assist Jews seeking refuge from the former Soviet Union and Ethiopia, and I am proud to have worked with my colleagues in Congress on various bills to fight anti-Semitism and racism. Just recently I supported a resolution urging the Administration to combat anti-Semitism globally. As a strong supporter of Israel, I will continue to advocate for stability in the Middle East. I congratulate Jewish people everywhere for their contributions to our community and to our country. To them I say Shalom and Kol Tov.

HONORING NIA DORROUGH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a goal oriented student at Quitman County Middle School.

Nia Dorrough was born on November 29, 2002 to Tawanda Dorrough. She is the granddaughter of Melvin and Virginia Dorrough. Nia

is a straight A student who has been on the Superintendent's List since kindergarten. She is an active member of the Quitman County Middle School's Student Council. She also represented the Language Arts department in her schools coronation as Miss Language Arts for her astounding scores. When Nia was at Quitman County Elementary School, Nia volunteered to help raise money for her school to build a new playground by collecting box tops. Some of Nia's goals include: helping medical researchers gain funding to find a cure for cancer and other diseases. She aspires to do this by becoming a successful lawyer with her own law firm. Nia is an active member in her community and works as a Junior Secretary for Burrell Chapel M. B. Church.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Nia Dorrough, as a student who is goal oriented and making a difference in her community.

CONGRATULATING WEST KENTUCKY COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate West Kentucky Community and Technical College (WKCTC) on recently being named one of the top three community colleges in America by the Aspen Institute.

Selected from 1,123 community colleges nationwide, this marks the second time WKCTC has been chosen as Finalist-with-Distinction in addition to having been ranked as a top ten finalist every year the Aspen Prize has been awarded since its launch in 2011.

Created by the Aspen Institute, The Aspen Prize is the nation's preeminent recognition of high achievement and performance in America's community colleges and is awarded every two years. The prize recognizes institutions for outstanding outcomes in four areas: student learning; certificate and degree completion; employment and earnings; and high levels of access and success for minority and low-income students.

WKCTC students graduate and transfer at rates that exceed the national average by eight percent and asserts no gap in graduation rates between minorities and other students—a rare occurrence in most of the nation's colleges and universities. Working to draw first-generation students into college, WKCTC faculty and staff consistently track student learning and completion outcomes and use this data to improve teaching and guidance practices. These efforts have resulted in an increase in student retention and degree completion, and place them among the very best in graduating students who are prepared for meaningful employment and/or success after transferring to a four-year institution.

WKCTC has been a primary player in efforts to expand economic growth, from a high-tech industrialized training facility for area companies to adding programs in anticipated growth areas, including marine technology, logistics and operations management.

Community colleges today enroll more than 40 percent of all U.S. undergraduates—7 million students—working toward degrees and certificates. While fewer than half of all community college students graduate nationwide, Aspen Prize finalist institutions demonstrate community colleges can help students achieve higher levels of success while in college and after they graduate.

West Kentucky Community and Technical College, located in Paducah, Kentucky, stands among these leading institutions and I am pleased to see its success once again being acknowledged.

IN RECOGNITION OF ELIZABETH ''BETTY'' M. PERRY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend and a true leader of our nation's seniors, Ms. Elizabeth ''Betty'' Perry, who recently passed away. I ask all my colleagues to join me in recognizing her for her work on behalf of all Americans.

A Sacramento native, Betty returned home to become a teacher after graduating from UC Berkeley. She first taught at Kit Carson Junior High School, and then became a teacher and counselor at C. K. McClatchy High School, where she influenced many students. One of these students was my husband, the late Congressman Robert Matsui. Bob adored Betty and remained close to her when he served on the Sacramento City Council and in Congress. After her teaching career came to a close, Betty emerged a true expert and leader on senior issues, where she and Bob worked closely to ensure Medicare and Social Security were preserved for future generations. Betty was especially known for her work with the Older Women's League (OWL), an organization whose mission is to improve the status and quality of life for midlife and older women. Within OWL, she served in many positions, including President of its Sacramento and California chapters, Coordinator of Education & Research, and Director of Public Policy. She also served as President of Health Access California. Betty was an unwavering advocate for improved access to quality health care, including universal coverage and improved in-home care, as well as fair housing laws and preserving each American's civil rights.

Betty married Calvin Perry in 1977, gaining three step-children and six step-grandchildren in the process. In addition to her thoughtful advocacy, she was known as an incredibly caring woman and accomplished athlete.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying honor to Elizabeth ''Betty'' M. Perry for her extraordinary service and advocacy to those of us in Sacramento and across the nation. Her life and legacy is an inspiration to us all. I ask that we take a moment and extend our utmost respect and condolences to her family.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, today I commend the House of Representatives for passing H.R. 1191, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. It is critical that Congress has a proper role in reviewing any final deal that may be reached regarding Iran's nuclear program. Congress must continue to play a role to ensure Iran does not acquire a nuclear weapon.

I have been outspoken in expressing my skepticism at the current negotiations with Iran and remain skeptical after the release of the recent framework. I have many questions that have yet to be answered and am deeply concerned by Iran's statements after the framework was released.

I have been and will continue to be defiant in demanding Congressional review of any final deal and am pleased the Senate passed this legislation last week and the House passed it today.

No deal is better than a bad deal, and this legislation allows for sufficient Congressional oversight while ensuring that we have an opportunity to review the details of any final deal should one be reached.

HONORING MARY FORTUNE WILLIAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a self-motivated leader and innovator of the community, Ms. Mary Fortune Williams, MBA, works as an Accountant for the State of Mississippi. She earned her Bachelor of Science degree in Marketing from Jackson State University and her Master of Business Administration degree from Mississippi College. She also earned a Certificate of Accounting from Mississippi College.

Ms. Williams is a single parent of one daughter. After becoming divorced, when her daughter was a toddler, she was determined that her child would not become another negative statistic attributed to single parent households. She strives to instill in her daughter one of the greatest fundamentals of life: Never let negative circumstances define who you are or what you can become.

Ms. Williams is actively involved in her daughter's educational and character development. She works diligently in her church and her community. She is part of the Youth Leadership Team at Greater Fairview Missionary Baptist Church, serves as an Assistant Leader of Girl Scout Troop 5576, serves on the PTSA Board of Murrah High School, and serves on the planning committee for the American Cancer Society's Relay for Life of Jackson, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Mary F. Williams for giving

back to the community in which she was born and reared.

IN HONOR OF SHERIFF JERRY M. MODENA, SR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant and courageous leader of the Macon, Georgia community, Sheriff Jerry M. Modena, Sr. Sadly, Sheriff Modena passed away on Wednesday, May 13, 2015. Funeral services to celebrate his life will be held on Monday, May 18, 2015 at 11:00 a.m. at Mabel White Memorial Baptist Church in Macon, Georgia.

Sheriff Jerry Modena was widely known in his community as a compassionate leader committed to fighting crime and making Bibb County a safer place to live. Throughout his entire career with the Sheriff's office, Sheriff Modena gave one hundred percent of his heart to his line of duty.

Prior to joining the Bibb County Sheriff's Office, Sheriff Modena served our country honorably as a paratrooper in the United States Army. In 1964, at the age of 23, he joined the Sheriff's office and remained there for over forty years. In 2001, he was elected Bibb County Sheriff and remained Sheriff for three terms before stepping down in 2012. Even after leaving the Sheriff's Office, he remained heavily involved and concerned for the wellbeing of the community.

From the beginning of his career, Sheriff Modena was determinedly committed to the safety and welfare of those he was charged to protect. Described as firm but fair, he not only had a positive impact on each individual he encountered, but he also had a tremendous and everlasting impact upon his community. He is celebrated for creating substations around Bibb County and for championing the cause of the mentally ill in the Bibb County Jail, reserving 200 beds for those with mental health issues in his newly expanded 966-person lockup that opened in 2007.

Perhaps one of Sheriff Modena's greatest accomplishments is his invaluable leadership in overseeing the merge of the Sheriff's Office and the Macon Police Department. He was also regarded as a mentor and guide to many in the Sheriff's Office. He taught others the importance of transparency in law enforcement, the need to be accessible to the community, and the importance of engaging with the people one serves.

George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind him distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." Sheriff Modena's impression on this earth extends beyond himself to the very wellbeing of the Macon community, and for it he will be remembered by the community for time to come.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 730,000 people in Georgia's Second Congressional District, salute Sheriff Jerry M. Modena, Sr. for an outstanding career in law enforcement, his significant contributions to Bibb County, and his lifelong dedication to serving his community. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Sheriff Modena's family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

INTRODUCTION OF FIBROID RESEARCH RESOLUTION

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, during National Women's Health Week, I rise as the original cosponsor of a resolution recognizing the need for greater uterine fibroid research and the minority disparity rates of African-American and Hispanic uterine fibroid patients. I thank Congressman SCOTT for joining me to introduce this important resolution.

Uterine fibroids are the most prevalent medical condition affecting women, with an estimated 80 percent of women developing an uterine fibroid by age 50. Actual incidence of fibroid tumors is estimated to be 3 times higher in African-American women and 2 times higher in Hispanic women compared to Caucasian women.

Further, uterine fibroids are estimated to cost the United States up to $34.4 billion annually, with an estimated annual lost work cost of up to $17.2 billion through absenteeism and short term disability in women age 25 to 54.

Those numbers are why I urge my colleagues to join Congressman SCOTT and me in seeking more research funding for the millions of women affected by fibroids.

HONORING CLARK-WILLIAMS FUNERAL HOME

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Clark-Williams Funeral Home, Inc. of Grenada, Mississippi.

Clark Funeral Home was founded in 1946 by James and Paralee Clark. The business was located at 602 Cherry Street in Grenada, MS.

As founder, Mr. Clark worked diligently and tirelessly to build a successful business until his death in 1958. Mrs. Clark continued to operate the business in the same manner until her death in 2001.

In February 2004, the business was sold to Clinton and Geraldine Williams. The new owners made many new changes to the funeral home, including its name—now Clark-Williams Funeral Home, Inc. Other changes included remodeling of the existing building—adding chapel space, updating the prep room, and additional garage space. The insurance debits were computerized and a full line of life insurance was added to give customers more options when planning ahead.

Geraldine died in July, 2008. Clinton continued to operate the business as sole owner.

In March 2009, Clinton married Shawan Cunningham and together they saw a need for even more changes to the business. In 2010 more land was purchased between Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and the funeral home to add a parking lot for the customers. And to meet the needs of their customers even more so, Clinton and Shawan made the business decision to offer monuments as products for purchase. A monument display was added as part of the new parking space.

Two students have completed their internships at Clark-Williams Funeral Home. Both became employees as licensed funeral directors and embalmers.

Today, Mr. and Mrs. Clinton Williams continue to own and successfully operate the business from its original location at 602 Cherry Street in Grenada. Offering consoling service, quality merchandise, economical prices, pre-needs, and life insurance. Clark-Williams Funeral Home Inc. serves Grenada County as well as surrounding counties.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Clark-Williams Funeral Home for its dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, May 18, 2015*

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 18, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

As the Members return from their various districts and our Nation enters a week which ends with Memorial Day, may we all be mindful in the busyness of life to remember our citizen ancestors who served our Nation in the armed services.

Grant that their sacrifice of self and, for so many, of life would inspire all of America's citizens to step forward, in whatever their path of life, to make a positive contribution to the strength of our democracy.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed Halls be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHABOT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, and applaud its passage by the House of Representatives. This bill prohibits the EPA from using its Waters of the U.S. rule to expand its authority beyond, way beyond, congressional intent.

Waters of the U.S. is yet another executive overreach by this administration. The Clean Water Act intentionally limited the EPA's jurisdiction to navigable waters, yet Waters of the U.S. would expand Federal jurisdiction to include virtually all water flows—from ditches to prairie potholes—even on private land.

Nebraskans are concerned Waters of the U.S. could severely harm our ag economy by increasing costs and uncertainty for producers.

America's farmers and ranchers are already great stewards of the land and take numerous steps to protect our natural resources. By blocking the Waters of the U.S. rule, H.R. 1732 stops the administration's latest power grab and supports ag producers across the country.

CONGRATULATING THE HOUSTON ROCKETS AND HOUSTON ASTROS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take long for a Texan to brag about things that we do in Texas. But I wanted to take my 1 minute today to talk about what the Houston Rockets have done for the first time in 19 years to advance to the next level of the NBA playoffs, being a Rockets fan for as long as we have had them. I know all Houstonians and basketball fans were amazed that they came from three games behind to win.

Also, basketball is not the only thing. In fact, a couple blocks from where the Rockets play, the Houston Astros are playing. A few years ago, we had the worst team in baseball, but they have been leading their division and just swept another home stand.

So I want to congratulate the Houston Rockets for moving forward in the playoffs and also the Houston Astros because it is a long season. We need to keep it up. But they are bringing sports history into Houston again.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF SRI LANKA'S CIVIL WAR

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the sixth anniversary of the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka. In a brutal war that lasted 37 years, we saw nearly 100,000 people killed—many of them civilians—as a result of the tensions between the country's Buddhist majority and Hindu minority.

Since the war ended, however, corruption and ongoing human rights abuses have prevented Sri Lanka from reaching a national reconciliation.

Then in January of this year, we saw President Sirisena democratically elected with significant support from the Sinhalese, Tamil, and Muslim communities.

Mr. Speaker, on this fortuitous occasion, I call on the new government to release the 200 detained political prisoners, account for the nearly 20,000 missing civilians from the war, and end oppressive restrictions on the Tamil provinces.

This sixth anniversary serves as a reminder of Sri Lanka's war-torn past and a chance to move it toward a future of democracy, justice, and equality for all its people because only then

can Sri Lanka finally achieve the stability, peace, and prosperity that it deserves.

PROTECTING NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS AND LANDOWNERS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in 2014, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issued a rule that would significantly broaden the Federal Government's power to regulate waters and adjacent lands under the Clean Water Act.

The Waters of the United States rule would give the Federal Government jurisdiction over puddles, roadside ditches, irrigation ditches, and storm and wastewater systems. Federal agencies frequently place burdensome regulations on the American public, and this rule is no exception.

Fortunately, last week, the House passed H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, which would require the agencies to start over and develop a new rule in consultation with State and local governments and other stakeholders. This commonsense legislation prevents an out-of-touch administration from threatening the livelihood of North Carolina's farmers and saddling local governments with exorbitant compliance costs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, The Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on May 15, 2015, at 3:33 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a copy of a notice filed earlier with the Federal Register continuing the emergency with Burma first declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–39)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared on May 20, 1997, is to continue in effect beyond May 20, 2015. The Government of Burma has made significant progress across a number of important areas, including the release of over 1,300 political prisoners, continued progress toward a nationwide cease-fire, the discharge of hundreds of child soldiers from the military, steps to improve labor standards, and expanding political space for civil society to have a greater voice in shaping issues critical to Burma's future. In addition, Burma has become a signatory of the International Atomic Energy Agency's Additional Protocol and ratified the Biological Weapons Convention, significant steps towards supporting global nonproliferation. Despite these strides, the situation in the country continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Concerns persist regarding the ongoing conflict and human rights abuses in the country, particularly in ethnic minority areas and Rakhine State. In addition, Burma's military operates with little oversight from the civilian government and often acts with impunity. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to Burma.

Despite this action, the United States remains committed to supporting and strengthening Burma's reform efforts and to continue working both with the Burmese government and people to ensure that the democratic transition is sustained and irreversible.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 2015.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1605

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS) at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

HOMELESS VETERANS' REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 474) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 474

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Programs Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. FIVE-YEAR EXTENSION OF HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.

Section 2021(e)(F) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2020''.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICES UNDER HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.

Subsection (a) of section 2021 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''reintegration of homeless veterans into the labor force.'' and inserting the following: ''reintegration into the labor force of—''

''(1) homeless veterans;

''(2) veterans participating in the Department of Veterans Affairs supported housing program for which rental assistance provided pursuant to section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)); and

''(3) veterans who are transitioning from being incarcerated.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 474.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 474, the Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Programs Reauthorization Act of 2015 would extend this very good job training and placement program for homeless veterans.

This bill would also make some commonsense changes to the program's eligibility rules by making veterans housed under the HUD-VA supported housing program and formerly incarcerated veterans eligible for HVRP.

Mr. Speaker, by making those eligibility changes, we will be offering training and placement services to groups of veterans who are largely unemployed and have significant barriers to employment. The program's history of a job placement rate of 70 percent has been recognized by many as among the best in the Federal Government and I believe warrants its continuation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 474, the Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Programs Reauthorization Act of 2015. This bipartisan bill reauthorizes the highly successful Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Program, HVRP, which provides grants to train and reintegrate homeless veterans into meaningful employment.

H.R. 474 also clarifies that in addition to homeless veterans, those participating in the HUD-VASH voucher program and those transitioning from being incarcerated are also eligible to participate in HVRP. HVRP is unique among Federal programs, as it is dedicated to providing employment assistance to homeless veterans. Other programs that we hear much about focus on needs such as emergency shelter, food, and abuse treatment.

Homeless veterans often face a variety of problems that can bar them from traditional employment pathways, including severe PTSD, histories of substance abuse, and encounters with the criminal justice system. HVRP service providers give our homeless veterans specialized intensive counseling and services to help them find a positive pathway forward, resulting in gainful employment.

This bill will not incur any direct spending costs, nor will discretionary costs be beyond the minimal.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WENSTRUP for his hard work on this bill, as well as Ranking Member TAKANO for his efforts to advance this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to support my bill, H.R. 474. I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 474. It is a good bill that will reauthorize and clarify the Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Program, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Again, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support my bill, H.R. 474, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 474.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENSURING VA EMPLOYEE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1038) to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1038

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Ensuring VA Employee Accountability Act''.

SEC. 2. RETENTION OF RECORDS OF REPRIMANDS AND ADMONISHMENTS RECEIVED BY EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 714. Record of reprimands and admonishments

''If any employee of the Department receives a reprimand or admonishment, the Secretary shall retain a copy of such reprimand or admonishment in the permanent record of the employee as long as the employee is employed by the Department.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''714. Record of reprimands and admonishments.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 1038.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, currently, if a VA employee is either reprimanded or admonished for their performance, all records of those administrative punishments are removed from the employee's personnel file within 3 years and 2 years, respectively. Subsequent to the removal of these personnel actions, there is no record of their poor performance or acts regardless of how many different jobs they hold within the VA or how long they remain a VA employee.

Mr. Speaker, personnel policies and rules such as we are addressing today are part of the culture of no accountability at the Department of Veterans Affairs that have contributed significantly to the recent public scandals. The list of scandals now includes the abuse of the purchase card program where some VA employees were spending $5 billion annually on goods and services without contracts, which was exposed at the Veterans' Affairs Committee hearings last Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to ensure that only the most ethical and most qualified employees who benefit from the tax dollars that support them move up through the ranks at VA. One way to assist that is to retain an employee's entire history in their personnel file. Now, no one is saying that employees can't improve their performance after being reprimanded or admonished, but managers should know the complete history of their staff or potential staff members.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 1038, the Ensuring VA Employee Accountability Act of 2015.

Currently, when a VA employee is reprimanded for misconduct, the paperwork describing the incident is removed from that employee's file after 3 years. Paperwork describing an incident leading to an admonishment is taken out after just 2 years. H.R. 1038 requires the Secretary to maintain all written reprimands and admonishments of any VA employee in that employee's file for the entire duration of his or her employment at VA.

As members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee work to ensure effective oversight of VA actions, it is important to maintain a record of VA employees' past misconduct. At the same time we are working toward greater accountability, we must also ensure that increased transparency does not come at the expense of fairness and the equitable treatment of VA employees.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues and all interested parties to clarify the intent of this legislation to ensure that we are not inadvertently affecting the use of negotiated settlement agreements when appropriate and that admonishments and reprimands are not wrongly used to silence whistleblowers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), the author of this bill.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to come before you today to speak on behalf of this commonsense effort to ensure greater employee accountability within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

We all agree that our veterans deserve the best service and care possible, and it is our responsibility to ensure that that care is provided by responsible employees.

My legislation, H.R. 1038, Ensuring VA Employee Accountability Act, is a further step in this direction. As you know, the VA carries out their disciplinary actions in a tiered system, and the two most commonly used are the lower-tiered actions, admonishments and reprimands.

As the VA continues to review the findings of the recent inspector general's investigations related to data manipulation, backlogs, and excessive wait times, it is apparent that a greater number of admonishments and reprimands are being issued to at-fault employees.

However, in the current policy, these disciplinary actions remain in an employee's file for only 3 years and are then deleted. This prevents the keeping of complete employee files and doesn't allow the poor performers within the VA to be tracked or held accountable.

Veterans expect the correct disciplinary action to be administered—indeed, all taxpayers do—and not simply the issuance of a temporary written warning. Therefore, as the VA continues to issue these lower-tier disciplinary actions more heavily than others, it is important that the personnel actions remain in the employee's record while employed at the VA.

My bill requires all reprimands and admonishments remain in a VA employee's file as long as they are employed at the VA, ensuring that the VA maintains good, complete employee records and holds those who care for our veterans accountable.

There are some concerns that this legislation could negatively impact flexibility in resolving routine personnel disputes, but there is nothing in this bill that imposes new employee penalties or would affect the existing process for a VA employee to appeal a disciplinary action.

We are open to working with our Senate counterparts to ensure that nothing in this legislation prevents a VA employee's ability to dispute a disciplinary action before a reprimand or admonishment is placed in their record. It is simply another tool for the Secretary to hold employees accountable during their tenure at the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will support my legislation to promote transparency and accountability where it is needed.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. COSTELLO for his work on this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1038 and to work with all of us to make sure going forward that the intent of the bill is accurately realized.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 1038, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1038.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICE DISABLED VETERAN OWNED SMALL BUSINESS RELIEF ACT

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1313) to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1313

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act''.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION OF TREATMENT UNDER CONTRACTING GOALS AND PREFERENCES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8127(h) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''rated as'' and all that follows through ''disability.'' and inserting a period; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) The date that—

''(i) in the case of a surviving spouse of a veteran with a service-connected disability rated as 100 percent disabling or who dies as a result of a service-connected disability, is 10 years after the date of the veteran's death; or

''(ii) in the case of a surviving spouse of a veteran with a service-connected disability rated as less than 100 percent disabling who does not die as a result of a service-connected disability, is three years after the date of the veteran's death.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to contracts awarded on or after such date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on H.R. 1313.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1313 would amend title 38 to allow certain surviving spouses of service-disabled small-business owners to continue to be classified as a service-disabled veteran-owned small business for a 3-year period following the death of the veteran owner.

Current law limits the continuation to just the surviving spouses of disabled veterans rated at 100 percent by VA. By changing the law, we will enable surviving spouses of the vast majority of small businesses owned by service-disabled veterans to make the transition from a preferred VA contractor to the private sector market. This small change will also provide a large measure of financial stability to surviving spouses.

I see this as another commonsense bill, and I thank Mr. MCNERNEY for bringing it to us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1313, the Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act of 2015. Veterans who are rated as 100 percent disabled by the Department of Veterans Affairs and who own at least 51 percent of their small business receive preferred status in the Federal contracting process.

If the veteran small-business owner passes away, the surviving family members and business partners are not allowed any time to transition away from this preferred status, thereby putting their businesses in jeopardy of losing any Federal contracts they may have. Last year, there were an estimated 500,000 of these businesses nationwide.

This bill provides a 3-year transition period during which the business would keep its preferential status and any

Federal contracts associated with that status should the veteran owner pass away.

Current law does, however, allow the surviving spouse to maintain preferred status for up to 3 years following the death of a veteran owner, but only if that veteran had a 100 percent service-connected disability rating and died due to the disability.

H.R. 1313 further expands the transition period from 3 to 10 years after the veteran owner's death if the veteran were either 100 percent disabled or died from a service-connected disability.

H.R. 1313 is a fair policy that will ensure we protect the hard work and investment of our service-connected disabled veterans who own small businesses.

I would like to thank Chairman WENSTRUP and Ranking Member TAKANO of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for their support of this bill and Mr. MCNERNEY for bringing it to us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I, again, reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Chairman WENSTRUP and Ranking Member TAKANO for their continued work on behalf of our Nation's veterans and for bringing these commonsense bills to the floor today.

Small businesses are the economic drivers in our communities, and we must give them opportunities they need to grow and prosper. Veteran entrepreneurs, in particular, are some of the most apt at starting, managing, and growing small businesses.

In the United States, there are about 5 million veteran-owned businesses and an estimated 500,000 service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses. A service-disabled veteran-owned small business is one that must be at least 51 percent directly owned and controlled by one or more service-disabled veterans.

The Federal Government established procurement contracting goals for small businesses in 1978 and set aside 3 percent of the total value of all Federal contracts for veteran-owned small businesses. Although some Federal agencies meet these goals, there are no penalties for not meeting the 3 percent small business procurement goal. The VA is diligent, on the other hand, in meeting this goal.

Under current law, if a veteran who was rated 100 percent disabled and owned a service-disabled veteran-owned small business passes away, the surviving spouse has 10 years to transition the business away from service-disabled veteran-owned small business status for contracts that the company has with the VA.

However, if the veteran businessowner was rated at less than 100 percent disabled or dies of a nonservice-connected injury, the surviving spouse has only 1 year to transition the business for contracts with the VA.

Unfortunately, this is not enough transition time for service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses whose owner passes away and was rated at less than 100 percent disabled to reposition the business, putting many service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses at a disadvantage. We need to correct this deficiency in the law.

That is why I introduced H.R. 1313, the Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act. My bill allows the service-disabled veteran-owned small business, whose principal owner passes away and was rated at less than 100 percent disabled at the time of death, with a reasonable 3-year transition period from service-disabled veteran-owned small business status with the VA.

It is only right that we provide our heroes and their families and the employees with flexibility and certainty to ensure their businesses continue to thrive. The loss of a veteran businessowner is already tragic enough for their families and can put service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses at severe risk of closing or downsizing because of the loss of Federal contracts.

H.R. 1313 is supported by the Paralyzed Veterans of America, AMVETS, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, The American Legion, and Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America. In addition, the VA said, at a subcommittee hearing on March 24 of this year, that the bill is a reasonable approach.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in passing this commonsense bill and support veteran-owned small businesses across the country.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1313, to ensure that our service-connected disabled-veteran small-business owners are able to leave a legacy for their families and coworkers when they pass away.

At this point, I don't have any other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 1313, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1313.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

BOOSTING RATES OF AMERICAN VETERAN EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1382) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1382

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act'' or the ''BRAVE Act''.

SEC. 2. PREFERENCE FOR OFFERORS EMPLOYING VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 8128 the following new section:

''§ 8129. Preference for offerors employing veterans

''(a) PREFERENCE.—In awarding a contract (or task order) for the procurement of goods or services, the Secretary may give a preference to offerors that employ veterans on a full-time basis. The Secretary shall determine such preference based on the percentage of the full-time employees of the offeror who are veterans.

''(b) ENFORCEMENT PENALTIES FOR MISREPRESENTATION.—(1) Any offeror that is determined by the Secretary to have willfully and intentionally misrepresented the veteran status of the employees of the offeror for purposes of subsection (a) shall be debarred from contracting with the Department for a period of not less than five years.

''(2) In the case of a debarment under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall commence debarment action against the offeror by not later than 30 days after determining that the offeror willfully and intentionally misrepresented the veteran status of the employees of the offeror as described in paragraph (1) and shall complete debarment actions against such offeror by not later than 90 days after such determination.

''(3) The debarment of an offeror under paragraph (1) includes the debarment of all principals in the offeror for a period of not less than five years.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8128 the following new item:

''8129. Preference for offerors employing veterans.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on H.R. 1382, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to improve employment opportunities for veterans and business opportunities for the companies that employ them, H.R. 1382, as amended, would require the Secretary to consider the number of veterans working for an offerer in the decision to award a contract.

Under the bill, the Secretary may give a preference to such employers based on the percentage of the workforce made up by veterans. The bill would also provide the Secretary with debarment authority for any offerer who willfully and intentionally misrepresents the number of veterans they employ.

Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate among certain age groups of veterans still exceeds their nonveteran peers, and this is one commonsense step to increase job opportunities for veterans of all ages.

I thank Miss RICE for her hard work on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1382, as amended, the Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act, or BRAVE Act, of 2015.

According to the April 2015 Bureau of Labor Statistics report, almost 7 percent of post-9/11 veterans are unemployed, which is higher than the national average.

□ 1630

These men and women have dutifully served their country. Now it is our job as Members of Congress to craft policies that will improve and increase employment opportunities for them. This includes improving the Federal contracting process to incentivize private sector companies to hire more veterans when they come home.

The Department of Veterans Affairs establishes long-term contracts with private sector businesses to provide veterans medical equipment, supplies, services, and other things. Currently, the VA gives preference for these contracts to veteran-owned small businesses, but it does not give preference to businesses that actively employ veterans. This bipartisan BRAVE Act allows the VA to consider the proportion of veterans employed by a prospective contractor when awarding those Federal contracts. It also encourages and incentivizes current VA contractors to employ more veterans.

H.R. 1382 deters companies from exaggerating the number of veterans they employ in order to become more competitive for procurement, requiring debarment for any company that knowingly misrepresents its proportion of veteran employees.

H.R. 1382 does not require offsets nor does it add any burdens on taxpayers. This bipartisan legislation will reward companies who hire veterans, thus incentivizing the private sector recruitment of veteran employees. It is, indeed, a win-win-win policy for the private sector, for the Federal Government, and, most importantly, for the veterans, themselves.

I want to thank Miss RICE, who is the sponsor of this bill, Chairman MILLER for bringing it to the floor, and Dr. WENSTRUP and Mr. TAKANO—the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity—for their work on the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE), who is the sponsor of this important legislation.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, H.R. 1382, the Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act.

I doubt there is a single Member of this body who would disagree that American veterans—men and women who have stepped up to protect our country and preserve the freedom that we cherish—deserve our full support when they have completed their service. They deserve the opportunity to find a good job, to support themselves and their families. They deserve the opportunity to succeed in civilian life, to adapt their extraordinary skills, training, and experience in order to thrive in a civilian workforce, and to continue making a meaningful contribution to our economy.

We have seen real progress in adding veterans to the workforce, but we cannot be satisfied with that progress while so many men and women still struggle to find the good jobs they deserve. We cannot be satisfied when the unemployment rate among post-9/11 veterans remains higher than the national average. We cannot be satisfied if even a single American veteran who wants to work is not given the opportunity to do so—is left jobless, homeless, forgotten, and abandoned by the country he or she served.

Unemployment among veterans is not only a stain on the character of our country, it is not only a dereliction of the promise we make to the people who risk their lives to protect us; it is a missed opportunity.

Veterans have received the most advanced and sophisticated training the world has to offer. They have unique skills and experience. They know how to work as members of a team. They know how to succeed in the most difficult conditions. They know how to get the job done, whatever that job may be. They received that training, they developed those skills, and gained that experience because we invested in them as servicemembers, and we would be foolish not to double down on that investment. We would be foolish not to invest in them as veterans—invest in their potential to adapt their training and skills and experience so they may use it to thrive in a civilian workforce and contribute to our economy.

We need businesses in the private sector to recognize the benefit of having veterans in their workforces. We need businesses to recognize that it is in their self-interest to actively seek out and employ veterans, not as an act of charity, but because they are excellent workers who know how to get the job done and how to bring out the best in their fellow employees. That is why it is so important that we pass H.R. 1382.

This legislation will make the kind of investment that Members of both parties can be pleased to support—the kind that costs no money. The Department of Veterans Affairs is already authorized for $19 billion in total procurement and contracting spending. This legislation will simply ensure that, when the Secretary of the VA is awarding those contracts, he has the authority to give preference to businesses with high concentrations of full-time veteran employees, businesses that make it a priority to actively seek out veterans and provide them with meaningful full-time employment.

As has been noted, the VA can already give such preference to veteran-owned businesses, as it should. We should give that same advantage to contractors who actively invest in veterans, who recognize their value and their potential to thrive in the civilian workforce.

Such companies do exist, and this legislation will reward them for their commitment to giving veterans the opportunities they have earned. But in doing so, in creating such an advantage, this legislation will also create an incentive for other contractors to do the same, to be proactive, to make it a priority to seek out veterans who are looking for employment. In time, I have no doubt that they will recognize the value of investing in veterans as they will find themselves with a more productive, efficient, and effective workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give a special thanks to my colead sponsor on the

other side of the aisle, Congressman PAUL COOK, a combat veteran who served 26 years and retired as a colonel from the United States Marine Corps.

I also think it is important to note that this bill has the support of several major veteran service organizations, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for another bill that I am proud to cosponsor, Dr. WENSTRUP'S legislation—H.R. 474, the Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Programs Reauthorization Act.

The HVRP provides critical support to help reintegrate homeless veterans into the workforce and to address the underlying issues that so often lead to life on the streets—services ranging from job training, job placement, and career counseling to clothing, housing, transportation, and treatment for mental health and substance abuse disorders. This program has been successful, and passing a 5-year reauthorization will secure its future and allow State and local agencies to plan long-term programming.

I thank Dr. WENSTRUP for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to give H.R. 474 their full support.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1382, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I don't have any additional speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 1382, as amended, and I thank Miss RICE for presenting this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1382, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

VETERAN'S I.D. CARD ACT

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 91) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 91

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Veteran's I.D. Card Act''.

SEC. 2. VETERANS IDENTIFICATION CARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Currently, veteran identification cards are issued to veterans who have either completed the statutory time-in-service requirement for retirement from the Armed Forces or who have received a medical-related discharge from the Armed Forces.

(2) A veteran who has served a minimum obligated time in service, but who does not meet the criteria described in paragraph (1), does not receive a means of identifying the veteran's status as a veteran other than using the official DD–214 discharge papers of the veteran.

(3) Goods, services, and promotional activities are often offered by public and private institutions to veterans who demonstrate proof of service in the military but it is impractical for a veteran to always carry official DD–214 discharge papers to demonstrate such proof.

(4) A general purpose veteran identification card made available to a veteran who does not meet the criteria described in paragraph (1) would be useful to such veteran in order to demonstrate the status of the veteran without having to carry and use official DD–214 discharge papers.

(5) The Department of Veterans Affairs has the infrastructure in place across the United States to produce photographic identification cards and accept a small payment to cover the cost of these cards.

(b) PROVISION OF VETERAN IDENTIFICATION CARDS.—Chapter 57 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 5705 the following new section:

''§ 5706. Veterans identification card

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall issue an identification card described in subsection (b) to any covered veteran who—

''(1) requests such card;

''(2) was discharged from the Armed Forces under honorable conditions;

''(3) presents a copy of the DD–214 form or other official document from the official military personnel file of the veteran that describes the service of the veteran; and

''(4) pays the fee under subsection (c)(1).

''(b) IDENTIFICATION CARD.—An identification card described in this subsection is a card that—

''(1) displays a photograph of the covered veteran;

''(2) displays the name of the covered veteran;

''(3) explains that such card is not proof of any benefits to which the veteran is entitled to;

''(4) contains an identification number that is not a social security number; and

''(5) serves as proof that such veteran—

''(A) honorably served in the Armed Forces; and

''(B) has a DD–214 form or other official document in the official military personnel file of the veteran that describes the service of the veteran.

''(c) COSTS OF CARD.—(1) The Secretary shall charge a fee to each veteran who receives an identification card issued under this section, including a replacement identification card.

''(2)(A) The fee charged under paragraph (1) shall equal an amount that the Secretary determines is necessary to issue an identification card under this section.

''(B) In determining the amount of the fee under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall ensure that the total amount of fees collected under paragraph (1) equals an amount necessary to carry out this section, including costs related to any additional equipment or personnel required to carry out this section.

''(C) The Secretary shall review and reassess the determination under subparagraph (A) during each five-year period in which the Secretary issues an identification card under this section.

''(3) Amounts collected under this subsection shall be deposited in an account of the Department available to carry out this section. Amounts so deposited shall be—

''(A) merged with amounts in such account;

''(B) available in such amounts as may be provided in appropriation Acts; and

''(C) subject to the same conditions and limitations as amounts otherwise in such account.

''(d) EFFECT OF CARD ON BENEFITS.—(1) An identification card issued under this section shall not serve as proof of any benefits that the veteran may be entitled to under this title.

''(2) A covered veteran who is issued an identification card under this section shall not be entitled to any benefits under this title by reason of possessing such card.

''(e) ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES.—(1) The Secretary shall ensure that any information collected or used with respect to an identification card issued under this section is appropriately secured.

''(2) The Secretary may determine any appropriate procedures with respect to issuing a replacement identification card.

''(3) In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the National Personnel Records Center.

''(4) The Secretary may conduct such outreach to advertise the identification card under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(f) CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to affect identification cards otherwise provided by the Secretary to veterans enrolled in the health care system established under section 1705(a) of this title.

''(g) COVERED VETERAN DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'covered veteran' means a veteran who—

''(1) is not entitled to retired pay under chapter 1223 of title 10; and

''(2) is not enrolled in the system of patient enrollment under section 1705 of this title.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5705 the following new item:

''5706. Veterans identification card.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on H.R. 91, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thankfully, many of the Nation's businesses offer discounts to our servicemembers and veterans. Unfortunately, unless a servicemember is a qualified military retiree, the DOD does not issue an ID card as proof of service. That means millions of veterans cannot take advantage of those discounts or proudly share evidence of their honorable service. This bill would change that by directing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue a veteran's ID card to any veteran who requests such card and who is not entitled to military retired pay nor is enrolled in the VA health care system.

The bill would require the card to display the veteran's name and photograph, and it would serve as proof that the veteran honorably served in the Armed Forces. This bill would also require the Secretary to determine a fee to be charged that would cover all costs of producing the cards and of managing the program. The bill also specifies that the card does not entitle the holder to any VA benefits.

I thank my colleague Mr. BUCHANAN for his efforts on this commonsense legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 91, the Veteran's I.D. Card Act, as amended.

This bill directs the Secretary to issue, upon a veteran's request, a veteran's identification card. In most instances, a veteran must be enrolled with the VA to receive a VA ID card or to utilize his or her DD–214 to prove military service. Many veterans are hesitant to carry around their DD–214s, which may contain personal health information. A veteran's ID card would provide those veterans with the ability to prove their service without the need to constantly have to produce official documents like their DD–214 forms.

Issuing an optional veteran's ID card is a simple way to provide a reliable and convenient method for our Nation's heroes to prove their honorable service and veteran status.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Veteran's I.D. Card Act.

This is bipartisan legislation I have introduced which will allow all veterans to receive an ID card through the VA.

Over the years, I have heard from countless veterans from Florida and across the country who have expressed frustration about their ability to document their service. This will allow them to document their service by getting ID cards. The ID card won't quite replace the DD–214, but they won't have to carry around the paperwork with them if they are looking to use it in the future. It will also help to cut down on identity theft.

One of the biggest things for veterans in our area is it will help with jobs and opportunities in terms of their not having to carry the paperwork. They will have proof of their service for their employers. It will also provide discounts from a lot of our businesses in the area. A lot of businesses offer veterans discounts, but veterans don't have the documentation. As a result, many times, they don't get the benefits. One of the biggest benefits is that there is no cost to the taxpayers, which is a big thing for a lot of people.

One other thing I just wanted to mention is that many of our veterans have served our country proudly, and this will help validate their service from that standpoint.

On behalf of the 70,000 veterans in my district, of the almost 2 million veterans in Florida and of the 22 million veterans in the country, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation to help our American heroes.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 91, as amended, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to support this legislation, H.R. 91, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 91, the Veteran's I.D. Card Act.

This legislation is a commonsense proposal to permit veterans to show their service without hassle and inconvenience. Upon enactment, the bill requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to issue a photo identification card to veterans who request it. The identification card serves as proof of honorable military service.

In the First District of Iowa, many of my constituents—including veterans of World War II, the Korean war, and Vietnam war—would benefit from the existence of such a card. The card would increase veterans' access to available military service discounts at commercial establishments. The Veterans I.D. Card Act, an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill and supported by AMVETS, Vietnam Veterans of America, and Veterans for Common Sense, makes proving veteran status easy, expedient, and credible.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to enact this commonsense legislation that assists veterans in receiving all the recognition and benefits they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 91, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1645

VULNERABLE VETERANS HOUSING REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1816) to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1816

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. EXCLUSION FROM INCOME.

Paragraph (4) of section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and any amounts'' and inserting '', any amounts'';

(2) by striking ''or any deferred'' and inserting '', any deferred''; and

(3) by inserting after ''prospective monthly amounts'' the following: '', and any expenses related to aid and attendance as detailed under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code''.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON AWARDS AND BONUSES PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 705 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 38 U.S.C. 703 note) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following '', except that the dollar amount limitation applicable under this section for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 shall be such dollar amount as reduced by $10,000,000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous materials on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1816, the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2015. I strongly urge my colleagues to support its passage.

H.R. 1816, legislation that has been long championed by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), is designed to help some of our Nation's greatest heroes, our disabled veterans, better afford the housing and medical care they desperately need.

To do so, H.R. 1816 would change how the Department of Housing and Urban Development calculates a disabled veteran's income for its Section 8 and public housing programs by exempting their service-related disability benefits and expenses related to in-home care. In other words, right now HUD is counting the aid and attendance disability payments of those heroes as income that could pay for housing, when it really should only be used to pay for their medical care.

CBO has estimated there are about 2,000 veterans that would be impacted by this change. This legislation will ensure that we don't punish low-income disabled veterans who are seeking or receiving housing assistance simply because of the disability benefits.

Fixing the income calculation of disabled veterans is not only a matter of fairness, it is also a matter of common sense. Many of these disabled veterans require extensive care and assistance to perform basic daily functions such as bathing, eating, and dressing. These aid and attendance payments are designed only to cover the costs of the in-home care they require to meet those needs, and it is wrong to ask these veterans to use that money for any other purpose.

The housing challenges faced by disabled veterans are great, and I commend Mr. HECK for his hard work to bring this issue and an appropriate fix for it to our attention.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HECK for his leadership on this bill. As a former veteran, he has a deep understanding of these issues. I also thank Mr. LUETKEMEYER, who is the chair of our Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance and one of our most active members on the committee, having served not only as a community banker, but as a community regulator.

I am very pleased to rise in strong bipartisan support of H.R. 1816, the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2015. This bill will bring a measure of fairness to our government's treatment of severely disabled veterans. The bill excludes the payments that disabled veterans receive for in-home aid and attendance from being considered as income when determining their eligibility for HUD housing assistance.

Under current law, these in-home aid and attendance payments are wrongly counted as disposable income, which makes it harder for disabled veterans who receive these payments to qualify for the Federal housing assistance which they deserve. These payments are absolutely not disposable income; rather, they are payments that are medically necessary to enable disabled veterans to perform everyday functions, functions that, if not for their extraordinary sacrifice, would not require in-home aid payments in the first place.

Thousands of veterans across our country are unable to qualify for Federal housing assistance, such as Section 8 rental assistance, because these payments are improperly counted as income. Let's be clear. These are veterans who have suffered life-changing injuries and who are now severely disabled as a result of their service to our country. It is their service and their sacrifice made in the name of peace and freedom that have made this the great Nation that it is today.

For our great Nation to turn around and make it harder for these veterans because of their service-related disabilities to qualify for housing assistance is grossly unfair and something that should be swiftly rectified. That is what this bill does. It rights a wrong in our Federal housing policy and gives the veterans the respect and support that they deserve.

I applaud my colleague, Mr. HECK, who has served this country as a veteran. For three times, he has brought this bill to this floor. It has passed on suspension three times. I really applaud his persistence in pursuing this commonsense fix that will help thousands of veterans that deserve the aid and the assistance from HUD to rightfully get it. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri and the gentlewoman from New York for their support.

I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support the bipartisan H.R. 1816, the Vulnerable Veterans Housing Reform Act of 2015. This bill would remove an unnecessary barrier that prevents our disabled wartime veterans from receiving the housing assistance they so critically need.

This body recognized the importance of this issue when it unanimously passed substantially similar bills, H.R. 6361 and H.R. 1742, during the 112th and 113th Congresses. Unfortunately, these bills were not considered by the Senate. I am hoping the third time is the charm.

Quite simply, H.R. 1816 prevents the Department of Housing and Urban Development from considering a veteran's aid and attendance benefits as income when calculating their eligibility for housing assistance. The aid and attendance benefit is an enhanced pension provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to our Nation's wartime veterans who are severely disabled and have little or no income.

Veterans eligible for this benefit are those requiring the aid of another person in order to perform their activities of daily living, such as bathing, eating, adjusting prosthetic devices, or protecting themselves from the hazards of their daily environment.

In order to receive this benefit, our severely disabled veterans must first establish their eligibility for a low-income pension, which requires an annual adjusted gross income of less than $12,868 for a single veteran with no dependents. Once eligibility is determined, low-income disabled vets can receive roughly an additional $8,600 in aid and attendance benefits annually to help defray the cost of their medical care. This is an important point. This aid and attendance benefit is for medical care. It is not discretionary income; it is not for groceries; it is not for transportation, utilities, or anything else.

As you can imagine, these low-income veterans struggle daily to keep the lights on, put food on the table, and keep a roof over their heads. Add to that the exorbitant cost of paying for a personal care attendant, and it becomes increasingly difficult for them to stay in their homes.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development operates a number of programs that can assist these veterans. However, current regulations require that the aid and attendance benefit be counted as income when determining eligibility for housing assistance. Mr. Speaker, this makes no sense.

The VA provides this benefit to ensure that our low-income disabled wartime vets have the necessary resources to receive the medical care they need and have earned. Now, while $8600 per year may seem like a substantial amount of money, it doesn't fully cover the cost of a full-time aide but is much more cost effective than a nursing home or assisted living facility. The median annual cost for a licensed home health aide in 2014 was about $19,000. The cost of an assisted living facility was $42,000, and the median cost of a room in a nursing home is about $80,000 annually. So continuing to count the aid and attendance benefit as income does nothing more than to reduce the housing assistance available to our

low-income disabled vets and jeopardizes their ability to live independently.

Mr. Speaker, it is the stated goal of both this House and this administration to reduce homelessness in our veterans population. The need for this legislative fix is just as strong today as it was last Congress and the Congress before that. Most recent statistics from the Department of Housing and Urban Development indicate that approximately 50,000 veterans are homeless, and we certainly don't want to add to that number.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1816 will go a long way towards preventing additional homelessness for our Nation's veterans. I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to underscore a point that Congressman HECK made that so many of our veterans become homeless, and it is a huge problem across this country. By passing this bill, we will enable more veterans to stay in their homes and to have the respect and dignity that they deserve.

This is a commonsense bill. It has passed this body two times before, almost unanimously. I hope that, as Mr. HECK said, the third time is the charm and that we will finally get this through the Senate. It is well deserved and long overdue. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this fair and commonsense proposal that will help our veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished lady from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for her fine work on this bill and for her strong support. I also want to thank the sponsor of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), for again bringing this to our attention and again attempting to right a wrong here. This is certainly something we certainly need to support and will do. I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1816, as amended

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 178

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING

SEC. 101. DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 3014. Additional special assessment

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 and ending on September

30, 2019, in addition to the assessment imposed under section 3013, the court shall assess an amount of $5,000 on any non-indigent person or entity convicted of an offense under—

''(1) chapter 77 (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons);

''(2) chapter 109A (relating to sexual abuse);

''(3) chapter 110 (relating to sexual exploitation and other abuse of children);

''(4) chapter 117 (relating to transportation for illegal sexual activity and related crimes); or

''(5) section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324) (relating to human smuggling), unless the person induced, assisted, abetted, or aided only an individual who at the time of such action was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter (and no other individual) to enter the United States in violation of law.

''(b) SATISFACTION OF OTHER COURT-ORDERED OBLIGATIONS.—An assessment under subsection (a) shall not be payable until the person subject to the assessment has satisfied all outstanding court-ordered fines, orders of restitution, and any other obligation related to victim-compensation arising from the criminal convictions on which the special assessment is based.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the 'Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund' (referred to in this section as the 'Fund'), to be administered by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

''(d) TRANSFERS.—In a manner consistent with section 3302(b) of title 31, there shall be transferred to the Fund from the General Fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section, which shall remain available until expended.

''(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts in the Fund, in addition to any other amounts available, and without further appropriation, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019, use amounts available in the Fund to award grants or enhance victims' programming under—

''(A) section 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044c);

''(B) subsections (b)(2) and (f) of section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105); and

''(C) section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

''(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (h)(2), none of the amounts in the Fund may be used to provide health care or medical items or services.

''(f) COLLECTION METHOD.—The amount assessed under subsection (a) shall, subject to subsection (b), be collected in the manner that fines are collected in criminal cases.

''(g) DURATION OF OBLIGATION.—Subject to section 3613(b), the obligation to pay an assessment imposed on or after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 shall not cease until the assessment is paid in full.

''(h) HEALTH OR MEDICAL SERVICES.—

''(1) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—From amounts appropriated under section 10503(b)(1)(E) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b–2(b)(1)(E)), as amended by section 221 of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, there shall be transferred to the Fund an amount equal to the amount transferred under subsection (d) for each fiscal year, except that the amount transferred under this paragraph shall not be less than $5,000,000 or more than $30,000,000 in each such fiscal year, and such amounts shall remain available until expended.

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—The Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall use amounts transferred to the Fund under paragraph (1) to award grants that may be used for the provision of health care or medical items or services to victims of trafficking under—

''(A) sections 202, 203, and 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a, 14044b, and 14044c);

''(B) subsections (b)(2) and (f) of section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105); and

''(C) section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

''(3) GRANTS.—Of the amounts in the Fund used under paragraph (1), not less than $2,000,000, if such amounts are available in the Fund during the relevant fiscal year, shall be used for grants to provide services for child pornography victims under section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

''(4) APPLICATION OF PROVISION.—The application of the provisions of section 221(c) of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 shall continue to apply to the amounts transferred pursuant to paragraph (1).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3013 the following:

''3014. Additional special assessment.''.

SEC. 102. CLARIFYING THE BENEFITS AND PROTECTIONS OFFERED TO DOMESTIC VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

''(F) NO REQUIREMENT OF OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of trafficking to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in this subsection or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled.''; and

(3) in subparagraph (H), as redesignated, by striking ''subparagraph (F)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (G)''.

SEC. 103. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 203. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may award block grants to an eligible entity to develop, improve, or expand domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims' services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

''(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

''(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

''(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

''(B) address the unique needs of child victims of human trafficking;

''(C) facilitate the rescue of child victims of human trafficking;

''(D) investigate and prosecute acts of human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking; and

''(E) utilize, implement, and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of child sex trafficking victims for prostitution offenses, and other laws aimed at the investigation and prosecution of child human trafficking;

''(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child human trafficking offenses and to rescue victims, including—

''(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer's time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

''(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

''(i) wire taps;

''(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;

''(iii) travel; and

''(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

''(C) dedicated anti-trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for State and local prosecutors, including assisting in paying trial expenses for prosecution of child human trafficking offenders, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall be not more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking;

''(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims' services through coordination with—

''(i) child advocacy centers;

''(ii) social service agencies;

''(iii) State governmental health service agencies;

''(iv) housing agencies;

''(v) legal services agencies; and

''(vi) nongovernmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking; and

''(E) the establishment or enhancement of other necessary victim assistance programs or personnel, such as victim or child advocates, child-protective services, child forensic interviews, or other necessary service providers;

''(3) activities of law enforcement agencies to find homeless and runaway youth, including salaries and associated expenses for retired Federal law enforcement officers assisting the law enforcement agencies in finding homeless and runaway youth; and

''(4) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for trafficking victims that include—

''(A) mandatory and regular training requirements for judicial officials involved in the administration or operation of the court program described under this paragraph;

''(B) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking, including case worker or child welfare supervision in collaboration with judicial officers, who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

''(C) the development of a specialized and individualized, court-ordered treatment program for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—

''(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;

''(ii) life skills training;

''(iii) housing placement;

''(iv) vocational training;

''(v) education;

''(vi) family support services; and

''(vii) job placement;

''(D) centralized case management involving the consolidation of all of each child human trafficking victim's cases and offenses, and the coordination of all trafficking victim treatment programs and social services;

''(E) regular and mandatory court appearances by the victim during the duration of the treatment program for purposes of ensuring compliance and effectiveness;

''(F) the ultimate dismissal of relevant non-violent criminal charges against the victim, where such victim successfully complies with the terms of the court-ordered treatment program; and

''(G) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, and nongovernmental organizations with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking to provide services to victims and encourage cooperation with law enforcement.

''(c) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

''(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

''(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

''(B) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant;

''(C) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section; and

''(D) disclose—

''(i) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

''(ii) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period ending on the date of the submission of an application under this section.

''(3) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

''(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b); or

''(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award.

''(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES SOLICITING DATA ON CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—No eligible entity shall be disadvantaged in being awarded a grant under subsection (a) on the grounds that the eligible entity has only recently begun soliciting data on child human trafficking.

''(d) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall expire 3 years after the date of award of the grant.

''(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 2 times and for a period of not greater than 2 years.

''(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall—

''(1) enter into a contract with a nongovernmental organization, including an academic or nonprofit organization, that has experience with issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct periodic evaluations of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section;

''(2) instruct the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to review evaluations issued under paragraph (1) to determine the methodological and statistical validity of the evaluations; and

''(3) submit the results of any evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

''(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

''(f) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity awarded funds under this section that is found to have used grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the block grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost is reported.

''(g) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if within the 5 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section, the grantee has been found to have violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

''(h) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount expended to carry out this section.

''(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section shall be—

''(1) 70 percent in the first year;

''(2) 60 percent in the second year; and

''(3) 50 percent in the third year, and in all subsequent years.

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING; FULLY OFFSET.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, is authorized to award not more than $7,000,000 of the funds available in the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund, established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

''(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'child' means a person under the age of 18;

''(2) the term 'child advocacy center' means a center created under subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

''(3) the term 'child human trafficking' means 1 or more severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) involving a victim who is a child; and

''(4) the term 'eligible entity' means a State or unit of local government that—

''(A) has significant criminal activity involving child human trafficking;

''(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing child human trafficking;

''(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat child human trafficking, including—

''(i) the establishment of a shelter for victims of child human trafficking, through existing or new facilities;

''(ii) the provision of trauma-informed, gender-responsive rehabilitative care to victims of child human trafficking;

''(iii) the provision of specialized training for law enforcement officers and social service providers for all forms of human trafficking, with a focus on domestic child human trafficking;

''(iv) prevention, deterrence, and prosecution of offenses involving child human trafficking, including soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing human acts with children;

''(v) cooperation or referral agreements with organizations providing outreach or other related services to runaway and homeless youth;

''(vi) law enforcement protocols or procedures to screen all individuals arrested for prostitution, whether adult or child, for victimization by sex trafficking and by other crimes, such as sexual assault and domestic violence; and

''(vii) cooperation or referral agreements with State child welfare agencies and child advocacy centers; and

''(D) provides an assurance that, under the plan under subparagraph (C), a victim of child human trafficking shall not be required to collaborate with law enforcement officers to have access to any shelter or services provided with a grant under this section.

''(l) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY; SPECIALIZED VICTIMS' SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—No grant funds under this section may be awarded or transferred to any entity unless such entity has demonstrated substantial experience

providing services to victims of human trafficking or related populations (such as runaway and homeless youth), or employs staff specialized in the treatment of human trafficking victims.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7101 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 203 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 203. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.''.

SEC. 104. DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.

The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(5) (42 U.S.C. 13001a(5)), by inserting '', including human trafficking and the production of child pornography'' before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 214 (42 U.S.C. 13002)—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Director and with the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime, may make grants to develop and implement specialized programs to identify and provide direct services to victims of child pornography.''.

SEC. 105. INCREASING COMPENSATION AND RESTITUTION FOR TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18.—Section 1594 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''that was used or'' and inserting ''that was involved in, used, or''; and

(ii) by inserting '', and any property traceable to such property'' after ''such violation''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', or any property traceable to such property'' after ''such violation'';

(2) in subsection (e)(1)(A)—

(A) by striking ''used or'' and inserting ''involved in, used, or''; and

(B) by inserting '', and any property traceable to such property'' after ''any violation of this chapter'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) TRANSFER OF FORFEITED ASSETS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General shall transfer assets forfeited pursuant to this section, or the proceeds derived from the sale thereof, to satisfy victim restitution orders arising from violations of this chapter.

''(2) PRIORITY.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall have priority over any other claims to the assets or their proceeds.

''(3) USE OF NONFORFEITED ASSETS.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not reduce or otherwise mitigate the obligation of a person convicted of a violation of this chapter to satisfy the full amount of a restitution order through the use of non-forfeited assets or to reimburse the Attorney General for the value of assets or proceeds transferred under this subsection through the use of nonforfeited assets.''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.—Section 524(c)(1)(B) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''chapter 77 of title 18,'' after ''criminal drug laws of the United States or of''.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 9703 (as added by section 638(b)(1) of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–393; 106 Stat. 1779)) as section 9705; and

(B) in section 9705(a), as redesignated—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (I)—

(aa) by striking ''payment'' and inserting ''Payment''; and

(bb) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(II) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''payment'' and inserting ''Payment''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) in clause (iii)—

(AA) in subclause (I), by striking ''or'' and inserting ''of''; and

(BB) in subclause (III), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(bb) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(cc) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

''(v) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement with respect to a violation of chapter 77 of title 18 (relating to human trafficking);'';

(II) in subparagraph (G), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(III) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CROSS REFERENCES.—

(i) TITLE 28.—Section 524(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking ''section 9703(g)(4)(A)(ii)'' and inserting ''section 9705(g)(4)(A)'';

(II) in paragraph (10), by striking ''section 9703(p)'' and inserting ''section 9705(o)''; and

(III) in paragraph (11), by striking ''section 9703'' and inserting ''section 9705''.

(ii) TITLE 31.—Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in section 312(d), by striking ''section 9703'' and inserting ''section 9705''; and

(II) in section 5340(1), by striking ''section 9703(p)(1)'' and inserting ''section 9705(o)''.

(iii) TITLE 39.—Section 2003(e)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 9703(p)'' and inserting ''section 9705(o)''.

(B) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''9701. Fees and charges for Government services and things of value.
''9702. Investment of trust funds.
''9703. Managerial accountability and flexibility.
''9704. Pilot projects for managerial accountability and flexibility.
''9705. Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund.''.

SEC. 106. STREAMLINING HUMAN TRAFFICKING INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (a), by inserting a comma after ''weapons)'';

(B) in subparagraph (c)—

(i) by inserting ''section 1581 (peonage), section 1584 (involuntary servitude), section 1589 (forced labor), section 1590 (trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),'' before ''section 1591'';

(ii) by inserting ''section 1592 (unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),'' before ''section 1751'';

(iii) by inserting a comma after ''virus)'';

(iv) by striking '',, section'' and inserting a comma;

(v) by striking ''or'' after ''misuse of passports),''; and

(vi) by inserting ''or'' before ''section 555'';

(C) in subparagraph (j), by striking ''pipeline,)'' and inserting ''pipeline),''; and

(D) in subparagraph (p), by striking ''documents, section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft))'' and inserting ''documents), section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''human trafficking, child sexual exploitation, child pornography production,'' after ''kidnapping''.

SEC. 107. ENHANCING HUMAN TRAFFICKING REPORTING.

Section 505 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) PART 1 VIOLENT CRIMES TO INCLUDE HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—For purposes of this section, the term 'part 1 violent crimes' shall include severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).''.

SEC. 108. REDUCING DEMAND FOR SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''or maintains'' and inserting ''maintains, patronizes, or solicits'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or obtained'' and inserting ''obtained, patronized, or solicited''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or obtained'' and inserting ''obtained, patronized, or solicited''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''or maintained'' and inserting '', maintained, patronized, or solicited''; and

(B) by striking ''knew that the person'' and inserting ''knew, or recklessly disregarded the fact, that the person''.

(b) DEFINITION AMENDED.—Section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)) is amended by striking ''or obtaining'' and inserting ''obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting''.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the amendments made by this section is to clarify the range of conduct punished as sex trafficking.

SEC. 109. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, defines a sex trafficker as a person who ''knowingly. . .recruits, entices, harbors, transports, provides, obtains, or maintains by any means a person. . .knowing, or in reckless disregard of the fact, that means of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion. . .or any combination of such means will be used to cause the person to engage in a commercial sex act, or that the person has not attained the age of 18 years and will be caused to engage in a commercial sex act'';

(2) while use of the word ''obtains'' in section 1591, United States Code, has been interpreted, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, to encompass those who purchase illicit

sexual acts from trafficking victims, some confusion persists;

(3) in United States vs. Jungers, 702 F.3d 1066 (8th Cir. 2013), the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit ruled that section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, applied to persons who purchase illicit sexual acts with trafficking victims after the United States District Court for the District of South Dakota erroneously granted motions to acquit these buyers in two separate cases; and

(4) section 108 of this title amends section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, to add the words ''solicits or patronizes'' to the sex trafficking statute making absolutely clear for judges, juries, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials that criminals who purchase sexual acts from human trafficking victims may be arrested, prosecuted, and convicted as sex trafficking offenders when this is merited by the facts of a particular case.

SEC. 110. USING EXISTING TASK FORCES AND COMPONENTS TO TARGET OFFENDERS WHO EXPLOIT CHILDREN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall ensure that—

(1) all task forces and working groups within the Innocence Lost National Initiative engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the investigative capabilities of State and local law enforcement officers in the detection, investigation, and prosecution of persons who patronize, or solicit children for sex; and

(2) all components and task forces with jurisdiction to detect, investigate, and prosecute cases of child labor trafficking engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the capacity of such components to deter and punish child labor trafficking.

SEC. 111. TARGETING CHILD PREDATORS.

(a) CLARIFYING THAT CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PRODUCERS ARE HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.—Section 2423(f) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''means (1) a'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(1) a'';

(2) by striking ''United States; or (2) any'' and inserting the following: ''United States;

''(2) any''; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ''; or

''(3) production of child pornography (as defined in section 2256(8)).''.

(b) HOLDING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACCOUNTABLE.—Section 2423(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''a preponderance of the evidence'' and inserting ''clear and convincing evidence''.

SEC. 112. MONITORING ALL HUMAN TRAFFICKERS AS VIOLENT CRIMINALS.

Section 3156(a)(4)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''77,'' after ''chapter''.

SEC. 113. CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(9) The right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea bargain or deferred prosecution agreement.

''(10) The right to be informed of the rights under this section and the services described in section 503(c) of the Victims' Rights and Restitution Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 10607(c)) and provided contact information for the Office of the Victims' Rights Ombudsman of the Department of Justice.'';

(2) in subsection (d)(3), in the fifth sentence, by inserting '', unless the litigants, with the approval of the court, have stipulated to a different time period for consideration'' before the period; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking ''this chapter, the term'' and inserting the following: ''this chapter:

''(1) COURT OF APPEALS.—The term 'court of appeals' means—

''(A) the United States court of appeals for the judicial district in which a defendant is being prosecuted; or

''(B) for a prosecution in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

''(2) CRIME VICTIM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term'';

(B) by striking ''In the case'' and inserting the following:

''(B) MINORS AND CERTAIN OTHER VICTIMS.—In the case''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) DISTRICT COURT; COURT.—The terms 'district court' and 'court' include the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.''.

(b) CRIME VICTIMS FUND.—Section 1402(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601(d)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting ''section'' before ''3771''.

(c) APPELLATE REVIEW OF PETITIONS RELATING TO CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: ''In deciding such application, the court of appeals shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.''.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any petition for a writ of mandamus filed under section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 114. COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMERCIAL SEX ACT; SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS; STATE; TASK FORCE.—The terms ''commercial sex act'', ''severe forms of trafficking in persons'', ''State'', and ''Task Force'' have the meanings given those terms in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(2) COVERED OFFENDER.—The term ''covered offender'' means an individual who obtains, patronizes, or solicits a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(3) COVERED OFFENSE.—The term ''covered offense'' means the provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(4) FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''Federal law enforcement officer'' has the meaning given the term in section 115 of title 18, United States Code.

(5) LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''local law enforcement officer'' means any officer, agent, or employee of a unit of local government authorized by law or by a local government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(6) STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''State law enforcement officer'' means any officer, agent, or employee of a State authorized by law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TRAINING AND POLICY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, PROSECUTORS, AND JUDGES.—

(1) TRAINING.—

(A) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice, including each anti-human trafficking training program for Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers, includes technical training on—

(i) effective methods for investigating and prosecuting covered offenders; and

(ii) facilitating the provision of physical and mental health services by health care providers to persons subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(B) FEDERAL PROSECUTORS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice for United States attorneys or other Federal prosecutors includes training on seeking restitution for offenses under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that each United States attorney or other Federal prosecutor, upon obtaining a conviction for such an offense, requests a specific amount of restitution for each victim of the offense without regard to whether the victim requests restitution.

(C) JUDGES.—The Federal Judicial Center shall provide training to judges relating to the application of section 1593 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to ordering restitution for victims of offenses under chapter 77 of such title.

(2) POLICY FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that Federal law enforcement officers are engaged in activities, programs, or operations involving the detection, investigation, and prosecution of covered offenders.

(d) MINIMUM PERIOD OF SUPERVISED RELEASE FOR CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT COMMERCIAL CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.—Section 3583(k) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''1594(c),'' after ''1591,''.

(e) BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS REPORT ON STATE ENFORCEMENT OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING PROHIBITIONS.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics shall—

(1) prepare an annual report on—

(A) the rates of—

(i) arrest of individuals by State law enforcement officers for a covered offense;

(ii) prosecution (including specific charges) of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(iii) conviction of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(B) sentences imposed on individuals convicted in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(2) submit the annual report prepared under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Task Force;

(D) the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)); and

(E) the Attorney General.

SEC. 115. SURVIVORS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING EMPOWERMENT ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act''.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking (referred to in this section as the ''Council''), which shall provide

advice and recommendations to the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)) (referred to in this section as the ''Group'') and the President's Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established under section 105(a) of such Act (referred to in this section as the ''Task Force'').

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of not less than 8 and not more than 14 individuals who are survivors of human trafficking.

(2) REPRESENTATION OF SURVIVORS.—To the extent practicable, members of the Council shall be survivors of trafficking, who shall accurately reflect the diverse backgrounds of survivors of trafficking, including—

(A) survivors of sex trafficking and survivors of labor trafficking; and

(B) survivors who are United States citizens and survivors who are aliens lawfully present in the United States.

(3) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint the members of the Council.

(4) TERM; REAPPOINTMENT.—Each member of the Council shall serve for a term of 2 years and may be reappointed by the President to serve 1 additional 2-year term.

(d) FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall—

(1) be a nongovernmental advisory body to the Group;

(2) meet, at its own discretion or at the request of the Group, not less frequently than annually to review Federal Government policy and programs intended to combat human trafficking, including programs relating to the provision of services for victims and serve as a point of contact for Federal agencies reaching out to human trafficking survivors for input on programming and policies relating to human trafficking in the United States;

(3) formulate assessments and recommendations to ensure that policy and programming efforts of the Federal Government conform, to the extent practicable, to the best practices in the field of human trafficking prevention; and

(4) meet with the Group not less frequently than annually, and not later than 45 days before a meeting with the Task Force, to formally present the findings and recommendations of the Council.

(e) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and each year thereafter until the date described in subsection (h), the Council shall submit a report that contains the findings derived from the reviews conducted pursuant to subsection (d)(2) to—

(1) the chair of the Task Force;

(2) the members of the Group;

(3) the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, Appropriations, and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Judiciary of the Senate.

(f) EMPLOYEE STATUS.—Members of the Council—

(1) shall not be considered employees of the Federal Government for any purpose; and

(2) shall not receive compensation other than reimbursement of travel expenses and per diem allowance in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(g) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Council shall not be subject to the requirements under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(h) SUNSET.—The Council shall terminate on September 30, 2020.

SEC. 116. BRINGING MISSING CHILDREN HOME ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Bringing Missing Children Home Act''.

(b) CRIME CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS.—Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) a recent photograph of the child, if available;''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''60 days'' and inserting ''30 days''; and

(ii) by inserting ''and a photograph taken during the previous 180 days'' after ''dental records'';

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children of each report received relating to a child reported missing from a foster care family home or childcare institution;'';

(F) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated—

(i) by inserting ''State and local child welfare systems and'' before ''the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) grant permission to the National Crime Information Center Terminal Contractor for the State to update the missing person record in the National Crime Information Center computer networks with additional information learned during the investigation relating to the missing person.''.

SEC. 117. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''covered grant'' means a grant awarded by the Attorney General under section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b), as amended by section 103.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All covered grants shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of a covered grant to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ''unresolved audit finding'' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of a covered grant that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive a covered grant during the following 2 fiscal years.

(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding covered grants the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for a covered grant.

(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded a covered grant during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and covered grants, the term ''nonprofit organization'' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a covered grant to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a covered grant and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subsection available for public inspection.

(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts transferred to the Department of Justice under this title, or the amendments made by this title, may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this title, or the amendments made by this title, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and

the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all approved conference expenditures referenced in this paragraph.

(D) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification that—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued;

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(iv) includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(4) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts awarded under this title, or any amendments made by this title, may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a covered grant has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another covered grant for not less than 5 years.

SEC. 118. SAVE ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act of 2015'' or the ''SAVE Act of 2015''.

(b) ADVERTISING THAT OFFERS CERTAIN COMMERCIAL ACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting ''advertises,'' after ''obtains,''.

(2) MENS REA REQUIREMENT.—Section 1591(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2), by inserting '', except where the act constituting the violation of paragraph (1) is advertising,'' after ''knowing, or''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1591(b) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''advertised,'' after ''obtained,''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''advertised,'' after ''obtained,''.

SEC. 119. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH TO TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS.

The Attorney General shall make available, on the website of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, a database for trafficking victim advocates, crisis hotline personnel, foster parents, law enforcement personnel, and crime survivors that contains information on—

(1) counseling and hotline resources;

(2) housing resources;

(3) legal assistance; and

(4) other services for trafficking survivors.

SEC. 120. EXPANDED STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR CIVIL ACTIONS BY CHILD TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS.

Section 1595(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''not later than 10 years after the cause of action arose.'' and inserting ''not later than the later of—

''(1) 10 years after the cause of action arose; or

''(2) 10 years after the victim reaches 18 years of age, if the victim was a minor at the time of the alleged offense.''.

SEC. 121. GAO STUDY AND REPORT.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on each program or initiative authorized under this Act and the following statutes and evaluate whether any program or initiative is duplicative:

(1) Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–164; 119 Stat. 3558).

(2) Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

(3) Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.).

(4) Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.).

(5) Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), which shall include—

(1) a description of the cost of any duplicative program or initiative studied under subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations on how to achieve cost savings with respect to each duplicative program or initiative studied under subsection (a).

TITLE II—COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Subtitle A—Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking

SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 343(b)(5) (42 U.S.C. 5714–23(b)(5))—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting '', severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))'' before the semicolon at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting '', severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))'' after ''assault''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by inserting '', including such youth who are victims of trafficking (as defined in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)))'' before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 351(a) (42 U.S.C. 5714–41(a)) by striking ''or sexual exploitation'' and inserting ''sexual exploitation, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))''.

Subtitle B—Improving the Response to Victims of Child Sex Trafficking

SEC. 211. RESPONSE TO VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking ''child prostitution'' and inserting ''child sex trafficking, including child prostitution''.

Subtitle C—Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking

SEC. 221. VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the term ''victim of trafficking'' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

SEC. 222. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE REPORT ON CHILD TRAFFICKING PRIMARY PREVENTION.

(a) REVIEW.—The Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, established under section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103), shall conduct a review that, with regard to trafficking in persons in the United States—

(1) in consultation with nongovernmental organizations that the Task Force determines appropriate, surveys and catalogs the activities of the Federal Government and State governments—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(2) surveys academic literature on—

(A) deterring individuals from committing trafficking offenses;

(B) preventing children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(C) the commercial sexual exploitation of children; and

(D) other similar topics that the Task Force determines to be appropriate;

(3) identifies best practices and effective strategies—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking; and

(4) identifies current gaps in research and data that would be helpful in formulating effective strategies—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall provide to Congress, and make publicly available in electronic format, a report on the review conducted pursuant to subparagraph (a).

SEC. 223. GAO REPORT ON INTERVENTION.

On the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that includes information on—

(1) the efforts of Federal and select State law enforcement agencies to combat human trafficking in the United States; and

(2) each Federal grant program, a purpose of which is to combat human trafficking or assist victims of trafficking, as specified in an authorizing statute or in a guidance document issued by the agency carrying out the grant program.

SEC. 224. PROVISION OF HOUSING PERMITTED TO PROTECT AND ASSIST IN THE RECOVERY OF VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C.

7105(b)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting '', including programs that provide housing to victims of trafficking'' before the period at the end.

Subtitle D—Expanded Training

SEC. 231. EXPANDED TRAINING RELATING TO TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Section 105(c)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Appropriate personnel'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Appropriate personnel'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated, by inserting '', including members of the Service (as such term is defined in section 103 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3903))'' after ''Department of State''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) TRAINING COMPONENTS.—Training under this paragraph shall include—

''(i) a distance learning course on trafficking-in-persons issues and the Department of State's obligations under this Act, which shall be designed for embassy reporting officers, regional bureaus' trafficking-in-persons coordinators, and their superiors;

''(ii) specific trafficking-in-persons briefings for all ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before such individuals depart for their posts; and

''(iii) at least annual reminders to all personnel referred to in clauses (i) and (ii), including appropriate personnel from other Federal departments and agencies, at each diplomatic or consular post of the Department of State located outside the United States of—

''(I) key problems, threats, methods, and warning signs of trafficking in persons specific to the country or jurisdiction in which each such post is located; and

''(II) appropriate procedures to report information that any such personnel may acquire about possible cases of trafficking in persons.''.

TITLE III—HERO ACT

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Human Exploitation Rescue Operations Act of 2015'' or the ''HERO Act of 2015''.

SEC. 302. HERO ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The illegal market for the production and distribution of child abuse imagery is a growing threat to children in the United States. International demand for this material creates a powerful incentive for the rape, abuse, and torture of children within the United States.

(2) The targeting of United States children by international criminal networks is a threat to the homeland security of the United States. This threat must be fought with trained personnel and highly specialized counter-child-exploitation strategies and technologies.

(3) The United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security serves a critical national security role in protecting the United States from the growing international threat of child exploitation and human trafficking.

(4) The Cyber Crimes Center of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement is a vital national resource in the effort to combat international child exploitation, providing advanced expertise and assistance in investigations, computer forensics, and victim identification.

(5) The returning military heroes of the United States possess unique and valuable skills that can assist law enforcement in combating global sexual and child exploitation, and the Department of Homeland Security should use this national resource to the maximum extent possible.

(6) Through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program, the returning military heroes of the United States are trained and hired to investigate crimes of child exploitation in order to target predators and rescue children from sexual abuse and slavery.

(b) CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, AND COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle H of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 890A. CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT, AND CYBER CRIMES UNIT.

''(a) CYBER CRIMES CENTER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a Cyber Crimes Center (referred to in this section as the 'Center').

''(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Center shall be to provide investigative assistance, training, and equipment to support United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement's domestic and international investigations of cyber-related crimes.

''(b) CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Child Exploitation Investigations Unit (referred to in this subsection as the 'CEIU').

''(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CEIU—

''(A) shall coordinate all United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement child exploitation initiatives, including investigations into—

''(i) child exploitation;

''(ii) child pornography;

''(iii) child victim identification;

''(iv) traveling child sex offenders; and

''(v) forced child labor, including the sexual exploitation of minors;

''(B) shall, among other things, focus on—

''(i) child exploitation prevention;

''(ii) investigative capacity building;

''(iii) enforcement operations; and

''(iv) training for Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel, upon request;

''(C) shall provide training, technical expertise, support, or coordination of child exploitation investigations, as needed, to cooperating law enforcement agencies and personnel;

''(D) shall provide psychological support and counseling services for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel engaged in child exploitation prevention initiatives, including making available other existing services to assist employees who are exposed to child exploitation material during investigations;

''(E) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of the recruiting, training, equipping and hiring of wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program; and

''(F) shall collaborate with other governmental, nongovernmental, and nonprofit entities approved by the Secretary for the sponsorship of, and participation in, outreach and training activities.

''(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The CEIU shall collect and maintain data concerning—

''(A) the total number of suspects identified by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

''(B) the number of arrests by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, disaggregated by type, including—

''(i) the number of victims identified through investigations carried out by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(ii) the number of suspects arrested who were in positions of trust or authority over children;

''(C) the number of cases opened for investigation by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(D) the number of cases resulting in a Federal, State, foreign, or military prosecution.

''(4) AVAILABILITY OF DATA TO CONGRESS.—In addition to submitting the reports required under paragraph (7), the CEIU shall make the data collected and maintained under paragraph (3) available to the committees of Congress described in paragraph (7).

''(5) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CEIU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3).

''(6) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Taskforce, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CEIU.

''(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

''(7) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the HERO Act of 2015, and annually for the following 4 years, the CEIU shall—

''(A) submit a report containing a summary of the data collected pursuant to paragraph (3) during the previous year to—

''(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

''(ii) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

''(iii) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

''(iv) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

''(v) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

''(vi) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

''(B) make a copy of each report submitted under subparagraph (A) publicly available on the website of the Department.

''(c) COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Computer Forensics Unit (referred to in this subsection as the 'CFU').

''(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CFU—

''(A) shall provide training and technical support in digital forensics to—

''(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

''(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;

''(B) shall provide computer hardware, software, and forensic licenses for all computer forensics personnel within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

''(C) shall participate in research and development in the area of digital forensics, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and

''(D) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of recruiting, training, equipping, and hiring wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program.

''(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CFU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

''(4) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Task Force, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CFU.

''(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

''(d) CYBER CRIMES UNIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Cyber Crimes Unit (referred to in this subsection as the 'CCU').

''(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CCU—

''(A) shall oversee the cyber security strategy and cyber-related operations and programs for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

''(B) shall enhance United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement's ability to combat criminal enterprises operating on or through the Internet, with specific focus in the areas of—

''(i) cyber economic crime;

''(ii) digital theft of intellectual property;

''(iii) illicit e-commerce (including hidden marketplaces);

''(iv) Internet-facilitated proliferation of arms and strategic technology; and

''(v) cyber-enabled smuggling and money laundering;

''(C) shall provide training and technical support in cyber investigations to—

''(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

''(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;

''(D) shall participate in research and development in the area of cyber investigations, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and

''(E) is authorized to recruit participants of the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program for investigative and forensic positions in support of the functions of the CCU.

''(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CCU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.''.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 890 the following:

''Sec. 890A. Cyber crimes center, child exploitation investigations unit, computer forensics unit, and cyber crimes unit.''.

(c) HERO CORPS HIRING.—It is the sense of Congress that Homeland Security Investigations of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement should hire, recruit, train, and equip wounded, ill, or injured military veterans (as defined in section 101, title 38, United States Code) who are affiliated with the HERO Child Rescue Corps program for investigative, intelligence, analyst, and forensic positions.

(d) INVESTIGATING CHILD EXPLOITATION.—Section 307(b)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 187(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) conduct research and development for the purpose of advancing technology for the investigation of child exploitation crimes, including child victim identification, trafficking in persons, and child pornography, and for advanced forensics.''.

SEC. 303. TRANSPORTATION FOR ILLEGAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY AND RELATED CRIMES.

Chapter 117 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking section 2421 and inserting the following:

''§ 2421. Transportation generally

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly transports any individual in interstate or foreign commerce, or in any Territory or Possession of the United States, with intent that such individual engage in prostitution, or in any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with a criminal offense, or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

''(b) REQUESTS TO PROSECUTE VIOLATIONS BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall grant a request by a State attorney general that a State or local attorney be cross designated to prosecute a violation of this section unless the Attorney General determines that granting the request would undermine the administration of justice.

''(2) REASON FOR DENIAL.—If the Attorney General denies a request under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall submit to the State attorney general a detailed reason for the denial not later than 60 days after the date on which a request is received.''.

TITLE IV—RAPE SURVIVOR CHILD CUSTODY

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Rape Survivor Child Custody Act''.

SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COVERED FORMULA GRANT.—The term ''covered formula grant'' means a grant under—

(A) part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg et seq.) (commonly referred to as the ''STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program''); or

(B) section 41601 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043g) (commonly referred to as the ''Sexual Assault Services Program'').

(2) TERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''termination'' means, when used with respect to parental rights, a complete and final termination of the parent's right to custody of, guardianship of, visitation with, access to, and inheritance from a child.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require a State, in order to receive an increase in the amount provided to the State under the covered formula grants under this title, to have in place a law that terminates any obligation of a person who fathered a child through rape to support the child.

SEC. 403. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Men who father children through rape should be prohibited from visiting or having custody of those children.

(2) Thousands of rape-related pregnancies occur annually in the United States.

(3) A substantial number of women choose to raise their child conceived through rape and, as a result, may face custody battles with their rapists.

(4) Rape is one of the most under-prosecuted serious crimes, with estimates of criminal conviction occurring in less than 5 percent of rapes.

(5) The clear and convincing evidence standard is the most common standard for termination of parental rights among the 50 States, territories, and the District of Columbia.

(6) The Supreme Court established that the clear and convincing evidence standard satisfies due process for allegations to terminate or restrict parental rights in Santosky v. Kramer (455 U.S. 745 (1982)).

(7) Currently only 10 States have statutes allowing rape survivors to petition for the termination of parental rights of the rapist based on clear and convincing evidence that the child was conceived through rape.

(8) A rapist pursuing parental or custody rights causes the survivor to have continued interaction with the rapist, which can have traumatic psychological effects on the survivor, and can make it more difficult for her to recover.

(9) These traumatic effects on the mother can severely negatively impact her ability to raise a healthy child.

(10) Rapists may use the threat of pursuing custody or parental rights to coerce survivors into not prosecuting rape, or otherwise harass, intimidate, or manipulate them.

SEC. 404. INCREASED FUNDING FOR FORMULA GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

The Attorney General shall increase the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants in accordance with this title if the State has in place a law that allows the mother of any child that was conceived through rape to seek court-ordered termination of the parental rights of her rapist with regard to that child, which the court is authorized to grant upon clear and convincing evidence of rape.

SEC. 405. APPLICATION.

A State seeking an increase in the amount provided to the State under the covered formula grants shall include in the application of the State for each covered formula grant such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require, including information about the law described in section 404.

SEC. 406. GRANT INCREASE.

The amount of the increase provided to a State under the covered formula grants under this title shall be equal to not more

than 10 percent of the average of the total amount of funding provided to the State under the covered formula grants under the 3 most recent awards to the State.

SEC. 407. PERIOD OF INCREASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall provide an increase in the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants under this title for a 2-year period.

(b) LIMIT.—The Attorney General may not provide an increase in the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants under this title more than 4 times.

SEC. 408. ALLOCATION OF INCREASED FORMULA GRANT FUNDS.

The Attorney General shall allocate an increase in the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants under this title such that—

(1) 25 percent the amount of the increase is provided under the program described in section 402(1)(A); and

(2) 75 percent the amount of the increase is provided under the program described in section 402(1)(B).

SEC. 409. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.

TITLE V—MILITARY SEX OFFENDER REPORTING

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Military Sex Offender Reporting Act of 2015''.

SEC. 502. REGISTRATION OF SEX OFFENDERS RELEASED FROM MILITARY CORRECTIONS FACILITIES OR UPON CONVICTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act is amended by inserting after section 128 (42 U.S.C. 16928) the following:

''SEC. 128A. REGISTRATION OF SEX OFFENDERS RELEASED FROM MILITARY CORRECTIONS FACILITIES OR UPON CONVICTION.

''The Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Attorney General the information described in section 114 to be included in the National Sex Offender Registry and the Dru Sjodin National Sex Offender Public Website regarding persons—

''(1)(A) released from military corrections facilities; or

''(B) convicted if the sentences adjudged by courts-martial under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), do not include confinement; and

''(2) required to register under this title.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 128 the following:

''Sec. 128A. Registration of sex offenders released from military corrections facilities or upon conviction.''.

TITLE VI—STOPPING EXPLOITATION THROUGH TRAFFICKING

SEC. 601. SAFE HARBOR INCENTIVES.

Part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1701(c), by striking ''where feasible'' and all that follows, and inserting the following: ''where feasible, to an application—

''(1) for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); or

''(2) from an applicant in a State that has in effect a law that—

''(A) treats a minor who has engaged in, or has attempted to engage in, a commercial sex act as a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons;

''(B) discourages or prohibits the charging or prosecution of an individual described in subparagraph (A) for a prostitution or sex trafficking offense, based on the conduct described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) encourages the diversion of an individual described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate service providers, including child welfare services, victim treatment programs, child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, or other social services.''; and

(2) in section 1709, by inserting at the end the following:

''(5) 'commercial sex act' has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

''(6) 'minor' means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

''(7) 'severe form of trafficking in persons' has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).''.

SEC. 602. REPORT ON RESTITUTION PAID IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN TRAFFICKING OFFENSES.

Section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)(Q)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''1590,'' the following: ''1591,'';

(2) by striking ''and 1594'' and inserting ''1594, 2251, 2251A, 2421, 2422, and 2423'';

(3) in clause (iv), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(4) in clause (v), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(5) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

''(vi) the number of individuals required by a court order to pay restitution in connection with a violation of each offense under title 18, United States Code, the amount of restitution required to be paid under each such order, and the amount of restitution actually paid pursuant to each such order; and

''(vii) the age, gender, race, country of origin, country of citizenship, and description of the role in the offense of individuals convicted under each offense; and''.

SEC. 603. NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.

Section 107(b)(1)(B) of the Victims of Crime Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Subject'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.—Beginning in fiscal year 2017, and in each fiscal year thereafter, of amounts made available for grants under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make grants for a national communication system to assist victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons in communicating with service providers. The Secretary shall give priority to grant applicants that have experience in providing telephone services to victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons.''.

SEC. 604. JOB CORPS ELIGIBILITY.

Section 144(a)(3) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3194(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) A victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)). Notwithstanding paragraph (2), an individual described in this subparagraph shall not be required to demonstrate eligibility under such paragraph.''.

SEC. 605. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE.

Section 566(e)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) assist State, local, and other Federal law enforcement agencies, upon the request of such an agency, in locating and recovering missing children.''.

SEC. 606. ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall implement and maintain a National Strategy for Combating Human Trafficking (referred to in this section as the ''National Strategy'') in accordance with this section.

(b) REQUIRED CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.—The National Strategy shall include the following:

(1) Integrated Federal, State, local, and tribal efforts to investigate and prosecute human trafficking cases, including—

(A) the development by each United States attorney, in consultation with State, local, and tribal government agencies, of a district-specific strategic plan to coordinate the identification of victims and the investigation and prosecution of human trafficking crimes;

(B) the appointment of not fewer than 1 assistant United States attorney in each district dedicated to the prosecution of human trafficking cases or responsible for implementing the National Strategy;

(C) the participation in any Federal, State, local, or tribal human trafficking task force operating in the district of the United States attorney; and

(D) any other efforts intended to enhance the level of coordination and cooperation, as determined by the Attorney General.

(2) Case coordination within the Department of Justice, including specific integration, coordination, and collaboration, as appropriate, on human trafficking investigations between and among the United States attorneys, the Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit, the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(3) Annual budget priorities and Federal efforts dedicated to preventing and combating human trafficking, including resources dedicated to the Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit, the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and all other entities that receive Federal support that have a goal or mission to combat the exploitation of adults and children.

(4) An ongoing assessment of the future trends, challenges, and opportunities, including new investigative strategies, techniques, and technologies, that will enhance Federal, State, local, and tribal efforts to combat human trafficking.

(5) Encouragement of cooperation, coordination, and mutual support between private sector and other entities and organizations and Federal agencies to combat human trafficking, including the involvement of State,

local, and tribal government agencies to the extent Federal programs are involved.

TITLE VII—TRAFFICKING AWARENESS TRAINING FOR HEALTH CARE

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015''.

SEC. 702. DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.

(a) GRANT OR CONTRACT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, and in consultation with the Administration on Children and Families and other agencies with experience in serving victims of human trafficking, shall award, on a competitive basis, a grant or contract to an eligible entity to train health care professionals to recognize and respond to victims of a severe form of trafficking.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF EVIDENCE-BASED BEST PRACTICES.—An entity receiving a grant under paragraph (1) shall develop evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize and respond to victims of a severe form of trafficking, including—

(A) consultation with law enforcement officials, social service providers, health professionals, experts in the field of human trafficking, and other experts, as appropriate, to inform the development of such best practices;

(B) the identification of any existing best practices or tools for health professionals to recognize potential victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(C) the development of educational materials to train health care professionals on the best practices developed under this subsection.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—Best practices developed under this subsection shall address—

(A) risk factors and indicators to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(B) patient safety and security;

(C) the management of medical records of patients who are victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(D) public and private social services available for rescue, food, clothing, and shelter referrals;

(E) the hotlines for reporting human trafficking maintained by the National Human Trafficking Resource Center and the Department of Homeland Security;

(F) validated assessment tools for the identification of victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(G) referral options and procedures for sharing information on human trafficking with a patient and making referrals for legal and social services as appropriate.

(4) PILOT PROGRAM.—An entity receiving a grant under paragraph (1) shall design and implement a pilot program to test the best practices and educational materials identified or developed with respect to the recognition of victims of human trafficking by health professionals at health care sites located near an established anti-human trafficking task force initiative in each of the 10 administrative regions of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(5) ANALYSIS AND REPORT.—Not later than 24 months after the date on which an entity implements a pilot program under paragraph (4), the entity shall—

(A) analyze the results of the pilot programs, including through an assessment of—

(i) changes in the skills, knowledge, and attitude of health care professionals resulting from the implementation of the program;

(ii) the number of victims of a severe form of trafficking who were identified under the program;

(iii) of those victims identified, the number who received information or referrals for services offered; and

(iv) of those victims who received such information or referrals—

(I) the number who participated in follow up services; and

(II) the type of follow up services received;

(B) determine, using the results of the analysis conducted under subparagraph (A), the extent to which the best practices developed under this subsection are evidence-based; and

(C) submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services a report concerning the pilot program and the analysis of the pilot program under subparagraph (A), including an identification of the best practices that were identified as effective and those that require further review.

(b) DISSEMINATION.—Not later than 30 months after date on which a grant is awarded to an eligible entity under subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) collaborate with appropriate professional associations and health care professional schools to disseminate best practices identified or developed under subsection (a) for purposes of recognizing potential victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(2) post on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services the best practices that are identified by the as effective under subsection (a)(5).

SEC. 703. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) The term ''eligible entity'' means an accredited school of medicine or nursing with experience in the study or treatment of victims of a severe form of trafficking.

(2) The term ''eligible site'' means a health center that is receiving assistance under section 330, 399Z–1, or 1001 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b, 280h–5, and 300).

(3) The term ''health care professional'' means a person employed by a health care provider who provides to patients information (including information not related to medical treatment), scheduling, services, or referrals.

(4) The term ''HIPAA privacy and security law'' has the meaning given to such term in section 3009 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300jj–19).

(5) The term ''victim of a severe form of trafficking'' has the meaning given to such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

SEC. 704. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, and this title shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

TITLE VIII—BETTER RESPONSE FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Ensuring a Better Response for Victims of Child Sex Trafficking''.

SEC. 802. CAPTA AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) made by this section shall take effect 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) STATE PLANS.—Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (xxii), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(xxiv) provisions and procedures requiring identification and assessment of all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102 (10)); and

''(xxv) provisions and procedures for training child protective services workers about identifying, assessing, and providing comprehensive services for children who are sex trafficking victims, including efforts to coordinate with State law enforcement, juvenile justice, and social service agencies such as runaway and homeless youth shelters to serve this population;''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

''(17) The number of children determined to be victims described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(xxiv).''.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106g) is amended—

(A) by striking ''For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) SPECIAL RULE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 3(2) and subsection (a)(4), a child shall be considered a victim of 'child abuse and neglect' and of 'sexual abuse' if the child is identified, by a State or local agency employee of the State or locality involved, as being a victim of sex trafficking (as defined in paragraph (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) or a victim of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in paragraph (9)(A) of that section.

''(2) STATE OPTION.—Notwithstanding the definition of 'child' in section 3(1), a State may elect to define that term for purposes of the application of paragraph (1) to section 3(2) and subsection (a)(4) as a person who has not attained the age of 24.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(2) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note) is amended by inserting ''(including sexual abuse as determined under section 111)'' after ''sexual abuse or exploitation''.

(3) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Paragraph (5)(C) of subsection (a), as so designated, of section 111 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106g) is amended by striking ''inhumane;'' and inserting ''inhumane.''.

TITLE IX—ANTI-TRAFFICKING TRAINING FOR DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY PERSONNEL

SEC. 901. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The term ''human trafficking'' means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 902. TRAINING FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL TO IDENTIFY HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement a program to—

(1) train and periodically retrain relevant Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other Department personnel that the Secretary considers appropriate, with respect to how to effectively deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking, and, where appropriate, interdict a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking, during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities; and

(2) ensure that the personnel referred to in paragraph (1) regularly receive current information on matters related to the detection of human trafficking, including information that becomes available outside of the Department's initial or periodic retraining schedule, to the extent relevant to their official duties and consistent with applicable information and privacy laws.

(b) TRAINING DESCRIBED.—The training referred to in subsection (a) may be conducted through in-class or virtual learning capabilities, and shall include—

(1) methods for identifying suspected victims of human trafficking and, where appropriate, perpetrators of human trafficking;

(2) for appropriate personnel, methods to approach a suspected victim of human trafficking, where appropriate, in a manner that is sensitive to the suspected victim and is not likely to alert a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking;

(3) training that is most appropriate for a particular location or environment in which the personnel receiving such training perform their official duties;

(4) other topics determined by the Secretary to be appropriate; and

(5) a post-training evaluation for personnel receiving the training.

(c) TRAINING CURRICULUM REVIEW.—The Secretary shall annually reassess the training program established under subsection (a) to ensure it is consistent with current techniques, patterns, and trends associated with human trafficking.

SEC. 903. CERTIFICATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall certify to Congress that all personnel referred to in section 402(a) have successfully completed the training required under that section.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to Congress with respect to the overall effectiveness of the program required by this title, the number of cases reported by Department personnel in which human trafficking was suspected, and, of those cases, the number of cases that were confirmed cases of human trafficking.

SEC. 904. ASSISTANCE TO NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.

The Secretary may provide training curricula to any State, local, or tribal government or private organization to assist the government or organization in establishing a program of training to identify human trafficking, upon request from the government or organization.

SEC. 905. EXPANDED USE OF DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.

Section 3014(e)(1) of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 101 of this Act, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) section 106 of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 17616).''.

TITLE X—HUMAN TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS RELIEF AND EMPOWERMENT ACT

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Human Trafficking Survivors Relief and Empowerment Act of 2015''.

SEC. 1002. PROTECTIONS FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS.

Section 1701(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(c)) is amended by striking ''where feasible'' and all that follows, and inserting the following: ''where feasible, to an application—

''(1) for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); or

''(2) from an applicant in a State that has in effect a law—

''(A) that—

''(i) provides a process by which an individual who is a human trafficking survivor can move to vacate any arrest or conviction records for a non-violent offense committed as a direct result of human trafficking, including prostitution or lewdness;

''(ii) establishes a rebuttable presumption that any arrest or conviction of an individual for an offense associated with human trafficking is a result of being trafficked, if the individual—

''(I) is a person granted nonimmigrant status pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(T)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T)(i));

''(II) is the subject of a certification by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 107(b)(1)(E) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(E)); or

''(III) has other similar documentation of trafficking, which has been issued by a Federal, State, or local agency; and

''(iii) protects the identity of individuals who are human trafficking survivors in public and court records; and

''(B) that does not require an individual who is a human trafficking survivor to provide official documentation as described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) of subparagraph (A)(ii) in order to receive protection under the law.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 178, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are here today to consider comprehensive legislation that will help address the scourge of human trafficking, generally, and child sex trafficking, specifically, that is occurring in every corner of the United States as we stand here today.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sex trafficking is the fastest growing business of organized crime and the third largest criminal enterprise in the world. One organization estimates that child sex trafficking in the United States alone is a $9.8 billion industry.

Criminal organizations, including some of the most violent criminal street gangs like MS–13, have realized that selling children can be more profitable than selling drugs. This is because drugs are only sold once, but minor children can be and are prostituted multiple times a day, every day. It is time for Congress to send a clear message that we won't stand for this.

Today marks the third time that I have stood on the House floor urging the passage of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. The House passed similar legislation in May 2014 and, again, in January of this year.

S. 178, the bill we consider today and its predecessors, are comprehensive legislation that, among other things, provide additional resources to law enforcement and service providers through a victim-centered grant program, help to facilitate investigations by providing that child sex trafficking and other similar crimes are predicate offenses for State wiretap applications, address the demand side by clarifying that it is a Federal crime to solicit or patronize child prostitutes or adult victims forced into prostitution, and strengthens the existing Federal criminal laws against trafficking through a number of clarifying amendments.

I am very pleased that a number of separate trafficking vehicles that were originally passed by the House Judiciary Committee and then by the full House are contained within S. 178, including the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015, introduced by Mr. PAULSEN of Minnesota; the SAVE Act of 2015, introduced by Mrs. WAGNER of Missouri; and the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015, introduced by Mrs. NOEM of South Dakota. I thank all of my colleagues for their dedication to ending this terrible crime.

I also thank Judge POE of Texas for sponsoring the two previous House versions of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

S. 178 is not perfect legislation, and I thank both House and Senate leadership, as well as the bill's sponsor, Senator CORNYN, for agreeing to fix technical issues with the bill in future legislation, but it is my belief that this legislation will do much good in the fight to end human trafficking.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support the bill and thus send it to the President to be signed into law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me join my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and thank him for his leadership in making sure that this bill would come to the floor. Along with the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS; subcommittee chairman, Mr. SENSENBRENNER; and myself as the ranking member, we are grateful for the leadership of our colleagues in working through the human trafficking legislation.

I would associate myself with the words that all of us have said very often. Tragically and heinously, sex trafficking, human trafficking, and the trafficking of children keeps on giving in an ugly, horrible, disastrous way that ruins the lives of innocent victims for they are used over and over again.

I stand here recognizing that Houston ranks very high among those cities that have the scourge of human trafficking. In fact, as I rise to support S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, I recognize that human trafficking is a scourge that impacts greatly on my home district in Houston, Texas. Houston currently ranks number one among the U.S. cities with the most victims of human trafficking.

On the House bill, I congratulate Congressman POE, my neighbor in Houston, and CAROLYN MALONEY, a member from New York, who worked together to bring about this bipartisan legislation.

I want to thank my colleagues as well from the Homeland Security Committee. Judge POE joined us in the first human trafficking hearing that I held in Houston, Texas, to further emphasize the coming together of law enforcement and social service advocates for the importance of this legislation.

In fact, as I recall this bill being written, there were so many different groups from faith organizations putting on walks to talk about trafficking. Houston recognized that they had a problem they need to fix.

In the backdrop of this legislation, as it was making its way through the House, we even had a massive human trafficking raid, if you will, where there were 20 to 30 persons in a home just a short distance from downtown. A couple of the individuals were minors. We know what their end would be.

Twenty-five percent of all human trafficking victims are in my home State of Texas. Currently, 30 percent of all human trafficking tips to the national rescue hotline come from Texas; but this is a national problem. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that one of every seven endangered runaways reported to the center are likely victims of minor sex trafficking and that at least 100,000 American children are victims of sex trafficking each year.

It is our duty to rescue these children, shelter them, and help them recover from the trauma that has been inflicted upon them. It is also our duty to prevent those crimes before they happen and to provide law enforcement with the tools they need to combat human traffickers.

This bill will be a significant weapon in the war against sex trafficking which, unfortunately, is the fastest growing business of organized crime in the United States, generating an estimated $9 billion annually. Mr. Speaker, we have said it continues to generate income and revenue.

I am very glad that there are a number of legislative initiatives incorporated into this final legislative document and that this will go to the President's desk and be signed.

I am glad it includes language I submitted in the Judiciary Committee that puts Congress squarely on the record in the sense of Congress, that we stand together on the issue of opposing human trafficking and viewing it as a dastardly deed.

Although not perfect, this is a comprehensive bill that includes a variety of measures intended to strike at the problem of child sex trafficking through prevention, law enforcement, and rehabilitation services for victims.

What I like most of all is that it puts the United States Congress and, ultimately, the President of the United States and the laws of the land on the side of children and on the side of victims who have been trafficked or victims of sex trafficking. The bill strikes at the demand for this business by adding criminal prohibitions for those who solicit and advertise human trafficking.

Law enforcement across the U.S. has identified online sex acts as the number one platform for buying and selling of sex with children and young women. These men can sit idly and relaxed in their homes and victimize individuals. This is an important step forward for law enforcement, to have the tools to reach those predators wherever they are.

This legislation provides the tools to rebuild the lives of those exploited by this business, and it specifically addresses the needs of thousands of homeless children, many of whom are on the streets of Houston. I say to them today that they will be embraced with a document that stands on their side, many who have fled physically and sexually abusive homes, only to be victimized again by sex traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that this bill is moving, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee and a champion in the fight against child sex trafficking and the author of one of the underlying pieces of legislation that led to the bill that we are considering here today.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman for bringing this legislation promptly to the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, it was 155 years ago that this Nation debated in this Chamber several volatile issues, including slavery. After 600,000 Americans, both from the North and the South, died in war, slavery was forever banned by the 13th Amendment to our Constitution.

Now, in our time, this ugly scourge has risen its head again one more time. The evil enterprise has taken on the enslavement of women and children. Traffickers—slave masters—buy and sell the young in the marketplace of child sex exploitation.

They treat these victims as cattle to be led to the stockyards of slavery. The traffickers even brand the victims, Mr. Speaker, on the neck so that other traffickers will know whose property they are.

The illicit revenue from trafficking is second only to the drug trade; and, as has been mentioned, my hometown of Houston seems to be the hub for child sex trafficking in United States.

The average age of the minor sex traffic victim, Mr. Speaker, is 13. Maria was an 11-year-old girl. She met a person that treated her nicely. He was an older male. Traffickers, Mr. Speaker, do not wear long trench coats. They are relatively young, good-looking guys.

He enticed her; he brought her some presents; he took her to his home, and then she became a slave. At 11 years old, she was sold on the marketplace for a long time, until she was able to escape the traffickers. That is what is taking place in our country.

Today, unlike 155 years ago, this Congress is united in stopping this curse of slavery. Ten bills dealing with sex trafficking overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives. One of those was one that I sponsored, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, along with CAROLYN MALONEY, who is here today.

Mr. Speaker, these are all bipartisan pieces of legislation, and you don't get much more bipartisan than CAROLYN MALONEY from New York and TED POE from Texas agreeing. We are only separated, as Churchill said, by a common language. I want to thank her for her

hard work for years on the issue of trafficking. The Senate combined these 10 bills, made some positive changes, and their bill passed the Senate 99–0.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act goes after the trafficker—the slave master, the slaveholder. It treats the child as a victim and not as a criminal and not as a child prostitute. It rescues the victim, and it targets the demand—the buyer, the child abuser—that buys these children for pleasure.

This legislation also allows Federal judges to impose not only prison for these criminals, but may order that fees go into a fund. That fund can be used for victims' services and even training for peace officers. Make these criminals pay the rent on the courthouse and pay for the system that they have created.

I want to thank all those that have been involved in these numerous issues. I especially want to thank the ladies of the House of Representatives on both sides for bringing this issue to a vote today. They are very powerful, Mr. Speaker, on this issue. They deserve recognition.

I also want to commend Senator CORNYN for the legislation he pushed forward—the original bill that we are voting on today—in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, America can no longer deny the inconvenient truth of sex trafficking. The enslavement of children is not acceptable, and it will not be tolerated. It will not be tolerated in this country, and it is not going to be tolerated in other countries as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD a letter sent by 163 different organizations in support of this legislation.

APRIL 29, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: We are an alliance of organizations and individual advocates from across the United States dedicated to improving the lives of vulnerable women and children. We write to express our support for the Senate anti-trafficking package, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, as amended, S. 178 (JVTA package) recently voted out of the Senate unanimously. This package, which includes nearly all of the trafficking bills passed overwhelmingly by the House in January, would provide much needed services to victims of human trafficking and help ensure that child victims ensnared in the sex trade are no longer arrested and treated as criminals.

According to the FBI, over 80 percent of all confirmed sex trafficking cases in the U.S. involve U.S. citizens, yet across the country, victims still lack basic necessities. Simply stated, there are more animal shelters in our country than programs or beds for victims of trafficking. This critical legislation provides unprecedented support to victims, who for too long have endured arrest, imprisonment, and stigma for their victimization instead of support and services. The Senate package contains critical funding for housing and services—a crucial element the House companion lacks. Moreover, the legislation supports training for federal prosecutors and judges on the importance of requesting and ordering restitution, so that victims can receive the compensation they are rightly owed by law.

Every day in this country, thousands of women and children are bought and sold. The unfettered demand for sex has caused pimps and exploiters to resort to more extreme tactics in order to meet exploding demand. The JVTA package directs the Department of Justice to incorporate strategies for reducing demand into anti-trafficking training programs and sting operations, including Innocence Lost. Women and children, especially girls, are advertised online where buyers purchase them with ease and anonymity. This happens in every city, in every state. The JVTA package would help fight online exploitation and work to bring buyers of child sex to justice. It creates a new partnership with wounded warriors, training them to serve as online investigators of child pornography and exploitation.

Advocates know: this is the most comprehensive and thoughtful piece of anti-trafficking legislation in years. The JVTA package represents a tremendous bipartisan effort to provide necessary support and protections for our victims of human trafficking, and at long last ends the culture of impunity for those who purchase our most vulnerable for sex. But these victims have waited too long. After several years of advocacy and over a month of delay on the Senate side, we are just one step away from providing this population with justice and healing.

As leaders in the anti-trafficking, anti-violence, faith-based, child welfare, law enforcement, and human rights movements, we urge the House to take up and pass this vital legislation without delay.

Sincerely,

Human Rights Project for Girls (Rights4Girls); National Domestic Violence Hotline; Coalition Against Trafficking in Women (CATW); Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN); ECPAT-USA; Girls Inc.; Shared Hope International; Equality Now; National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ); National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO); National Alliance to End Sexual Violence; New York State Coalition Against Sexual Assault; Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Services; Utah Coalition Against Sexual Assault; Arizona Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence; Florida Council Against Sexual Violence; New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic & Sexual Violence; Ohio Alliance to End Sexual Violence.

Wisconsin Coalition Against Sexual Assault; Connecticut Sexual Assault Crisis Services; National Children's Alliance (NCA); Jewish Women International (JWI); Children's Advocacy Institute; National Association of Counsel for Children; Courtney's House, survivor-led service provider; PROTECT; First Focus Campaign for Children; Franciscan Action Network; Breaking Free, survivor-led service provider; The Organization for Prostitution Survivors; Religious Sisters of Charity; Sanctuary for Families; Maryknoll Sisters of St. Dominic.

Dominican Sisters of Peace; DC Rape Crisis Center; Congregation of St. Joseph; Religious of the Sacred Heart; Survivors for Solutions, survivor-led service provider; YouthSpark; Poverty Elimination and Community Action (PEACE) Foundation; Providence House Inc.; Freedom From Exploitation; Society of the Holy Child Jesus, American Province; Sisters of Mercy; Second Life of Chattanooga; Girls Inc. of the Pacific Northwest; Advocacy for Justice and Peace Committee of the Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia; Naomi Project; YWCA National Capital Area; U.S. Fund for UNICEF.

National Center for Youth Law (NYCL); Christ United Methodist Church; ENC Stop Human Trafficking; Sisters of St. Joseph CA; W. Haywood Burns Institute; Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary; School Sisters of Notre Dame—CP Province Shalom—JPIC Office; WestCoast Children's Clinic; Pan Pacific and South East Asia Women's Association; Trinity Health; Ursuline Sisters of Tildonk, U.S. Province; Society for Incentive Travel Excellence (SITE).

Dominican Sisters of Hope; Wildwood United Methodist Church; Daughters of Mary and Joseph; Presbyterian Women; Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary, Western American Province; San Francisco Department on the Status of Women; Enterprising and Professional Women—NYC; MPower Mentoring; Children Now; Hollywood Business and Professional Women; Mark P. Lagon, Former Ambassador-At-Large to Combat Trafficking in Persons, U.S. Dept. of State.

Delores Barr Weaver Policy Center; Perhaps Kids Meeting Kids Can Make A Difference; California Federation Business & Professional Women; Virginia Beach Justice Initiative; Sex Trafficking Survivors United; Burning Bush Moments; Sara Kruzan, Survivor Advocate; Mary David, Survivor Advocate; Mentari, New York-based trafficking provider; MISSSEY Inc.; WITNESS; World Outreach Worship Center; Citizens Against Trafficking; Culture Reframed; Parenting Project.

Human Trafficking Awareness; Sisters of Charity of St. Elizabeth; Samaritan House; Regent Law Center for Global Justice, Human Rights, and the Rule of Law; The Advisory Council on Child Trafficking; Center for Global Justice; Slavery Today; The Salvation Army 614 Corps; Regent Law Center for Global Justice; Dare for More; Sisters of St. Joseph NW PA; The Samaritan Women; Worthwhile: Go; CHI Memorial Community Health Center; Hamilton County Health Department.

City Church of Chattanooga; The Healing Place of Hampton Roads; Lee University; Hope Hollow Exploitation Victim Assistance and Consultation Services; Task Force Against Human Trafficking for the Episcopal Diocese of New York; Protect HER; Mary Kay Cosmetics; Community Coalition Against Human Trafficking; Chattanooga Women's Club; Brainerd Baptist Church; Young America Ministries.

Lions Club; United Methodist Women; Duoloyi Ministry; Hamilton County Health Department; Gateway Christian Center; Sisters of Charity; OLP Foundation; The Advocates for Human Rights; Burks United Methodist Church; Sisters of Providence; Congregation of Sisters of St. Agnes; Chattanooga Coalition Against Human Trafficking; Regent University Center for Global Justice; Episcopal Diocese of New York.

Jewish Child Care Association; All Saints Institute for Asian American Concerns; Therapeutic Interventions, Inc.; Church of the Incarnation; Lutheran Family Services of Virginia; Center for Global Justice at Regent Law; Children's Law Center of California; Seraphim Global; Christina Oaks; Chattanooga State Community College; Savior Arts, Inc.; Church of the Holy Comforter;

Sex Trade 101; Project Woman, Ohio-based domestic violence and sexual assault center.

John Jay College of Criminal Justice; The Up Center; Foster Family-based Treatment Association; Alternatives to Violence Center; Tri County Help Center, Inc.; Alameda County Foster Youth Alliance; Business and Professional Women (BPW); Amara Legal Center; All Saints Episcopal Church; University of Hawai'i at Mānoa; Advancing the Ministries of the Gospel (AMG) International; Sisters of Charity of St. Elizabeth; St. Paul's Episcopal Church.

New York Presbyterian Church; First Centenary United Methodist Church; West Virginia Foundation for Rape Information and Services; Rape Crisis Team Trumbull County; Cleveland Rape Crisis Center; Poverty Elimination and Community Education (PEACE) Foundation; SHEBA USA; Hope Tree Family Services.

Mr. POE of Texas. America's kids, Mr. Speaker, are not for sale.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great privilege to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), whom I have worked with over the years on issues dealing with women's rights and the abuse and misuse of children and certainly her work on the issues of sexual abuse and sex trafficking of children and women.

Congresswoman MALONEY is a member of the Financial Services Committee and an original cosponsor, along with Congressman POE, of this legislation in the House.

□ 1715

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Senate-passed Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

I commend the ranking member for the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations for her hard work on this bill and so many others and on this issue, and to Chairman GOODLATTE and the leadership for bringing this bill swiftly to the floor.

I particularly applaud the efforts of Congressman POE, who, as a former judge and prosecutor, brought a keen understanding and passion to moving this bill forward. For well over 10 years, I have worked on trying to pass legislation that focused on the demand side of sex trafficking. It is only by going after the demand side that you will ever make a dent in protecting these young girls and boys. With his leadership, he brought new life and focus to getting this passed, and I cannot thank him enough. I truly believe that this bill will save lives.

I am so pleased that Democrats and Republicans have come together, as we have historically done, in efforts to combat human slavery, human trafficking, and to bring forward a bill to help victims of this modern-day form of slavery.

This bill cracks down on traffickers and provides resources to trafficking survivors. There are an estimated 21 million victims around the world today, including in all 50 States, being sold for sex and slave labor.

Business is very good for some very bad people. Every year, sex trafficking yields well over $9 billion in illegal profits. But unlike guns and dope that can only be sold once, the human body can be sold over and over again, usually until they die. This legislation starts to put a dent in those profits by levying fines on convicted traffickers and using the money to create the domestic trafficking victims fund.

This is appropriate justice. Traffickers are forced to pay for rehabilitative services for the girls, boys, men, women, and children whom they have victimized and profited from.

But we have to capture these criminals first, and perpetrators too easily have slipped through the cracks. In fact, trafficking victims are commonly charged with prostitution, while their pimps and johns and traffickers are never held accountable for their terrible crimes.

This bill will flip that equation by giving law enforcement tools to help victims, and new powers and resources to identify, arrest, and prosecute buyers and sellers of sex with minor children, pornography, slave labor, and other forms of sex and labor trafficking. This will clarify, once and for all, that traffickers and johns and pimps are the true criminals in sex trafficking because, make no mistake, prostitution is not, and never has been, what has often been called a victimless crime.

Patronizing a trafficked individual is not a casual act of sex; it is a criminal act of rape. Stiffening penalties and levying fines on perpetrators of these terrible crimes can start to decrease demand and put the people who buy and sell children behind bars, protecting other children from being hurt and destroyed—put them behind bars, where they belong.

This bill also enables victims and survivors to get the help that they deserve. Most trafficked individuals have multiple encounters with law enforcement while enslaved, but police are not sufficiently equipped to identify them. To that end, the bill also provides support for law enforcement to better identify and serve trafficking victims. These are victims who need help, not culprits to lock up while their traffickers and pimps go free.

We cannot afford to miss opportunities to recognize a trafficked victim when he or she walks into the police station or hospital or local clinic. And there must be protocols, such as those called for in this bill, in place to ensure their safety and not to treat them as the criminals.

This bill provides a comprehensive approach to address these issues and to banish this horrific crime from the United States of America. I urge Congress to act right away so victims need wait no longer for justice and the critical services and resources that they so desperately deserve. I urge complete bipartisan support for this bill. It is long overdue, and it will give a better future for those who have survived the worst crime in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. This bill is so critically important. Of all the bills that we have passed—and this body, in a bipartisan way, has passed a whole series of bills—this particular one has enforcement, it has prevention, and it has help for the survivors.

I applaud everyone who worked on this important piece of legislation, and we can't pass it fast enough.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the gentleman from Texas in thanking the gentlewoman from New York for her good work on this for a long time now, and to thank the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, Ms. JACKSON LEE, for this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), another champion in the fight against sex trafficking, particularly on the Internet.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the chairman very much for his leadership on this issue and so many others.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, and all of the House-passed human trafficking legislation that was incorporated into this Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the culmination of a long journey for myself and many Members in both Chambers who have worked on this important issue. This legislation represents a significant step forward in the Federal Government's efforts to combat the scourge of modern-day slavery, known as human trafficking. This bill makes enormous progress in the fight against trafficking by providing resources to law enforcement officials and collecting fees from sex traffickers that go into a new fund for victims.

It also includes my signature legislation, the SAVE Act, which make it illegal to knowingly advertise the victims of human trafficking, especially on the Internet. I thank my friends and colleagues, Senator MARK KIRK and DIANNE FEINSTEIN, for offering the SAVE Act as an amendment to this very important legislation.

Beyond the multiple tools and resources it gives to law enforcement and survivors, this legislation also serves an important symbolic purpose. This

bill symbolizes the longstanding and steadfast commitment that Members of Congress have towards protecting the most vulnerable members of our society.

No longer will the cruel exploitation of women and children be allowed to continue unchecked. No longer will sexual predators be allowed to torture, rape, and kill young Americans in the name of financial profit. Mr. Speaker, with this legislation, we are providing voice to the voiceless and advocating for those who cannot advocate for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of all of the good, bipartisan work done by my colleagues here in Congress on this issue of human trafficking. Years of work by many of my colleagues, including Representatives POE, SMITH, NOEM, PAULSEN, BEATTY, MALONEY, and many, many others, Mr. Speaker, have laid the foundation for this long overdue action.

I am grateful that many of my colleagues have held events in their home districts to raise awareness and educate the public about human trafficking. Awareness, training, and education are the key to preventing this horrible crime from happening in the first place. Young people must be warned about the devious and manipulative strategies employed by traffickers to ensnare them in the trap of sexual slavery.

The children at risk are not just school students. Pimps or traffickers are known to prey on victims as young as 9 years old. Traffickers may target minor victims through social media Web sites, afterschool programs, shopping malls and clubs, and through friends or acquaintances who recruit students on school campuses.

One of the best ways to combat human trafficking is through education. Many States have successful programs that train school personnel about how to identify the victims. We should work with schools to develop policies and protocols and partnerships to address and prevent the exploitation of children.

Partnership between public and private sectors is the key to combating human trafficking. Many times, frontline employees in the transportation and hospitality industry are the ones best suited to identify trafficking victims or their predators. Increased awareness and training will lead to more victims being identified, which is the critical step in breaking the cycle of exploitation and victimization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation and all efforts to combat human trafficking, and I look forward to continuing this work in the House of Representatives, and this Congress as a whole, for years to come.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a great advocate for human rights here in the House.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, a comprehensive bill authored by Senator CORNYN, with input from many.

This extremely important legislation includes numerous bipartisan bills passed by the House earlier this year under the extraordinary leadership of Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, Conference Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, and our own good chairman, BOB GOODLATTE.

When enacted into law, S. 178 will provide powerful new tools in the struggle to abolish modern-day slavery, including a domestic trafficking victims fund designed to provide assistance to victims of human trafficking and grants to States and localities funded by a $5,000 penalty assessed on convicted offenders.

The bill seeks to protect runaways from the horror of trafficking, strengthen the child welfare agency response, aid victims of child pornography, and criminalize advertisement for the commercial exploitation of children.

Each year, Mr. Speaker, as you know, there are approximately 100,000 American children, mostly runaways, trafficked in the U.S. The average age of initial enslavement is 13.

These children, when found, are often charged with prostitution, fined, or put in juvenile detention, where there are, or should be, other options available. These children, mostly young girls, need to be protected and cared for and treated with compassion and respect, not prosecution. The pending bill moves us towards this goal.

Indeed, title VI authorizes DOJ to give preferential treatment in awarding public safety and community-oriented police grants to an applicant from a State that treats a minor engaged in commercial sex as a victim.

Title VII was inspired by a groundbreaking study conducted by Laura Lederer and funded by several foundations, including the Charlotte Lozier Institute, that found that approximately 88 percent of domestic trafficking victims ''had contact with a health care provider while being trafficked, with the most common being a hospital'' or a hospital emergency room, almost 64 percent.

Situation awareness coupled with best practices will, without a doubt, help victims escape from this cruelty to freedom and protection.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 178—the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015—a comprehensive bill authored by Senator CORNYN, with input from many.

This extremely important legislation includes numerous bipartisan bills passed by the House earlier this year under the extraordinary leadership of Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, Conference Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS and Chairman GOODLATTE.

When enacted into law, S. 178 will provide powerful new tools in the struggle to abolish modern day slavery including a Domestic Trafficking Victims Fund designed to provide assistance to victims of human trafficking and grants to states and localities funded by a $5,000 penalty assessed on convicted offenders.

The bill seeks to protect runaways from the horror of human trafficking, strengthen the child welfare agency response, aid victims of child pornography, criminalize advertisement for the commercial exploitation of children, and beefs up the Departments of Homeland Security, Defense and HHS' anti-human trafficking activities.

Each year there are approximately 100,000 American children, mostly runaways, trafficked in the U.S. The average age of initial enslavement is 13 years old.

These children, when found, are often charged for prostitution, fined or put in juvenile detention, when there are—or should be—other options available. These children, mostly young girls, need to be protected and cared for and treated with compassion and respect—not prosecuted. The pending bill moves us toward this goal.

Indeed, Title VI authorizes DOJ to give preferential treatment in awarding public safety and community oriented police grants to an applicant from a state that treats a minor engaged in commercial sex as a victim—because that is what they are and that's already federal law due to the TVPA of 2000.

Title VII of S. 178 was inspired by a groundbreaking study conducted by Laura Lederer and funded by several foundations, including the Charlotte Lozier Institute, that found approximately 88 percent of domestic trafficking victims ''had contact with a health care provider while being trafficked with the most common contact being a hospital/ER (63.3%).''

Situation awareness coupled with best practices will without a doubt help victims escape to freedom and protection.

So, in response, Title VII requires HRSA to award a competitive grant to an eligible entity to design and implement a pilot program utilizing evidence-based best practices to train health care professionals to recognize trafficking victims and respond effectively.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, anti-human trafficking bills are often difficult to pass. When I first introduced the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, in 1998, the legislation was met with a wall of skepticism and opposition. People both inside of government and out thought the bold new legislation that included sheltering, asylum, and significant protections for the victims, long jail sentences and asset confiscation for the traffickers, and tough sanctions for governments that failed to meet minimum standards was merely a solution in search of a problem.

So as the prime author of the landmark Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 as well as reauthorizations of that law in 2003 and 2005, I believe the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act will further prevent the horrific crime of human trafficking, protect and assist

victims, and aid in the prosecution of those who exploit and abuse.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 5¾ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas has 9¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), who has also contributed one of the pieces of legislation included in this effort, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on combating this issue because today is a very important moment in the fight against modern-day slavery.

For several years, members of both parties have been working diligently with law enforcement, with victims, with social service providers and policy experts to end the sale and victimization of innocent girls. This bill today is the culmination now of all the initiatives previously passed in the House that will increase penalties for pimps and johns, that will enhance the Federal Government's response to trafficking, that will increase cooperation with governments overseas, and it will go after the Web sites that aid in the trafficking of minors.

□ 1730

I am pleased that this package also includes my legislation, the safe harbor legislation, that ensures that we will be treating minors who are trafficked as victims, rather than as criminals, and improve the services that they receive.

Mr. Speaker, the traffickers that we see today, they use every tool they can use to keep victims silent and under their control, whether it is by using threats, violence, drugs, or deception.

And trafficking victims all share one thing in common: it is a loss of freedom and a loss of the ability to speak out. Today we stand with these victims to bring them out of the shadows and say, enough is enough, because our girls are not for sale.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the Members who have spoken and highlighted a number of points that I want to reinforce.

I want to reinforce what my good friend from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) have said: that we are now looking the pimps and the johns straight in the eye and really focusing on demand. But connected to demand are those lives, those lives that we want to restore and give them a new opportunity in life. We want them to not be bruised. We want them to have the ability to restore their lives as young as under 10, 11, or 12, teenagers or young women.

This particular legislation, which I want to highlight, promotes rehabilitation by encouraging the development of specialized court programs for victims of child human trafficking.

As the chair of the Children's Caucus, I realize how vulnerable our children are all over the world. And what I am most interested in is the outpatient treatment, life skills training, housing placement, vocational training, education, family support services, and job placement.

When you find a homeless teen or one who has been victimized, they are empty. They are without any substance to know that they have something of quality to save and to mold and to build. The rehabilitation part of this particular legislation—and I do want to acknowledge the gentleman from Texas, Senator CORNYN—is a very, very important part of this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation before us to combat human trafficking.

Not only would I like to thank the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE, and his committee, but I would also especially like to thank our senior Senator from the State of Texas, Mr. CORNYN, for his leadership in getting this important legislation through the Senate.

This bipartisan bill will strengthen our laws against human trafficking, train law enforcement to better target criminals engaged in trafficking, and ensure that the victims of human trafficking are cared for with compassion.

These victims are taken from their homes, enslaved, treated as objects. Human trafficking is a terrible, heinous crime, and its victims are usually voiceless. Today we are their voice, and we are taking action on their behalf.

This legislation provides resources and services that help victims to be identified, rescued, and, most importantly, to begin to heal from these traumatic events. S. 178 takes steps that would serve as a model for other nations to follow in combating the inhumane crime of human trafficking.

We must do all that we can to restore dignity to its victims and bring justice to its perpetrators, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of now yielding 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), the author of H.R. 246 that protects children from being criminalized, which is included in this bill, and I thank her for her work.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the bipartisan Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, S. 178.

But first I would like to thank both Chairman GOODLATTE of Virginia and Ranking Member CONYERS of Michigan of the Judiciary Committee for bringing this important bill to the floor for consideration. I also would like to thank the gentlewoman from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for her leadership and for managing the bill today for the Democrats, and a special thank you to the original sponsors.

This comprehensive legislation is a major milestone in our efforts to crack down on sex trafficking and to help protect vulnerable children across America.

One of my top priorities in the 114th Congress was to pass my trafficking bill, H.R. 246, and today's bill includes it and nine other bipartisan House bills aimed at combating the scourge of human trafficking.

I thank Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman GRASSLEY of Iowa for offering the language of my bill as an amendment during the markup of S. 178 to ensure its inclusion in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 2015, I sat through the Senate Judiciary Committee markup to witness and hear the committee's discussion and vote. Today I am proud to stand on this House floor with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, advocating for this legislation that will provide child sex trafficking victims with greater restitution, justice, and resources.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is one of the fastest-growing crimes in the world. We have heard that, and it is worth repeating.

In fact, according to the United States State Department, human trafficking is the world's second-largest criminal enterprise after the illegal drug trade.

As we know, it is not just happening in faraway lands. It happens in our own backyards.

I am proud to have participated and led discussions on preventing child sex trafficking in my district. Last year, I joined a bipartisan roundtable discussion to hear firsthand stories and challenges from once child victim Theresa Flores, who is now a national spokesperson and best-selling author of ''The Slave Across the Street.''

In the United States, some 300,000 children are at risk each year for commercial sexual exploitation. In my home State of Ohio, each year, an estimated 1,100 Ohio children become victims of human trafficking, and over 3,000 more are at risk.

The average age of trafficked victims in the United States is between 12 and 13 years of age. At this early age, Mr. Speaker, children should be in middle school, making new friends, playing

sports, enjoying afterschool programs, or just being children.

Mr. Speaker, these children deserve better, and today's legislation is a much-needed step in that right direction.

We know that no single system can successfully combat trafficking. Preventing, identifying, and serving victims of trafficking requires a multi-coordinated approach across all levels of government as well as input and assistance from nongovernmental entities and the American people.

My provision in this bill will update Federal law to include the term ''child sex trafficking'' to reinforce that children who are trafficked should not be criminalized as prostitutes; instead, treated as victims. We need to ensure people understand that if they report an instance of child sex trafficking, law enforcement is not going to pursue the child and prosecute them as a criminal. They are victims.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, let me end by asking and encouraging all people, when they see something, say something.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues today to support this legislation so we may send it to the President's desk for signature, finally bringing justice to the tens of thousands of human trafficking victims.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 3¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, so many important points have been made, and I would just like to quickly summarize by adding my appreciation, again, to the sponsors and to the speakers today, Congresswoman MALONEY and Congresswoman BEATTY, and, of course, the speakers of our friends on the other side of the aisle.

I want to emphasize something that I think should pierce our hearts, which is that children should be protected. There are several elements that I think are important to make mention of regarding these children being protected.

One, I would like to acknowledge the responsibilities of the Attorney General to create a system to monitor the issuance and enforcement of mandatory restitution. Remember, these children have been victimized over the years and really have been thrown to foster care or other agencies where moneys were not available. These restitution orders will compensate victims not only of human trafficking but also related immigration and child pornography cases. The establishment of a domestic victims fund will also improve the conditions for our children.

We worked on a cybersecurity bill, an important part of this bill that establishes a national cyber crimes center to manage and provide data essential for this effort. It authorizes the U.S. Marshals Service to provide assistance to State, local, and other Federal law enforcement agencies. It has placed the U.S. Marshals in a very effective manner.

Let me note the fact that there are mandatory minimums. In a very small way in this bill, we will be looking at sentencing reformation and reform in the following months.

What I would say is that our children are enormously important. This is a very important bill. And I think it is very important that we move this legislation and view it as an embracing of our children and protecting of our women, standing as a country against the violence of sex trafficking and child trafficking.

Might I also say that this bill encourages and forces training for our law enforcement, something that we view as very important as we are going forward, to investigate human trafficking as well as training for those essential to our criminal justice system.

I might, as I close, indicate that we have finally come full circle to be able to stand again on the floor of the House and acknowledge that if you engage in these activities, we will find you wherever you are, and we will prosecute you. And the idea that you can hide as a pimp or a john is no more, and the idea that children are left to their own devices after they have been victimized is no more.

We look to reunite families, to strengthen families, to provide for these children, and, as my colleague has just said, not to criminalize the children but, tragically, first to restore the victims' lives.

I ask my colleagues to support the Senate bill, the underlying bill, the bill on the floor of the House. I thank the members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, the members of the Judiciary Committee here in the House, both the chairman and ranking member, and the members of our committee as we work through this process, and all the Members who put forward outstanding initiatives that are now a part of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is a scourge that greatly impacts on my home district in Houston, Texas. Houston currently ranks #1 among U.S. cities with the most victims of human trafficking. Twenty-five percent of all human trafficking victims are in my home state of Texas. Currently, thirty percent of all human trafficking tips to the National Rescue Hotline come from Texas.

Obviously, Houston does not shoulder this threat alone. Human trafficking impacts our whole nation. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that one of every seven endangered runaways reported to the Center are likely victims of minor sex trafficking, and that at least 100,000 American children are the victims of sex trafficking each year.

It is our duty to rescue these children, shelter them, and help them recover from the trauma that has been inflicted upon them. It is also our duty to prevent these crimes before they happen and to provide law enforcement with the tools they need to combat human traffickers.

This bill will be a significant weapon in the war against sex trafficking, which unfortunately is the fastest growing business of organized crime in the United States, generating an estimated $9 billion annually.

Although not perfect, S. 178 is a comprehensive bill that includes a variety of measures intended to strike at the problem of child sex trafficking through prevention, law enforcement, and rehabilitation services for victims.

This bill addresses the demand for this business by adding criminal prohibitions for those who solicit and advertize human trafficking. Law enforcement officials across the U.S. have identified online sex ads as the number one platform for the buying and selling of sex with children and young women.

The legislation provides the tools to rebuild the lives of those exploited by this business. It specifically addresses the needs of thousands of homeless children, many who have fled physically and sexually abusive homes, only to be victimized again by sex traffickers.

The bill promotes rehabilitation by encouraging the development of specialized court programs for victims of child human trafficking. These court programs will provide: outpatient treatment, life skills training, housing placement, vocational training, education, family support services, and job placement.

These programs will largely respond to the practical needs of those victimized by human trafficking. It is our duty to provide the tools to reclaim these stolen lives.

The bill goes further by encouraging through grant programs to the States that establish safe harbors for children who have been victims of sex trafficking. These safe harbors play a critical role in preventing youth, forced into the sex trade, from being re-victimized and stigmatized a second time by the criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill we are stating clearly: these children are not criminals. They are victims of one of the most heinous types of crime, and they deserve to be rescued and treated so that they may have the opportunity of overcoming their horrendous traumas.

The bill also allows victims of sex trafficking with related criminal charges to be eligible for acceptance in Job Corps program, an important process for reintegration into society.

Victims of sex trafficking deserve and need restitution for rehabilitation. This bill requires the Attorney General to create a system to monitor the issuance and enforcement of mandatory restitution orders. These restitution orders will compensate victims not only of human trafficking, but also related immigration and child pornography cases.

The establishment of a Domestic Trafficking Victims Fund will also improve services to children who have been rescued, in the form of

long-term rehabilitative services, relief that is long overdue.

The requirement to monitor enforcement of restitution orders will in turn provide a strong basis for determining the next steps necessary to ensure that victims are justly compensated for the traumas inflicted on them by their traffickers.

The necessary reporting must also identify current gaps in research and data. This information will be helpful in formulating effective strategies in deterring children from becoming victims of trafficking. It requires the Government Accountability Office to report on both federal and state enforcement efforts to combat human trafficking and the commercial sexual exploitation of children.

The bill provides significant support for law enforcement officers to identify and rescue the victims of human trafficking. The bill establishes a National Cyber Crimes Center to manage and provide data essential for this effort. It authorizes the U.S. Marshals Service to provide assistance to state, local, and other federal law enforcement agencies in locating and recovering missing children when requested to do so by those agencies.

Given the Marshals Service's well-established history, reputation, and success in locating missing persons and fugitives, this requirement makes perfect sense.

We must not underestimate the task ahead for law enforcement to effectively combat human trafficking. In my home state, it is well known to both state and federal officials that Mexican cartels facilitate, control, and benefit from nearly all human smuggling activity along the Texas-Mexico border. As I've already mentioned, domestic human trafficking is a nine billion-dollar business.

This legislation provides law enforcement with the tools to prosecute these crimes and to rebuild the lives of those exploited by this business

S. 178 gives block grants to states to assist law enforcement with the expenses of wiretaps, the use of experts, and essential travel.

The legislation requires better coordination between law enforcement and a variety of other entities, including: child advocacy centers, social service agencies, state governmental health service agencies, housing agencies, and legal services agencies.

When it comes to recovering and rehabilitating our missing children, we must utilize every available resource.

Several provisions in this bill encourage and foster training for law enforcement to investigate human trafficking as well as for training for those essential to our criminal justice system, such as physical and mental health care providers, federal prosecutors, and judges.

S. 178 empowers women who have been the victims of rape by providing incentives to states to pass laws allowing termination of parental rights of rapists.

In addition, the bill seeks to hinder demand by prosecuting not just the trafficker, but also—for the first time—those who patronize and solicit children for illicit sexual acts. Without the consumers of the human sex trafficking, there would be no victims.

And, S. 178 would criminalize the act of using the Internet to advertise human trafficking. While the Internet has enriched out lives significantly, it has also provided traffickers with a ready tool used to further the heinous trafficking of minors for sex.

Finally, the bill will help to foster better collaboration among federal, state, and local law enforcement in the fight against sex trafficking. Specifically, S. 178 directs that a task force be established within the Violent Crimes Against Children Program to facilitate such coordination.

This bill attacks the scourge of human trafficking by undercutting demand, providing law enforcement with the tools they need for intervention, and by providing rehabilitation and recovery for the victims of human trafficking.

I had hoped that before S. 178 was presented to the President, it would not contain provisions that extend the use of mandatory minimum sentences. Frankly, I am surprised that the final bill includes additional mandatory minimum sentencing provisions. Mandatory minimums have led to mass incarceration and a one-size-fits-all philosophy in sentencing that we should reject. But the overall value of the bill in protecting child sex victims and adult and child trafficking and sex victims is crucial. I support the vital purpose of this bill. On balance however, the many other positive provisions this legislation provides to combat human trafficking counsels in favor of its passage. Nevertheless, we must be vigilant in monitoring the execution of this bill after it becomes law, and effectuate modifications if necessary. The health and welfare of so many of our young people depend on it. The U.S. Department of Justice estimates that 300,000 children in this country are at risk of being trafficked.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these innocent children that I strongly encourage support for this legislation.

With that, I ask for Members' support on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) who has also contributed a major piece of the legislation before the House today.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is an issue that I believe many people see as far removed from them and their families, but the reality is that it is happening all around us: in our schools, near our homes, on Web sites that our kids visit and frequent.

My words are not intended to alarm people today but to bring into perspective that it isn't just happening overseas or in communities far away from our homes. It is happening across this country, even in my home State of South Dakota.

In my State, there are three main ways that people are trafficked, according to Kimberly LaPlante, who works at an organization called Call to Freedom in Sioux Falls. One, trafficking victims are brought from bigger cities or from our Native American reservations and sent to the North Dakota oil fields. Two, they are sold at large events, like the annual Sturgis Motorcycle Rally. Or three, it is homegrown trafficking, meaning this demand originates in my State, and that, by the way, is the most common problem across this country.

In 2013, the South Dakota Attorney General's Office held a 6-day undercover operation at the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally in western South Dakota. They put up an online ad and, over the 6 days, received more than 180 responses.

Local law enforcement did the same thing in a community not far from my home. Over the course of 2 days, they received 110 responses.

This form of slavery is happening almost every single day, and it is time we do something about it. This bill is our opportunity to do something about it. It is an opportunity for both Chambers of Congress to stand together and support legislation that protects our children and our communities.

One of the components of this legislation is a provision that I wrote to help combat many of the problems that we are facing in South Dakota but also other places in the country.

□ 1745

Today there are only about 200 beds for underage victims in the United States. The language that I wrote included in this bill ensures that shelters can get access to more resources to build safe housing for those trying to escape and recover from trafficking.

There is also a severe lack of information about trafficking and its victims. To help prevent it and to intervene when it does occur, my language aims to make sure that the information on the state of trafficking in this country is analyzed and used to decide how those Federal resources should be used to combat it.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to see this package coming to the floor today. I urge the President to sign it quickly so that we can all join hands and act to prevent this human trafficking from continuing across our country and protect as many children and help them heal as we possibly can.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 178.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1987) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1987

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART III—COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATIONS AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS

''CHAPTER 27—AUTHORIZATIONS

''§ 2702. Authorization of appropriations

''Funds are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017 for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard as follows:

''(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for—

''(A) $6,981,036,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

''(B) $6,981,036,000 for fiscal year 2017.

''(2) For the acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment—

''(A) $1,546,448,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

''(B) $1,546,448,000 for fiscal year 2017.

''(3) For the Coast Guard Reserve program, including operations and maintenance of the program, personnel and training costs, equipment, and services—

''(A) $140,016,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

''(B) $140,016,000 for fiscal year 2017.

''(4) For the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the Coast Guard under chapter 19 of this title—

''(A) $16,701,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

''(B) $16,701,000 for fiscal year 2017.

''(5) To the Commandant of the Coast Guard for research, development, test, and evaluation of technologies, materials, and human factors directly related to improving the performance of the Coast Guard's mission with respect to search and rescue, aids to navigation, marine safety, marine environmental protection, enforcement of laws and treaties, ice operations, oceanographic research, and defense readiness, and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment—

''(A) $19,890,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

''(B) $19,890,000 for fiscal year 2017.

''§ 2704. Authorized levels of military strength and training

''(a) ACTIVE DUTY STRENGTH.—The Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength for active duty personnel of 43,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

''(b) MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS.—The Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017 as follows:

''(1) For recruit and special training, 2,500 student years.

''(2) For flight training, 165 student years.

''(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions, 350 student years.

''(4) For officer acquisition, 1,200 student years.

''CHAPTER 29—REPORTS

''§ 2904. Manpower requirements plan

''(a) IN GENERAL.—On the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for fiscal year 2017 under section 1105 of title 31, on the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for fiscal year 2019 under such section, and every 4 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a manpower requirements plan.

''(b) SCOPE.—A manpower requirements plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include for each mission of the Coast Guard—

''(1) an assessment of all projected mission requirements for the upcoming fiscal year and for each of the 3 fiscal years thereafter;

''(2) the number of active duty, reserve, and civilian personnel assigned or available to fulfill such mission requirements—

''(A) currently; and

''(B) as projected for the upcoming fiscal year and each of the 3 fiscal years thereafter;

''(3) the number of active duty, reserve, and civilian personnel required to fulfill such mission requirements—

''(A) currently; and

''(B) as projected for the upcoming fiscal year and each of the 3 fiscal years thereafter;

''(4) an identification of any capability gaps between mission requirements and mission performance caused by deficiencies in the numbers of personnel available—

''(A) currently; and

''(B) as projected for the upcoming fiscal year and each of the 3 fiscal years thereafter; and

''(5) an identification of the actions the Commandant will take to address capability gaps identified under paragraph (4).

''(c) CONSIDERATION.—In composing a manpower requirements plan for submission under subsection (a), the Commandant shall consider—

''(1) the marine safety strategy required under section 2116 of title 46;

''(2) information on the adequacy of the acquisition workforce included in the most recent report under section 2903 of this title; and

''(3) any other Federal strategic planning effort the Commandant considers appropriate.''.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 662 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating such section as section 2701;

(2) by transferring such section to appear before section 2702 of such title (as added by subsection (a) of this section); and

(3) by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

''(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for.

''(2) For the acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment.

''(3) For the Coast Guard Reserve program, including operations and maintenance of the program, personnel and training costs, equipment, and services.

''(4) For the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the Coast Guard under chapter 19 of this title.

''(5) For research, development, test, and evaluation of technologies, materials, and human factors directly related to improving the performance of the Coast Guard.

''(6) For alteration or removal of bridges over navigable waters of the United States constituting obstructions to navigation, and for personnel and administrative costs associated with the Alteration of Bridges Program.''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL END STRENGTHS.—Section 661 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating such section as section 2703; and

(2) by transferring such section to appear before section 2704 of such title (as added by subsection (a) of this section).

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) TRANSMISSION OF ANNUAL COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION REQUEST.—Section 662a of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating such section as section 2901;

(B) by transferring such section to appear before section 2904 of such title (as added by subsection (a) of this section); and

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1) by striking ''described in section 661'' and inserting ''described in section 2703''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2) by striking ''described in section 662'' and inserting ''described in section 2701''.

(2) CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN.—Section 663 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating such section as section 2902; and

(B) by transferring such section to appear after section 2901 of such title (as so redesignated and transferred by paragraph (1) of this subsection).

(3) MAJOR ACQUISITIONS.—Section 569a of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating such section as section 2903;

(B) by transferring such section to appear after section 2902 of such title (as so redesignated and transferred by paragraph (2) of this subsection); and

(C) in subsection (c)(2) by striking ''of this subchapter''.

(e) ICEBREAKING ON THE GREAT LAKES.—For fiscal years 2016 and 2017, the Commandant of the Coast Guard may use funds made available pursuant to section 2702(2) of title 14, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section) for the selection of a design for and the construction of an icebreaker that is capable of buoy tending to enhance icebreaking capacity on the Great Lakes.

(f) ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives—

(1) each plan required under section 2904 of title 14, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section;

(2) each plan required under section 2903(e) of title 14, United States Code, as added by section 206 of this Act;

(3) each plan required under section 2902 of title 14, United States Code, as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section; and

(4) each mission need statement required under section 569 of title 14, United States Code.

SEC. 102. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ANALYSIS FOR TITLE 14.—The analysis for title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to part II the following:

''III. Coast Guard Authorizations and Reports to Congress ..... 2701''.

(b) ANALYSIS FOR CHAPTER 15.—The analysis for chapter 15 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 569a.

(c) ANALYSIS FOR CHAPTER 17.—The analysis for chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 661, 662, 662a, and 663.

(d) ANALYSIS FOR CHAPTER 27.—The analysis for chapter 27 of title 14, United States Code, as added by section 101(a) of this Act, is amended by inserting—

(1) before the item relating to section 2702 the following:

''2701. Requirement for prior authorization of appropriations.'';

and

(2) before the item relating to section 2704 the following:

''2703. Authorization of personnel end strengths.''.

(e) ANALYSIS FOR CHAPTER 29.—The analysis for chapter 29 of title 14, United States Code, as added by section 101(a) of this Act, is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 2904 the following:

''2901. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request.
''2902. Capital investment plan.
''2903. Major acquisitions.''.

(f) MISSION NEED STATEMENT.—Section 569(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking ''in section 569a(e)'' and inserting ''in section 2903''; and

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking ''under section 663(a)(1)'' and inserting ''under section 2902(a)(1)''.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

SEC. 201. VICE COMMANDANT.

(a) GRADES AND RATINGS.—Section 41 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''an admiral,'' and inserting ''admirals (two);''.

(b) VICE COMMANDANT; APPOINTMENT.—Section 47 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''vice admiral'' and inserting ''admiral''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 51 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting ''admiral or'' before ''vice admiral,'';

(2) in subsection (b) by inserting ''admiral or'' before ''vice admiral,'' each place it appears; and

(3) in subsection (c) by inserting ''admiral or'' before ''vice admiral,''.

(d) APPLICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the officer who, on the date of the enactment of this Act, is serving as Vice Commandant of the Coast Guard—

(1) shall have the grade of admiral, with the pay and allowances of that grade; and

(2) shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this Act, including the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 202. VICE ADMIRALS.

Section 50 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) The President may—

''(A) designate, within the Coast Guard, no more than 5 positions of importance and responsibility that shall be held by officers who, while so serving, shall have the grade of vice admiral, with the pay and allowances of that grade, and shall perform such duties as the Commandant may prescribe (if the President designates 5 such positions, 1 position shall be a Chief of Staff); and

''(B) designate, within the executive branch, other than within the Coast Guard or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, positions of importance and responsibility that shall be held by officers who, while so serving, shall have the grade of vice admiral, with the pay and allowances of that grade.''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A) by striking ''under paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''under paragraph (1)(A)''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) at the discretion of the Secretary, while awaiting orders after being relieved from the position, beginning on the day the officer is relieved from the position, but not for more than 60 days; and''.

SEC. 203. COAST GUARD REMISSION OF INDEBTEDNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 461 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 461. Remission of indebtedness

''The Secretary may have remitted or cancelled any part of a person's indebtedness to the United States or any instrumentality of the United States if—

''(1) the indebtedness was incurred while the person served on active duty as a member of the Coast Guard; and

''(2) the Secretary determines that remitting or cancelling the indebtedness is in the best interest of the United States.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 461 and inserting the following:

''461. Remission of indebtedness.''.

SEC. 204. ACQUISITION REFORM.

(a) MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—Section 572(d)(3) of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (H) as subparagraphs (E) through (J), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) the performance data to be used to determine whether the key performance parameters have been resolved;''; and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (C), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, the following:

''(D) the results during test and evaluation that will be required to demonstrate that a capability, asset, or subsystem meets performance requirements;''.

(b) CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN.—Section 2902(a)(1) of title 14, United States Code, as redesignated and otherwise amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''completion;'' and inserting ''completion based on the proposed appropriations included in the budget;''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''at the projected funding levels;'' and inserting ''based on the proposed appropriations included in the budget;''.

(c) DAYS AWAY FROM HOMEPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment

of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall—

(1) implement a standard for tracking operational days at sea for Coast Guard cutters that does not include days during which such cutters are undergoing maintenance or repair; and

(2) notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the standard implemented under paragraph (1).

(d) FIXED WING AIRCRAFT FLEET MIX ANALYSIS.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a revised fleet mix analysis of Coast Guard fixed wing aircraft.

SEC. 205. AUXILIARY JURISDICTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 822 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''The purpose'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The purpose''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) LIMITATION.—The Auxiliary may conduct a patrol of a waterway, or a portion thereof, only if—

''(1) the Commandant has determined such waterway, or portion thereof, is navigable for purposes of the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard; or

''(2) a State or other proper authority has requested such patrol pursuant to section 141 of this title or section 13109 of title 46.''.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall—

(1) review the waterways patrolled by the Coast Guard Auxiliary in the most recently completed fiscal year to determine whether such waterways are eligible or ineligible for patrol under section 822(b) of title 14, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)); and

(2) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a written notification of—

(A) any waterways determined ineligible for patrol under paragraph (1); and

(B) the actions taken by the Commandant to ensure Auxiliary patrols do not occur on such waterways.

SEC. 206. LONG-TERM MAJOR ACQUISITIONS PLAN.

Section 2903 of title 14, United States Code, as redesignated and otherwise amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) LONG-TERM MAJOR ACQUISITIONS PLAN.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include a plan that describes for the upcoming fiscal year, and for each of the 20 fiscal years thereafter—

''(1) the numbers and types of cutters and aircraft to be decommissioned;

''(2) the numbers and types of cutters and aircraft to be acquired to—

''(A) replace the cutters and aircraft identified under paragraph (1); or

''(B) address an identified capability gap; and

''(3) the estimated level of funding in each fiscal year required to—

''(A) acquire the cutters and aircraft identified under paragraph (2);

''(B) acquire related command, control, communications, computer, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems; and

''(C) acquire, construct, or renovate shoreside infrastructure.''.

SEC. 207. COAST GUARD COMMUNITIES.

Section 409 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998 (14 U.S.C. 639 note) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''The Commandant may recognize any other community in a similar manner if the Commandant determines that such community has demonstrated enduring support of the Coast Guard, Coast Guard personnel, and the dependents of Coast Guard personnel.''.

SEC. 208. "POLAR SEA" MATERIEL CONDITION ASSESSMENT AND SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION DECISION.

Section 222 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–213; 126 Stat. 1560) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall—

''(1) complete a materiel condition assessment with respect to the Polar Sea;

''(2) make a determination of whether it is cost effective to reactivate the Polar Sea compared with other options to provide icebreaking services as part of a strategy to maintain polar icebreaking services; and

''(3) submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate—

''(A) the assessment required under paragraph (1); and

''(B) written notification of the determination required under paragraph (2).'';

(2) in subsection (b) by striking ''analysis'' and inserting ''written notification'';

(3) by striking subsection (c);

(4) by redesignating subsections (d) through (h) as subsections (c) through (g), respectively;

(5) in subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (4) of this section)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''based on the analysis required''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''analysis'' and inserting ''written notification'';

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) DECOMMISSIONING.—If the Secretary makes a determination under subsection (a) that it is not cost effective to reactivate the Polar Sea, then, not later than 180 days after written notification of that determination is submitted under that subsection, the Commandant of the Coast Guard may decommission the Polar Sea.''; and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) RESULT OF NO DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary does not make a determination under subsection (a) regarding whether it is cost effective to reactivate the Polar Sea, then the Commandant of the Coast Guard may decommission the Polar Sea.'';

(6) in subsection (d)(1) (as redesignated by paragraph (4) of this section) by striking ''analysis'' and inserting ''written notification''; and

(7) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (4) of this section) by striking ''in subsection (d)'' and inserting ''in subsection (c)''.

SEC. 209. REPEAL.

Section 225(b)(2) of the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–281; 128 Stat. 3039) is repealed.

SEC. 210. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 14.

Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in the analysis for part I by striking the item relating to chapter 19 and inserting the following:

''19. Environmental Compliance and Restoration Program ..... 690'';

(2) in section 46(a) by striking ''subsection'' and inserting ''section'';

(3) in section 47 in the section heading by striking ''**commandant**'' and inserting ''**Commandant**'';

(4) in section 93(f) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Commandant may lease submerged lands and tidelands under paragraph (1) only if—

''(A) the lease is for cash exclusively;

''(B) the lease amount is equal to the fair market value of the use of the leased submerged lands or tidelands for the period during which such lands are leased, as determined by the Commandant;

''(C) the lease does not provide authority to or commit the Coast Guard to use or support any improvements to such submerged lands and tidelands, or obtain goods and services from the lessee; and

''(D) proceeds from the lease are deposited in the Coast Guard Housing Fund established under section 687.'';

(5) in the analysis for chapter 9 by striking the item relating to section 199 and inserting the following:

''199. Marine safety curriculum.'';

(6) in section 427(b)(2) by striking ''this chapter'' and inserting ''chapter 61 of title 10'';

(7) in the analysis for chapter 15 before the item relating to section 571 by striking the following:

''Sec.'';

(8) in section 573(c)(3)(A) by inserting ''and shall maintain such cutter in class'' before the period at the end;

(9) in section 581(5)(B) by striking ''$300,000,0000,'' and inserting ''$300,000,000,'';

(10) in section 637(c)(3) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by inserting ''it is'' before ''any'';

(11) in section 641(d)(3) by striking ''Guard, installation'' and inserting ''Guard installation'';

(12) in section 691(c)(3) by striking ''state'' and inserting ''State'';

(13) in the analysis for chapter 21—

(A) by striking the item relating to section 709 and inserting the following:

''709. Reserve student aviation pilots; Reserve aviation pilots; appointments in commissioned grade.'';

and

(B) by striking the item relating to section 740 and inserting the following:

''740. Failure of selection and removal from an active status.'';

(14) in section 742(c) by striking ''subsection'' and inserting ''subsections'';

(15) in section 821(b)(1) by striking ''Chapter 26'' and inserting ''Chapter 171''; and

(16) in section 823a(b)(1), by striking ''Chapter 26'' and inserting ''Chapter 171''.

SEC. 211. DIGITAL BOAT PROFILE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department

in which the Coast Guard is operating determines that there are at least 2 digital boat profile technologies that are commercially available, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program, in accordance with this section, under which digital boat profiles are utilized for—

(1) not less than 2 National Security Cutters;

(2) not less than 4 Fast Response Cutters; and

(3) not less than 4 Medium Endurance Cutters (270 foot).

(b) TIMING.—With respect to the National Security Cutters and Fast Response Cutters participating in the pilot program, a digital boat profile shall be established prior to the commissioning of the cutters.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the pilot program, and annually thereafter for the succeeding 4 years, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing—

(1) the implementation of the pilot program; and

(2) the results of the use of digital boat profiles under the pilot program with respect to—

(A) efficient maintenance of the cutters involved; and

(B) the post-delivery warranty management of equipment items, the repair and replacement of which are contractually obligated.

(d) DIGITAL BOAT PROFILE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''digital boat profile'' means a commercially available off-the-shelf technology that creates an electronic data source with respect to a vessel that—

(1) provides lifecycle management support, including through the incorporation of systems manuals, schematics, and vessel documentation;

(2) incorporates all manufacturer recommendations and operator best practices;

(3) incorporates the use of real-time analytics of deferred tasks, future tasks, readiness assessments, and budgetary planners;

(4) provides advance electronic notification of upcoming maintenance and inspections to multi-level permission-based recipients on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis;

(5) facilitates oversight for pre-delivery discrepancy reporting and post-delivery warranty management of equipment items, the repair and replacement of which are contractually obligated; and

(6) is accessible by computing devices.

SEC. 212. DISCONTINUANCE OF AN AID TO NAVIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall establish a process for the discontinuance of an aid to navigation established, maintained, or operated by the Coast Guard.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The process established under subsection (a) shall include procedures to notify the public of any discontinuance of an aid to navigation described in that subsection.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In establishing a process under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with and consider any recommendations of the Navigation Safety Advisory Council.

(d) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after establishing a process under subsection (a), the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the process established.

SEC. 213. MISSION PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an assessment of the efficacy of the Coast Guard's Standard Operational Planning Process with respect to annual mission performance measures.

SEC. 214. COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall establish and carry out a response capabilities pilot program to assess, at not fewer than 2 Coast Guard command centers, the effectiveness of a radio gateway that—

(1) provides for—

(A) multiagency collaboration and interoperability; and

(B) wide-area, secure, and peer-invitation-and-acceptance-based multimedia communications;

(2) is certified by the Department of Defense Joint Interoperability Test Center; and

(3) is composed of commercially available, off-the-shelf technology.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the succeeding 4 years, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an assessment of the pilot program, including the impacts of the program with respect to interagency and Coast Guard response capabilities.

SEC. 215. COAST GUARD GRADUATE MARITIME OPERATIONS EDUCATION.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall establish an education program, for members and employees of the Coast Guard, that—

(1) offers a master's degree in maritime operations;

(2) is relevant to the professional development of such members and employees;

(3) provides resident and distant education options, including the ability to utilize both options; and

(4) to the greatest extent practicable, is conducted using existing academic programs at an accredited public academic institution that—

(A) is located near a significant number of Coast Guard, maritime, and other Department of Homeland Security law enforcement personnel; and

(B) has an ability to simulate operations normally conducted at a command center.

TITLE III—SHIPPING AND NAVIGATION

SEC. 301. TREATMENT OF FISHING PERMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 313 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 31310. Treatment of fishing permits

''(a) LIMITATION ON MARITIME LIENS.—This chapter—

''(1) does not establish a maritime lien on a fishing permit; and

''(2) does not authorize any civil action to enforce a maritime lien on a fishing permit.

''(b) TREATMENT OF FISHING PERMITS UNDER STATE AND FEDERAL LAW.—A fishing permit—

''(1) is governed solely by the State or Federal law under which it is issued; and

''(2) shall not be treated as part of a vessel, or as an appurtenance or intangible of a vessel, for any purpose under Federal law.

''(c) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as imposing any limitation upon the authority of the Secretary of Commerce—

''(1) to modify, suspend, revoke, or impose a sanction on any fishing permit issued by the Secretary of Commerce; or

''(2) to bring a civil action to enforce such a modification, suspension, revocation, or sanction.

''(d) FISHING PERMIT DEFINED.—In this section the term 'fishing permit' means any authorization of a person or vessel to engage in fishing that is issued under State or Federal law.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 31309 the following:

''31310. Treatment of fishing permits.''.

SEC. 302. SURVIVAL CRAFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3104 of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 3104. Survival craft

''(a) REQUIREMENT TO EQUIP.—The Secretary shall require that a passenger vessel be equipped with survival craft that ensures that no part of an individual is immersed in water, if—

''(1) such vessel is built or undergoes a major conversion after January 1, 2016; and

''(2) operates in cold waters as determined by the Secretary.

''(b) HIGHER STANDARD OF SAFETY.—The Secretary may revise part 117 or part 180 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect before January 1, 2016, if such revision provides a higher standard of safety than is provided by the regulations in effect on or before the date of the enactment of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015.

''(c) INNOVATIVE AND NOVEL DESIGNS.—The Secretary may, in lieu of the requirements set out in part 117 or part 180 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015, allow a passenger vessel to be equipped with a life saving appliance or arrangement of an innovative or novel design that—

''(1) ensures no part of an individual is immersed in water; and

''(2) provides an equal or higher standard of safety than is provided by such requirements as in effect before such date of the enactment.

''(d) BUILT DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'built' has the meaning that term has under section 4503(e).''.

(b) REVIEW; REVISION OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) REVIEW.—Not later than December 31, 2015, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a review of—

(A) the number of casualties for individuals with disabilities, children, and the elderly as a result of immersion in water, reported to the Coast Guard over the preceding

30-year period, by vessel type and area of operation;

(B) the risks to individuals with disabilities, children, and the elderly as a result of immersion in water, by passenger vessel type and area of operation;

(C) the effect that carriage of survival craft that ensure that no part of an individual is immersed in water has on—

(i) passenger vessel safety, including stability and safe navigation;

(ii) improving the survivability of individuals, including individuals with disabilities, children, and the elderly; and

(iii) the costs, the incremental cost difference to vessel operators, and the cost effectiveness of requiring the carriage of such survival craft to address the risks to individuals with disabilities, children, and the elderly;

(D) the efficacy of alternative safety systems, devices, or measures in improving survivability of individuals with disabilities, children, and the elderly; and

(E) the number of small businesses and nonprofit vessel operators that would be affected by requiring the carriage of such survival craft on passenger vessels to address the risks to individuals with disabilities, children, and the elderly.

(2) REVISION.—Based on the review conducted under paragraph (1), the Secretary may revise regulations concerning the carriage of survival craft pursuant to section 3104(c) of title 46, United States Code.

SEC. 303. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 55305(d) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) Each department or agency that has responsibility for a program under this section shall administer that program consistent with this section and any regulations promulgated pursuant to subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, issued by the Secretary of Transportation, and developed in consultation with each department and agency subject to this section.'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2)(A) The Secretary, after consulting with the department, agency, organization, or person involved, shall have sole responsibility for determining the applicability of this section to a program of a Federal department or agency, after consulting with the department, agency, organization, or person involved.

''(B) The head of a Federal department or agency shall request the Secretary to determine the applicability of this section to a program of such department or agency if the department or agency is uncertain of such applicability. Not later than 30 days after receiving such a request, the Secretary shall make such determination.

''(C) Subparagraph (B) shall not be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary to make a determination regarding the applicability of this section to a program administered by a Federal department or agency.

''(D) A determination made by the Secretary under this paragraph regarding a program shall remain in effect until the Secretary determines that this section no longer applies to such program.'';

(3) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) shall conduct an annual review of the administration of programs subject to the requirements of this section to determine compliance with the requirements of this section;''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) On the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary shall make available on the Internet website of the Department of Transportation a report that—

''(A) lists the programs that were subject to determinations made by the Secretary under paragraph (2) in the preceding year; and

''(B) describes the results of the most recent annual review required by paragraph (3)(A), including identification of the departments and agencies that transported cargo in violation of this section and any action the Secretary took under paragraph (3) with respect to each violation.''.

(b) DEADLINE FOR FIRST REVIEW.—The Secretary of Transportation shall complete the first review required under the amendment made by subsection (a)(1)(C) by not later than December 31, 2015.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3511(c) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (46 U.S.C. 55305 note) is repealed.

SEC. 304. MODEL YEARS FOR RECREATIONAL VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4302 of title 46, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e)(1) If in prescribing regulations under this section the Secretary establishes a model year for recreational vessels and associated equipment, such model year shall, except as provided in paragraph (2)—

''(A) begin on June 1 of a year and end on July 31 of the following year; and

''(B) be designated by the year in which it ends.

''(2) Upon the request of a recreational vessel manufacturer to which this chapter applies, the Secretary may alter a model year for a model of recreational vessel of the manufacturer and associated equipment, by no more than 6 months from the model year described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) APPLICATION.—This section shall only apply with respect to recreational vessels and associated equipment constructed or manufactured, respectively, on or after June 1, 2015.

(c) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall publish guidance to implement section 4302(d)(2) of title 46, United States Code.

SEC. 305. MERCHANT MARINER CREDENTIAL EXPIRATION HARMONIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c) and not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall establish a process to harmonize the expiration dates of merchant mariner credentials, mariner medical certificates, and radar observer endorsements for individuals applying to the Secretary for a new merchant mariner credential or for renewal of an existing merchant mariner credential.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the process established under subsection (a)—

(1) does not require an individual to renew a merchant mariner credential earlier than the date on which the individual's current credential expires; and

(2) results in harmonization of expiration dates for merchant mariner credentials, mariner medical certificates, and radar observer endorsements for all individuals by not later than 6 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The process established under subsection (a) does not apply to individuals—

(1) holding a merchant mariner credential with—

(A) an active Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping endorsement; or

(B) Federal first-class pilot endorsement; or

(2) who have been issued a time-restricted medical certificate.

SEC. 306. MARINE EVENT SAFETY ZONES.

Section 6 of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (33 U.S.C. 1225) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) MARINE EVENT SAFETY ZONES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall recover all costs the Coast Guard incurs to enforce a safety zone under this section if such safety zone is established for a marine event conducted under a permit or other authorization by the Coast Guard.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may not recover costs under paragraph (1) from a State or local government.

''(3) TREATMENT OF RECOVERED COSTS.—Costs recovered by the Secretary under this subsection shall be credited to the appropriation for operating expenses of the Coast Guard.

''(4) MARINE EVENT DEFINED.—In this section the term 'marine event' means a planned activity of limited duration that by its nature, circumstances, or location, will introduce extra or unusual hazards to the safety of life on the navigable waters of the United States.''.

SEC. 307. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) TITLE 46.—Title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 103, by striking ''(33 U.S.C. 151).'' and inserting ''(33 U.S.C. 151(b)).'';

(2) in section 2118—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''title,'' and inserting ''subtitle,''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''title'' and inserting ''subtitle'';

(3) in the analysis for chapter 35—

(A) by adding a period at the end of the item relating to section 3507; and

(B) by adding a period at the end of the item relating to section 3508;

(4) in section 3715(a)(2), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(5) in section 8103(b)(1)(A)(iii), by striking ''Academy.'' and inserting ''Academy; and''; and

(6) in section 11113(c)(1)(A)(i), by striking ''under this Act''.

(b) GENERAL BRIDGE STATUTES.—

(1) ACT OF MARCH 3, 1899.—The Act of March 3, 1899, popularly known as the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of 1899, is amended—

(A) in section 9 (33 U.S.C. 401), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''; and

(B) in section 18 (33 U.S.C. 502), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''.

(2) ACT OF MARCH 23, 1906.—The Act of March 23, 1906, popularly known as the Bridge Act of 1906, is amended—

(A) in the first section (33 U.S.C. 491), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating'';

(B) in section 4 (33 U.S.C. 494), by striking ''Secretary of Homeland Security'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''; and

(C) in section 5 (33 U.S.C. 495), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''.

(3) ACT OF AUGUST 18, 1894.—Section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved August 18, 1894 (33 U.S.C. 499) is amended by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''.

(4) ACT OF JUNE 21, 1940.—The Act of June 21, 1940, popularly known as the Truman-Hobbs Act, is amended—

(A) in the first section (33 U.S.C. 511), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating'';

(B) in section 4 (33 U.S.C. 514), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating'';

(C) in section 7 (33 U.S.C. 517), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''; and

(D) in section 13 (33 U.S.C. 523), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''.

(5) GENERAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1946.—The General Bridge Act of 1946 is amended—

(A) in section 502(b) (33 U.S.C. 525(b)), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''; and

(B) in section 510 (33 U.S.C. 533), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''.

(6) INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1972.—The International Bridge Act of 1972 is amended—

(A) in section 5 (33 U.S.C. 535c), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''; and

(B) in section 8 (33 U.S.C. 535e), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating''.

SEC. 308. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS OF MARINE CASUALTY REPORTING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the actions the Commandant will take to implement recommendations on improvements to the Coast Guard's marine casualty reporting requirements and procedures included in—

(1) the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General report entitled ''Marine Accident Reporting, Investigations, and Enforcement in the United States Coast Guard'', released on May 23, 2013; and

(2) the Towing Safety Advisory Committee report entitled ''Recommendations for Improvement of Marine Casualty Reporting'', released on March 26, 2015.

SEC. 309. RECREATIONAL VESSEL ENGINE WEIGHTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall issue regulations amending Table 4 to Subpart H of Part 183–Weights (Pounds) of Outboard Motor and Related Equipment for Various Boat Horsepower Ratings (33 C.F.R. 183) as appropriate to reflect ''Standard 30–Outboard Engine and Related Equipment Weights'' published by the American Boat and Yacht Council, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 310. MERCHANT MARINER MEDICAL CERTIFICATION REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 7509. Medical certification by trusted agents

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, a trusted agent may issue a medical certificate to an individual who—

''(1) must hold such certificate to qualify for a license, certificate of registry, or merchant mariner's document, or endorsement thereto under this part; and

''(2) is qualified as to sight, hearing, and physical condition to perform the duties of such license, certificate, document, or endorsement, as determined by the trusted agent.

''(b) TRUSTED AGENT DEFINED.—In this section the term 'trusted agent' means a medical practitioner certified by the Secretary to perform physical examinations of an individual for purposes of a license, certificate of registry, or merchant mariner's document under this part.''.

(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall issue a final rule implementing section 7509 of title 46, United States Code, as added by this section.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

''7509. Medical certification by trusted agents.''.

SEC. 311. ATLANTIC COAST PORT ACCESS ROUTE STUDY.

Not later than April 1, 2016, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall conclude the Atlantic Coast Port Access Route Study and submit the results of such study to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

SEC. 312. CERTIFICATES OF DOCUMENTATION FOR RECREATIONAL VESSELS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall issue regulations that—

(1) make certificates of documentation for recreational vessels effective for 5 years; and

(2) require the owner of such a vessel—

(A) to notify the Coast Guard of each change in the information on which the issuance of the certificate of documentation is based, that occurs before the expiration of the certificate; and

(B) apply for a new certificates of documentation for such a vessel if there is any such change.

SEC. 313. PROGRAM GUIDELINES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) develop guidelines to implement the program authorized under section 304(a) of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–241), including specific actions to ensure the future availability of able and credentialed United States licensed and unlicensed seafarers including—

(A) incentives to encourage partnership agreements with operators of foreign-flag vessels that carry liquified natural gas, that provide no less than one training billet per vessel for United States merchant mariners in order to meet minimum mandatory sea service requirements;

(B) development of appropriate training curricula for use by public and private maritime training institutions to meet all United States merchant mariner license, certification, and document laws and requirements under the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978; and

(C) steps to promote greater outreach and awareness of additional job opportunities for sea service veterans of the United States Armed Forces; and

(2) submit such guidelines to the Committee Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

SEC. 314. REPEALS.

(a) REPEALS, MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936.—Sections 601 through 606, 608 through 611, 613 through 616, 802, and 809 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 53101 note) are repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 575 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 57501, by striking ''titles V and VI'' and inserting ''title V'' ; and

(2) in section 57531(a), by striking ''titles V and VI'' and inserting ''title V''.

(c) TRANSFER FROM MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 801 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 53101 note) is—

(A) redesignated as section 57522 of title 46, United States Code, and transferred to appear after section 57521 of such title; and

(B) as so redesignated and transferred, is amended—

(i) by striking so much as precedes the first sentence and inserting the following:

''§ 57522. Books and records, balance sheets, and inspection and auditing'';

(ii) by striking ''the provision of title VI or VII of this Act'' and inserting ''this chapter'';

(iii) by striking ''That the provisions'' and all that follows through ''Commission; (2)'' ; and

(iv) by redesignating clauses (3) and (4) as clauses (2) and (3), respectively.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 575, of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 57521 the following:

''57522. Books and records, balance sheets, and inspection and auditing.''.

(d) REPEALS, TITLE 46, U.S.C..—Section 8103 of title 46, United States Code, is amended in subsections (c) and (d) by striking ''or operating'' each place it appears.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 308. Authorization of appropriations

''There is authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Maritime Commission $24,700,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017 for the activities of the Commission authorized under this chapter and subtitle IV.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 3 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''308. Authorization of appropriations.''.

SEC. 402. DUTIES OF THE CHAIRMAN.

Section 301(c)(3)(A) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (ii) by striking ''units, but only after consultation with the other Commissioners;'' and inserting ''units (with such appointments subject to the approval of the Commission);'';

(2) in clause (iv) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in clause (v) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) prepare and submit to the President and Congress requests for appropriations for the Commission (with such requests subject to the approval of the Commission).''.

SEC. 403. PROHIBITION ON AWARDS.

Section 307 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Federal Maritime Commission'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Maritime Commission''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Federal Maritime Commission may not expend any funds appropriated or otherwise made available to it to issue an award, prize, commendation, or other honor to a non-Federal entity.''.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. CONVEYANCE OF COAST GUARD PROPERTY IN MARIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard may convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the covered property, upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the covered property.

(b) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—The County of Marin, California shall have the right of first refusal with respect to purchase of the covered property under this section.

(c) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the covered property shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Commandant.

(d) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The fair market value of the covered property shall—

(1) be determined by appraisal; and

(2) be subject to the approval of the Commandant.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—The responsibility for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with a conveyance under this section shall be determined by the Commandant and the purchaser.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Commandant may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under this section as the Commandant considers appropriate and reasonable to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—Any proceeds received by the United States in a conveyance under this section shall be deposited in the Coast Guard Housing Fund established by section 687 of title 14, United States Code.

(h) COVERED PROPERTY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered property'' means the approximately 32 acres of real property (including all improvements located on the property) that are—

(1) located at Station Point Reyes in Marin County, California;

(2) under the administrative control of the Coast Guard; and

(3) described as ''Parcel A, Tract 1'', ''Parcel B, Tract 2'', ''Parcel C'', and ''Parcel D'' in the Declaration of Taking (Civil No. C–71–1245 SC) filed June 28, 1971, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

SEC. 502. ELIMINATION OF REPORTS.

(a) DISTANT WATER TUNA FLEET.—Section 421 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (46 U.S.C. 8103 note) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(b) ANNUAL UPDATES ON LIMITS TO LIABILITY.—Section 603(c)(3) of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (33 U.S.C. 2704 note) is amended by striking ''on an annual basis.'' and inserting ''not later than January 30 of the year following each year in which occurs an oil discharge from a vessel or nonvessel source that results or is likely to result in removal costs and damages (as those terms are defined in section 1001 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701)) that exceed liability limits established under section 1004 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2704).''.

(c) INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1972.—The International Bridge Act of 1972 is amended by striking section 11 (33 U.S.C. 535h).

SEC. 503. VESSEL DOCUMENTATION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and infrastructure of the House and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a description of actions that could be taken to—

(1) improve the efficiency of performance of the functions currently carried out by the National Vessel Documentation Center, including by—

(A) transferring such functions to Coast Guard headquarters; and

(B) reassigning Coast Guard personnel to better meet the Coast Guard's vessel documentation mission; and

(2) strengthen the review of compliance with United States ownership requirements for vessels documented under the laws of the United States.

SEC. 504. CONVEYANCE OF COAST GUARD PROPERTY IN TOK, ALASKA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard may convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the covered property, upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the covered property.

(b) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—The Tanana Chiefs' Conference shall have the right of first refusal with respect to purchase of the covered property under this section.

(c) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the covered property shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Commandant.

(d) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The fair market value of the covered property shall be—

(1) determined by appraisal; and

(2) subject to the approval of the Commandant.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—The responsibility for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with a conveyance under this section shall be determined by the Commandant and the purchaser.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Commandant may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under this section as the Commandant considers appropriate and reasonable to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—Any proceeds received by the United States from a conveyance under this section shall be deposited in the Coast Guard Housing Fund established under section 687 of title 14, United States Code.

(h) COVERED PROPERTY DEFINED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term ''covered property'' means the approximately 3.25 acres of real property (including all improvements located on the property) that are—

(A) located in Tok, Alaska;

(B) under the administrative control of the Coast Guard; and

(C) described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION.—The property described in this paragraph is the following:

(A) Lots 11, 12 and 13, block ''G'', Second Addition to Hartsell Subdivision, Section 20, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Copper River Meridian, Alaska as appears by Plat No. 72-39 filed in the Office of the Recorder for the Fairbanks Recording District of Alaska, bearing seal dated 25 September 1972, all containing approximately 1.25 Acres and commonly known as 2-PLEX – Jackie Circle, Units A and B.

(B) Beginning at a point being the SE corner of the SE ¼ of the SE ¼ Section 24, Township 18 North, Range 12 East, Copper River Meridian, Alaska; thence running westerly along the south line of said SE ¼ of the NE ¼ 260 feet; thence northerly parallel to the east line of said SE ¼ of the NE ¼ 335 feet; thence easterly parallel to the south line 260 feet; then south 335 feet along the east boundary of Section 24 to the point of beginning; all containing approximately 2.0 acres and commonly known as 4-PLEX – West ''C'' and Willow, Units A, B, C and D.

SEC. 505. SAFE VESSEL OPERATION IN THE GREAT LAKES.

The Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–281) is amended—

(1) in section 610, by—

(A) striking the section enumerator and heading and inserting the following:

''SEC. 610. SAFE VESSEL OPERATION IN THE GREAT LAKES.'';

(B) striking ''existing boundaries and any future expanded boundaries of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve'' and inserting ''boundaries of any national marine sanctuary that preserves shipwrecks or maritime heritage in the Great Lakes''; and

(C) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', unless the designation documents for such sanctuary do not allow taking up or discharging ballast water in such sanctuary''; and

(2) in the table of contents in section 2, by striking the item relating to such section and inserting the following:

''Sec. 610. Safe vessel operation in the Great Lakes.''.

SEC. 506. USE OF VESSEL SALE PROCEEDS.

(a) AUDIT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of funds credited in each fiscal year after fiscal year 2004 to the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund that are attributable to the sale of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that were scrapped or sold under sections 57102, 57103, and 57104 of title 46, United States Code, including—

(1) a complete accounting of all vessel sale proceeds attributable to the sale of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that were scrapped or sold under sections 57102, 57103 and 57104 of title 46, United States Code, in each fiscal year after fiscal year 2004;

(2) the annual apportionment of proceeds accounted for under paragraph (1) among the uses authorized under section 308704 of title 54, United States Code, in each fiscal year after fiscal year 2004, including—

(A) for National Maritime Heritage Grants, including a list of all annual National Maritime Heritage Grant grant and subgrant awards that identifies the respective grant and subgrant recipients and grant and subgrant amounts;

(B) for the preservation and presentation to the public of maritime heritage property of the Maritime Administration;

(C) to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and State maritime academies, including a list of annual awards; and

(D) for the acquisition, repair, reconditioning, or improvement of vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet; and

(3) an accounting of proceeds, if any, attributable to the sale of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that were scrapped or sold under sections 57102, 57103, and 57104 of title 46, United States Code, in each fiscal year after fiscal year 2004, that were expended for uses not authorized under section 308704 of title 54, United States Code.

(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit the audit conducted in subsection (a) to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

SEC. 507. FISHING VESSEL AND FISH TENDER VESSEL CERTIFICATION.

Section 4503 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following: ''Subsection (a) does not apply to a fishing vessel or fish tender vessel described in subsection (d)(6), if the vessel complies with an alternative safety compliance program established under that subsection for such a vessel.''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

''(6) The Secretary shall establish an alternative safety compliance program for fishing vessels or fish tender vessels (or both) that are at least 50 feet overall in length, and not more than 79 feet overall in length, and built after July 1, 2013.''.

SEC. 508. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES COST COMPARISON.

(a) COST COMPARISON.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall seek to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences under which the Academy, by no later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a comparison of the costs incurred by the Federal Government for each of the following alternatives:

(1) Transferring the *Polar Sea* to a non-governmental entity at no cost, and leasing back the vessel beginning on the date on which the Coast Guard certifies that the vessel is capable of the breaking out and missions described in subsection (c)(1).

(2) The reactivation and operation by the Coast Guard of the *Polar Sea* to an operational level at which the vessel is capable of such breaking out and missions.

(3) Acquiring and operating a new icebreaker through the Coast Guard's acquisition process that is capable of such breaking out and missions.

(4) Construction by a non-Federal entity of an icebreaker capable of such breaking out and missions, that will be leased by the Federal Government and operated using a Coast Guard crew.

(5) Construction by a non-Federal entity of an icebreaker capable of such breaking out and missions, that will be leased by the Federal Government and operated by a crew of non-Federal employees.

(6) The acquisition of services from a non-Federal entity to perform such breaking out and missions.

(b) INCLUDED COSTS.—For purposes of subsection (a), the cost of each alternative includes costs incurred by the Federal Government for—

(1) the lease or operation and maintenance of the vessel concerned;

(2) disposal of such vessel at the end of the useful life of the vessel;

(3) retirement and other benefits for Federal employees who operate such vessel; and

(4) interest payments assumed to be incurred for Federal capital expenditures.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—For purposes of comparing the costs of such alternatives, the Academy shall assume that—

(1) each vessel under consideration is—

(A) capable of breaking out of McMurdo Station, and conducting Coast Guard missions in the United States territory in the Arctic (as that term is defined in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111)); and

(B) operated for a period of 20 years;

(2) the acquisition of services and the operation of each vessel begin on the same date; and

(3) the periods for conducting Coast Guard missions in the Arctic are of equal lengths.

SEC. 509. PENALTY WAGES.

(a) FOREIGN AND INTERCOASTAL VOYAGES.—Section 10313(g) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''all claims in a class action suit by seamen'' and inserting ''each claim by a seaman''; and

(B) by striking ''the seamen'' and inserting ''the seaman''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''class action''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking '', by a seaman who is a claimant in the suit,'' and inserting ''by the seaman''.

(b) COASTWISE VOYAGES.—Section 10504(c) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''all claims in a class action suit by seamen'' and inserting ''each claim by a seaman''; and

(B) by striking ''the seamen'' and inserting ''the seaman''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''class action''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking '', by a seaman who is a claimant in the suit,'' and inserting ''by the seaman''.

SEC. 510. RECOURSE FOR NONCITIZENS.

Section 30104 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before the first sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) RESTRICTION ON RECOVERY FOR NONRESIDENT ALIENS EMPLOYED ON FOREIGN PASSENGER VESSELS.—A claim for damages or expenses relating to personal injury, illness, or death of a seaman who is a citizen of a foreign nation, arising during or from the engagement of the seaman by or for a passenger vessel duly registered under the laws of a foreign nation, may not be brought under the laws of the United States if—

''(1) such seaman was not a permanent resident alien of the United States at the time the claim arose;

''(2) the injury, illness, or death arose outside the territorial waters of the United States; and

''(3) the seaman or the seaman's personal representative has or had a right to seek compensation for the injury, illness, or death in, or under the laws of—

''(A) the nation in which the vessel was registered at the time the claim arose; or

''(B) the nation in which the seaman maintained citizenship or residency at the time the claim arose.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1987, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015, reauthorizes funding for the United States Coast Guard through fiscal year 2017 at levels that are fiscally responsible and that will reverse the misguided cuts proposed by the administration.

The President's budget would slash the service's acquisition budget by over 17 percent. This will only worsen the Coast Guard's growing gaps in mission performance, increase acquisition delays, drive up the costs of new assets, and deny our servicemembers the critical resources they need to perform their duties.

Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard has become somewhat of the Swiss Army knife of the seas. They are responsible

for law enforcement, dealing with fisheries, alien interdiction, drug interdiction, maritime law, and national security. Mission after mission has been heaped upon the Coast Guard without the corresponding resources for those servicemembers to do their job. H.R. 1987 provides sufficient funding to ensure these cuts do not happen and the service has what it needs to successfully conduct its missions.

The bill also makes several reforms to Coast Guard authorities, as well as laws governing shipping and navigation. Specifically, H.R. 1987 supports Coast Guard servicemembers by authorizing sufficient funds to allow for pay raises consistent with the NDAA and by ensuring they receive access to some of the same benefits as their counterparts in the Department of Defense.

It improves Coast Guard mission effectiveness by aligning the leadership structure of the service to that of other armed services and by replacing and modernizing Coast Guard assets in a cost-effective manner.

The bill enhances oversight of the Coast Guard, reduces inefficient operations, and saves taxpayers' dollars by making commonsense reforms to the service's administration and its acquisition process. It supports the U.S.-flagged and crewed vessels by strengthening the enforcement of cargo preference laws. It encourages job growth in the maritime sector by cutting regulatory burdens on job creators. It reauthorizes and reforms the administrative procedures of the Federal Maritime Commission to improve accountability.

Finally, it includes language to require an independent assessment of leases versus constructing a new polar icebreaker. Mr. Speaker, right now, other nations operating in the Arctic far exceed the capabilities of the United States. This is an area where we must focus and ensure that the United States' capabilities are capable of protecting our interests in that region. I believe it could potentially deliver this critically needed asset—polar icebreaking capabilities—much sooner and save a tremendous amount of taxpayer funds if we pursue a public-private partnership to acquire a polar icebreaker.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1987 is a bipartisan effort that was put together in close consultation with the minority. I want to commend Ranking Members DEFAZIO and GARAMENDI for their efforts, as well as Chairman SHUSTER and Subcommittee Chairman HUNTER for their leadership.

I also want to thank the men and women of the Coast Guard for the tremendous job they do for our Nation. Coast Guard servicemembers risk their lives on a daily basis to save those in peril, ensure the safety and security of our ports and waterways, and protect our environment; and they do all this on aging and obsolete cutters and aircraft, some of which were first commissioned in World War II.

Passing H.R. 1987 will help rebuild and strengthen the Coast Guard. It will also demonstrate the strong support Congress has for the men and women of the Coast Guard and the deep appreciation we have for the sacrifices they make for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 1987, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Subcommittee Ranking Member GARAMENDI and Chairman HUNTER for their work on this legislation. I fully support this very important piece of legislation.

H.R. 1987 authorizes robust funding for the United States Coast Guard's operations, and particularly for its acquisition program. The Coast Guard has been cut to the bone, and everybody knows that. If we fail to ensure adequate funding for the construction of critically needed new cutters, then the Coast Guard of the future will be less capable than the Coast Guard of the past has been, something that should be unacceptable to our Nation.

I strongly support section 303 of this measure, which strengthens the enforcement of existing statutes that require government-impelled cargoes to be carried on U.S.-flagged vessels. Today, according to the Maritime Administration, there are just 83—just 83—ships flying the U.S. flag in the foreign trade. We have lost more than 20 ships from the U.S.-flagged foreign trade fleet just since the end of 2012.

Our merchant marine not only carries commercial cargo, it provides vital sealift capacity to the United States military. And yet, particularly during periods of demobilization, we have repeatedly allowed our blue-water fleet to decay until unforeseen crises have created an urgent new need for sealift capacity. Such a post-mobilization decline is happening again, but now our fleet is falling to such low levels that we risk reaching a tipping point from which we may never recover. We cannot afford to let that happen, and I remind my colleagues this is our watch.

Mr. Speaker, effective enforcement of our existing cargo preference requirements is essential to the success of our U.S.-flagged fleet, and it is just like any other Buy America policy that ensures the expenditure of U.S. taxpayer dollars supports the interests of United States taxpayers.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee for working with me to look closely at this critical issue. I also commend Chairman HUNTER for offering an amendment to the NDAA that would provide a 1-year increase in the MSP annual operating stipend. I want to thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, I note that section 302 of this bill is of deep concern to me. Section 302 would gut much of what was enacted in section 609 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010. Section 609 was enacted to ensure that all survival craft approved by the United States Coast Guard provide the basic protection of keeping individuals out of the water if they are forced to abandon a vessel. Of particular concern is ensuring that the elderly, children, and those with disabilities have access to a survival craft that can actually ensure their survival. The National Transportation Safety Board has been clear for the last 40 years that out-of-water survival craft save lives.

Rather than rolling back the requirements contained in the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010, we should be focused on ensuring full implementation of these requirements. As such, I hope that before this authorization is finalized, section 302 is removed from it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I again thank my colleagues for their hard work on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

Congratulations here to Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for getting this important bill to the floor today. We are certainly proud to support our men and women serving in the United States Coast Guard. They play such a critical role there through rescue and saving lives and the role that they play also in drug interdiction and in protecting our territorial waters.

I would also like to recognize the cooperative way in which Chairman Hunter has worked to address concerns about how this bill would impact an important lifesaving program under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and that is the Food for Peace program. Over the past several years, the effort to reform the Food for Peace program so that we can feed more people in crisis overseas in less time for less money has been portrayed as a zero-sum game between the intended beneficiaries of our generosity and the U.S. merchant marine. That is unfortunate because that is wrong.

What is clear, though, is that we need to fix this problem in the sense that, after Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines in 2013, U.S. purchase and shipping requirements delayed deliveries of U.S. food for 3 weeks. Now, fortunately, with the Food for Peace program, those needs were met.

But now in Nepal, it would take 45 days to get U.S. food in country even

though food has been pre-positioned in nearby Sri Lanka. So that is why this element of the Food for Peace program is so important. If we had to wait 45 days to respond to every humanitarian disaster, some people would perish. Certainly many would be on the verge of starvation over that 45-day period.

I am, therefore, pleased to see that this year the Coast Guard authorization bill does not raise cargo preference requirements from 50 percent to 75, and further, the bill's cargo preference enforcement provisions maintain important consultation and public comment requirements. At the same time, the recently passed national defense authorization bill will accelerate support for the existing Maritime Security Program.

□ 1800

I appreciate Chairman HUNTER's work to ensure that U.S. maritime security needs are fulfilled through a national defense mechanism rather than relying upon food aid cargos.

Mr. Speaker, preserving U.S. maritime security is essential, but it need not come at the expense of food aid. I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman HUNTER and Ranking Member GARAMENDI on creative solutions that enable us to preserve U.S. maritime security while making Food for Peace more effective, more efficient, and most importantly, getting it there on time for those that are in need after a disaster.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We, obviously, covered all the key points of this legislation, the important side.

I would like to briefly highlight the fact that the U.S. Coast Guard's mission has fundamentally changed over the last several years in regard to the mission upon mission heaped upon this agency and the greater role they are now playing in regard to national security, cooperating with our other defense and Armed Forces.

I want to make note that this legislation ensures that the Coast Guard is on a path to playing that role and being able to perform their responsibilities and their duties proficiently.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I first want to echo Chairman HUNTER in stating my strong support for H.R. 1987, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015, legislation that will tend to the needs of our Nation's fifth military service, the United States Coast Guard.

I also want to express my sincere appreciation to Chairman HUNTER for his genuine bipartisan collaboration throughout the development of this important legislation. Not only will this bill improve our oversight of the Coast Guard, it also will enhance the capabilities and performance of this indispensable, multi-mission maritime agency.

I also want to thank the Chairman of the Transportation Committee, BILL SHUSTER, and the Ranking Democrat Member, PETER DEFAZIO, and acknowledge them for their thoughtful contributions.

I am particularly pleased that this legislation will provide stability in budget authority for the Coast Guard. Erratic budgets and perpetual continuing resolutions have had a deleterious impact on the Coast Guard. Perhaps most notable, unpredictable and insufficient funding has hampered the Coast Guard's ability to keep pace with its long-term program to recapitalize its offshore fleets of surface and air assets.

Some of the Coast Guard's legacy cutters are fifty years old. These vessels are well beyond their estimated service life and have become increasingly unreliable and much more expensive to maintain and repair. We can, and we should, do better by our Coast Guard.

The authorized funding levels for the Acquisitions, Construction and Improvement Account in this legislation will allow the Coast Guard to keep this recapitalization initiative on track. I am optimistic that these authorizations will send a strong signal to our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

I also support provisions in the bill that will require the Coast Guard to initiate long-term capital planning, to require better assessments of mission performance metrics and personnel needs, and to assess and test new communication and vessel management technologies.

The bill also contains provisions important to our merchant marine. Provisions that would harmonize the renewal of different mariner credentials and allow mariners greater flexibility in acquiring their medical certifications should improve convenience without sacrificing compliance with fitness and training standards.

The bill also further advances my strong interest in using the imminent U.S. LNG export trade as a new economic opportunity for our shipyards and the U.S. flag in our foreign trade.

This legislation would direct the Secretary of Transportation to develop guidelines to promote the use of U.S. flag vessels and U.S. seafarers in the transport of LNG. I urge members to support this provision that will create maritime jobs here at home.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not perfect, but rarely is that the case. This legislation is, however, a balanced, responsible and forward thinking product that will support our Coast Guard and address important issues raised by maritime stakeholders.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor, and I urge members on both sides to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1987, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 91, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1313, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1382, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

VETERAN'S I.D. CARD ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 91) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

YEAS—402

Abraham	Bilirakis	Brownley (CA)
Adams	Bishop (GA)	Buchanan
Aderholt	Bishop (MI)	Buck
Aguilar	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Allen	Black	Burgess
Amash	Blackburn	Bustos
Amodei	Blum	Butterfield
Ashford	Blumenauer	Byrne
Babin	Bonamici	Calvert
Barr	Bost	Capuano
Barton	Boustany	Carney
Bass	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Beatty	Brady (TX)	Carter (GA)
Becerra	Brat	Carter (TX)
Benishek	Bridenstine	Cartwright
Bera	Brooks (AL)	Castor (FL)
Beyer	Brooks (IN)	Castro (TX)

Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—30

Barletta
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Capps
Cárdenas
Clay
Cohen
Culberson
Davis, Danny
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Farenthold
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Hunter
Jordan
Lamborn
Lee
Moore
Pallone
Pascrell
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Sires
Tiberi
Tsongas
Yoho

□ 1857

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 240 I missed the vote because of flight delay and bad weather. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

SERVICE DISABLED VETERAN OWNED SMALL BUSINESS RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1313) to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 241]

YEAS—403

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci

Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—29

Barletta
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Capps
Cárdenas
Culberson
Davis, Danny
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Farenthold
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Hunter
Jordan
Lamborn
Lee
Moore
Pallone
Pascrell
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Sires
Tiberi
Tsongas
Wilson (SC)
Zinke

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOOSTING RATES OF AMERICAN VETERAN EMPLOYMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1382) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

YEAS—404

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—28

Barletta
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Capps
Cárdenas
Culberson
Davis, Danny
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Farenthold
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Hunter
Jordan
Lamborn
Lee
Moore
Pallone
Pascrell
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Sires
Tiberi
Tsongas
Zinke

□ 1914

Mr. AMASH changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, this evening, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast votes on three bills: H.R. 91, the Veteran's I.D. Card Act, as amended; H.R. 1313, the Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act; and H.R. 1382, the Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act, as amended.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on each of the three bills.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I missed the following votes: H.R. 91, the Veteran's I.D. Card Act. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on this bill. H.R. 1313, the Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on this bill.

H.R. 1382, the Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 240, 241, and 242. I was unavoidably detained due to a flight delay. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye," "aye," and "aye."

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 3

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 7, 2015, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to be held on June 7, 2015, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

This annual celebration honors King Kamehameha I who established a unified Kingdom of Hawai'i in 1810. King Kamehameha Day was celebrated first on June 11, 1872, and has been a Hawai'i State holiday since 1959. In 1970, the celebration of King Kamehameha's birthday in our nation's capital opened the rich history and culture of Hawai'i to more Americans.

In 1758, with the birth of Kamehameha, a prophecy foretelling that a great leader would be born and unite the islands of Hawai'i was fulfilled. Born into royal families from the islands of Hawai'i and Maui, Kamehameha's mentoring started at a young age. He learned religion, oral history, culture, economics, governance, navigation, warfare, and other fields of knowledge necessary to build a nation.

Kamehameha rose to power through political astuteness and superior forces. He was a visionary leader with a strategic mind, dominating presence, and persuasive personality. Kamehameha developed relationships with other royal families, built coalitions and sought the counsel of those steeped in modern warfare. By 1790, Kamehameha's modernized armed forces equipped with cannons and firearms and use of psychological warfare to undermine the spirits of opposing forces led to one successful military campaign after another.

While uniting the islands of Hawai'i, Kamehameha contemplated on the future of the Kingdom of Hawai'i and reasoned that for a nation to be vibrant, its citizens must feel safe and secure. Kamehameha reflected on a military encounter with fishermen gathering food from the ocean for their families. As Kamehameha gave chase to the fishermen, his leg got caught among the shoreline rocks. One of the fishermen hit him on the head with a paddle that broke into splinters. The fisherman spared Kamehameha's life.

Later, the fisherman was brought before Kamehameha. In his wisdom, Kamehameha ruled that the fisherman was innocent. The fisherman was protecting his family and land from an aggressor who could have done them harm. From that experience, Kamehameha embraced the inalienable rights of all men and women by proclaiming the Law of the Splintered Paddle (Kānāwai Māmala Hoe), the law of the land. The law stated, "Let every elderly person, woman, and child lie by the roadside in safety." The Law of the Splintered Paddle sets the moral tone to do no harm to fellow human beings, take personal responsibility and think before committing an act of violence. It is fitting that the words of the Law of the Splintered Paddle are enshrined in the Hawai'i State Constitution. Its values have become a model for human rights law regarding the treatment of civilians and other non-combatants.

Kamehameha knew that in order to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of his people, it was imperative to create economic opportunities. Kamehameha invested resources to maintain viable fishponds and taro patches; protect fresh water streams, fertile soils, and forest lands; build schools and train a new generation of leaders. Kamehameha also bore witness to rapid unfolding events occurring since the arrival of Captain James Cook in 1778. Kamehameha knew that it was the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the Native Hawai'ian people, and he made wise decisions to prepare his people for the future.

In closing, I would like to extend my appreciation to the staff of the Committee on House Administration, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Office of Sergeant at Arms who have helped make this annual birthday celebration for King Kamehameha I a success.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on Senate Concurrent Resolution 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN STROKE MONTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remind us that May is American Stroke Month.

According to the American Heart Association, stroke is the leading cause of disability in the United States. In fact, one out of every six people will suffer from a stroke in his or her lifetime, yet strokes are largely preventable and treatable.

Small changes in diet and exercise can have an enormously positive impact on your heart health and help prevent a stroke. America's amazing medical researchers and practitioners are also doing their part by pioneering new treatments that save lives every day.

Finally, let's remember these four letters, F-A-S-T: face drooping, arm weakness, speech difficulty, and it is time to call 911. If you or your loved one experience any of these symptoms, call 911.

MARKING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, 50 years ago today, President Lyndon B. Johnson announced from the White House Rose Garden that enrollment would begin for an early childhood education program called Project Head Start.

For the last half century, Head Start has been more than just an education program. It not only includes quality preschool but also critical support services, including family engagement, health services, and good nutrition. Studies have found that children in Head Start do better academically, have better behavior, and better health status than their peers. The program also saves more money than it costs by reducing teen pregnancy, high school dropouts, and the likelihood of incarceration.

Madam Speaker, we know that Head Start works. As we mark the occasion of 50 years of one of the most successful early intervention programs, let us recommit ourselves to the ideal that all of our children have access to quality preschool education, like Head Start.

PENNSYLVANIA AMERICAN LEGION'S EAGLE SCOUT OF THE YEAR

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 17-year-old Devin Anderson of Weedville, Pennsylvania, for being named the Pennsylvania American Legion's Eagle Scout of the Year. Devin, who is a member of Kersey Troop 94, first joined the Boy Scouts after learning about them during an assembly in the first grade. Since then, Devin has dedicated himself to church, school, scouting, and community and personifies all that an Eagle Scout should be.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending Devin's Eagle Scout ceremony back in November of 2012, and I knew right away, then and there, that this young man had a bright future ahead. Devin now advances to the national level, where he will compete among 56 applicants to earn the coveted National Eagle Scout of the Year award.

Like Devin's parents, Joe and Karen Anderson, I am so proud of all of Devin's accomplishments, and I wish him all the best as he competes for this national award.

125TH ANNIVERSARY, UA LOCAL 50 OF NORTHERN OHIO

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, Members of Congress attend many events. And over the weekend, I was very privileged to be a part of the 125th anniversary celebration of United Allied Trades, Local 50 Plumbers, Pipefitters, and Allied Trades in northern Ohio—125 years of building America forward.

Over 1,500 people came into this mammoth hall, and we remembered those who had come before us and had been a part of building, of plumbing, of pipefitting, of building America forward—in our refineries, in our nuclear power plants, in the natural gas lines that are laid. The power of America was before us in the hands and minds of those who have the skills to build for us.

The training academy they have built at local 50 is probably the finest in the country, at least one of the finest. And I am just so proud of the younger men and women who are coming up in the trades. They have a decent wage. They can earn enough to join the middle class. They have retirement plans. They have health plans, including the one they built from scratch, serving thousands and thousands and thousands of people.

Congratulations at 125 years to United Allied Trades Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 50 in Ohio. God bless you. You have blessed America.

RECOGNIZING RABBI HAROLD KRAVITZ

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Minnesota Rabbi Harold Kravitz for his national leadership as chair of the board for MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger.

As Rabbi Kravitz's term as chair comes to an end, I want to thank him for the work he has done both in Minnesota and across the country in the fight against poverty and for his work on child advocacy.

He has received numerous awards for his efforts and for his leadership, including being named one of America's Most Inspiring Rabbis by Jewish Daily Forward. However, it is more than awards, Madam Speaker, because anyone who has met Rabbi Kravitz will tell you, it is a passion that he has for the causes that he advocates for that brings his success.

I wish Rabbi Kravitz success in moving forward and the best as he moves on to new endeavors, which I am sure will include many continued projects to make the world a better and safer and just place. His service and commitment to helping our community and the causes that he champions have made a significant difference, and we thank him for his tireless efforts.

HOUSTON ROCKETS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, what about those Houston Rockets.

In the 18th Congressional District, in the Toyota Center last night, we reclaimed the name Clutch City. Let me thank the young men of the Houston Rockets, the Rockets organization. For the first time in 18 years, the Rockets are in the Western Championship.

Oh, I know that it is not the championship of the National Basketball Association, but it is really good for Houstonians.

We had a rockin' good time. For those who were able just to be on the streets, those who were inside the arena, those who were at various sites around the city, I watched my constituents have just a great amount of joy.

It is my privilege to thank the owners, the coach, and, yes, all of the team. We know there are great stars on the team. We know that they work as a team, and that is what makes the Houston Rockets great.

I am here today saying, what about those Rockets, with a red coat on to salute the Houston Rockets and push them on tomorrow night to be champions again. I thank them for being the right kind of role models for our young people and letting them know that academics and sports go together. The National Basketball Association realizes the importance of young people having role models but young people staying in school, and they are staying focused on that.

So I am rooting for the Houston Rockets. What about those Houston Rockets. Clutch City.

HONORING TRIPLE ACE COLONEL ''BUD'' ANDERSON

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I am equally excited about the Golden State Warriors starting this week, but that is not why I am here tonight.

Over the weekend, I had the opportunity to participate in a really great ceremony for a gentleman who is a World War II triple ace in Auburn, California, Colonel Bud Anderson. He dedicated so much to his community not just during the war but in all his efforts afterwards and leadership.

Colonel Anderson, as a triple ace, helped as a cornerstone to keep the war effort against Germany by escorting fighters and bombers in for the important bombing run to help turn the tide in World War II against the German effort to make war. So being able to honor him with so many of his friends and others showing up with P–51D Mustangs was a great, great tribute to him over the weekend. And this week as well he will be honored with the Congressional Gold Medal ceremony that will be taking place this Wednesday at 3 p.m. eastern time. I hope everybody will take that in.

THE URGENCY OF NOW: ADDRESSING REFORM, ACCOUNTABILITY, EQUALITY, AND DIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I am glad to be joined by my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois, Ms. ROBIN KELLY. Thank you, Congresswoman KELLY, for joining me in coanchoring this Special Order hour tonight. Thank you also to the members of the Congressional Black Caucus and to all those watching from home.

Madam Speaker, last month, Freddie Gray, a 25-year-old man Baltimore man, died in police custody from a spinal cord injury. His death, ruled a homicide, has drawn ongoing national

attention to the increasingly frayed relations between police and communities throughout the United States.

Tonight we come together as a caucus to address the urgent need to reform our criminal justice system and promote police accountability and also to talk about many different issues of diversity in our Nation.

Our Nation is at a crossroads. Failure to make meaningful reforms to our criminal justice system risks damaging relations between communities and police beyond repair. But real commonsense reforms that enhance transparency, advance public safety, eradicate discrimination, and instill trust can create a system that works for all Americans.

Currently, our law enforcement system and criminal justice system aren't working for African Americans and other minorities. As a result, a meaningful dialogue between law enforcement and the communities they are charged with protecting remains illusive.

Tonight we will speak to the urgent need to reform our criminal justice and police systems so that we can breathe new life into the American promise of full equality and justice for all.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank my friend from New Jersey for leading tonight's Special Order hour.

Madam Speaker, once again, the Congressional Black Caucus has the opportunity to discuss some of the many important issues and challenges facing our Nation right now. I strongly believe that our conversation here tonight is a critical discussion for the record as we continue the work of making our communities and country better. The urgency of now, addressing reform, accountability, equality, and diversity, that is quite a title, but what does it all mean in the context of our full discussion?

□ 1930

America is celebrated for being a melting pot, but I like to say a tossed salad or a stew, because in a stew or salad you don't lose your identity, but you learn to live together in the same gravy or the same salad dressing. This Congress is, without a doubt, a true testament to the diverse people, personalities, and communities that make this great Nation so great.

But in these dynamic times, how can we ensure that our laws and policies are fully embracing our melting pot or our stew of a nation? How can we ensure that we make this great Union even more perfect? It starts with holding ourselves accountable in just a myriad of respects on the economic front, with respect to our justice system, in appreciating our diversity and inclusion for all Americans. I look forward to a fruitful conversation on this and thank my coanchor, Representative PAYNE.

I did want to acknowledge the Diversity Dinner that we had last week. These days we hear so much about the toxic partisan atmosphere in Congress, titles like ''How Congress Became So Partisan'' in The Washington Post to Nick Gass at Politico's piece, ''This Graphic Shows How America's Partisan Divide Grew.'' The reports of Congress' hyperpartisanship are abundant. The reports point to the loss of camaraderie and friendship amongst colleagues across the aisle. This perception undoubtedly contributes to our dismal 15 percent approval rating.

Since my time as a State legislator in the Illinois statehouse, I have been hosting Diversity Dinners to grow friendships and nurture collegial working relations among legislators who may not otherwise interact. Tonight as we discuss equality and diversity, I want to reflect on what I see as encouraging in bridging differences and understanding in different communities.

Last week I hosted, along with other Members, my second annual congressional Diversity Dinner. Forty Members of Congress from both parties, including Members from both Republican and Democratic leadership, showed up and enjoyed a meal with their colleagues. During the dinner, we weren't Democrats or Republicans; we were colleagues with some great stories to share. At this year's dinner, I saw a microcosm of our Nation, a crowd made up of Members from coast to coast with truly diverse backgrounds coming together to enjoy each other's company.

If we can put aside our partisan blinders to break bread together, I am confident we can find ways to work together. That is what America wants and needs, and that type of leadership is the kind of leadership we deserve.

Today we have an opportunity to celebrate diversity and show that bipartisanship can thrive in Congress. In recent months we have seen the trust between political parties, law enforcement, and communities across the Nation spike. Now is the time for us to come together to address the reforms needed to rebuild this trust. Let's show the American people that we are a diverse body that won't let party lines divide us or define us.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to thank the gentlewoman for her thoughtful comments.

Madam Speaker, it is true, we have come to a point in this Nation where one side has gone to one corner and the other side has gone to another corner not to meet in the middle to solve issues and problems. There was a time when this great body would compromise. You didn't get everything you wanted, and I didn't get everything I wanted. So that means we compromised and came to a decision.

The gentlewoman also makes a good point about working with Members on the other side of the aisle. The gentlewoman from Arizona, the Speaker pro tempore this evening, has become a great collaborator with myself on the Homeland Security Subcommittee which she chairs, and we have worked extensively together on legislation that we both support. We need more of that. We need more of that to happen. We need to take the time to hear each other, to listen, and to see where we don't agree on everything but there are common threads that we can build and bind together.

So with that, I am proud to see her sitting in that chair. I get to sit next to her in committee, so it puts me closer to the Speaker's chair, and I feel privileged for that.

Right now, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas, the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE. She is one of the most thoughtful Members of the United States House of Representatives. She hails from Houston, Texas, and she always has great words of wisdom, thoughts, and ideas on the issues that we face in this great Nation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I think by the spirit and the tone of this Special Order we can see that there is hope and a pathway for collaboration.

Let me thank Mr. PAYNE, who has evidenced those collaborative efforts through his leadership on homeland security and successful leadership, passing any number of legislative initiatives in a bipartisan manner. I also am delighted to join Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY. And she is right. She had a very successful Diversity Dinner last week, and I am sure it outdid the one the year before, and there was a lot of cross-pollination, good feelings, and discussions about very important issues.

We found that America is a diverse nation, and we are happy when we have the ability to understand each other's cultures or understand the background that each of us have come from. Our own neighborhoods make us different, our own faith modes are different, our family members' mode is different, where we went to school. Yet in this place, the American people ask us, as both Mr. PAYNE and Ms. KELLY are saying today, to walk a pathway of bipartisanship, but really towards success. So allow me just briefly to comment on one or two points regarding diversity.

I would highlight that one of the areas is where I formerly served as a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. In years past, we have gathered around science, technology, engineering, and math, and we have gathered around transportation infrastructure. I hope in our words tonight that we will find a way to forge a way forward for transportation infrastructure, because every one of us

needs not only good roads, highways, and dams, but we need good public transportation, as evidenced by the heinous and unacceptable tragedy last week with Amtrak.

I might add that I am a space chauvinist, a NASA supporter. Many centers are around the Nation. It is a job creator, as is infrastructure, and I would hope that we would write a bill and have Republicans and Democrats support the value of human space exploration. What a pathway for bipartisanship. We haven't gone that way, Madam Speaker, but I am hoping that the words we offer tonight will see us do that.

Let me focus on my last point and indicate that we have a moment, a significant moment in history. This is a great cause, and that cause is to find a pathway for criminal justice reform. Yesterday marked the 61st anniversary of the landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Education, a decision that overruled the separate but equal doctrine of Plessy v. Ferguson and gave needed momentum for the fight for reform, equality, and diversity in our Nation's schools and, I would say, society at large.

Many communities are waiting for that kind of evenhandedness in justice in the criminal justice system. This does not mean that we throw targets at our friends in law enforcement. It means that we find ways for there to be an acceptance that we all can stand improvement, correction, enhancement, educational opportunities, tactics, and training. There is no shame to any of that.

As I stood with our officers and families who were on the grounds of the Capitol on May 15, as I joined them for the police memorial for those who had fallen in duty, there were faces from all backgrounds, and we were singularly noting the tragedy of lost officers. At the same time as we mourn those officers, we know that there are officers who will look to work with us as we move this criminal justice system along.

I would just like to acknowledge that as we do so, we can find bipartisanship, because the cost of incarceration, for example, is almost prohibitive. Madam Speaker, $75 billion is spent on local, State, and Federal incarceration. We have the largest percentage, 2 million people, incarcerated across America.

We can do better, and part of that is expanding community-oriented policing, building trust, a bill that I introduced, H.R. 59, that would create a pathway for ensuring that communities feel that they are being protected but not feel differently that they are being, if you will, put in a certain category to be utilized as a basis for revenue raising in our communities.

Then we heard FBI Director Comey, and I agree with him. The science of doing a better job is data and statistics. So I introduced the CADET bill, Collection and Analysis of Data to Educate and Train Law Enforcement Officers. What it simply means is give them the numbers, the statistics, to know how they can do a better job at planning, going forward, how they police. Let there be information for us to be able to design the right kind of policing tactics that work for law enforcement and for the community. It is right out of the FBI Director's playbook. He said that we are operating without data, without statistics, and, frankly, that is not what we should be doing.

Tomorrow we will be holding a hearing on the issue of police accountability and gaining the facts in the Judiciary Committee, but there is much more for us to do. For example, what are the educational requirements? What are the various resources used for mental health? And psychological needs and training and nonviolent conflict resolution received by police forces, police officers, the feasibility and emphasis of making greater use of the technological devices, such as body cameras. But I want more technology, laptops. Many law enforcement have laptops. We might need to move to iPads to be able to give them quicker response times and quicker support systems, to be able to ensure that we have the right tools to work together.

And yes, you cannot breathe life into the reform of a criminal justice system if you do not have a component dealing with our youth, so I have introduced, of course, the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization bill and the antibullying Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act to be able to address a sort of a cause and a release for our young people. Madam Speaker, I would offer to say that there is much work that we can do. We will be looking at the legislation that many people have passed.

I want to conclude on this note, to simply acknowledge the ranking member, JOHN CONYERS, on the Judiciary Committee that wants to join together with me to embrace the legislative initiatives of our Members to get the right kind of omnibus bill going forward for the American public to see criminal justice reform. I want to thank my colleagues for allowing me these comments and, as well, the bipartisan approach that you have taken.

Madam Speaker, yesterday marked the 61st anniversary of the landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Education, the decision that overruled the "separate but equal doctrine" of Plessey v. Ferguson and gave needed momentum to the fight for reform, equality, and diversity in our nation's schools and society at large.

Although much progress has been made in narrowing the gap between the nation's founding ideals and the objective reality, recent events demonstrate that we still have a ways to go before the dream of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is realized in the areas of criminal justice reform, economic opportunity, and workplace diversity.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Madam Speaker, the problems revealed by several of the more notorious incidents involving the use of lethal force against unarmed citizens that have captured the attention of the nation over the past several months require a national response because the problems identified are not isolated or limited to one region of the country.

For example, the death of 43 year-old Eric Garner resulting from the application of a NYPD police chokehold occurred in the Northeast and the death of 18 year-old Michael Brown and the resulting events in Ferguson occurred in the border state of Missouri.

The killing of 12 year-old Tamir Rice by a Cleveland police officer occurred in the Midwest and death of unarmed 26 year-old Jordan Baker by an off-duty Houston police officer occurred in Texas.

In Phoenix, Arizona, Rumain Brisbon, an unarmed black father of four, was shot to death when a police officer allegedly mistook his bottle of pills for a gun.

In Pasadena, California 19 year-old Kendrec McDade was chased and shot seven times by two police officers after a 911 caller falsely reported he had been robbed at gunpoint by two black men, neither of whom in fact was armed.

And, of course, on April 4, the conscience of the nation was shocked by the horrifying killing of 50 year-old Walter Scott by a North Charleston police officer in the southern state of South Carolina.

Madam Speaker, while the problem is national in scope, it appears to affect disproportionately and adversely a particular demographic group: African American males.

Because all lives matter in our great nation, it is imperative that we in Congress act swiftly and decisively to focus much needed attention and resources on legislative proposals intended to address the problem of misuse of lethal force by law enforcement and to rebuild the public trust and confidence needed to ensure that law enforcement receive and maintain the support of the communities they serve and protect.

As Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I note that there are several promising legislative criminal justice reform initiatives that have been introduced and are worthy of consideration.

Among them are H.R. 59, the "Build TRUST in Municipal Law Enforcement Act of 2015" (Rept. JACKSON LEE); H.R. 1459, the Democracy Restoration Act of 2015 (Rep. CONYERS); H.R. 1810, the "Collection and Analysis of Data to Educate and Train Law Enforcement Officers" ("CADET Act"); H.R. 920, the "Smarter Sentencing Act of 2015" (Rept. LABRADOR); and S. 675, the "Record Expungement Designed to Enhance Employment Act of 2015" (REDEEM Act) (Sens. PAUL and BOOKER).

Madam Speaker, earlier this year FBI Director James Comey delivered a remarkable speech at Georgetown University in which he

laid out several hard truths about the administration of the criminal justice system and state of community policing in our country.

One of the hardest truths discussed by Director Comey is the fact we have limited information and inadequate data regarding the scope and extent of the problems endemic in the criminal justice system.

This lack of information hampers the ability of policymakers and administrators at the federal, state, and local level to identify and implement laws, policies, and practices to remedy identified problems.

The Judiciary Committee should immediately conduct hearings to educate the Congress and the public on the nature and extent of deficiencies in the nation's criminal justice systems and the efficacy of proposed solutions.

Specifically, hearings should be held to investigate practices and policies governing: 1. the use of lethal force by state and local police departments; 2. educational requirements, mental health and psychological evaluations, and training in non-violent conflict resolution received by veteran law enforcement officers and new recruits; and 3. the feasibility and efficacy of making greater use of technological devices such as body cameras.

A fourth area to be explored is the state of the social science research in the academic study of criminal justice reform because there is much the Committee can learn by engaging leading experts in the field regarding the state of knowledge in their respective disciplines.

Madam Speaker, reforming the criminal justice system so that it dispenses justice impartially and equally to all persons is one of the most important challenges facing this Congress.

And it is a goal that can be achieved if we work together in a spirit of goodwill and bipartisan cooperation.

There are few things we can do that will provide a greater service to our nation.

JOBS AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Madam Speaker, the current unemployment rate for African Americans is 9.6%, this is nearly twice of the 4.7% unemployment rate of white Americans.

African American children between the age of 16 and 19 have an unemployment rate of 27.5% whereas the unemployment rate for white teenagers of the same age is 14.5%.

The median African American (34,600) household income is nearly 24,000 less than the median income for White Americans' household.

African Americans are almost 3 times more likely to live in poverty than white Americans.

Madam Speaker, although the unemployment rate has decreased over the past year, a significant race-gap still remains.

WORKPLACE DIVERSITY

Workplace diversity is critical to an organization's success and competitiveness.

Workplace Diversity allows for an increased adaptability, broader service range, a variety of viewpoints, and more effective execution.

Madam Speaker, with an increasingly global economy, the workforce has become more diverse, and an organizations success depends on its ability to manage diversity.

That is why, for example, introduced an amendment that was adopted by the House to H.R. 4899, the ''Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America that Works Act of 2014,'' to include legislation establishing an Interior Department Office of Energy Employment and Training charged with working with minority-serving educational institutions and other to expand the numbers and diversity of persons from across the voluntary with the skills and qualifications needed to take advantage of the exciting and rewarding opportunities that American energy industry has to offer and to keep America the world leaders in emerging energy technologies.

I also introduced H.R. 70, the ''Deficit Reduction, Job Creation, and Energy Security Act,'' that requires the Secretary to establish an office of Energy Employment and Training and an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion responsible for all matters of the Department of the Interior relating to diversity in management, employment, and business activities.

I also introduced, and the House adopted, an amendment to H.R. 4923, ''Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for FY 2015,'' that increased funding for the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity by $500,000 to provide grants to Minority Serving Institutions to expand STEM programs and opportunities.

Mr. PAYNE. I really appreciate the always thoughtful and timely remarks by the gentlewoman from Texas.

Madam Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a gentleman who has served this House with distinction. He served with my father, and now I have the great opportunity to work with him.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey. In fact, he did refer to the relationship that I had with DON PAYNE, a young Congressman from New Jersey who, in fact, engaged me as a new Member in the Caribbean Caucus. During that period of time that I engaged with the Congressman's father, we tried to pay attention to the Caribbean, as some would say, a gateway to the United States of America, but a land of a number of islands of people who are not only most accommodating to the United States of America, but really thoughtful in ingenuity involved in the people of the Caribbean.

□ 1945

I found through the relationship that I had with then-Congressman PAYNE, as he was co-chairman of the Caribbean Caucus, I learned the things that he tried to teach me about not only people, but about a relationship with the United States of America.

I do miss Don. I want to thank the gentleman for not only knowing that, but acknowledging that. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me to file the rule.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas who, as I said, has had a distinguished career to this point and will continue to show great leadership in this House of Representatives, and I thank him for his friendship.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, we heard a common thread about diversity. At the bottom of the Statue of Liberty, there are words on it and it says: ''Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.''

That has allowed many diverse people come here and look for the freedom that this Nation can extend to you and prosper. We need to continue that great tradition.

I hear a lot these days about the borders and eliminating pathways to come here, and that has not been our tradition, so I do not believe, at this point in time in this Nation's history, that we should talk that way, or else, we should remove those words from the bottom of Lady Liberty.

Equality and diversity is the center of criminal justice concerns. The inequality force is distrust which erodes relationships between police and communities. Baltimore and other police-related tragedies over the past year speak to the broader challenges.

Unfortunately, racial discrimination persists throughout our Nation, undercutting the gains of African Americans in their communities.

As we work to reform our criminal justice system, we must also work in support of equality in all context. This is the only way to fully meet the needs of our communities.

As a caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus is committed to ensuring that the increasing diversity of the Nation is reflected in American business. To that end, we will make sure that American businesses receive the government contracts and tax preferences and taking concrete steps to improve diversity in efforts at all levels.

Diversity in the workforce means diversity in all sectors, including technology industries where there is a lack of African Americans. We need to engage the tech center in increasing African American representation and inclusion in the industry.

The American promise that we all are created equal must guide our efforts at all levels, from policing in our communities, to expanding opportunities for minorities in the workforce.

Madam Speaker, there has to be balance in everything. We see the issues that towns such as Ferguson and Baltimore and Long Island, New York, have

suffered with the tragedies of losing people in those communities, but we also know that police organizations have a difficult job, and they are trained to protect and serve. We must make sure that that is the goal, to protect and serve.

Unfortunately, at times, we find circumstances or situations where they are in a position where they are not protecting and serving, but more like an occupying force. That is not what we need from our law enforcement officers.

We need for them to engage in the community and understand what is going on in that community and have a good enough relationship that, when and if there is a circumstance where they need information, that the community feels comfortable enough to go to them with the information they need in order to serve the issue.

There is good and bad in everyone, Madam Speaker. There are good public servants and bad public servants; there are good teachers and bad teachers; there are good speakers and bad speakers, poor speakers, but, when it comes to law enforcement, we need to have them serve the community.

I stand here to say I thank them for the difficult task that they have every single day, to go into the community, and their families say good-bye to them and hope they return from that shift that evening. I don't take it lightly.

There is enough responsibility on all sides, from law enforcement and from the community, that has a responsibility to law enforcement, but we need to continue to strive to make this a more perfect union.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman PAYNE. I did want to say to Madam Speaker, I appreciate you participating in the Diversity Dinners last week. I can't have Congressman PAYNE have a one-up on me, so thank you so much. I really appreciate it.

As we continue our conversation on accountability, equality, and diversity, I would like to offer some statistics on our economy 50 years ago and today with respect to the African American community and women.

In 1965, African American jobseekers could be denied employment based on the color of their skin; and, when they could find jobs, they were disproportionately paid less than White males in the same position. In fact, in 1965, the Black unemployment rate was 8.1 percent, almost twice the national unemployment rate which stood at 4.5 percent.

Fifty years later, we have made great strides, and our Nation's workforce is more diverse than ever, but we have much more work to do. Today, at 10.4 percent, the Black unemployment rate is still almost double the national unemployment rate of 5.6 percent. While it is significantly smaller, there is still a racial wage gap.

The median African American household has less than two-thirds the income of the average White median household. In the past year, we have seen the greatest economic growth in decades. More and more women have been able to enter the workforce, reducing the employment rate among women to a 6-year low.

Unfortunately, Black women have yet to reap the benefits of the economic rebound. In fact, while the overall unemployment rate for women declined, the Black female unemployment rate has increased over the past 2 months. According to a recent analysis by the National Women's Law Center, the Black women's unemployment rate is more than twice the unemployment rate of White women.

Despite having comparable levels of education, Black women have had the highest unemployment rate of any other group. A possible factor in the stubborn unemployment rate for Black women is that we are disproportionately employed in the public sector, which is experiencing a much slower recovery than the private sector.

NWLC said the stagnant job situation for Black women is a ''red flag'' in the employment landscape and urged lawmakers to act to promote a stronger, more widely shared recovery. I couldn't agree more.

We need to invest more in job training and retraining programs that help Black women adapt to the changing workforce and prepare for the careers of tomorrow. We must work to promote diversity in hiring and encourage employers to model their workforces on the communities in which they operate.

As we look for ways to help increase diversity in the workplace and help women succeed, we must be mindful of the unique challenges Black women face and develop targeted policies that help level the playing field for all women.

These facts I have just covered point to the systemic problems. We need to address them today. It should be our mission today to see to it that in 50 years, when lawmakers stand here, they will proudly be touting the progress our Nation has made because all Americans are paid equally and no one is discriminated against in the workplace.

As chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust, I am working to address our Nation's health equity gap by exploring legislative and policy initiatives to reduce minority health disparities and promote better health outcomes for all Americans.

With respect to the African American community, the health disparity gap is particularly wide as Blacks have high rates of many adverse health conditions. Across the medical spectrum—from cancer to diabetes, from hypertension to stroke—Blacks are overrepresented and often undertreated.

A major barrier to African Americans getting the medical care they need is the lack of African American doctors in their communities. Studies show that African Americans are more comfortable seeking treatment from doctors who look like them and are much more likely to adhere to courses of treatment prescribed by Black doctors; yet, while African Americans comprise 13 percent of the U.S. population, we represent only 4 percent of the physician workforce, according to the Association of American Medical Colleges' 2014 diversity in the physician workforce report.

The infamous Tuskegee study fostered an enduring legacy of mistrust of the medical establishment in the African American community that makes diversity in medicine vital to closing the health disparities gap.

In order to achieve health equity, we must work to create a physician workforce that reflects our Nation. One key way to do that is to encourage more African Americans to pursue education and training in science, technology, engineering, and math. Congress must do more to support investments in STEM education and to create avenues of access for African American students to enter the STEM fields.

In my district, I launched the Second Congressional District STEM Academy to expose students to STEM fields in hopes of encouraging them to pursue STEM-related careers.

Also, a STEM workforce made up of diverse ranks is crucial to future innovation. To help in that mission, folks across the country and in Silicon Valley have taken note. I know Facebook has sought to change the face of innovation through efforts like their Facebook Academy and Facebook University, which target high school and college students from underrepresented groups.

Similar to my STEM Academy, it is good to see them making an effort to build a pipeline and introduce women and people of color to jobs in STEM—which, of course, could be IT, engineering—and hopefully, more young people decide to become doctors, and they can work in African American communities or underserved communities.

A medical student population that reflects our country's population will create a pipeline of diverse doctors to our communities which will, in turn, put all Americans on track to live a healthier life.

I turn back to my colleague from New Jersey, Congressman DONALD PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, Ms. KELLY. We appreciate your comments.

In closing, I would like to thank you for cohosting the Special Order on

criminal justice reform, accountability, and diversity. It is through these Special Orders that we are able to speak directly to our constituents about the valuable work the Congressional Black Caucus does to reduce injustice and promote equality for all African American communities.

Our criminal justice and police systems are in a state of crisis. Too often, under these systems, Black lives are treated as though they don't matter. We saw this last month, when Baltimore's Freddie Gray died in police custody from a brutal spine injury. Such tragedies erode trust between our communities and the police.

This problem is compounded by a wide range of factors, from disturbing gaps in incarceration rates to racial disparities in sentencing. We need a system that holds criminals accountable and protects law enforcement while, at the same time, ensuring the safety and equal treatment of all communities.

This includes implementing police body cameras in order to promote transparency and accountability while deterring wrongdoing.

□ 2000

At the same time, we need to make sure that law enforcement officers don't resort to discriminatory policing practices.

It is undeniable that racial profiling remains an ongoing crisis in our Nation. There is a clear and growing need to ensure a robust and comprehensive Federal commitment to ending racial profiling by law enforcement agencies. The End Racial Profiling Act, which I proudly support, would do just that. It was constructed after a law in New Jersey, authored by my uncle, Assemblyman William Payne. It was the first racial profiling law passed in the United States, a law of which I am very proud. I took that idea and brought it Federal.

Of course, real accountability means that we will, at times, need independent investigations of police-related deaths. We are glad to see, finally, Attorney General Lynch launch an investigation into the Baltimore Police Department, with the stated goal of assisting police departments across the country in developing their practices. In less than 1 month on the job, Attorney General Lynch is already making a difference, and we thank her for that.

As we reflect on the dire need for the reform of our criminal justice system, we need to advance the cause of equality in all contexts. This means expanding diversity in the workforce, in health, and in all aspects of life—from the mailroom to the boardroom, from the manufacturing industry to the technology sector. Many of these challenges we face today are great, but as a caucus, we remain committed to solving them.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus, in support of today's Special Order Hour: "The Urgency of Now: Addressing Reform, Accountability, Equality and Diversity." As the conscience of the Congress since 1971, these issues are of paramount importance to the Congressional Black Caucus in the 114th Congress.

There is a crisis in America—one that centers on criminal justice reform and law enforcement accountability. Just over a month ago, Freddie Gray lost his life at the hands of the police in a city plagued by a weak economy, high levels of crime, and a lack of good-paying jobs. While Baltimore is a city with a unique set of issues, its problems are common to many of America's inner cities. The pressure to address, not only the police accountability and criminal justice issues, but the context in which those issues arise, grows exponentially with each new tragedy.

As we watch American cities battered, bruised and burned during demonstrative outcries against injustice, I am reminded of the words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. "We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there "is" such a thing as being too late. This is no time for apathy or complacency. This is a time for vigorous and positive action." These words are just as true today as they were when Dr. King delivered them at the 1963 March on Washington.

Far too often, unarmed African American men die at the hands at police officers with little or no accountability. This reinforces the painful narrative that black life is not valued in this country. It is sad, yet very telling, that Americans celebrated when state officials announced that criminal charges were being brought against the Baltimore police involved in Freddie Gray's death. For too long, African-American communities nationwide felt as if no one could hear its cry. But the cries are not just the result of pain caused by police brutality. They are the result of a nation divided: one that grants access to quality healthcare to some, while denying it for others; one that provides economic security for a privileged few, while denying opportunities to the poor and the middle class; one that seeks justice for the unwarranted taking of a human life; while ignoring the rising death toll of American youth at the hands of police officers.

We cannot view the situations in Baltimore and Ferguson as limited incidents; instead, we have to look at the toxic environments that birthed these situations of unrest. If we do not comprehensively address the systemic issues that plague cities like Baltimore, relations between the people and its government will only grow worse. It is time that we honor the sacred truth of this nation—that all men are created equal, and demand equal justice. As we strive to become a more perfected union, it is imperative that the commitments of the American system be applied to African-Americans, just as it is to every other American. Madam Speaker, the urgency of addressing these issues has reached its pinnacle. Congress must act. We must act swiftly, and we must act now.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1806, AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2250, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2353, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS (during the Special Order of Mr. PAYNE) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–120) on the resolution (H. Res. 271) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1806) to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE PRESIDENT'S 2016 BUDGET REQUEST AND ENERGY POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the House for the opportunity to talk this evening about the 2016 President's budget request and energy policy in this Nation.

Madam Speaker, there are a number of energy programs in this Nation whereby public lands resources are leased and energy is produced on public lands and in the offshore waters of this Nation.

As you can see here, this is a table that explains some of the different programs that are out there today.

Onshore, on Federal lands, when you produce Federal resources—or energy resources—like oil, gas, coal, and other resources, you can see that 50 percent of the funds from that energy production on Federal lands goes to the Federal Government and that 50 percent goes to the States under the Mineral Leasing Act. There are no constraints whatsoever in regard to how those

States can spend those funds. So 50 percent of the money from energy production on Federal lands goes directly to the States.

Right here, of the 50 percent that goes to the Federal Government, 40 percent of that 50 percent—or 80 percent of the Federal funds—actually goes into what is called the reclamation fund to be used on water projects in the 17 Western States. In effect, 90 percent of the funds that are produced from energy production on Federal lands goes back and is invested, in many cases, in those same States where production occurs. There is one anomaly, and that is the State of Alaska, where 90 percent of the money goes back to the State with no strings attached whatsoever.

You can see here on geothermal energy that 25 percent goes to the Federal Government, and 50 percent goes to the State. Even the counties share in 25 percent of the revenue. For offshore alternative energy, such as wind and wave energy and things along those lines, 27 percent of the revenues are shared with the adjacent States.

I am going to come back to this one on oil and gas offshore, but I will just make note that there is an extraordinary disparity in regard to how these different resources are treated.

I made reference to the Mineral Leasing Act. Again, except for in the case of Alaska, when you produce energy on Federal lands, 50 percent of the money goes directly to those States. Of the offshore dollars, up to $900 million each year goes into what is called the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which all 50 States benefit from, for national parks, for urban parks, for playgrounds, and for wildlife refuges that the States manage.

You have $150 million that goes into the Historic Preservation Fund to ensure the preservation of historic buildings. You have 27 percent in the 3-mile zone offshore of the 6 States that produce energy, and they get 27 percent under section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, you also have 12.5 percent of the revenues given to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and then remaining funds go to the General Treasury.

Let me just recap this disparity here.

If you are producing energy on Federal lands onshore, 50 percent of the money goes directly to the State with no strings attached; 40 percent of the money goes into the reclamation fund; and only 10 percent goes into the U.S. Treasury. If you are producing energy in the offshore, effectively, all of that money goes to the Federal Government.

I will show you another poster here that demonstrates some of the dollars that have been given to States that produce offshore energy.

You can see here, in the case of Alaska—and this accounting mechanism came off of the Department of the Interior's Web site and from the Office of Natural Resources Revenue, and this pertains to different types of sales year data, so it will vary to some degree each year—that between 2009 and 2014, 97 percent of the funds that were generated from energy production on Federal revenues was returned to the State of Alaska. They received $158 million out of $163.6 million in revenue generated on Federal lands.

In the case of California, 52 percent of the money went to the State of California. It was over half a billion dollars during that time period. To give you an idea on some of these amazing figures, you can go to the State of Colorado, where they produced nearly $2 billion in energy production on Federal lands, and they received over $900 million with no strings attached.

Madam Speaker, there are two extraordinary ones. The State of New Mexico generated $5.5 billion in revenue between 2009 and 2014 from the production of energy on Federal lands. That State received $2.75 billion back, or approximately 50 percent. In the case of Wyoming, they produced $11.7 billion in revenue between 2009 and 2014 from energy production on Federal lands, and they received $5.8 billion—over $1 billion a year—with no strings attached whatsoever.

I want to be clear that I think that is great. I think that is how Federal policy should work. I think the revenues should be returned and shared with the States that host such energy production, but here is the incredible, absolutely indefensible comparison of what happens with offshore energy revenues.

This shows you that, in 2009, less than 1 percent of revenues were returned to the States that produced offshore energy. Those are the States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, California, and Alaska. Those States in 2009 generated over $5 billion in revenue for the U.S. Treasury. Those 6 States—and in some cases shared with counties and parishes—received only $30 million of that, or 0.56 percent. In 2010, they received 0.06 percent. In 2012, they produced $6.5 billion in revenue for the Federal Government from energy production offshore of the coasts of those States, and those 6 States in 2012, on $6.5 billion in revenue, shared only $837,000. Unbelievable—less than $100,000 per State.

If you take overall the comparison between 2009 and 2014, approximately $41 billion in revenue was produced from offshore energy production, and less than $50 million of that, or 0.12 percent, was shared. In the case of onshore energy, States, in some cases, are getting 90 percent of the revenues. In the case of offshore energy, the 6 States that produce all of this offshore energy are receiving 0.12 percent, not the 90 percent and not the 50 percent. They are receiving 0.12 percent.

Madam Speaker, you have to ask: What roles do these six States play in our overall energy production?

It is pretty amazing. With just 2 percent of the offshore Outer Continental Shelf actually leased, the oil production offshore accounts for 18 percent of all of the oil production in the United States. With just 2 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf offshore leased for energy production, that production is approximately 5 percent of the Nation's natural gas production. For example, in 2014, it generated incredible numbers—$7.3 billion. This is one of the largest recurring nontaxed revenue streams that goes into the U.S. Treasury each year.

To add insult to injury, I guess it would be five of the six States that produce offshore energy only have 3 miles of State waters, which means they only get 100 percent of revenues from State water energy production, which would be between zero and 3 miles offshore of their coasts.

In the cases of Florida, which doesn't produce energy, and the State of Texas, they actually have three times that—or 9 miles—of State waters. So you have disparity, and that onshore production gets 50 to 90 percent of the revenues. In the case of offshore production, the States only get 0.12 percent of the revenues to date, and you have the fact that the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, California, and Alaska only have 3 miles of State waters. In the cases of Texas and Florida, they have 3 marine leagues, or, roughly, 9 miles, of State waters. The disparity is unbelievable.

This House has taken many efforts dating back decades ago, with some of the more recent ones in the mid-nineties, to try to rectify—to try to address—this disparity. Dating back to the mid-nineties, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, known as CARA, brought together such diverse interests as those of Congressman DON YOUNG of Alaska and Congressman George Miller of California, who are two Members who, I am quite certain, agreed upon nothing except for this. It was really amazing to see this House pass legislation bringing together everyone from the oil and gas community to the environmental community in order to ensure that these resources were reinvested back into coastal States that produced energy and back into ensuring that we conserve and protect our outdoors and opportunities for future generations. Unfortunately, that legislation, despite passing the House with a strong margin, didn't pass in the Senate.

Rolling forward to the early 2000s, in 2001, as I recall and I believe again in 2003, additional efforts included in the Energy Policy Act, during a conference report, passed the House of Representatives, once again, with a strong margin to share offshore energy revenues with

the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, California, Alaska, and those States that produced offshore energy. Unfortunately, those efforts died in the United States Senate.

Then you roll forward to 2006. In 2006, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act—in December of that year—was enacted. What that did is that largely replicated an offer that President Truman made to the States decades ago whereby President Truman offered those States that produced offshore energy 37½ percent of all of the revenues generated from energy production in Federal waters. Those States, apparently, turned down that offer from President Truman and asked for a higher share. Despite that being offered decades and decades ago, it was not until 2006 when Congress finally acted and enacted again what is known as the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, which would share 37½ percent of revenues from new energy production. I want to be clear on that distinction—new energy production—which is energy production that occurs prospectively after December of 2006.

□ 2015

It is not 37½ percent of all energy production. It is not 37½ percent of these numbers you see here, of the overall energy production, the billions of dollars. It is merely a fraction of that. So it is not anything close to parity with what happens for onshore revenues, but it is a start; and it is establishing parity in onshore and offshore policy, and it is a movement in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, in the State of Louisiana, we actually passed a constitutional amendment with an amazing margin that dedicated every penny of those revenues from the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, GOMESA, here, dedicated every penny of it to hurricane protection and coastal restoration, to making our coastal communities and our coastal ecosystem more resilient, ensuring that we don't see a repeat of what we all witnessed from Hurricane Katrina, where in our home State of Louisiana we had over 1,200 of our brothers and sisters, of our neighbors, of our friends, of our coworkers lose their lives—over 1,200.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 caused or resulted in gasoline price spikes nationwide to the tune of 75 cents a gallon—nationwide average. And again in 2008 we saw price spikes $1.40 a gallon on average in the 50 States—$1.40—constituting the largest price spike in gasoline since the Arab oil embargo.

Mr. Speaker, you may be wondering the reason I am here tonight. The reason I am here tonight is to talk about the President's budget request. This year, when the President submitted his budget request, he submitted a request where he proposes to withdraw the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, to withdraw the pittance—or in 2014, the $8.6 million—that was split among the four Gulf States that produce offshore energy, trying to prevent that from ever happening again.

In the President's budget request he says: This proposal generates $5.6 billion in savings over 10 years through legislative reform proposals, including oil and gas management reforms to encourage diligent development of Federal energy resources while improving the return to taxpayers from relative reforms.

Well, let's talk about that for a minute. He says that it is going to generate savings. He says that its management reforms on oil and gas production are going to encourage diligent development. Mr. Speaker, by withdrawing revenue sharing and potentially discouraging offshore energy production, that is not encouraging diligent development. It results in us having to import more energy from other nations.

I remind you, nations like Venezuela, nations like Nigeria and many countries in Africa and the Middle East that don't share America's values, we are sending hundreds of billions of dollars to those countries. In 2011, over one-half of this Nation's trade deficit was attributable to importing energy from other nations. That effectively is sending jobs. It is sending hundreds of billions of dollars to those other countries that in many cases are taking those same dollars and using them against the United States' interests around the globe. It doesn't encourage diligent development of Federal energy resources, as the President's budget request suggests.

They also say that it improves the return to taxpayers. I am struggling with how this improves the return to taxpayers whenever study after study is crystal clear that proactive investment in things like coastal restoration, hurricane protection, hazard mitigation investments, according to the CBO it returns $3 for every $1 invested; according to a FEMA study, it returns $4 in cost savings for every $1 invested; and many, many others have estimated that the cost savings are multiple times that.

Now, what is incredible to me, when we had the Secretary of the Interior, who I asked for a meeting, I believe it was, on February 4, and here we are on May 18 and we still have not been able to get that meeting, including offering to meet with the Deputy Secretary or anyone else who can speak intelligently on this issue. I will take the receptionist, if you are watching. We have asked for that meeting.

In their budget request, it specifically says this cut has been identified as a lower priority program activity for purpose of the GPRA Modernization Act. Now, that is the Government Performance Results Act. So I said: Well, wow, they did an evaluation. So let's go ahead and ask the Secretary, Madam Secretary, could you explain to me how you did an evaluation and what the outcome of that was?

Well, her first response was: What is GPRA?

Well, this is in her budget request, and she asked me what GPRA was, despite the fact that it said they did an analysis and it determined that it was a low-priority program. After I explained it, they were unable to answer the question.

I asked if they would provide us their calculation here to show how it is a lower priority program and how it may compare with other onshore programs. Of course, here we are months later, and you will be shocked to learn that we still have not received that information that simply doesn't exist.

Politics, Mr. Speaker, at its best. Unbelievable.

You can't justify it from a policy perspective; you can't justify it from a financial perspective; you can't justify it from a resiliency perspective; you can't justify it from an environmental perspective. Absolutely incredible.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a quote here from the Environmental Defense Fund, from the National Wildlife Federation, and from the National Audubon Society, where they note, let's see: ''This proposed budget undercuts the administration's previous commitments to restore critical economic infrastructure and ecosystems in the Mississippi River Delta, where we are losing 16 square miles of critical wetlands every year—a preventable coastal erosion crisis.''

''We urge Congress to fund the President's commitments to coastal restoration and conservation by maintaining GOMESA funding that is vital to the Gulf Coast and by identifying additional funding for . . . other priorities.''

That is a quote from the environmental community. This is the administration, I guess, attempting to win accolades from the environmental community, who turned around and criticized him for that.

Now, the irony goes even further in that in 2013, Secretary Jewell actually sends out a press release saying how great these dollars that are being shared are. It talks about how these revenues were distributed to State, local, and Federal tribes to support critical reclamation, conservation, and other projects. So here they are taking credit for it, saying how great it is, and then they come back and make an about-face that they can't explain, justify, can't even meet on, and haven't even been able to provide any documentation as to how they came to their decision.

In December of 2014, once again a press release from the Department of the Interior giving all sorts of accolades to themselves for sharing these

revenues and all the great investments that they will result in, yet in the fiscal year 2016 budget request we have seen them attempt to withdraw those dollars.

Now, what is interesting in the press release, the administration said that this should be done because these resources, these public resources, these energy resources offshore, should be shared by all Americans. Well, okay, let's talk about that.

As we noted here, for onshore production, 50 percent of the money goes to the Federal Government, but of that, 80 percent of this actually is returned back to the States; 50 percent goes directly to the States with no strings attached. So the Federal Government only gets 10 percent. The Federal Government only gets 10 percent, yet they didn't cut this program.

So I am struggling with how they have determined that these resources should be shared with all Americans, yet they are only doing it for this one program and leaving this other program entirely intact. Once again, the disparity cannot be defended.

Let's go ahead and take their idea that resources should be shared with all Americans, and let's apply it to other Federal resources. What about a national park? What about a national wildlife refuge? What about some BLM land somewhere?

These facilities that charge entrance fees, they take all those dollars, and they give it right back to that park. The State of Louisiana doesn't get any of it. It goes back to the park. We don't get any disparate benefit from that. The State that hosts the national park and hosts the national wildlife refuge, it benefits from that in the form of tourism and economic activity and a place for their citizens to recreate. Explain to me that disparity. Once again, it simply can't be done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make note of the problem in coastal Louisiana and why it is so critical that these dollars be invested, that the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act be continued. In coastal Louisiana, prior to the Federal Government building levees on the Mississippi River, the Atchafalaya River, and our coastal region of the State, the State of Louisiana was growing to the tune of three-quarters of a square mile per year, on average. Our State was accreting; it was growing in land.

When the Corps of Engineers came in and built levees on our river system, we immediately went from growing, or accreting, to losing land. In some decades, we have lost an average of 16 square miles per year. In other decades, we have lost closer to 26 or 28 square miles per year. In 2005, we lost nearly 200 square miles of our coast per year. To add it all up, the total figure, we have lost 1,900 square miles of our State since the 1930s. To put it in comparison, if the State of Rhode Island lost 1,900 square miles, the State of Rhode Island wouldn't exist anymore. If the State of Delaware lost 1,900 square miles, it would consist only of its inland waters. Nineteen hundred square miles is an extraordinary amount of land. Then to watch this administration come out and say: You know what? We are going to propose this new waters of the U.S. definition, because waters of the United States are so important and wetlands are so important to us, we have got to protect them. Yet the Federal Government is causing the greatest wetlands loss in the United States—prospective, ongoing, and historic—the Federal Government, the same agency, the Corps of Engineers, that actually is supposed to be enforcing wetlands laws.

So the State of Louisiana said, yes, we are going to take these dollars whenever they finally begin flowing in some degree in 2017 and 2018, we are going to take those dollars and we are going to invest them. We are going to protect them by constitutional amendment. We are going to complement them with billions of dollars and other State-controlled spending, and we are going to invest them in making the coast of Louisiana more resilient, making our communities more resilient, making the economy of this Nation more resilient.

I remind you, in 2005, because of hurricane impacts to the State of Louisiana, prices spiked 75 cents a gallon nationwide, on average. In 2008, when hurricanes hit the Gulf Coast and Louisiana, prices spiked $1.40 a gallon, on average, nationwide. This is a national issue.

Mr. Speaker, following the 2005 hurricanes, the Federal Government expended over $100 billion—by some estimates, perhaps close to $130 billion or $140 billion—responding to these disasters. If we had taken somewhere in the range of $8 billion to $9 billion, we could have prevented the 1,200 lives that were lost that I referenced earlier. We could have prevented the expenditure of well over $100 billion in taxpayer funds, the majority of that going toward deficit spending.

It doesn't save money to cut the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. To the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it is going to cost our Nation more dollars; and history has proven that, studies by Congressional Budget Office, studies by FEMA, and many others have proven that this is penny-wise and pound-foolish. It will result in additional deaths. It will result in additional flooding. It will result in additional economic disruption in this Nation, and it is the wrong approach.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say it one more time. Onshore energy revenues are shared 90 percent between the Mineral Leasing Act and the Bureau of Reclamation funds, 90 percent; offshore energy revenues, we get well less than 1 percent, well less than 1 percent per year today. And as we try and slowly begin addressing the disparity but nowhere close to what happens for onshore production, when we try to do the right thing and make sure that these funds are constitutionally protected to be invested in making the communities more resilient, making the ecosystem more resilient, and addressing the wrongs of the Federal Government, addressing natural resource flaws of the Federal Government, we now have this administration who is supposed to be the environmental administration coming out and taking these dollars away, which is once again why the Environmental Defense Fund, National Wildlife Federation, Audubon Society, and many, many others came out against this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to urge, as we continue to move through the appropriations bills and continue to work on energy policy, that we truly seek to do what the President says in regard to an all-of-the-above policy, which includes conventional fuels, to ensure that the States that are producing these energies receive some type of mitigative funds or revenue sharing, to ensure that the State of Alaska, that the East Coast and other States that are bringing offshore production online are treated fairly, and to ensure that these dollars are reinvested back in the resilience of these communities and in the ecosystem.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2030

CURRENT NEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot in the news recently about questions being asked of people running for President. It has been interesting. In taking that issue up, though, it is important to look at some of the current news.

Here is an article on May 17 by Bill Sanderson of the New York Post. It says: ''Saudi Arabia to buy nuclear bombs from Pakistan.''

It says:

> Saudi Arabia will join the nuclear club by buying ''off-the-shelf'' atomic weapons from Pakistan, U.S. officials told a London newspaper.

Wow. Well, that was something that we weren't expecting back when President Bush went into Iraq when he made that call that some day, Saudi Arabia and others in the Middle East would become so nervous about the chaos created in the Middle East that they would determine: We may need to get

nuclear weapons ourselves. In the past, we have always been comforted by the fact that the United States would keep peace in the Middle East. They wouldn't let anything get out of hand. They would keep other Middle Eastern countries, especially radical Islamist countries, from having nukes.

This administration has shown it is not capable of preventing nukes from proliferation in the Middle East, so therefore, our allies our getting quite nervous.

Here is an article from today by a brilliant prosecutor of the original bomber of the World Trade Center in 1993, Andrew McCarthy. It is dated today, May 18. The title of his article in National Review says: ''The Iraq Question is the Iran Question—At Least It Should Be.''

He goes on to point to the question that is being asked of some Republican Presidential candidates. Obviously, the mainstream media, those that donate to the Clinton foundation, and those kind of folks—those that would take a hostile position against Republicans in debates, those who act as mediators or emcees in a debate would actually speak on behalf of the Democrat—they are not asking this question of Democrats, but it is a legitimate question.

This is what Andrew McCarthy brings up. He says: ''Was it a mistake to invade, knowing what we know now?''

He is talking about Iraq.

Mr. McCarthy says:

> It is a very fair point that the question should not be asked solely of Republicans—Hillary Clinton and other Democrats who supported the war should be grilled, too.

He says further down: ''Many of us who supported the Iraq war based that support on the principles enunciated in the Bush doctrine.''

Then he sets out his take on the Bush doctrine. I think it is well set out.

It says: ''Attack the jihadists wherever they operate and make rogue states understand that if they support the terrorists we will treat them as enemies. In that calculation, Iraq was an enemy regardless of whether it had weapons of mass destruction. It''—talking about Iraq—''obviously was not the worst such enemy—Iran was. And it obviously was a potentially more dangerous enemy if it had weapons of mass destruction that could have been shared with jihadists. Iraq, nevertheless, was surely in the camp of states that, using Bush's 'with us or against us' metric, was against us.''

Then we have an article here from IJReview: ''U.S. Special Forces Just Took Out a Top ISIS Leader—And Captured His Sex Slavery-Condoning Wife,'' by Justen Charters.

It says: ''While airstrikes continue to hammer ISIS positions, it turns out that that is not the only thing the jihadists need to worry about. U.S. Special Forces appear to be doing more than just training 'rebels,' they're now engaging the enemy. And, they just put down a top Islamic State leader: Abu Sayyaf.

''USA Today reported further on the operation, which will be hurting the terrorists' bankroll and morale.''

It goes out to set out something from USA Today.

That is such an intriguing story, Mr. Speaker. I find it very intriguing because I can't remember how many times, but it was many times that the President and other members of this administration said: There will be no boots on the ground in Syria in this area—no boots on the ground.

We were told that over and over, which is really perplexing because we all trust the same people that told us, If you like your insurance, you can keep it; if you like your doctor, you can keep him—all these things—that they are not going to persecute people of religious beliefs, then they persecuted them.

Who would have thought that this administration would say there will be no boots on the ground and then put boots on the ground?

Now, it could have been, in fairness to the administration, that they hovered and were able to lift up the wife of the ISIS leader without actually getting boots on the ground, or it is quite possible they didn't wear boots. Maybe they were wearing moccasins or something like that; maybe they went barefoot, and that would explain why those in the administration would say: We will never put boots on the ground; no boots are going to be on the ground.

Maybe they really weren't wearing boots. I know boots have come a long way since I was in the Army, and I never did understand why we had to wear those black boots that you had to spit-shine to shine them up. It made no sense to me.

I like the new boots the military is wearing now much better; but maybe they have got some other shoes they have figured out so they don't have to actually put boots on the ground.

In any event, what happened in the Middle East is most intriguing.

Then we have a story today from Judicial Watch. Judicial Watch has now gotten documentation as a result of a court order on May 15. They have been able to get more documentation than Congress has been able to get because they are fighting this administration in court, and they are getting court orders to force the issues.

The only way you will get information out of this transparent Obama administration is if you bring them out kicking and screaming with the documents, under threat of what a judge can order and do; that is obvious because, as a Member of Congress asking for the documents that were provided in discovery in 2008 to the convicted terrorists in the Holy Land Foundation trial, I got on a Web site one time. I asked for the boxes of documents that the Justice Department gave to the terrorists.

I understand Attorney General Holder was saying there may be classification issues, but I keep coming back to the point they gave them to terrorists. Surely, you can give them to Members of Congress, but that also points to a problem that is ongoing in this administration. They keep helping the wrong people.

In Egypt, we have been told by the administration: Gee, President Morsi was elected in a very questionable election, and there were allegations of a great deal of fraud.

But I was told by Egyptians that it was made clear to the opponent of Morsi that, if he raised any issues about fraud in the election, the Muslim Brothers would burn the country down, and he chose not to contest what was some apparent fraud in the election.

Morsi allegedly got 13 million votes or so, and despite the fact—well, at least reported by many news organizations—there were over 30 million Egyptians out of their 90 million or so in the country that went to the streets peaceably.

It was the largest demonstration, peaceable or otherwise, in the history of the world, from the best I can find out. They went to the streets. They demanded a nonradical Islamist President. They demanded the peaceable ouster of Morsi, who they believed had committed treason and who they understood had basically torn up, figuratively, the constitution that the U.S. Government was helpful advising in, but somehow, our advisers did not persist in making sure they had a provision for a peaceful impeachment of the President of Egypt. They had no way to get him out.

These moderate Muslims—and I have talked to a number of them that were there demonstrating—these secularists, Christians, Jews, and the Coptic Pope himself told me how moved he was to have so many people from so many walks being an encouragement: We don't want you persecuted in our country of Egypt anymore. It is not right.

Naturally, what would the Obama administration do? They would demand that the man that was figuratively shredding the constitution in Egypt, that was persecuting Christians, that was weaponizing the Sinai, which was building the radical Islamism organization within Egypt, this administration was giving them weapons, wanted to help them any way they could, which leads to the question that I have been asked by moderate Arab Muslim leaders in the Middle East: Why does this administration keep helping the Muslim Brothers? Do you not understand they are at war with you?

Well, it should have been clear, but this administration was helping the

wrong side. It didn't stop with pushing for the ouster of this country's ally in Egypt, Mubarak. This administration decided to oust Qadhafi, a dictator with blood on his hands from the eighties and nineties.

□ 2045

After 2003, after the Bush administration ordered the taking out of Saddam Hussein, Qadhafi got scared, opened up his weapons, says he will not pursue nukes; he will do whatever the United States tells him with regard to his weapons.

As some in Israel have told me, he was really helping with information against terrorists more than anybody but maybe us; yet this administration undertook a bombing effort against Qadhafi.

Now, we find out confirmation from documents that have been acquired by Judicial Watch that this administration was actually helping with weapons, at least that is the way it appears; that is what we have been hearing all along.

Some have said even in my trip to Libya with friends STEVE KING and Michelle Bachmann, if it weren't for the Obama administration bombing Qadhafi, they could not have gotten him out of office, and he would still be helping us find and kill terrorists.

Now, Libya is in chaos. There are Muslim Brothers doing the best they can to put Egypt in chaos. Syria is now in chaos. Iran is taking over more and more, including, just last September, this President referred to the success story in Yemen. Now, Iran is the power player in Yemen, not the United States. The Obama administration in Yemen basically has been whipped by Iran.

This is scary stuff, when you look at what has happened in the Middle East since this administration took over. The story from Judicial Watch dated May 18, is pretty timely, includes information about the documentation that was ordered by the United States District Court and has now been obtained, even though the administration blacked out a lot of information that apparently would be embarrassing to it.

The story says: ''Judicial Watch announced today that it obtained more than 100 pages of previously classified 'Secret' documents from the Department of Defense and the Department of State revealing that the DOD almost immediately reported that the attack on the U.S. Consulate in Benghazi was committed by the al Qaeda and Muslim Brotherhood-linked 'Brigades of the Captive Omar Abdul Rahman,' and had been planned at least 10 days in advance. Rahman is known as The Blind Sheikh''—that is the one that Andrew McCarthy had prosecuted as lead prosecutor—''and is serving life in prison for his involvement in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and other terrorist acts. The new documents also provide the first official confirmation that shows the U.S. Government was aware of arms shipments from Benghazi to Syria. The documents also include an August 2012 analysis warning of the rise of ISIS and the predicted failure of the Obama policy of regime change in Syria.

''The documents were released in response to a court order in accordance with a May 15, 2014, Freedom of Information Act lawsuit filed against both the DOD and State Department seeking communications between the two agencies and congressional leaders 'on matters related to the activities of any agency or department of the U.S. Government at the Special Mission Compound and/or classified annex in Benghazi.'

''A Defense Department document from the Defense Intelligence Agency, DIA, dated September 12, 2012, the very day after the Benghazi attack, details that the attack on the compound had been carefully planned by the 'Brigades of the Captive Omar Abdul Rahman' to 'kill as many Americans as possible.' The document was sent to then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, then-Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Obama White House National Security Council. The heavily redacted Defense Department 'information report' says that the attack on the Benghazi facility 'was planned and executed by The Brigades of the Captive Omar Abdul Rahman.' The group subscribes to 'al Qaeda ideologies.' ''

Now, that was part of the message of September 12, 2012.

Now, it is understandable why President Obama would not have gotten this message because, clearly, he had to get a good night's sleep because he was going to a campaign event in Las Vegas on September 12. He surely didn't have time to review this material in pursuit of his campaign. Here he was, just less than 2 months away from election day.

It is understandable that he would not get the information and would not know that this was not about a video; it was about a carefully planned attack by subscribers to al Qaeda.

The Defense Intelligence Agency knew that, and that message was sent to Hillary Clinton. It was sent to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and it was sent to those who were not out campaigning in Las Vegas at the White House.

The article goes on: ''The attack was planned 10 or more days prior on approximately 01 September 2012. The intention was to attack the consulate and to kill as many Americans as possible to seek revenge for U.S. killing of Aboyahiye''—also lists him as Alaliby—''in Pakistan and in memorial of the 11 September 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center buildings.''

This is quoting from the DIA report. It says: '' 'A violent radical . . . the leader of BCOAR is Abdul Baset,' '' also called Azuz. '' 'Azuz was sent by Zawari' ''—the leader of al Qaeda, that is—'' 'to set up al Qaeda bases in Libya.' The group's headquarters were set up with the approval of a 'member of the Muslim Brotherhood movement . . . where they have large caches of weapons. Some of those caches are disguised by feeding troughs for livestock. They have SA–7 and SA–2¾ MANPADS . . . they train almost every day focusing on religious lessons and scriptures, including three lessons a day of jihadist ideology.' ''

Mr. Speaker, I am very confused by that. I don't understand how these Muslim Brothers, these jihadists, could be studying scripture, and this is quoting from the Defense Intelligence Agency report, when it says they are focused on religious lessons and scriptures, including three lessons a day of jihadist ideology because this Defense Intelligence Agency reports they are studying religious lessons and scripture, claiming to be Islamists.

That couldn't possibly be because this administration has made clear these people are not religious. They are not Islamists. They have nothing to do with Islam. These people are just ne'er-do-wells. I don't understand why the Defense Intelligence Agency would report that they were studying religious lessons when they are not religious at all, according to this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I take you back to that so-called Arab Spring, when this administration was helping the Muslim Brothers, and I stood right here on this floor and pointed out: Look, we know that there are al Qaeda in these rebels. We don't know what percentage; we don't now how many, but we know there is some al Qaeda in these rebels that this administration is helping. We should wait and not keep militarily supporting people that we know include al Qaeda until we find out more.

But this administration went ahead.

As this story says: ''The Defense Department reported the group maintained written documents in 'a small rectangular room, approximately 12 meters by 6 meters . . . that contain information on all of the al Qaeda activity in Libya' ''—wow, al Qaeda ties.

Anyway, ''The DOD documents also contain the first official documentation that the Obama administration knew that weapons were being shipped from the Port of Benghazi to rebel troops in Syria.''

An October 2012 report also is confirming: ''Weapons from the former Libya military stockpiles''—which word is we helped get there—''were shipped from the Port of Benghazi, Libya, to the Port of Banias and the Port of Borj Islam, Syria. The weapons shipped during late August 2012 were sniper rifles, RPGs, and 125-millimeter and 155-millimeter howitzers missiles.''

Anyway, it goes on. The DIA report said ''the opposition in Syria was driven by al Qaeda and other extremist Muslim groups: 'the Salafist, the Muslim Brotherhood, and AQI are the major forces driving the insurgency in Syria,' '' which this administration wants to keep calling vetted moderate Syrian rebels, when their own report says they have got al Qaeda ties.

As this says: ''The deterioration of the situation has dire consequences on the Iraqi situation,'' and it goes on to set those out.

I think the big question that should be forcefully put to former President George W. Bush and anybody who is running for President the next time, they ought to be asked this question: If you had known before we went into Iraq, going after the brutal dictator Saddam Hussein, who had killed hundreds of thousands of people, including Kurds, with chemical weapons and other weapons, and you knew he could be ousted, and after a surge, the war could be won; but then that, after your victory in Iraq, following the surge, you would be followed as President with an administration that was too incompetent to negotiate a status of forces agreement with Iraq, and so you end up having—that administration is going to have to leave and actually commit other acts that will help create absolute chaos in the Middle East; and you are going to be followed by this administration that will help the Muslim Brothers that your Muslim allies in the Middle East say, The Muslims Brothers are at war with you, yet this administration that follows you will keep helping America's enemies, and that, because of the creation of chaos by this succeeding administration, Iran will be pursuing nuclear weapons; and that the succeeding administration will be so incompetent and clueless as to what is happening in the Middle East, they think it is okay to let them keep enriching uranium, pursuing nukes, and it gets so bad that this next administration will even cause our allies like Saudi Arabia, to go buy nukes; and then we end up with this subsequent administration that helps the Muslim Brothers create more chaos than we could have imagined, knowing all of that, would you go into Iraq?

That is a question.

□ 2100

But it is really a tough question. How in the world would President George W. Bush have known that he would be followed by such incompetence that would help our enemies and would just create chaos across the entire Middle East such that our friends would be in conferences with people like me going: We don't understand America anymore. You keep helping your enemies. We don't get it. We thought we were your friends, but you are helping the people at war with you.

I mean, how could President George W. Bush be expected to anticipate that that is the kind of thing that would follow his administration and completely destroy the situation in the Middle East and in Iraq and in the Sinai and in Gaza and in Libya, in Lebanon, in Syria, a massive migration into Jordan. Jordanian pilots now to the point they would be burned alive. Christians raped, persecuted, killed in all kinds of horrendous ways. Jews ostracized, killed.

Who would have ever dreamed that we would have an administration come in and take the success after the surge and turn it into the chaos it is today?

So I will be interested, Mr. Speaker, in the days ahead, as people seek to lead this country, to find out which leaders would have gone ahead into Iraq, knowing the chaos they would create in the subsequent administration.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of flight delays.

Mr. LAMBORN (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a flight delay.

Mr. TIBERI (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of flight delays.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 14, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 651. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office.''

H.R. 1075. To designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the ''Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry.''

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1491. A letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Strategic Economic and Community Development (RIN: 0570-AA94) received May 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1492. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Bruce A. Litchfield, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1493. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement, pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, on a transaction involving Gunes Ekspres Havacilik A.S. of Antalya, Turkey; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1494. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; NAAQS Update [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0819; FRL-9927-48-Region 5] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1495. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fragrance Components; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0821; FRL-9927-38] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1496. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trichoderma asperelloides strain JM41R; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0963; FRL-9926-87] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1497. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trinexapac-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0340; FRL-9926-62] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1498. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau/MD, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operations in the 3550-3650 MHz Band [GN Docket No.: 12-354] received May 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1499. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement, pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, on a transaction involving China Southern Airlines of Guangzhou, China; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1500. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1501. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Semiannual Report to Congress

from the Office of Inspector General, of the Department of Health and Human Services, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, Pub. L. 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1502. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1503. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the Statement of Disbursements for the United States Capitol Police for the period of October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Pub. L. 109-55, Sec. 1005; (H. Doc. No. 114-38); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1504. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Trawl Rationalization Program; Catch Monitor Program; Observer Program [Docket No.: 130503447-5336-02] (RIN: 0648-BD30) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1505. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's modification of fishing seasons final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #1 and #2 [Docket No.: 140107014-4014-01] (RIN: 0648-XD868) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1506. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trawl Rationalization Program; Midwater Trawl Fishery Season Date Change [Docket No.: 141222999-5322-02] (RIN: 0648-BE72) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1507. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Management Reference Point Updates for Three Stocks of Pacific Salmon [Docket No.: 150227200-5347-02] (RIN: 0648-BE79) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1508. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Blueline Tilefish in the South Atlantic Region [Docket No.: 140501394-5279-02] (RIN: 0648-XD869) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1509. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2015 Gulf of Alaska Pollock Seasonal Apportionments [Docket No.: 140918791-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-XD845) received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1510. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 140918791-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-XD876) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1511. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 meters) Length Overall Using Jig or Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bogoslof Pacific Cod Exemption Area in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD886) received May 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1512. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Notional Principal Contracts; Swaps with Nonperiodic Payments [TD 9719] (RIN: 1545-BM62) received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1513. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revocation of Rev. Rul. 78-130 (Rev. Rul. 2015-09) received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1514. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Triple Drop and Check (Rev. Rul. 2015-10) received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1515. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Eligibility for Minimum Essential Coverage for Purposes of the Premium Tax Credit [Notice 2015-37] received May 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1516. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Attorney General's Second Quarterly Report of FY 2015 on the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994, pursuant to the Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008, Pub. L. 110-389; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2016 (Rept. 114–118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 2262. A bill to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 271. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1806) to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–120). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2390. A bill to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2391. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the payment of an additional rebate to the State Medicaid plan in the case of increase in the price of a generic drug at a rate that is greater than the rate of inflation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 2392. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require an applicant for voter registration for elections for Federal office to affirmatively state that the applicant meets the eligibility requirements for voting in such elections as a condition of completing the application, to require States to verify that an applicant for registering to vote in such elections meets the eligibility requirements for voting in such elections prior to registering the applicant to vote, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FARR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BOST, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BLUM, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LONG, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. HILL, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 2394. A bill to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2396. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the regulation of health software, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2397. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration to disclose certain return information related to identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 2399. A bill to establish the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee to advise the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture on wildlife and habitat conservation, hunting, recreational shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 2400. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Inspector General for Monitoring the Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, the Judiciary, Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2401. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to require annual permits and assess annual fees for commercial filming activities on Federal land for film crews of 5 persons or fewer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 2402. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit the public disclosure of protected information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. BOST, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2403. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 2404. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Res. 270. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the Palestinian Authority's purported accession to the International Criminal Court for the purpose of initiating prosecutions against Israeli soldiers, citizens, officials, and leaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

27. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 101, designating the month of May 2015 as ''Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month'' in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 2393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, Congress has the authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, Congress has the authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which allows Congress to regulate trade with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 which, in part, states: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, . . . and the Sixteenth Amendment which states: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(b) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''; and

(c) Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states that ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time''; and

(d) Article II, Section 2, Clause 2, which states that the President, ''by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States . . .''

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 2402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 54.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This resolution is enacted pursuant to the powers conferred by the United States Constitution upon Congress by Article V. which provides that ''The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . . which shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States . . .''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 91: Mr. SIRES, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 93: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 160: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 169: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 209: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 232: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 239: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 306: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 402: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 451: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 474: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 528: Mr. BARR and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 585: Mr. ROUZER and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 605: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 627: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 649: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 662: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 663: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 675: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 703: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 704: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 721: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 756: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 767: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 774: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 793: Mr. HARPER and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 817: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 825: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 829: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 845: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 868: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 874: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 886: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BARTON, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 912: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 915: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 920: Mr. SANFORD, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 999: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1088: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1089: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1112: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1158: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1178: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1289: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FARR, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1299: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 1300: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1327: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1369: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1382: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1384: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1388: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 1399: Mr. YOHO, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1401: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1424: Ms. ESTY and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1427: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1439: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1453: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1464: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1475: Mr. CARTER of Texas and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1478: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1482: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1508: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1516: Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1559: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1567: Mr. DENT and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1585: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1599: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. ROSS,

H.R. 1600: Mr. LANCE and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1614: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1627: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1644: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1700: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1718: Mr. YOHO, Mr. COLE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1748: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1786: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1814: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1836: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1861: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1877: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1902: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1920: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1921: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1943: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1964: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1971: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1984: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1989: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1992: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 2003: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2016: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2025: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2058: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2072: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2077: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2110: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2124: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2125: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2126: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2132: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2141: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2142: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2156: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BLUM, Mr. LONG, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2170: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. VELA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2173: Mr. ISRAEL and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2189: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2192: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2193: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2214: Mr. WALZ, Mr. JONES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2216: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2222: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2233: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2260: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 2272: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2277: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2280: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2290: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2300: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2302: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2309: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2315: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2330: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 2352: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2368: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2379: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2383: Mr. BRAT and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. PETERS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. MICA.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H. Res. 118: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 130: Mr. WOODALL and Ms. MOORE.
H. Res. 204: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Res. 209: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. COOK, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 210: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 218: Mr. BABIN.
H. Res. 226: Mr. PERRY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2353, ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

H.R. 2353 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 2353, the ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative SMITH, or a designee, to H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

SENATE—*Monday, May 18, 2015*

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, thank You for Your steadfast love and unchanging mercy, for we are sustained by Your tender compassion.

Give our lawmakers the wisdom to follow Your example of self-sacrifice and keep them from traveling down dead-end paths. Lord, strengthen them in their challenging work, as they strive to find common ground. Shield them from strife, as they seek to unite for the good of our Nation and world. Empower them to trust You, even during life's storms, believing that in everything You are working for the good of those who love You. Lord, do for them exceedingly, abundantly above all that they can ask or think.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Democratic leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it seems as if every day the majority leader keeps telling us how great the Senate is working—better than ever, he says. Let's take a look at a couple of things today.

The growing backlog on nominations is another story. There are more than 100 nominations pending in committees. This is an interesting way the Republicans do this. They say we do not have anything on the calendar. We cannot have anything on the calendar if they do not report them out of the committees.

There are 48 nominations currently pending in the Foreign Relations Committee, including Ambassadors of really important countries, such as Pakistan, Finland, Sweden, Kosovo, and many other countries. The Environment and Public Works Committee has 11 pending nominations, and 9 nominations are waiting in the HELP Committee. At the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, there is a score—many of them there. There are eight nominations awaiting consideration in the banking committee. Seven are pending in commerce, and six await Senate Finance Committee action.

In the Judiciary Committee—I spoke here a little while ago, a week ago, about Judge Felipe Restrepo. He is a Federal district court judge in Pennsylvania. It is being delayed, even though both Senators—a Democrat and Republican—from Pennsylvania want this nomination to go forward. So they say. He is one of 20 pending nominations awaiting in the Judiciary Committee. That is unbelievable. Committee consideration is not the only obstacle to confirmation, the Republican leader also slows down the consideration once they get here on the floor.

The Republicans' refusal to consider the President's judicial nominations is especially pronounced, especially when you consider that the assistant Republican leader came to the floor here and said we are going to move these expeditiously. He is from Texas. We had one judge, George Hanks, who was confirmed by a vote of 91 to 0. He was only the second judicial nomination we have considered in this Republican Congress in some 5 months.

Imagine that. We know there are judicial emergencies and vacancies throughout the country, but we have only considered two judges in this entire Congress.

When this year started, we had 12 emergencies. Now there are 25, more than double from the beginning of this year alone. In Texas alone, there are seven judicial emergencies, the most of any State in the Nation.

Judge Olvera has been nominated to fill a judicial emergency in the Southern District of Texas. His nomination certainly was not controversial. It was reported out of the Judiciary Committee by voice vote in February.

At his hearing, as I indicated earlier, the assistant majority leader said he wanted to move these judges expeditiously. If this is expeditiously, I do not know what the term means. Why is this noncontroversial nomination being delayed for months? Is this the type of swift type of confirmation that Texans can expect from their leaders?

If our Republican colleagues would make good on their public statements and confirm these qualified executive and judicial nominations before the Memorial Day holiday, that would be great. But they are not going to. Is the Senate working better than ever? I do not think so.

HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. REID. ''America is one big pothole.'' Those are not my words. They are the words of former Republican Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood, a longtime Member of Congress and a Republican from Illinois. That is how he described America's crumbling infrastructure: ''America is one big pothole.''

It is hard to argue with Secretary LaHood's assessment. According to the Federal Highway Administration, 50 percent of American roads are in disrepair. Half of the roads we drive on are in disrepair. What are State legislatures around the country doing? Raising the speed limit.

There are a number of places in America where the speed limit is 80 miles an hour. That means that this weekend—Memorial Day weekend—as American families load up their cars and head to the beach or the lake or to visit loved ones, half of the highways they travel on are in dire need of repair.

If that were not troubling enough, 64,000 American bridges are structurally deficient. As each day goes by, these roads and bridges get a little worse—one big pothole.

It is not just our roads and our bridges. Our Nation's infrastructure affects every means of travel. We are all distraught by last week's Amtrak train derailment in Pennsylvania. Eight people were killed. Hundreds were injured. It has been reported that the horrible derailment might have been prevented if speed control safeguards had been installed on this particular section of track.

What we have here in this Congress—my Republican friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky, is talking about the Senate running better than ever. I think not.

The story of our Nation's infrastructure woes is very clear. We have the technology. This great country has the resources. But my friends will not appropriate any money to do this. Stunningly, time and again, we have failed to fix the problems—one big pothole. Fifty percent of our roads are deficient, and 64,000 bridges are structurally deficient. Specifically, Republicans in Congress have refused to work with Democrats in making an adequate long-term investment in our country's service transportation.

What we have here time after time are short-term extensions of the highway bill. Before the Republicans hit town here, we used to do long-term highway bills—they have stood in the way of doing that—so that the Department of Transportation and leaders in all 50 States could plan ahead. That is why we did these long-term bills. The way it is now, a 2-month extension or a 6-month extension does not work. It is terribly inefficient and very, very expensive.

The highway trust fund runs out in about 8 or 10 weeks. The authorization for the Federal highway program expires later this month. Later this month, if we have not extended the highway bill, there could be no money spent on highways.

The fact that these programs are expiring is no secret. Our Republican colleagues have known about this deadline for months and months. Yet here we are at the end of May, and Republicans are no closer to crafting a long-term investment in our roads, bridges, and railways. They have not had a markup in the four committees of jurisdiction. In fact, Republicans are trying to do the opposite. They are going to the extreme of gutting our already inadequate transportation.

Look at what happened with Amtrak. The House Republicans chose to cut Amtrak in the hours just after the derailment by a quarter of a billion dollars. Who could help but be astonished by this act of carelessness?

Former Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell, who knows quite a bit about Pennsylvania, speaking of the Republicans in Congress said: ''Normally, after a tragedy, a pipeline bursts, a bridge collapses, everyone for a couple of weeks says 'we've really got to do something.' Here, less than 12 hours after seven people died''—of course, now it is eight—''these Republicans in Congress didn't even have the decency to table the vote.''

They went right ahead and did it, cutting a quarter of a billion dollars from Amtrak.

In addition to what it does and does not do to highways, our bridges, our dams, is the fact that it stops job creation. Every billion dollars we spend on highway construction, infrastructure development, we create 47,500 high-paying jobs. Instead of slashing Federal funding or putting critical transportation infrastructure on the back burner, we should be crafting a long-term plan to boost our Nation's investment and infrastructure.

With precious little time before the Federal highway program expires, there is no hope for anything but a short-term authorization longer than a few months. We understand that. We are not happy about it, but that is the reality of the situation that the Republicans have forced us to be in.

The U.S. highway system is crucial to our Nation's economic well-being. It is how we move goods and services. It is central to American families who use our roads and bridges every day.

The American Society of Civil Engineers predicts that our economy will lose $1 trillion without adequate infrastructure investment. That is almost 3.5 million jobs, and some say more than that.

Congress must invest in working families and businesses by addressing our Nation's transportation needs. I invite congressional Republicans to work with us in building bipartisan consensus to ensure a strong and robust investment in our Nation's infrastructure. What is being done as we speak is that they are trying to patch together a 2-month extension. A 2-month extension or a 6-month extension, I think, is the wrong way to go. It is not good for our country.

Would the Chair announce the business before the Senate today.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Utah.

HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to take just a few minutes today to talk about the ongoing effort to maintain funding for the highway trust fund.

As we all know, while the highway trust fund currently has a large enough balance in terms of funding to last another 2 months, contracting authority expires at the end of May. Therefore, unless this Congress acts before we break for the Memorial Day recess, we will start seeing work stoppages on transportation projects around the country.

No one wants to see that. There is bipartisan agreement on that basic point. There is similar agreement on the desire for a long-term highway bill. Members of both parties are tired of kicking the can down the road and want to see a real, long-term fix. The problem is that the bipartisan agreement tends to end there.

The gold standard for a future, long-term highway bill has been set at 6 years. That is what everyone apparently wants to see happen, though few have offered workable solutions on how to pay for it.

According to CBO, a 6-year highway bill would cost a little more than $90 billion. That is not chump change, even by Congress's standards. It takes real work and significant policy changes to raise that kind of money. One party cannot do it alone. It takes cooperation and compromise, something that, unfortunately, has been lacking around here for some time.

As the chairman of the committee with jurisdiction over the funding for highways, I am committed to finding a solution that gets us as far into the future as possible before we have to revisit the issue again. Toward that end, I have been working with Chairman RYAN of the House Ways and Means Committee and others on a path forward.

Our initial plan was to pull together enough funding to get us through the end of 2015. That would have cost roughly $11 billion—with a ''b''—not an insignificant number, by any means, but very doable under the circumstances.

We had roughly $5 billion in agreed-upon tax compliance offsets from the previous highway episode late last year. Chairman RYAN and I thought it seemed reasonable to couple that with an equal amount in spending reductions and reforms, getting us very close to what we would need to get the country through the rest of the year on highways.

For a time, it appeared as though at least some of our colleagues on the other side were willing to work with us on this general framework. Unfortunately, that cooperation did not last. In fact, it never really began.

Last week, rather than even consider a path forward that includes spending reductions, our Democratic counterparts, at the urging of their leadership here in the Senate, effectively walked away from the negotiating table. As a result, it appears that the only immediate path forward is to extend contracting authority until the end of July, when the funding runs out, setting us up for another deadline and potential cliff in just a few short weeks.

Let me be clear, I do not fault Republican leaders in either Chamber for taking this route. It was, given the short timetable, the only option left after Democrats failed to engage in meeting us halfway with a balanced package of compliance revenue and spending reductions.

But make no mistake, we are going to be here again in 2 months, facing the same problem, because unless someone has $90 billion just lying around, a long-term highway solution is not going to simply materialize between now and July. Don't get me wrong, fixing it in December was going to be difficult as well, but in the end it will likely take at least that long to find a solution that has a chance of passing through both Chambers.

The other side's strategy appears pretty transparent. They clearly have two goals in mind. First, they think

that if they make Republicans vote on highway funding over and over again, we can be cajoled into accepting their preferred solution, which is a large tax hike. Second, they think that by maintaining a constant state of chaos and uncertainty, they can make the Republican-led Congress look bad or look ineffectual.

That first goal is pretty predictable. After all, a tax hike is their answer to pretty much every question that arises here. I hope I am wrong on the apparent second goal. If I am right, it is just sad. Apparently, after spending years in the majority trying to make sure the Senate never did anything productive, their goals have not changed now that they are in the minority.

But things are different now. These days, we are getting things done in the Senate, much to the consternation of some of my friends on the other side of the aisle. Despite this most recent shift on highway funding, I am confident we can work together to find a workable path forward. It just may take a few more votes to get us there.

Today, though I am frustrated, I am undeterred. I am committed to finding a long-term solution to our highway problems. I plan to keep working with my colleagues on finding a way to get us there, particularly Chairman INHOFE, whose committee deals with much of the highway policy, as well as those who serve on the Finance and Ways and Means Committees.

The highway bill should be a bipartisan effort. It used to be. Hopefully, after we get this latest episode behind us, it will be again.

PROTECTING STATES' RIGHTS TO PROMOTE AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY ACT

Mr. HATCH. Finally, Mr. President, I would also like to briefly talk about legislation I introduced earlier this year, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act, which reinforces States' already effective regulatory practices relating to hydraulic fracturing.

This important piece of legislation recognizes States' demonstrated ability to properly address hydraulic fracturing and allows them to continue regulating on this issue. Importantly, this legislation does not prevent the Bureau of Land Management from promulgating baseline standards where none exist.

As background, for over 60 years, States have safely and successfully regulated hydraulic fracturing in a way that protects the environment. When I was in the oil business back in the early 1970s, hydraulic fracturing was being used then, although it has been brought clearly into a much more safe and responsible way since. Even the Obama administration has admitted there has never been an example of harm to human health or groundwater contamination caused by hydraulic fracturing under existing State regulations and oversight.

States should be able to continue to regulate hydraulic fracturing, and swift passage of this bill will afford needed certainty and future security for emerging U.S. energy development companies.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1314, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Pending:

Hatch amendment No. 1221, in the nature of a substitute.

Hatch (for Flake) amendment No. 1243 (to amendment No. 1221), to strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program.

Hatch (for Lankford) amendment No. 1237 (to amendment No. 1221), to establish consideration of the conditions relating to religious freedom of parties to trade negotiations as an overall negotiating objective of the United States.

Brown amendment No. 1242 (to amendment No. 1221), to restore funding for the trade adjustment assistance program to the level established by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two managers or their designees.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Thank you, Madam President.

Finally, at long last, the Senate has begun its debate on the Bipartisan Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, a bipartisan and bicameral bill to renew trade promotion authority or TPA. As one of the authors of this legislation, I am glad we have gotten to this point and look forward to a spirited and fulsome debate on the floor.

This legislation has been in the works for a long time. As we all know, the previous iteration of TPA expired in 2007. The original version was originally enacted in 2002. In other words, it has been 13 years since Congress seriously considered legislation to renew trade promotion authority. I think it is safe to say that at least for those who focus on trade policy, the debate and discussion surrounding what would go into the next TPA bill has been going on that entire time.

For me, while I have long been a supporter of free trade and TPA, the real work on this bill began in earnest in the spring of 2013. I worked for the better part of a year with former Chairman Max Baucus and Dave Camp on legislation to renew TPA for a 21st century economy. We introduced our bill—which, in many ways, formed the basis for the legislation we are debating now—in January of last year.

This year, when I became chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I sought to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make improvements to the bill in order to broaden its support. Most notably, I worked closely with my colleagues on the Finance Committee and with chairman PAUL RYAN of the House Ways and Means Committee to craft an improved TPA bill. Senator WYDEN and I work well together, and we were able to bring this bill to fruition. I think we were successful.

Indeed, we were able to build upon the efforts of last Congress to make important changes that will enhance Congress's role in crafting our trade policy and improve overall transparency and accountability. We introduced our bill on April 16, and on April 22, the Finance Committee reported the bill along with a few other important trade bills you may have heard about.

The vote on our TPA bill was 20 to 6. The last time the Senate Finance Committee reported a TPA bill on the Senate floor was 1988. While we passed other TPA bills in the nearly three decades since that time, this is the first to go through regular order, including a full committee process and original consideration on the floor.

I want to thank my colleagues, in both the House and the Senate, who have worked with me to get us to this point, especially Senator WYDEN and others on the Democratic side as well and certainly everybody on the Republican side. The fact that we are now on the floor debating this bill is, in and of itself, a milestone. In fact, I would call it historic, but let's not fool ourselves. We still have a long way to go.

Let's talk about the bill for just a moment. I would like to begin by addressing the most basic question: What

is TPA or trade promotion authority? Put simply, TPA is the most important tool Congress has to advance our Nation's trade agenda. Specifically, TPA represents a compact between the Senate, the House, and the administration. Under this arrangement, the administration agrees to pursue objectives specified by Congress and agrees to consult with Congress as it negotiates trade agreements. In return, both the House and Senate agree to allow for time-specific consideration of trade agreements without amendments. This ensures that Congress leads the way in setting our Nation's trade agenda while giving our trade negotiators in the administration the tools necessary to reach high-standard trade agreements.

Why is this compact so important? There are a number of reasons, but for now I will just focus on two. First, the TPA compact ensures that Congress has a voice in setting trade priorities before a trade agreement is finalized. By setting clear negotiating objectives in a TPA bill, Congress is able to specify what a potential trade agreement must contain in order to gain passage.

Second, the compact allows our trade negotiators to deliver on an agreement. As our negotiators work with our trading partners on trade agreements, they need to be able to give assurance that the deal they sign will be the one Congress votes on. They cannot do that without TPA. In a sense, without TPA, our trading partners are negotiating not only with the professionals at USTR but also with all 535 Members of Congress, whose views and priorities may be unknown or unknowable. Under this scenario, our partners will not put their best efforts on the table because many will have no guarantees that the agreement they reach will remain intact once it goes through Congress. In short, TPA is essential for both the conclusion and passage of strong trade agreements.

I would like to take a few minutes to talk about some of the specifics of our bill. First of all, our TPA bill updates the congressional negotiating objectives to focus trade agreements on setting fair rules and tearing down barriers to trade. In fact, the TPA bill we are now debating now contains the clearest articulation of congressional trade priorities in our Nation's history, including nearly 150 ambitious, high-standard negotiating objectives, most of them designed to break down barriers that American exporters face in the 21st century economy.

Under the bill, future trade agreements must include strong international rules to counter unfair trade practices, including those related to currency, digital piracy, cross-border data flows, cyber theft of trade secrets, localization barriers, nonscientific sanitary and phytosanitary practices, state-owned enterprises, and labor and environmental policies.

Our bill also requires that U.S. trade agreements reflect a standard of intellectual property rights protection similar to that found in U.S. law. We also call for an end to the theft of U.S. intellectual property by foreign governments, including piracy and the theft of trade secrets and for the elimination of measures that require U.S. companies to locate their intellectual property abroad in return for market access.

Finally, the TPA bill expands congressional engagement in ongoing and future negotiations by ensuring that Members can review proposals and discuss them with our trade negotiators. The bill also creates new congressional oversight mechanisms to ensure that the administration—whichever administration it is—closely adheres to the objectives set by Congress, including a new procedure that Congress can employ if our trade negotiators fail to consult or make progress toward meeting the negotiating objectives. As you can see, this bill addresses the needs of our modern economy, and it fully takes into account the concerns expressed by Members of Congress and the American public about the trade negotiating process.

The legislation before us also contains the Finance Committee's bill to reauthorize trade adjustment assistance or TAA. I think I have made it pretty clear that I am not TAA's biggest fan. I oppose the program in general and voted against the TAA bill in committee, but from the outset of this process, it was clear to us on the Republican side that we would have to swallow hard and allow TAA to pass in order to get TPA across the finish line. Toward that end, we joined the two bills together on the floor.

In short, this is a good bill and one that Members of both parties should be able to support.

As I mentioned, the vote in the Finance Committee in favor of TPA was 20 to 6. I hope we will get a similar bipartisan result on the floor. I think we can.

To conclude, I just want to make it clear that I am not naive. I am well aware not everyone agrees with me on these issues. There are some—including a few of our colleagues in the Senate—who oppose what we are trying to do with this legislation. They oppose TPA and virtually all free-trade agreements. In essence, though they usually deny it, they oppose trade in general.

Of course, I respect the views of my colleagues on these matters as well as any others on which we happen to disagree, but let's be clear about a few things. When you oppose TPA and trade agreements, you stand against the creation of new, higher paying jobs for American workers. You stand against American farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, entrepreneurs, and the workers they employ who need access to foreign markets, and you stand against the advancement of American values and interests on the world stage.

I will have more to say on the floor about these issues in the coming days about how TPA and trade agreements can help small businesses and agriculture and how important our trade policies are to our national security. I plan to do all I can to make the case that U.S. trade with foreign countries is a good thing and that this legislation represents our best opportunity to advance a trade agenda that works for America.

For now, I will just say once again that while I am pleased—very pleased, in fact—that we made it this far on TPA, I will not be satisfied until we have a bill on the President's desk—a President who is behind this bill, strongly supportive of it, and has encouraged us every step of the way.

As I have stated, we need to have a fair and open debate on these issues. I am committed to hearing arguments, considering amendments, and demonstrating how a functioning Senate is supposed to operate. I hope my colleagues will join me in that type of discussion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, first, let me thank Chairman HATCH for our partnership over these many months, and let me be clear at the outset that I agree with much of what Chairman HATCH has said. What I would like to start with is what I think is the bedrock principle of this debate about trade and put it all straightforward and upfront; that is, this is about trade done right. This is not the trade policy of the 1990s. This is not the NAFTA playbook. It is not even the 2002 TPA package. I realize the Presiding Officer was not in the Senate at that time. After my opening remarks, I am going to start outlining the 30 progressive changes in the 2015 TPA package that were not in the 2002 program to show how different this trade policy will be.

The point of what I have started with—this focus on trade done right—is to drive home the potential for more good-paying jobs for our workers. This would be true in Oregon, Utah, Iowa, and across the land. In my State, one out of five jobs revolves around exports. The export jobs often pay better than do the nontrade jobs.

The reason I bring this up is I do not think there is any more pressing economic issue in our country than finding ways to increase wages for Americans and particularly the middle class and those who aspire to be middle class. The facts demonstrate clearly that the export jobs often pay better than do the nonexport jobs. The reason that is the case is because there is often a very large value-added component. There is increased productivity.

The fact is, when we grow things in Iowa or Oregon or any other part of the country and make things in America and we add value to them, then we can ship them somewhere.

What the Department of Commerce has found in a number of their analyses is that those export-related jobs often pay better than do the nonexport jobs.

The reason I am starting with this is that this is particularly relevant given the potential market that is out there for the people of Oregon, Iowa, and every other part of our country. The analysis shows that by 2025, there are going to be about 1 billion middle-class consumers in the developing world—1 billion people with a significant amount of disposable income. I think they want to buy the Oregon brand, they want to buy the American brand. They are going to be interested in buying our computers. They are going to want to buy our wine and agricultural products. They are going to buy our helicopters. They are going to buy our planes. They are going to buy a whole host of products. The question is, Are Americans going to reap the fruit of those export opportunities? That, fundamentally, is what this is all about with respect to exports and particularly employment opportunities.

The reality is that our markets are basically open, but a lot of the countries that are part of the region we are looking at for the first agreement—what is called the Trans-Pacific Partnership—have markets that are much more closed. They have double- and triple-digit tariffs. I suspect the Presiding Officer is very concerned about the double- and triple-digit tariffs on agricultural commodities. Certainly, the people of Oregon are very concerned about the consequences of those huge tariffs on our agricultural goods.

So, as we start this discussion, right at the center is this focus on what I call trade done right and my view that trade done right can create an enormous array of economic opportunities for hard-working middle-class Americans who deserve to have us come up with policies that shape a better future for them rather than the alternative.

Make no mistake about the alternative. If we walk off the field, China comes onto the field and China says: Fine; we are happy to write the rules.

To me—I am going to outline this—what Chairman HATCH and I and others have produced is a policy that will force standards up as opposed to much of what critics say about past trade policies, that they drive—it is a race to the bottom, that it drives standards down. This is a piece of legislation which is going to drive up standards.

With that, I am going to start outlining the differences between the 2015 TPA package and the 2002 TPA package. I am going to start with the requirement for labor, the environment, and affordable medicines.

In 2002, there was no requirement for trading partners' laws to comply with core international labor standards. Let me repeat that. In 2002—more than a dozen years ago—there was no requirement for trading partners' laws to comply with core international labor standards. Under the package Chairman HATCH and our colleagues and I on the Finance Committee have produced, trading partners must adopt and maintain core international labor standards, and there are trade sanctions if they do not comply. It could not be more different—the rules from 2002 TPA and the rules for 2015 under what Chairman HATCH and I and others on the Finance Committee insisted on.

Let's talk about the environment. I mentioned labor first. Let's talk about the environment. In 2002, there was no requirement for trading partners' laws to comply with common multilateral environmental agreements. In 2015, under the bipartisan Finance package, trading partners must adopt and maintain common multilateral environmental agreements, and there are trade sanctions if they do not comply. Again, 2002 and 2015—the differences could not be more stark with respect to environmental protection.

With respect to affordable medicines, in 2002, there were no provisions balancing intellectual property protections to ensure access to medicines for developing countries. In 2015, there are directives for trade agreements to promote access to medicine and foster innovation.

I do want to yield to the distinguished majority leader, but I wanted to begin this debate—particularly when Chairman HATCH is on the floor—by highlighting the differences between 2002 and 2015, particularly in areas so important to the American people, such as labor, environmental protection, and access to medicines.

I know we all want to hear from the distinguished majority leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I thank my good friend from Oregon, and I congratulate both the Senator from Oregon and the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator HATCH, for moving this important legislation forward.

Thursday's vote to open this debate on trade was very important for our country. It brought middle-class families one step closer to the increased American exports and American trade jobs our economy needs. It took a lot of work to get us this far. It is going to take a lot more of that kind of work to bring these American jobs over the finish line. Cooperation from both sides of the aisle will be critical to doing so. For instance, we were ready to be in session on Friday to get more of our work done on trade and allow Senators from both parties the chance to offer amendments. All the unnecessary delaying and filibustering we have seen has left us with less time for debate and amendments on this bill—less time for debate and amendments on this bill. It cost the Senate over a week in lost time.

We have been hearing some interesting suggestions from our friends about their level of cooperation over on the minority side. I would certainly agree that putting these words into action would be very good news for our country. This week, our colleagues will have the perfect opportunity to prove they are serious. They will have a chance to turn the page completely from the far left's strategy of wasting time on trade for its own sake, on an issue we all know is President Obama's top domestic legislative priority.

I want to be very clear. The Senate will finish its work on trade this week. We will remain in session as long as it takes to do so. I know we became used to hearing these types of statements in the past, but Senators should know that I am quite serious. I would advise against making any sort of travel arrangements until the path forward becomes clear. It is also my intention this week to address the highways issue and to responsibly extend the expiring provisions of FISA. The quickest way to get there would be to cooperate across the aisle so we can pass the trade bill in a thoughtful but efficient manner. I know Members on both sides are going to want a chance to offer amendments to the bill. They should offer amendments. I am for that. I encourage them to do so, both Republicans and Democrats. Now is the time for Senators from both parties to offer those amendments and work with the bill managers to set up the vote.

This is where our Democratic friends' rhetoric about working cooperatively in the minority will be put to the test. The more our colleagues across the aisle try to throw sand in the gears this week, the less opportunity Members—including Members of their own party—will have for amendments. So I hope they will not do that.

We have a lot to get accomplished. We have 1 less week to do so. That is why I would encourage Members of both parties to bring their amendments to the bill managers and work to get them pending. Let's process amendments from both sides—both sides—and then let's pass this bill so we can boost American jobs and exports by knocking down unfair barriers to the things we make and grow right here in America.

Let me be clear again. This week, we will finish the trade promotion authority bill. We will act on a highway extension and we will act on FISA before we leave for the Memorial Day recess.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I appreciate the majority leader's comments. I know Senator SESSIONS will be speaking in a moment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SESSIONS succeed me after I speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I would remind the majority leader that the last time he used the term, ''We shouldn't waste our time on trade,'' meaning not that we shouldn't pass this trade agreement—of course he supports that—but that we should not spend so much time on trade—the last time, 13 years ago, when Congress debated a trade issue, it led to much smaller trade agreements; most immediately, the Central America Free Trade Agreement. That was the one President Bush most wanted to negotiate at that time, if I recall. That debate lasted for 3 weeks. I am not suggesting this debate last 3 weeks, but I am suggesting that to say we are wasting our time on trade, on a long debate, on a thorough debate with a number of amendments, is a bit of a reach.

I would add that this trade agreement, this fast-track, speaks to, ultimately, at least 60 percent of the world's GDP; first, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is pretty much already negotiated, even though the USTR will not let much of this trade agreement actually see the light of day prior to voting on fast-track; and, second, once TTIP—the United States-European Union agreement—is brought to the Senate and House for approval, that will mean 60 percent of the world's GDP will be included.

So to say we can only debate this for 3 days and squeeze the number of amendments, when I know that at least a dozen Senators, at least a dozen more, probably like a dozen and a half on the Democratic side alone—I know a number of Republicans have amendments too—want to offer amendments, want them debated on, and want them voted on.

AMENDMENT NO. 1242

So the first amendment that I believe we will vote on tonight is my amendment on trade adjustment assistance. Everyone acknowledges—from those who oppose TPA and oppose TPP to its most vehement cheerleaders, the Wall Street Journal editorial board, a number of conservative think tanks, and a number of free-trade advocates—that trade agreements result in winners and losers because they bring dislocation in the economy. We can debate whether the winners outweigh the losers—I don't think they do. I think the losers outweigh the winners in what happens in trade.

I know that the wealthiest 5 percent in this country, by and large, gain from these trade agreements, but the broad middle and below typically lose from these trade agreements. I know what they have done to my State. I know what they have done to the Presiding Officer's State, and I know what they have done especially to manufacturing.

What is not debatable is some industries are going to get hurt, some communities will be hollowed out, some worker jobs will be lost. We know that. We owe it to workers who are going to have their lives upended, through no fault of their own, to do everything we can to ease the transition.

Think about that. We make a decision—President Obama asks us to pass this, the Republican leadership asks us to pass this, and the Senate Republican leadership in the House, joining President Obama—to pass this. So the decisions we make here—the President of the United States and Members of Congress—will cost people their jobs. We know that whether you are for TPA or not.

We know some people will lose their jobs because of these trade agreements. We owe it to them, to those workers who have lost jobs, to those communities that experience devastation, small towns that have seen plants close. That creates devastation in those towns. We owe it to provide training and assistance to help those communities, to help those workers get back on their feet.

That is why I am calling on all my colleagues—regardless of how you feel about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, regardless of how you are going to vote on fast-track—to support this amendment, which restores trade adjustment assistance funding levels to $575 million a year. This is the same level that was included in the bipartisan TAA bill in 2011. One-quarter of current Senate Republicans—sitting Senate Republicans, one-quarter of them—voted for that higher number.

This amendment is fully paid for. I know some of you think that $450 million, the amount included in the underlying bill, is sufficient, but it is not. The truth is that $450 million likely will not be enough. In 2009 and 2010, TAA cost $685 million each year.

If you take the average of funding levels for the 3 years when program eligibility was nearly the same as the one we are considering today, TAA expenditures averaged $571 million a year. Put on top of that what has happened with the South Korea trade agreement—predictions of job growth, almost identical numbers, except it was job loss—that means more people eligible for TAA. Put on top of that the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

We know there will be winners and losers. The losers need help. Add that to the dollar figures we need for Trade adjustment assistance. TAA helps workers retrain for new jobs so they can compete. We have clear evidence that TAA works. It helps workers develop the skills they need to find work and stay employed.

If we are going to compete, we need to invest in these workers to make sure they are ready to meet that global competition.

Right now, this body considers fast-track authority for trade agreements that encompass 60 percent of the world's economy. Now is exactly the wrong time to underinvest in training workers. If we don't support my amendment, that is what we are doing. Make no mistake, if you go home after voting no on this dollar figure, of putting it back to where this Congress voted on it only 4 years ago, you are leaving workers behind. You are underinvesting in workers. You are showing that these workers who lose their jobs because of South Korea, these workers who lose their jobs because of NAFTA, CAFTA or what has happened with PNTR or the South Korea trade agreement, you are saying to those workers: Sorry. We don't have enough money to take care of you—even though it was our actions in the House, the Senate, and this President who caused those workers to lose their jobs.

This is the same level that, in 2011, 70 Senators supported, including 14 current Republican Senators who sit in this body today. In 2011, 307 Members of the House of Representatives also supported the dollar figure that this amendment calls for. I ask my colleagues, including the nearly one-quarter—the fully one-quarter of Senate Republicans who supported it at this level—to support it again today. If we are going to pursue aggressive trade promotion, an aggressive trade promotion agenda, we owe it to our workers, we owe it to our businesses, we owe it to our communities to make sure they are ready for the competition that is about to come their way.

We have a moral obligation to help the families whose livelihoods will be yanked out from under them, not from something they did wrong, not from a decision they made but from a decision we in this body made to change the rules.

We know that will happen. We saw it with NAFTA. We saw it with CAFTA. We are seeing it with Korea. We know we will see it again with TPP.

There is no question that potential new trade agreements we are considering will create economic loss. There is no question that Americans will lose jobs. There is no question. Nobody disputes that.

Are we not to take care of those workers who lose their jobs? Again, it wasn't their decision. It was our decision, in this body, to vote for these trade agreements and then not to fund those workers' comebacks, not to help those workers get back on their feet, not to retrain those workers who lost their jobs because of what we did in this body. Talk about a moral issue.

It is our duty to look out for those workers who end up on the losing end of our defined trade policy. That is why I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting trade adjustment assistance today at levels that this Congress overwhelmingly agreed to in a bipartisan manner 4 years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for allowing me to speak, for suggesting I speak next, which was my understanding I would be able to do.

We have good people on both sides of this issue, but Senator BROWN is an advocate, and I think he has made some good points with regard to the questions facing America.

Our colleagues earlier said this is a trade deal done right. Well, in a way that seems to say: don't pay attention to previous trade deals that haven't done so well.

We have a number of people who live in the business world, who trade internationally regularly, and they say this is not a good trade deal, and it will not work. We also hear it said frequently that we want increased wages for Americans by everybody on both sides of this issue.

But the proponents of the legislation—if you watch carefully what they have been saying—they are only saying it will only increase wages in export industries, not across the economy. And we know that in this Nation our exports amount to only 13 percent of GDP, which is the lowest in the developed world. We don't have a lot of exports. Perhaps, if we export more, maybe wages will go up a little bit, but if we import more in other industries in the 87 percent, we might see a decline in wages and jobs.

So what are the facts? More exports are good, but if increased imports dwarf increased exports, it is not so good as a result of this agreement, especially when we have had virtually a six-year-record trade deficit in March and one of the worst quarters in years—the first quarter of this year—in importing more than we export.

So the Korea agreement didn't live up to the promises we had for it. I supported it. I voted for it. But will this one be any better? Don't we need to know?

So I asked five questions of the President more than 10 days ago.

First, regarding jobs and wages. On net, will TPP increase the total number of manufacturing jobs in the United States, generally, or reduce them and auto manufacturing jobs, specifically.

Will hourly wages for U.S. workers go up or down? Don't you have that information? Shouldn't that be shared with us before we vote?

Regarding trade deficits, I ask: Will TPP reduce or increase our cumulative trade deficit with TPP countries overall?

And with the big, new members, it will be significantly impacted—Japan and Vietnam, specifically.

Regarding China, could TPP member countries add new countries—including China—to the agreement without future congressional approval?

Some have tried to say it can't be done. You have to go down in the secret room here, read it, and you are very limited in what you can find out. But as I have read the agreement, I don't think there is any doubt that under WTO rules which will be adopted, new members can be added without a vote of Congress.

Regarding the phrase, the ''living agreement'' that is in this deal, the fact that the agreement itself said this is unprecedented. It is the first time we have ever had language like ''living agreement'' in a trade deal.

What does that mean? Can the agreement be changed after adoption without congressional action? It appears so.

So I have asked, Mr. President, make this living agreement language—it is not much—public, and let's discuss and analyze just what it means. Does it mean the President can meet with other countries, even vote against a change in trade policy or an agreement with them, lose the vote and have law of Congress overridden or us be in violation of the agreement, subject to sanctions by the Commission or international body.

And will the President state, explicitly, and accept language that would mean that rules regarding immigration would not be changed? I hope we can do that.

I will just say I see my colleague and admired chairman of the Finance Committee on the floor. He has been willing to meet with my staff, talk respectfully about these issues, and consider how to wrestle through them. I hope we can make some progress, but I am concerned we might not make sufficient progress.

We need to think about these things. It can no longer be denied that wages for American workers have been flat or even falling for decades. One analysis says that real hourly wages today are lower than they were in 1973. At the same time, the share of Americans actually working—the percentage of Americans in their working years who are actually working—has steadily declined to its lowest level in four decades.

The middle class is shrinking. I wish it were not so.

CNN recently summarized the results of a Pew study which found:

> Most states saw median incomes fall between 2000 and 2013, an ominous sign for the well-being of the middle class. . . .

That is really a catastrophe. So in 13 years we have seen a steady decline in wages for the middle class.

A separate Pew Research Center study shows that the share of adults in middle-income households has fallen from 61 percent in 1970 to 51 percent in 2013. The erosion over the past four decades has been sure and steady. That is the Pew research.

They continue:

> If past trends continue to hold, there is little reason to believe the recovery from the Great Recession will eventually lead to a rebound in the share of adults in middle-income households.

In other words, they are going to be below a middle-income level. And that is not good. Don't we, colleagues, have a responsibility to honestly say: What is causing this?

We have had Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents during this time. Trends are occurring out there. Some of them may be difficult to overcome. But don't we need to talk about it more comprehensively?

Pew further finds that while middle-income families—who are the majority of Americans by far—earned 62 percent of the Nation's household income in 1970, today they earn only 44 percent of the Nation's household income. So the sad fact is that the middle class is getting smaller. This has enormous implications not just economically but socially. The size and strength of a middle class impacts the health of a community and a nation in many ways. What are we here for in the Senate if not to address, consider, and deal with these kinds of issues? We need to ask some tough questions about why the middle class is shrinking and why pay isn't rising.

I have no doubt that bigger government, more regulations, more taxes, our huge $18 trillion debt and the interest we pay on it, and, lately, ObamaCare are important factors in weakening American economic growth and the wages of Americans. I truly believe those are significant factors. But is that all there is? I am afraid there is more. It appears there are two other factors of significance that are not being sufficiently recognized or seriously discussed by any of our political, corporate, and academic leaders, or the media establishment. So it is time for us to begin a vigorous analysis of our conduct of trade. I believe that is one of the factors that may be impacting the wages and income of Americans.

Over a number of years, I have pointed out that I believe immigration actions are also containing the growth of wages, as economic studies repeatedly show. But what about trade? Do our policies like the Trans-Pacific Partnership concede too much to our mercantilist competitor allies? These are good countries—Japan, Vietnam. We want to see Vietnam develop and move into the world orbit. There are other countries, but those are the two big ones that would be most impacted by this agreement.

We already have trade agreements with Canada, Mexico, Australia, Chile, and others. What about those that have a different philosophy on trade than we do—the mercantilist ideas? Do their actions over the years establish that they have developed trade and nontrade barrier systems that provide their workers and manufacturers substantial advantages in the world marketplace? Have they figured out how to utilize other barriers—other than just tariffs—to advantage their manufacturers and jobs?

It is astounding to me how little serious discussion there has been on these issues.

For some trade advocates, even bad trade deals are good. Truly, this is so. Many advocates are quite open in their belief that as long as the consumer gets a lower price for their product, there should be no concern if American plants close, workers are laid off, and wages fall. They say that in their writings. The politicians don't say it; they have to answer to the people. Many of the theorists for open borders and utterly free trade say that often. So I fear we have almost an obsession with trade agreements and that this is so strong that many TPP advocates don't concern themselves with anything but that we admit more cheaper goods, that lower prices are good for consumers.

That we are all consumers, there can be no doubt. That is a valuable thing, for consumers to have products at lower prices. I don't dispute that. I know some do, but I don't. But is any trade agreement good because it creates more low-cost imports, especially if we are competing against partners who know how to cheat the system and gain manipulative advantage and we don't stand up and try to correct that?

Are trade deficits, which are at all-time-high levels, immaterial? Some say trade deficits don't make much of a difference. They do. Is the continuing shuttering of American manufacturing of no concern? I think it is of great concern. Fundamentally, can America be strong without a manufacturing base? Can we be secure without a steel industry, which is getting hammered through unfair trade and dumping and other actions by our trading competitors?

At bottom, we must ask whether our aggressive trading partners, using a mercantilist philosophy, may be gaining unfair advantage over the American manufacturing base and workers in America.

These nations—good nations, good allies—are not religious about free trade. In general, while they assert their desire for expanded free trade, their actual policies seek fewer U.S. exports to them using nontariff as well as tariff barriers, and our trade competitors use currency manipulation, subsidies, and other actions to expand their exports to us. Their goal is naturally to seek full employment in their countries while exporting their unemployment to our country.

This refusal by many to acknowledge the mercantilist policies of our trading competitors has gone, it seems to me, from promoting healthy trading relationships, to some sort of ideology, even to the nature—I have said, and others have as well—of a religion. If you just knock down all trade barriers, allow our competitors to use whatever tactics they want to use, accept any product that comes in that is cheaper, somehow we will have world peace, cancer will be cured, and the economy will boom. But forgive me if I am not willing to buy into that.

Cheaper products are good, is what our promoters say. That is all you need to know. Don't ask too many questions about facts. You are going to get cheaper products. That is the only thing that counts.

Well, I don't dismiss the advantage of cheaper products. It is a serious issue. This issue deserves everybody's serious discussion. But I have to tell you, I am having my doubts. I have voted for other trade agreements, and I am uneasy about this.

Conservatism is not an ideology; it is, as my friend Bob Tyrrell at the American Spectator likes to say, a cast of mind. It lives in the real world. And certainly the real world is not working so well for Middle America today. It is not. Their financial status continues to decline.

The conservative thing to do at this point in time is to avoid any dramatic and sudden changes that destabilize families and communities further, to not accelerate the problem that exists. And let's dig in deeply to the questions I ask: Will wages go up? Will trade deficits be reduced?

By the way, the Korea Free Trade Agreement didn't work so well. We were promised a number of things. President Obama promised the Korea Free Trade Agreement would increase U.S. goods exported by $10 billion to $11 billion. However, since the deal was ratified several years ago, our exports have risen only $0.8 billion—less than $1 billion—while Korean exports to the United States increased by more than $12 billion, widening our trade gap substantially, almost doubling it. I am just telling you that is what was promised, and the reality didn't match the promises. So is it any wonder the American people are uneasy about these agreements? And I think all of us should be. We should look to be more careful about them.

Capital is mobile. People can move money and invest anywhere in the world almost with the click of a computer button. But many times workers are not mobile like that. So when a company closes its plant in the United States and shifts production to a lower wage country, the company may make more money, but the workers in their communities, who cannot move overseas, suddenly don't have jobs, and they are hurt.

Of course we can't stop globalization in this economy. We can't reverse the effects of trade. But we can work for trade agreements that create a more level playing field against our good but mercantilist, aggressive trading partners who look for advantages every day and who lust after access to the American marketplace. That is what they want, but we don't have to give that access unless they treat our products with respect and allow access to their marketplaces.

So many in our country have an inflexible ideology that the United States and the American people should allow for the completely unrestricted movement of goods and labor into the United States, even when our trading partners manipulate rules for their advantage. Those truest believers are most adamant about passing this fast-track legislation as fast as possible, with the least discussion possible. But the United States is a country, colleagues, not an economy, and a country's job is first and foremost to protect its citizens from military attacks and also from unfair trade policies that threaten our economic well-being.

Any trade agreement we enter into should have a mutually beneficial impact on all parties, not just our country but other countries that enter into the agreement. It should be mutually beneficial. That is what contracts do every day. It must not continue or further the decline of manufacturing in the United States. It should seek to end trade unfairness and to increase, not reduce, wages in the United States.

We cannot afford to lose a single job nowadays to unfair competition or unfair trade agreements. We are experiencing a decline in wages, a decline in employment. We need to fight for every single job. And that means fair trade—you open your markets before you demand that we open ours. They haven't done so, while we have maintained open markets here.

But the fast-track procedures ensure that any trade deal—which is yet unseen—can pass through Congress with a minimum of actual scrutiny after years of soaring trade deficits. Shouldn't we apply more scrutiny to trade agreements, not less? Are we afraid to ask tough questions?

Take the issue of currency manipulation. This President has refused to confront this practice that provides a clear advantage for certain foreign competitors. His negotiations have refused to put any provisions in the Trans-Pacific Partnership that address this issue. And if Congress were to force it in, I am not sure he would even then enforce it.

The people pushing for this trade agreement, my colleagues have to

know, don't want to confront the currency manipulation. They think it is all right. They do not think it is a problem. It reduces the price of imports, so we should be thankful, they say. And under fast-track, there will be nothing we can do to amend or stop it.

Finally, the reality is that this fast-track legislation is a significant vote. No fast-track deal, once passed, has ever been blocked. So if we want to confront currency manipulation and other unfair practices, our best bet is to have trade bills come before Congress through the regular order—not as a fast-track deal. Then Congress can properly exercise its responsibilities that have been delegated to us under the Constitution of the United States.

I appreciate the able leaders of the committee who are advancing this legislation. I respect them and many of the arguments they have made. There is much value to them. But I am uneasy about where we are going today. I think we need to spend more time analyzing the actual impact—not the theoretical impact—of trade agreements—the actual results of our ability to penetrate the foreign markets. If we do that, maybe we can figure a way to actually improve the financial condition of mainstream America.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before he leaves the floor, I just wish to respond to a couple of the points made by our colleague from Alabama, because he brings up issues that Chairman HATCH and I talked a great deal about during the discussion of this proposal. I would just like to respond very specifically to some of the concerns raised by the Senator, my friend from Alabama.

My friend from Alabama said there would be no scrutiny—those were his words—of this particular agreement, and that it would be passed through as quickly as possible without any discussions.

Now, that certainly is an area where I have been very concerned. Chairman HATCH has been concerned that there hasn't been enough discussion in the past. So Chairman HATCH and I have changed this, and I want to be very clear what is going to happen now.

First, for a full 60 days before the President of the United States signs an agreement—starting with TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership—it would have to be made public for those full 60 days before the President signs it. Then after that, there would be close to 2 additional months when the American people would have the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, or any other, in their hands before anyone casts a vote on an actual agreement on the floor of the Senate or in the other body, in the House of Representatives.

So as to this idea that my friend from Alabama has said, that there wouldn't be any scrutiny of anything, we are starting to get a little flack that it would be out there for too long before people started voting. But what this——

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WYDEN. If I could just finish my statement.

Mr. SESSIONS. OK.

Mr. WYDEN. I was happy to listen to my colleague.

What this means is the people of Alabama, Iowa, Oregon, and everywhere else could come to one of our townhall meetings, have the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement in our lap, and ask questions of their elected representatives about a trade agreement for close to 4 months before it was voted on here or in the other body.

I am going to have to leave for a meeting to talk again about how we are going to see if we can find some common ground, but I do want to address one other point that my colleague made, and that deals with this question of middle-class wages.

My colleague and I agree completely that middle-class people are hurting. There is no question about it. We have millions of middle-class people in this country walking an economic tightrope, balancing their food bill against their fuel bill and their fuel bill against their housing bill—no question about that.

The difference of opinion here, between two Senators who enjoy each other's company, is that my colleague from Alabama says the principal problem is trade—that trade is the reason for this. Respectfully, the data from the Department of Commerce shows that export jobs—which is the focus of this bill and the focus of trade done right—pay better than do the nontrade jobs because they have a value-added kind of benefit to them. That is why—and I note for my friend from Alabama, who cares a great deal about the steel industry—the steel industry sent a letter to Chairman HATCH and me saying they were for this. The American steel industry sent a letter to Chairman HATCH and me saying they were for this because they know this is connected to producing more high-skilled, high-wage jobs, particularly in manufacturing, where my State is a leader.

So the question then becomes this: What are the big challenges? Certainly, technology is one, and globalization is one. Chairman HATCH and I have talked about flawed tax policy. I think it is particularly ominous that the tax breaks go for shipping jobs overseas rather than rewarding the manufacturers and those who produce what I call ''red, white, and blue'' jobs.

But during the time that I have here on the floor, I am going to be talking about the differences between this trade promotion act proposal and the last one of 2002. Nothing could illustrate the differences more than the new requirements for transparency and opportunity for the American people to weigh in. The facts are that, as a result of what Chairman HATCH and the Finance Committee have put together, the American people, before a vote is cast—before a vote is cast on a trade agreement here on the floor of the Senate or on the floor of the other body, the American people are going to have those trade agreements in their hands for pretty close to 4 months.

If my colleague wants to ask a question, I am happy to yield my time to him.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank Senator WYDEN. He is so principled, and I know his heart is right on all these issues. But there are some disagreements.

I do think the Senator gives a little more time between the actual agreement being adopted and its passage, which is preferable. But the truth is that none of our fast-track agreements have ever been defeated. There seems to be a majority in both Houses that would vote for that, and once it is here, it is up or down. There is no other deal. We can't have any amendments and little input from rank-and-file Senators, although the Finance Committee chairman and a few others get some enhanced powers under this agreement—not the average Senator.

So it is not the kind of—if we pass the fast-track, I think with 60 votes, I think we are on a path to adopt an agreement, if history is true.

I noticed again my colleague said it would enhance salaries in export job areas. That might be so. Hopefully, we would have some increase in exports. In Korea, we had about a $1 billion increase or a little less, instead of 10. But it was a little increase. So maybe that would help a few jobs and a few salaries.

But what about the others, the imports that are coming in, imports that are coming in competing with American manufacturing in whole massive areas of the economy? Isn't that likely to close some factories? Isn't it likely to put downward pressure on wages? I think so.

Finally, I think the steel industry and some others are saying they cannot support this trade deal unless we do something about nontariff barriers, currency being one of them. That is what people have told me: If there isn't a fix on currency, we can't go forward with a deal.

So there is no full-fledged support, that I am aware of, from the steel industry for the agreement as it is likely to pass, which is not going to include any currency fix with teeth in it, I am afraid. Then, finally, my concern about not having an adequate debate is less. We have to get into some of these constitutional issues—the ability of two-

thirds of the members of this so-called new commission, this transnational commission that will be established, who can add new members without our approval. We have to talk about that some.

But I asked five questions. I would ask them to Senator HATCH.

What would it do to wages? What does the living agreement mean? Does it override American law? What about trade deficits and other issues?

I think those are the issues that are not being discussed that need to be.

So again, with the greatest respect, I thank my colleagues for the hard work they have put into this. There is no committee that has more to do around here than the Finance Committee. I understand their interest in this. I am raising questions. I don't pretend to know all the answers. But I do think the American people are concerned about it, and we should be sure that what we do advances the interests of Middle America as well as corporate America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I have been very interested in the debate, especially between the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I have to say that it is very interesting that almost every business in this country wants this bill. Let me just start with mentioning that all the chairs of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under Presidents Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, William Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama have all said:

> We believe that agreements to foster greater international trade are in our national economic and security interests, and support a renewal of Trade Promotion Authority.

This is from Alan Greenspan, Michael Boskin, R. Glenn Hubbard, Ben Bernanke, Austan Goolsbee, Charles Schultze, Laura D'Andrea Tyson, N. Gregory Mankiw, Edward B. Lazear, Alan B. Krueger, Martin Feldstein, Martin Baily, Harvey S. Rosen, and Christina D. Romer, just to mention a few.

They say, in a letter to Senator MCCONNELL and HARRY REID, and to the leaders in the House, JOHN BOEHNER and NANCY PELOSI that virtually every chamber of commerce in the country has come behind this bill. To read one paragraph:

> TPA is a longstanding and proven partnership between Congress and the President that enables Congress to set negotiating objectives and requires the executive branch to consult extensively with legislators during negotiations. We urge you to act on this essential legislation. . . .

I think these chambers of commerce know what is best for business. I think they know what is best for the economy. In fact, U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Thomas J. Donohue issued the following statement hailing the introduction of the ''Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, which will renew Trade Promotion Authority.''

These are people who take these things seriously. Take the Business Roundtable:

> Washington—Business Roundtable, representing CEOs of U.S. companies from every sector of the economy, today commended Senators Orrin Hatch (R–UT) and Ron Wyden (D–OR) and Representative Paul Ryan (R–WI) for their introduction of a bipartisan bill to update and renew Trade Promotion Authority (TPA). Approval of legislation to modernize TPA is a top priority for Business Roundtable.

We can go on and on. Jim Greenwood of the Biotechnology Industry Organization has come out in favor of it. Even Gabe Horwitz of the Third Way has come out in favor of it. Tom Linebarger of the Business Roundtable has come out in favor. Thomas Donohue, as I said, has come out in favor of it. David Thomas of Trade Benefits America has come out for this. Matthew Shay of the National Retail Federation says: We urge Congress to quickly pass TPA legislation. Peter Allgeier, from the Coalition of Service Industries, has come out for it.

If we start to look at businesses throughout the country, they don't seem to be a bit concerned with some of the issues that have been raised by my friend from Alabama because we have covered them in this bill.

Think about it. The tech companies—these are America's moviemakers, software developers, computer manufacturers, the people who drive America's innovation—understand that promoting American trade requires protecting American intellectual property. ''That's the only way to keep our competitive edge in the 21st century. And that's exactly what TPA will do.'' That is quoting them. TPA lays out almost 150 negotiating objectives for the administration to pursue in trade deals.

Chris Dodd, the head of the Motion Picture Association of America, praised TPA.

Microsoft's general counsel, Brad Smith came out and said:

> Passage of renewed TPA, with its updated objectives for digital trade, is critical for America to be able to pursue its interests. And passage is important for Microsoft and our network of more than 400,000 partners—the majority of which are small businesses—to compete in the global economy.

Chris Padilla, the vice president of IBM, also spoke in favor: ''TPA is a critical step in preserving the transformative role of data, and in strengthening America's economy and competitiveness.''

Victoria Espinell, CEO of BSA, the software alliance, said: ''This legislation will help ensure that pending trade agreements include necessary rules to promote cross-border data flows.''

Gary Shapiro, CEO of the Consumer Electronics Association, said: ''TPA takes a modern approach to trade agreements to ensure a robust digital economy and growth of the Internet,'' which are ''vital to American innovation.''

Dean Garfield, CEO of the Information Technology Industry Council, said: ''Tech's message to Congress is simple: supporting TPA will promote job creation and propel us forward in building a strong 21st century economy.''

John Neuffer, CEO of the Semiconductor Industry Association, said: ''TPA represents a much-needed shot in the arm for free trade, which is critical to the U.S. semiconductor industry, to American jobs, and to our economy.''

We are talking about real jobs here. We are talking about a potential to raise the average pay by as much as 18 percent.

Carl Guardino, CEO of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, said: ''Our businesses rely on a robust export market and this bill will go a long way in empowering the U.S. and enabling U.S. companies to remain competitive across the globe.''

Mark McCarthy, vice president of the Software & Information Industry Association, said: ''TPA legislation is crucial for finalizing agreements that will set the template for 21st Century trade and for protecting the global digital leadership of the United States.''

Scott Belcher, CEO of the Telecommunications Industry Association said: ''The passage of Trade Promotion Authority legislation is critical to increasing the competitiveness of U.S. companies overseas, particularly in the information and communications industry, and to ensuring continued job growth at home.''

So tech has spoken out—in one voice, really—to support TPA as essential to innovation and competitiveness. We can put our heads in the sand and act as if this is not important, but it is extremely important.

Then, you get into agriculture. Agricultural exports support over 1 million U.S. jobs, both on and off the farm. Fiscal years 2010 to 2014 represented the strongest 5 years in U.S. history for agricultural exports, with sales totaling $675 billion. They are expecting grow once we get fair trade rules with the countries we are currently negotiating with.

By the way, when we are talking about the 11 nations of the TPP negotiations we are undergoing, one of the countries we are talking about is Japan. We have had trouble breaking down trade barriers with Japan for years. We now have a Prime Minister over there who is willing to work with

us and seize the advantage—not just for Japan but for the region as well.

If we do not pass this TPA bill, we are just throwing the China the Asia-Pacific. They are already making strides in that area that would not be happening if we had this trade agreement already. I might add that there is the new innovative bank that they have started. At first, there were only a few countries that wanted to join it. Now it is over 60, as I understand it. Upwards of 60 countries have now jumped on board, including some of the major countries in this negotiation. We are going to just stand here and act as if this is not happening and that our interests in free trade are not important unless we get everything we want, which, ironically, we basically get in these agreements.

U.S. producers rely on and prosper from access to foreign markets. Currently, we export half of U.S. wheat, milled rice, and soybean production; 70 percent of walnut and pistachio production; more than 75 percent of cotton production; 40 percent of grape production; 20 percent of cherry production; 20 percent of apple production; 20 percent of poultry and pork production; and 10 percent of beef production.

Today, only a relatively small percentage of U.S. companies export, yet 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of the United States. What are we going to do—ignore these facts and not acknowledge that we need to pass this bill?

We need to get real about trade. Trade agreements are the most effective way to eliminate foreign tariffs, unscientific regulatory barriers, and bureaucratic administrative procedures designed to block trade.

I could go on and on. Today there are some 400 trade agreements, and we have only been party to a small fraction. That is because we have not had trade promotion authority. Are we going to sit back and put our heads in the sand and act as if this were not important?

The manufacturers are rallying behind this bill throughout the country. They said this:

Manufacturers need TPA and new market-opening trade agreements now more than ever.

That was said by National Association of Manufacturers vice chair for international economic policy and Emerson chairman and CEO David Farr.

He adds:

Trade is increasingly critical for the bottom lines of businesses of all sizes, but U.S. exports face higher tariffs and more barriers abroad than nearly any other major economy. Manufacturers need TPA to restore U.S. leadership in striking new trade deals that will knock down barriers so that manufacturers can improve their access to world's consumers.

The National Association of Manufacturers is the largest manufacturing association in the United States. They are begging us to do this. American manufacturers want TPA. What are we going to do—bury our head in the sand and say that is not so? It is time for us to wake up and realize we have to get in the real world.

This agreement has been well thought through. Is it perfect? No, nothing is perfect around here. But it goes a long way toward resolving our problems, creating more jobs in America, more opportunities in America, more income in America, and more economic stability in America. Without it, my gosh, what are we going to be? Become just a nation that does not participate, when we have the capacity to participate all over the world. This is an important step that we are talking about here and we need to take it.

Let me take a few more moments—I notice the distinguished Senator is here to bring up his amendment. Let me take a few minutes and respond to my colleagues' concerns about provisions contained in the Trans-Pacific Partnership or TPP.

Specifically, there are some who have said that TPP contains an unprecedented, ''living agreement'' provision that would allow parties to amend the agreement after it is adopted and, in the process, change U.S. law without Congress's approval. Let me state this as clearly as possible. These assertions are 100-percent false. No trade agreements—past, present or future—can change U.S. law without the consent of Congress. This is not even a close question.

No reasonable interpretation of our Constitution, our laws or our trade agreements lends credence to that interpretation. Of course, I know that my counter-assertions by themselves will not be enough to convince people they are wrong on this issue. So let's delve into this a bit further.

True enough, TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, reportedly includes a provision to create a forum along the joint working groups to help parties evaluate whether the agreement is being implemented as intended and to provide a way to discuss new issues as they arise. But guess what. Most U.S. free-trade agreements contain similar provisions. This is not new or unprecedented. This is standard for every modern trade agreement. My friend from Alabama raised the Korea agreement. It has only been in existence since 2012. We have not seen it fully implemented yet, and it is not fully implemented.

For example, the U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement has a ''joint committee,'' and CAFTA-DR has a ''free trade commission,'' both of which perform the same functions as have been reported for the TPP commission.

These agreements specify that these bodies can oversee operations of the agreement. However, nothing in the text of either agreement gives either committee the power to change U.S. law—nothing whatsoever. The same is true of the commission that is reportedly part of TPP. In addition, TPP will almost undoubtedly include a process for amending the agreement. This, too, is standard procedure for modern trade agreements. That is a good thing.

These provisions, which once again are included in all of our existing trade agreements, help ensure that the United States can protect its interests when new issues arise. Most importantly, they contain a backstop to protect our country's sovereignty.

For example, in our free-trade agreement with South Korea, the relevant provision states that ''an amendment shall enter into force after the parties exchange written notification certifying that they have completed their respective legal requirements and procedures.''

In NAFTA, the section describing the amendment process states: ''When so agreed and approved in accordance with the applicable legal procedures of each party, a modification or addition shall constitute an integral part of this agreement.''

Of course, in the United States, the applicable legal procedure for amending a free-trade agreement and for any and all changes to U.S. law includes approval by Congress. In other words, no free-trade agreement—again, that is past, present or future—to which the United States is a party can be amended without Congress's approval.

Once again, these ''living agreement'' provisions are standard practice for free-trade agreements. For the most part, they have not been remotely controversial, up until now, I guess. In fact, one of our colleagues, who has been very vocal on this issue and has even filed at least one amendment to our TPA bill on this matter, voted in favor of free-trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama, all of which included provisions very similar to those that are reportedly part of TPP. It is not just I who am saying this.

I have a memo sent to my staff from the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service that reiterates these points.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of this memo, immediately following my remarks.

Madam President, this is U.S. Government 101. Under our system, only Congress can change the law. I am certainly not oblivious to the fact a number of my colleagues—both here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives—deeply distrust our current President. I am hardly a shrinking violet when it comes to criticizing President Obama—and even his predecessors—and his propensity for overreach. I have been very critical of this administration's effort to expand executive power, and I will continue to be.

But no one should channel distrust of President Obama into opposition to the TPA bill. If anything, the opposite is true.

Our bill contains numerous provisions solidifying the principle that U.S. law cannot be changed without Congress's consent. Under our bill, no secretive provisions of a trade agreement can be withheld from Congress and still enter into force.

Furthermore, the bill goes further than any previous version of TPA in ensuring transparency and accountability in both the trade negotiating process and the approval procedures.

In short, Madam President, if you are suspicious of executive authority but still want to support free trade, you should support our TPA bill. Once again, there is simply no reason to be concerned about ''living agreement'' provisions in the TPP or any other trade agreement. Our Constitution, our laws, our trade agreements, and, of course, our TPA bill all ensure that when it comes to the U.S. trade policy, Congress has the final say.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2015.

MEMORANDUM

To: U.S. Senate Committee on Finance, Attention: Everett Eissenstat.

From: Daniel T. Shedd, Legislative Attorney, 7–8441; Brandon J. Murrill, Legislative Attorney, 7–8440.

Subject: Amendment of Free Trade Agreements and Role of Congress.

This memorandum responds to your request regarding whether the President, acting alone, can change U.S. domestic law by negotiating an amendment to an existing free trade agreement (FTA). In order for an amendment to an existing FTA to affect domestic law, Congress would have to implement that change through legislation. Because of the expedited nature of this request, this memorandum does not represent an exhaustive analysis of FTAs and the processes established to amend those FTAs.

Under the Constitution, the President has the authority to negotiate agreements with foreign countries. However, the Constitution on also identifies Congress as the branch with responsibility to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Therefore, although the President can negotiate FTAs and amendments to FTAs, in order for those agreements to have controlling effect in U.S. domestic law, Congress must enact legislation approving the agreement and providing for the implementation of its requirements, as necessary. For FTAs, the implementing legislation is often enacted through procedures established by Trade Promotion Authority (TPA), often referred to as ''fast track'' authority. If any agreement, or any amendment to an agreement, requires a change in U.S. law in order for the United States to come into compliance with the agreement, Congress would have to pass legislation for there to be any change to domestic law.

U.S. FTAs often contain provisions allowing for their amendment. For example, the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (KORUS) provides: ''The Parties may agree, in writing, to amend this Agreement . . .'' However, it is important to note that FTAs also contain provisions that establish that the domestic legal procedures of each country that is a party to the agreement must be followed in order for the amendment to take effect. Again, the text from KORUS is illustrative: ''An amendment shall enter into force after the Parties exchange written notifications certifying that they have completed their respective applicable legal requirements and procedures . . .'' Other FTAs contain similar provisions providing that an amendment to an agreement will only have legal force if it is approved through the necessary legal procedures of each country that is a party to the agreement. Furthermore, even absent these provisions in FTAs, because FTAs are not viewed as self-executing agreements, an amendment to an FTA would not change domestic law unless Congress enacted a statute to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, we are a little bit behind and our colleagues have been very patient.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator PETERS be able to speak briefly about one of his constituents who had a tragic death, followed by our colleague, Senator LANKFORD from Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that those Senators be allowed to speak in that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

REMEMBERING RACHEL JACOBS

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise today with a heavy heart and with great sadness to commemorate the life of Rachel Jacobs. Rachel was tragically killed in last week's Amtrak train crash.

This morning, my wife Colleen and I joined hundreds of mourners who attended her funeral as she was laid to rest in Metro Detroit. Rachel was only 39 years old when her life was so tragically cut short. She had a life filled with love, with accomplishment, and with promise. She was the beloved daughter of my dear friends Gilda and John Jacobs. Rachel was a wife, the mother of a 2-year-old son, and the CEO of an education startup in Philadelphia. While she worked in Philadelphia and lived in New York City, this is a profound loss for the Detroit area, where she grew up but which she never left behind.

Rachel was the cofounder of Detroit Nation, an organization to engage former residents of the Detroit area in cities and communities around our great country. Rachel helped to connect people and motivated her friends. She took part in Detroit Homecoming, an event held last fall to engage accomplished leaders across the United States who grew up in the Metro Detroit area and now want to give back to the community they still love and call home.

Rachel was a leader in this important work—work that will now need to be carried on by those whom she inspired. I am heartbroken for her many friends and deeply saddened by this tragic loss for the Metro Detroit area.

My heart goes out to her young son Jacob, her husband Todd, her wonderful parents Gilda and John, her sister Jessica, and her entire family as they struggle with this painful loss.

As parents, we want to give everything to our children. We want to give them a stable home and a loving family. We want to give them a great education and a bright future. But the one thing we cannot give or promise them is a long life. That is in God's hands, and now Rachel is as well.

Madam President, we have suffered an incredible loss with the passing of Rachel Jacobs. We have lost a brilliant businesswoman, an active community leader, and a loving mother, wife, sister, and daughter. May her memory be a blessing.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 1237, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 1237 be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 4, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that Senator VITTER be added as a cosponsor to my amendment.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, trade agreements are about a set of values and beliefs. Do we believe the American workers and American products can compete with the rest of the world and provide answers and products the world needs? It is an overwhelming yes. When we trade, we not only exchange goods, we exchange ideas and values. Our greatest export is our American value—the dignity of each person, hard work, innovation, and liberty. That is what we send around the world. It has the greatest impact.

What we wrote into our Declaration of Independence is not just an American value statement; we believe it is a statement about every person. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men, not just men and women within the United States but that all people worldwide are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among these are

life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Governments were created to protect the rights given to us by God. We believe every person should have the protection of government to live their faith, not the compulsion of government to practice any one faith or to be forced to reject all faith altogether. That is one of the reasons Americans are disturbed by the trend in our courts, our military, and our public conversation. It is not the task of government to purge religious conversation from public life; it is the task of government to protect the rights of every person to live their faith and to guard those who choose not to have any faith at all.

Thomas Jefferson, in one of the pinnacle works of his life, the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, states:

> Almighty God hath created the mind free, and manifested his supreme will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments, or burthens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness.

With that backdrop, I worked for 2 years with my colleagues to place language into the negotiating language of this trade bill to push our negotiators to consider religious liberty in their negotiations. I have been told over and over again that we don't talk about religious freedom in our trade negotiations. I have just asked, why not? We should encourage trade with another country when that country acknowledges our basic value of the dignity of every person to live their own faith.

Our Nation is not just an economy; our Nation is a set of ideas and values. We believe each person has value and worth. It benefits every person from each nation in the trade agreement if we lead with our values and not sell out for a dollar people who have been in bondage as a prisoner of conscience for years.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom recently recommended that the United States should ''ensure that human rights and religious freedom are pursued consistently and publicly at every level of the U.S.-Vietnam relationship, including in the context of discussions relating to military, trade, or economic and security assistance, such as Vietnam's participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership, as well as in programs that address Internet freedom and civil society development, among others.''

When people have freedom of conscience and faith, they are also better trading partners. Their country is stable, their families are stable, and their economy will grow.

With that, I encourage this body to do something new. Let's start exporting the values we hold dear, not to compel other nations to have our faith but to have other nations recognize the power of the freedom of religion within their own borders.

I have a simple amendment to the trade promotion authority asking the trade negotiators to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States. It is not complicated. It is a simple encouragement, and it is a step toward us exporting our value.

I ask for the support of this body as we consider our greatest export—freedom.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 10 minutes.

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

AGRICULTURE IN RURAL AMERICA AND GOVERNMENT REGULATION

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, the Presiding Officer comes from a State very similar to mine, and what I was going to say is that when you do—in fact, our State has twice as many cattle as it has people—you begin to understand the importance of agriculture to our Nation's economy and the communities that comprise our State. In rural Kansas, as it would be in rural Iowa, agriculture is our economic lifeblood.

One of the primary reasons I sought public office was my belief in rural America and that it needed a strong voice in Washington advocating on behalf of that part of the country. Since the time I was first elected to Congress, I believe that has only become even more important.

People involved in farming and ranching endure challenges that no other industry, no other profession faces. They are at the mercy of Mother Nature and rely on favorable weather to produce a crop. The severe drought that has plagued parts of Kansas for a long number of years and is once again crippling this year's wheat crop is evidence of the unique challenges.

Farmers and ranchers also operate in a global marketplace that oftentimes is distorted by high foreign subsidies and tariffs. American farmers are the most efficient producers in the world. Too often, however, our farmers cannot be afforded the opportunity to compete on a level playing field.

Unfortunately, agriculture is also under assault from the Obama administration. Overregulation by the EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service threatens the livelihood of farmers and ranchers in my State, which in turn threatens the viability of family businesses that line main streets in rural towns across our State.

To better understand the damage caused by foolish overregulation, consider waters of the United States. Despite the overwhelming outcry that the Obama administration received from American producers—from agriculture and other businesses—after proposing the potentially harmful regulation, the administration has continued their march forward toward finalizing that rule. The regulation is a troublesome expansion of Federal control over the Nation's waters. The Obama administration has continued to repeat the mantra that the rule is only intended to clarify the scope of the Clean Water Act, but we all know better. Not only has the rule failed to provide clarity or certainty, it also seeks to expand the EPA's jurisdiction to include thousands of new miles of streams, rivers, and even dry ditches.

Where I come from, the term ''navigable waters,'' which is what the statute says, means something on which you can float a boat. We don't have many of those waters in the State of Kansas. Yet, this administration seems to believe they have the right to enforce those burdensome regulations on land that is far removed from what is traditionally considered navigable waters.

People in rural Kansas also faced increased regulation from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. As my colleagues will recall, I led a debate earlier this year to delist the lesser prairie chicken from the endangered species list. The bird's listing is creating havoc and uncertainty in Kansas, where its habitat is located.

Wind energy projects have been abandoned, oil-and-gas production has slowed, and farmers and ranchers are faced with uncertainty regarding new restrictions as to what they can do on their privately owned land.

Those of us from Kansas know that we need the return of rainfall and moisture and that will increase the habitat and therefore increase the population of the lesser prairie chicken, not burdensome Federal regulations that hinder the rural economy.

While the lesser prairie chicken regulation is directly harming the western part of Kansas, the administration's recent proposal to list the long-eared bat as a threatened species will do the same in our State's eastern communities.

We often speak about the ever-increasing average age of farmers in the country and the need to encourage more young people to stay on the farm and to return from college to the farm. I could not agree more with this goal. I believe a key component in achieving this objective is to make certain our Nation's policies and regulations make farming and ranching an attractive venture for our children and grandchildren. Unfortunately, the regulations we have seen from this administration too often make farming and ranching much less attractive, much less profitable, and young people have

made the conclusion that the battle cannot be won.

I am deeply concerned about the impact of this administration's regulatory scheme and the effect that scheme will have on farmers and ranchers, but there remains reason for us to be optimistic about the future of American agriculture. We are faced with a growing rural population who is hungry for high-quality, nutritious food products grown by American farmers. We must continue to work toward reducing foreign barriers to make certain that people from around the globe have affordable access to U.S.-grown products. We must continue to invest in policies that lift up rural America, not hold it back.

I am the chairman of the agriculture subcommittee, and I am working to make certain that Congress is doing its part to support farmers and ranchers. American policies should aim to keep rural America strong by way of implementation of the farm bill, preserving and protecting crop insurance, investing in agriculture research, and supporting rural development.

I often tell my colleagues here in Washington about the special way of life in Kansas and the opportunities that special way of life continues to provide. The strength of rural Kansas is a key component to what makes our State a great place to live, work, and raise families. The future of communities in rural America depends upon the economic viability of our farmers and ranchers, and it is time to make certain that Federal policies and regulatory decisions coming out of Washington, DC, reflect this critical importance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 7 minutes.

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

(The remarks of Mr. DAINES pertaining to the introduction of S. 1361 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. DAINES. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I am here on the floor almost every Monday, and this is the 11th time I have been on the floor over the last 3 months or so to speak about the waste of the week. We are trying to identify those areas of fraud and abuse and waste of taxpayers' money so we can take reasonable steps, hopefully soon in the Congress, to end this misuse of taxpayers' funds. Then we can either return it back to the taxpayers or sometimes use the funds to offset other spending that may be necessary to make for a more efficient government. The taxpayers deserve to have their dollars they send here, after a lot of hard work, treated carefully. We continue to expose areas, and the Office of the Inspector General of the Office of Management and Budget and nonpartisan committees are looking at ways to identify misuse of those funds.

One of the areas we haven't spoken about but will today are the benefits for higher education. Many of these are well intended and many of them are used effectively. For example, there is a lifetime learning credit for graduate courses and other classes. There is the Hope credit for undergraduate expenses. There is the American opportunity tax credit, which temporarily replaced the Hope credit, but that is set to expire. There are a raft of confusing proposals that are designed to help people who want to work through their education and get tax credits for the expenses they pay. So this is well intended. However, what has happened is that it has become a confusing mess as to how these are applied and how they are used.

The Treasury inspector general for tax administration determined that the IRS paid out billions of dollars in potentially erroneous education tax credits to more than 3.6 million taxpayers. So Congress has passed a law. They have adjusted the Tax Code to give credits and benefits to those who are going to school to get a graduate education or to get their postsecondary education. This is a worthwhile use, in most cases, but it has been deemed by Congress to be so and made part of the Tax Code. Yet the inspector general who looks at all this has said it has become a ripe area for fraud, waste, and abuse, as well as some honest mistakes.

I wish to repeat that again. The IRS paid out billions of dollars in erroneous education tax credits to more than 3.6 million taxpayers seeking these credits. Now, some say, What do you mean? What are some of the mistakes? Students who weren't eligible for the benefit got the benefit. Institutions that received the benefits were ineligible to receive the benefits for a number of reasons.

In most cases, higher education institutions send out returns known as 1098–Ts to taxpayers who pay for tuition. These forms help taxpayers and the IRS determine if students qualify for the education tax benefits, including by indicating whether the student is enrolled more than half time or is a graduate student. In other words, they must show that the student qualifies for the tax benefit. They found out that many don't qualify but nevertheless receive those benefits.

The inspector general reports that 2 million taxpayers did not submit the form or have the form—the 1098–T paperwork—to indicate they had actually paid the tuition. Of these almost 40,000 taxpayers, some received credits for students who are under the age of 14. These tax credits are for postsecondary education. There may be a couple of genius kids out there who are enrolled in college at the age of 14 or under, but I don't think there are very many, if any under the age of 14 or over the age of 65.

Additionally, tax credits were awarded improperly to over 2,100 incarcerated people.

How do we correct this? Well, there is a pretty basic idea I wish to propose. Many of us are familiar with the letters we receive back when we make a charitable contribution, and most of us know that if that contribution is over $250, the IRS wants to know that we have proof that we have actually made that charitable contribution. So our tax preparers always ask: Do you have a receipt? Do you have the letter back from the Boy Scouts or your church or wherever you give the money? Do you have that available for when we might happen to need it if the IRS requires it when they are looking into that?

So what we are proposing is simply a requirement that taxpayers should claim a tuition tax credit, have proof that they have actually received the credit and are eligible to receive the credit. That proof is the 1098–T form. We are proposing to simply require that taxpayers hold a valid 1098–T or some form of substantiation in their possession when they fill out their tax returns and claim tuition deductions.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that this very simple requirement would save $576 million over the next 10 years. We have already proven we can save billions by better management of taxpayers' money and now we are going to add another $576 million to this. As my colleagues see, we are on the way to $100 billion of savings through some very basic and simple modifications and changes in our Tax Code and in our procedures in terms of how we run this government.

Next week, we will be sharing again the fraud and waste of the week, but Congress now has a pool of funds that are misused and a way in which we can either, as I said, offset needed spending programs or return that money to the taxpayers or not have them send it in in the first place.

It is a dysfunctional government that can't better manage taxpayers' funds. If we are going to maintain credibility and the support of our taxpayers for what we do that is right, we better stop and pay attention and look and change and modify the abuse that is taking place and bring it to an end. We need to demonstrate that we are looking out carefully at the use of taxpayers' dollars.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1242

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be added as cosponsors to the Brown amendment: STABENOW, KLOBUCHAR, BALDWIN, SCHUMER, BLUMENTHAL, WHITEHOUSE, UDALL, SANDERS, WARREN, MANCHIN, MARKEY, REED, FRANKEN, and HEINRICH.

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

Mr. BROWN. The support for this amendment is broad and deep. The support for this funding level reached 300-some House Members 4 years ago and 70 Senators—including, obviously, a number in each party—4 years ago when we decided to support this number. So this funding level of $575 million is bipartisan. It was established 4 years ago.

Some say that $450 million—the amount included in the underlying bill—is enough to operate the program and that we should not bring the funding level back to the $575 million. The fact is that we do not really know. What we do know is that TAA—the trade adjustment assistance, the money we provide to workers to be retrained after they have lost a job because of a decision President Obama and the Congress made to pass a trade agreement, which always produces winners and losers—free trade supporters and free trade opponents all agree and even cheerleaders as passionate as the Wall Street Journal, as strongly supportive as they are of these free-trade agreements, even they acknowledge there are winners and there are losers. The losers are those people who lost their jobs in Indiana, Ohio, Utah, and all over the country because of decisions we made in this body. They are not decisions they made to not show up to work, not decisions they made to not do their work well; they are decisions we made in this Congress and President Obama made at the White House to push these trade agreements, resulting in dislocation, so some workers lose their jobs. That is why it is a moral issue that we provide adequate funding for training for these workers.

I mentioned the years 2009, 2010—it cost $685 million each year. Of course, those are years during the great recession. But if you take the average of funding levels for the 3 years when program eligibility was nearly the same as it is now, TAA expenditures were about $571 million a year. That is roughly the figure we are choosing for our amendment, the number the President asked for in his budget originally.

TAA works. Seventy-six percent of participants who completed training in fiscal year 2013 received a degree or an industry-recognized credential. Seventy-five percent of workers who exited the program found employment within 6 months. Of those workers who became employed, over 90 percent were still employed at the end of the year. So we know trade adjustment assistance works.

This reduction of $125 million a year, in other words, is simply cuts for the sake of cuts.

It helps workers retrain for new jobs so they can compete in the global economy. We know that even though the economy is better today than when President Obama took office or it is better today then it was in 2010 before we did the RECOVERY Act or it is better today than it was that year when we did the auto rescue that helped the Presiding Officer's State of Indiana and my State of Ohio and the whole national economy so much—we do know that since that time, we have had the South Korea trade agreement, and the President and supporters of that promised 70,000 increased jobs. We have actually lost 70,000 jobs instead because of a swelling trade deficit with South Korea. We have the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Even its supporters acknowledge there will be workers who lose their jobs—they believe a net gain, but nonetheless numbers of workers will lose their jobs and will need retraining.

So that conservative number of only $450 million, when it is clear we need the larger number of $575 million—the same level President Obama included in his budget; the same level that 70 Senators—a number in each party—and 300-plus Members of the House supported. I ask my colleagues to support it again today.

Again, it was not the choice of these workers to lose their jobs; it was the choice of this institution to pass a trade agreement that results in some workers losing their jobs. We all acknowledge that on both sides. That is why this amendment is so important to adopt.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds more.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, look, significantly increasing funding levels for TAA may very well make TAA much harder to pass both here and in the House of Representatives. It is a program that is not supported by a great number of us. That being the case, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting no on this amendment.

We have put together a bill that literally has brought together both sides as well as we possibly could. Hopefully, we will vote no on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Brown amendment No. 1242.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Alaska (Mrs. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay'' and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) would have voted ''nay.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 181 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—41

Ayotte	Blunt	Capito
Barrasso	Boozman	Cassidy

Coats	Hatch	Risch
Cochran	Heller	Roberts
Cornyn	Hoeven	Rounds
Cotton	Inhofe	Sasse
Crapo	Johnson	Sessions
Daines	Kirk	Shelby
Enzi	Lankford	Sullivan
Ernst	Lee	Thune
Fischer	McConnell	Tillis
Flake	Moran	Wicker
Gardner	Paul	Wyden
Grassley	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—14

Alexander	Isakson	Rubio
Corker	McCain	Scott
Cruz	Murkowski	Toomey
Durbin	Murray	Vitter
Graham	Portman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

VOTE ANNOUNCEMENT

● Mr. DURBIN. I was unavoidably delayed on United flight No. 616 and not present for the vote on Senator BROWN's amendment No. 1242 to increase funding levels for the Trade Adjustment Assistance program. Had I been here, I would have voted yea.●

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1237, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 1237, as modified, offered on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. LANKFORD.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) would have voted ''yea.''

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 182 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Alexander	Cardin	Durbin
Ayotte	Carper	Enzi
Baldwin	Casey	Ernst
Barrasso	Cassidy	Feinstein
Bennet	Coats	Fischer
Blumenthal	Cochran	Flake
Blunt	Collins	Franken
Booker	Coons	Gardner
Boozman	Corker	Gillibrand
Boxer	Cornyn	Grassley
Brown	Cotton	Hatch
Burr	Crapo	Heinrich
Cantwell	Daines	Heitkamp
Capito	Donnelly	Heller
Hirono	Mikulski	Schumer
Hoeven	Moran	Scott
Inhofe	Murkowski	Sessions
Johnson	Murphy	Shaheen
Kaine	Murray	Shelby
King	Nelson	Stabenow
Kirk	Paul	Sullivan
Klobuchar	Perdue	Tester
Lankford	Peters	Thune
Leahy	Reed	Tillis
Lee	Reid	Udall
Manchin	Risch	Warner
Markey	Roberts	Warren
McCaskill	Rounds	Whitehouse
McConnell	Sanders	Wicker
Menendez	Sasse	Wyden
Merkley	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—8

Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Graham	Portman	Vitter
Isakson	Rubio	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment, as modified, is agreed to.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, April 18, 2012, was not the first time I spoke on the Senate floor on the dangers of carbon pollution, but it was the first in the weekly series that brings me here today with my increasingly dog-eared sign.

Opponents of responsible climate action do best in the dark, so I knew if anything was going to change around here, we would need to shine some light on the facts, on the science, and on the sophisticated scheme of denial being conducted by the polluters.

I decided to come to the floor every week the Senate is in session to put at least my little light to work, and today I do so for the 100th time, and I thank very much my colleagues who have taken time from their extremely busy schedules to be here, particularly my colleagues from the House, JIM LANGEVIN and DAVID CICILLINE, who traveled all the way across the building.

I am not a lone voice on this subject. Many colleagues have been speaking out, particularly our ranking member on the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator BOXER. Senator MARKEY has been speaking out on the climate longer than I have been in the Senate. Senators SCHUMER, NELSON, BLUMENTHAL, SCHATZ, KING, and BALDWIN have each joined me to speak about the effects of carbon pollution on their home States and economies. Senator MANCHIN and I—from different perspectives—spoke here about our shared belief that climate change is real and must be addressed. More than 30 fellow Democrats held the floor overnight to bring attention to climate change under the leadership of Senator SCHATZ. Our Democratic leader, Senator REID, has pressed the Senate to face up to this challenge, and thousands of people in Rhode Island and across the country have shown their support.

Sometimes people ask me: How do you keep coming up with new ideas? It is easy. There are at least 100 reasons to act on climate. Hundreds of Americans have sent me their reasons through my Web site, Facebook, and Twitter using the hashtag ''100Reasons.'' I will highlight some of their reasons in this speech.

What is my No. 1 reason? Easy. Rhode Island. The consequences of carbon pollution for my Ocean State are undeniable. The tide gauge at Naval Station Newport is up nearly 10 inches since the 1930s. The water in Narragansett Bay is 3 to 4 degrees Fahrenheit warmer in the winter than just 50 years ago.

Lori from West Kingston, RI, said that is her top reason too. ''We stand to lose the best part of Rhode Island,'' she wrote, ''the 400 miles of coastline, which will be severely impacted, environmentally and economically.''

Even Kentucky's Department of Fish and Wildlife has warned—get this—that sea level rise and increased storms along our eastern seaboard could get so bad that it would trigger ''unprecedented'' population migration from our east coasts to Kentucky. That is serious.

Winston Churchill talked about ''sharp agate points upon which the ponderous balance of destiny turns.'' What if we now stand at a hinge of history? Will we awaken to the duty and responsibility of our time or will we sleepwalk through it? That is the test we face.

I have laid out in these speeches the mounting effects of carbon pollution all around us, and the evidence abounds. This March, for the first time in human history, the monthly average carbon dioxide in our atmosphere exceeded 400 parts per million. The range had been 170 to 300 parts per million for hundreds of thousands of years.

Mr. President, 2014 was the hottest year ever measured. Fourteen of the warmest 15 years ever measured have been in this century. Our oceans warm as they absorb more than 90 percent of the heat captured by greenhouse gases. You measure their warming with a thermometer. As seawater warms, it expands and sea levels rise. Global average sea level rose about 1 inch from 2005 to 2013. You measure that with a yardstick. Ocean water absorbs roughly a quarter of all of our carbon emissions, making the water more acidic and upsetting the very chemistry of ocean life. You measure this, too, with a pH test like a third grade class would use for its fish tank.

It is virtually universal in peer-reviewed science that carbon pollution is causing these climate and oceanic

changes. Every major scientific society in our country has said so. Our brightest scientists at NOAA and NASA are unequivocal. But time and again we hear ''I am not a scientist'' from politicians who are refusing to acknowledge the evidence. We are not elected to be scientists; we are elected to listen to them.

If you don't believe scientists, how about generals? Our defense and intelligence leaders have repeatedly warned of the threats posed by climate change to national security and international stability.

How about faith leaders? Religious leaders of every faith appeal to our moral duty to conserve God's creation and to protect those most vulnerable to catastrophe.

How about our titans of industry? Leaders such as Apple and Google, Coke and Pepsi, Walmart and Target, Nestle and Mars are all greening their operations and their supply chains and calling on policymakers to act.

How about constituents? I have talked with community and business groups across the United States. Local officials—many of them Republicans—don't have the luxury of ignoring the changes we see. State scientific agencies and State universities are doing much of the leading research on climate change.

If you are a Senator who is not sure climate change is real, manmade, and urgent, ask your home State university. Even in Kentucky. Even in Oklahoma.

Flooding puts mayors in kayaks on South Florida streets. New Hampshire and Utah ski resorts struggle with shorter and warmer winters, and Alaskan villages are falling into the sea. Yet, no Republican from these States yet supports serious climate legislation.

This resistance to plain evidence is vexing to many Americans. Elizabeth from Riverside, RI, says her grandchildren are her top reason for action. She wrote:

> I fail to understand the Republican opposition to what is clearly factual scientific information about climate change. Are they not educated? Can they not read? Do they not have children and grandchildren to be concerned about the future they leave? Or is it money that clouds their vision?

The truth is that Republican cooperation in this area, which existed for some time, has been shut down by the fossil fuel industry. The polluters have constructed a carefully built apparatus of lies propped up by endless dark money.

Dr. Riley Dunlap of Oklahoma State University calls it the ''organized climate-denial machine.'' He found that nearly 90 percent of climate-denial books published between 1982 and 2010 had ties to conservative fossil fuel-funded think tanks such as the Heartland Institute. In other words, it is a scam.

Dr. Robert Brulle of Drexel University has documented the intricate propaganda web of climate denial with over 100 organizations, from industry trade organizations, to conservative think tanks, to plain old phony front groups. The purpose of this denial beast, to quote Dr. Brulle, is ''a deliberate and organized effort to misdirect the public discussion and distort the public's understanding of climate.''

John from Tucson, AZ, says this is his top reason to act:

> These ''merchants of doubt,'' the professional climate denier campaigners, have lied to us and attacked the people who can help us most; the scientists.

Sound familiar? It should because the fossil fuel industry is using a playbook perfected by the tobacco industry. Big Tobacco used that playbook for decades to bury the health risks of smoking. Ultimately, the truth came to light. It ended in a racketeering judgment against that industry.

The Supreme Court has handed the polluters a very heavy cudgel with its misguided Citizens United decision, allowing corporations to spend—or, more importantly, to threaten to spend—unlimited amounts of undisclosed money in our elections. More than anyone, polluters use that leverage to demand obedience to their climate denial script.

Jan from Portland, OR, said this kind of corruption is her top reason to act on climate. She said: It would be beneath our dignity to ruin our planet just for money.

Jan, I hope you are right.

There has been progress.

The Senate has held votes showing that a majority believes climate change is real, not a hoax, and is driven by human activity. Republican colleagues such as the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia, and the senior Senator from South Carolina have made comments here recognizing the need to do something. The senior Senator from Maine has a bill on non-CO_2 emissions. Against the relentless pressure of the fossil fuel industry and its front groups, that takes real courage.

The President's Climate Action Plan is ending the polluters' long free ride. The administration has rolled out strong fuel and energy efficiency standards. Its Clean Power Plan will, for the first time, limit carbon emissions from powerplants. The United States heads an ambitious international climate effort as well, even engaging China, now the world's largest producer of carbon pollution.

Perhaps most heartening are the American people. Eighty-three percent of Americans, including 6 in 10 Republicans, want action to reduce carbon emissions. And with young Republican voters, more than half would describe a climate-denying politician as ''ignorant,'' ''out of touch'' or ''crazy.''

With all this, I think the prospects for comprehensive climate change legislation are actually pretty good. But as Albert Einstein once said, ''politics is more difficult than physics.'' That seems literally to be the case here as Citizens United political gridlock keeps us, for now, from heeding laws of nature.

But when the polluters' grip slips, I will be ready with legislation that many Republicans can support: a fee on carbon emissions. Pricing carbon corrects the market failure that lets polluters push the cost of air pollution on to everybody else. A carbon fee is a market-based tool aligned with conservative free-market values. Many Republicans, at least those beyond the swing of the Citizens United fossil fuel cudgel, have endorsed exactly that idea.

Let's have a real debate about it. It is time. I will be announcing my carbon fee proposal on June 10, during an event at the American Enterprise Institute.

Climate change tests us. First, it is an environmental test—a grave one. We will be graded in that test against the implacable laws of science and nature. Pope Francis has described a conversation with a humble gardener who said to him:

> God always forgives. Men, women, we forgive sometimes. But, Father, creation never forgives.

There are no do-overs, no mulligans—not when we mess with God's laws of nature.

Behind nature's test looms a moral test. Do we let the influence of a few wealthy industries compromise other people's livelihoods, even other people's lives, all around the planet and off into the future? It is morally wrong, in greed and folly, to foist that price on all those others. That is why Pope Francis is bringing his moral light to bear on climate change, and to quote him: ''There is a clear, definitive and ineluctable ethical imperative to act.'' Our human morality is being tested.

Lastly, this is a test of American democracy. All democracies face the problem of how well they address not just the immediate threat but the looming ones. America's democracy faces an added responsibility of example, of being the city on a hill. In a world of competing ideologies, why would we want to tarnish ours?

This is the top reason for Ralph from Westerly, RI. He wrote:

> Someday, world leaders will look back on this time that something should have been done to save the planet. . . . We had the chance but let it slip through our fingers.

We have all done something wrong in our lives. Some things we do that are wrong don't cause much harm. But there is not an oddsmaker in Vegas who would bet against climate change causing a lot of harm. And some things that we do wrong we get away with.

But there is no way people in the world won't know why this happened when that harm hits home. There is no way the flag we fly so proudly won't be smudged and blotted by our misdeeds and oversights today.

Think how history regards Neville Chamberlain when he misjudged the hinge of history in its time. At least Chamberlain's goal was noble: peace, peace after the bloody massacres of World War I, peace in his time. Our excuse is what—on climate change? Keeping big polluting special interests happy?

Anybody who is paying attention knows those special interests are lying. Anybody paying attention knows they are influence-peddling on a monumental scale. And while the polluters have done their best to hide that their denial tentacles are all part of the same denial beast, people all over who are paying attention have figured it out.

One day, there will be a reckoning. There always is.

If we wake up, if we get this right, if we turn that ponderous balance of destiny in our time, then it can be their reckoning, and not all of ours. It can be their shame, not the shame of our democracy, not the shame of our beloved country, not the shame of America. As we close in on this weekend, on Memorial Day, we will remember those who fought and bled and died for this great Republic. The real prospect of failing and putting America to shame makes it seriously time for us to wake up.

Mr. President, once again, I thank my colleagues for their courtesy in attending this 100th speech.

I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of the entire Democratic caucus, I wish to extend my accolades, my admiration for the persistence and integrity of Senator WHITEHOUSE. This is an issue that speaks well of him and our entire country, and I am very proud of the work he has done and will continue to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I have had the privilege of serving longer in this body than any other Member of the Senate, currently. I can count on my one hand, or probably a few fingers, some of the great speeches I have heard by both Republicans and Democrats in this body. One great speech I will never forget was that of the Senator from Rhode Island. He speaks to a subject that every single Vermonter would agree with, and this veteran Senator thanks him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, my dear friend and colleague deserves a great moment of recognition today. We are all passionate about issues here in the Senate. But very few of us take to the floor each week to stoke the fire on a single issue and to inspire others to action. That is what Senator WHITEHOUSE has done on one of the defining issues of our time—climate change.

Today's speech is the 100th such speech he has made on the floor of the Senate, pleading us to take meaningful action on climate change. It is the 100th time he has brought that now iconic poster to the floor. We can tell it is getting a little frayed. It is getting a little dented. It is the 100th time many of us have paused and said: ''It's time to wake up.''

One hundred is a significant number today for many reasons. The first rough calculations on the impact of human carbon emissions on the climate began over 100 years ago in the late 19th century. For decades we have been certain of the science connecting human activity to changes in the global climate. Yet these incremental changes in the climate did not spur us to act. As the good Senator from Rhode Island just said, the years of incremental change are over.

In my home State of New York, Superstorm Sandy was a wake-up call. Those who for years have been telling us that a changing climate and rising seas are figments of the imagination had to eat their words after Sandy—the third significant storm to hit New York in those 2 years. Those who continue to deny the real and very tangible evidence of climate change are like ostriches with their heads buried in the sand.

Senator WHITEHOUSE is right, and whether he tells us it is time to wake up 10 times more or another 100, until we do something, he will continue to be right. I thank him for his leadership, his persistence, his eloquence, and his devotion to the cause. I hope for his sake and for all of our sakes that this body takes his words to heart.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I stand here as the ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. The day Senator WHITEHOUSE got elected, I knew I wanted him on that committee. I think he has shown through the weeks and months and years that what he is going to do is very simple, which is to come to the floor and tell the truth to the American people about this issue and bring the facts about this issue to the Senate.

What I think is fascinating and something he and I always look at is the deniers on the other side and their latest argument, which is that ''we are not scientists.'' Well, that is obvious. And we are not, either. That is the reason we listen to the scientists. There is no scientist who is going to say something because he feels it is going to benefit him or her. They are going to tell the truth. And 98, 99 percent of the scientists agree that what is happening in terms of carbon pollution is hurting this planet and will hurt it irreversibly forever. Anyone in this body who doesn't listen to this, who turns away from this will be judged by history and their Maker. But that is not good enough, because it is my grandkids and the grandkids of my colleagues who are going to have to deal with this.

I will close with this. This whole notion of ''I am not a scientist'' is ridiculous and it is ludicrous. If one of our Republican friends went to the doctor and, God forbid, the doctor said you have a serious cancerous tumor and you really need to have it taken care of, they are not going to look at the doctor and say: Well, I don't know, I am not a doctor. You might get a second opinion. That is good. In the case of climate, we have 97, 98, 99 percent of scientists agreeing on this problem.

You wouldn't say to your doctor: Gee, I don't know, maybe I will let this cancer go because I am not a doctor and what do I know? You have to rely on the people who know. And I have never seen anything like this. This is the tobacco company stance, when politicians cleared the way and tobacco businesses stood up and raised their right hand and said that nicotine was not a problem—and we know how that story ended—too late for a lot of people who died of cancer, too late for a lot of people who got hooked on cigarettes.

We want to make sure SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and those of us who agree with him are not going to wait too long. It is not going to be too late. We can actually save our families from the devastation of the ravages of climate change.

So I say to Senator WHITEHOUSE: It takes a lot of fortitude to stand up here in the Chamber time after time after time, and I think what he has done is make a record, which is very important because he has really touched on and continues to touch on all the new information. That is critical, and everyone should read it because it really does spell it out in very direct terms.

It also shows the fight that Senator WHITEHOUSE has, the belief that he has that we can win this battle. I share that view. It is because, as Senator WHITEHOUSE points out, a vast majority of the American people, including the vast majority of Republicans out there, think if you are a denier, you are losing it—that is my vernacular. They just don't believe it. They can't believe it. They think there is something wrong with you if you are a denier. So that is what we have in our back pocket, and right here in the Senate we have this treasure of a person, a Senator who will continue to fight,

continue to work, and I can assure him, as long as I am here and even when I am not, I will be echoing many of the things he is saying.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order during today's session of the Senate to call up the following amendments: No. 1299, Portman-Stabenow; No. 1251, Senator Brown; No. 1312, Inhofe, as modified; No. 1327, Warren; No. 1226, McCain; and No. 1227, Shaheen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object. I have no intent to object at this point. I just want to say this, to me, seems like a very balanced package. We have three amendments on each side raising important issues. Chairman HATCH has indicated, and I support him on this, that we are ready to go again first thing in the morning. I think that is what it is going to take to ensure that all sides feel that they have a chance to have their major concerns aired, have their amendments actually voted on.

I withdraw my reservation and I commend Chairman HATCH for working with us cooperatively so we can have this balanced package go forward. With that, I withdraw my reservation.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1312, AS MODIFIED, AND 1226 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators INHOFE and MCCAIN, I call up amendment No. 1312, as modified, and amendment No. 1226, and ask unanimous consent that they be reported by number.

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

The clerk will report en bloc by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] proposes en bloc amendments numbered 1312, as modified, and 1226 to Amendment No. 1221.

The amendments en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1312, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to require the development of a plan for each sub-Saharan African country for negotiating and entering into free trade agreements)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

(a) PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND REPORTING.—Section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723) is amended by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

''(b) PLAN REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall develop a plan for the purpose of negotiating and entering into one or more free trade agreements with all sub-Saharan African countries and ranking countries or groups of countries in order of readiness.

''(2) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required by paragraph (1) shall include, for each sub-Saharan African country, the following:

''(A) The steps such sub-Saharan African country needs to be equipped and ready to enter into a free trade agreement with the United States, including the development of a bilateral investment treaty.

''(B) Milestones for accomplishing each step identified in (A) for each sub-Saharan African country, with the goal of establishing a free trade agreement with each sub-Saharan African country not later than 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Trade Act of 2015.

''(C) A description of the resources required to assist each sub-Saharan African country in accomplishing each milestone described in subparagraph (B).

''(D) The extent to which steps described in subparagraph (A), the milestones described in subparagraph (B), and resources described in subparagraph (C) may be accomplished through regional or subregional organizations in sub-Saharan Africa, including the East African Community, the Economic Community of West African States, the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa, and the Economic Community of Central African States.

''(E) Procedures to ensure the following:

''(i) Adequate consultation with Congress and the private sector during the negotiations.

''(ii) Consultation with Congress regarding all matters relating to implementation of the agreement or agreements.

''(iii) Approval by Congress of the agreement or agreements.

''(iv) Adequate consultations with the relevant African governments and African regional and subregional intergovernmental organizations during the negotiation of the agreement or agreements.

''(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Trade Act of 2015, the President shall prepare and transmit to Congress a report containing the plan developed pursuant to subsection (b).''.

(c) MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE COMPACTS.—After the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative and Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall consult and coordinate with the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation regarding countries that have entered into a Millennium Challenge Compact pursuant to section 609 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7708) that have been declared eligible to enter into such a Compact for the purpose of developing and carrying out the plan required by subsection (b) of section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723), as amended by subsection (a).

(d) COORDINATION OF USAID WITH FREE TRADE AGREEMENT POLICY.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to the United States Agency for International Development under section 496 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293) may be used in consultation with the United States Trade Representative—

(A) to carry out subsection (b) of section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723), as amended by subsection (a), including for the deployment of resources in individual eligible countries to assist such country in the development of institutional capacities to carry out such subsection (b); and

(B) to coordinate the efforts of the United States to establish free trade agreements in accordance with the policy set out in subsection (a) of such section 116.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ELIGIBLE COUNTRY.—The term ''eligible country'' means a sub-Saharan African country that receives—

(i) benefits under for the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.); and

(ii) funding from the United States Agency for International Development.

(B) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''sub-Saharan African country'' has the meaning given that term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3706).

AMENDMENT NO. 1226

(Purpose: To repeal a duplicative inspection and grading program)

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—EXPANDING TRADE EXPORTS

SEC. 301. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE INSPECTION AND GRADING PROGRAM.

(a) FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008.—Effective June 18, 2008, section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) is repealed.

(b) AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014.—Effective February 7, 2014, section 12106 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79; 128 Stat. 981) is repealed.

(c) APPLICATION.—The Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of law struck by this section had not been enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to say, first of all, thank you to our distinguished leader of the Finance Committee for including the Portman-Stabenow amendment.

First, before calling it up, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator DONNELLY as a cosponsor and thank Senators BURR, GRAHAM, COLLINS, BALDWIN, BROWN, CASEY, HEITKAMP, KLOBUCHAR, MANCHIN, SCHUMER, SHAHEEN, and WARREN for being cosponsors as well.

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1299.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW], for Mr. PORTMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1299 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To make it a principal negotiating objective of the United States to address currency manipulation in trade agreements)

In section 102(b), strike paragraph (11) and insert the following:

(11) CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency exchange practices is to target protracted large-scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets by a party to a trade agreement to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to the agreement, by establishing strong and enforceable rules against exchange rate manipulation that are subject to the same dispute settlement procedures and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement and are consistent with existing principles and agreements of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization. Nothing in the previous sentence shall be construed to restrict the exercise of domestic monetary policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 1251 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1251.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 1251 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the approval of Congress before additional countries may join the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement)

At the end of section 107, add the following:

(c) LIMITATIONS ON ADDITIONAL COUNTRIES JOINING THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to an agreement described in subsection (a)(2) with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries only if that implementing bill covers only the countries that are parties to the negotiations for that agreement as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES TO ADDITIONAL COUNTRIES.—If a country or countries not a party to the negotiations for the agreement described in subsection (a)(2) as of the date of the enactment of this Act enter into negotiations to join the agreement after that date, the trade authorities procedures shall apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to an agreement with such country or countries to join the agreement described in subsection (a)(2) only if—

(A) the President notifies Congress of the intention of the President to enter into negotiations with such country or countries in accordance with section 105(a)(1)(A);

(B) during the 90-day period provided for under section 105(a)(1)(A) before the President initiates such negotiations—

(i) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate each certify that such country or countries are capable of meeting the standards of the Trans-Pacific Partnership; and

(ii) the House of Representatives and the Senate each approve a resolution approving such country or countries entering into negotiations to join the agreement described in subsection (a)(2);

(C) the agreement with such country or countries to join the agreement described in subsection (a)(2) is entered into before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under section 103(c); and

(D) that implementing bill covers only such country or countries.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, very briefly, in 30 seconds, I will explain the amendment.

There are 12 countries in the Trans-Pacific Partnership. If at some point the President of the United States would like to add another country or two, this amendment simply says that Congress must approve; there must be a vote of the U.S. House of Representatives and a vote of the Senate in order to admit a new country.

There is some concern that the People's Republic of China, which is now the second largest economy in the world, would come in through the backdoor without congressional approval.

We want to make sure that neither the President who is in the White House today nor the next President nor the President after that can admit China or any other country with any other large economy or small economy in the TPP without congressional approval.

We will discuss and debate this amendment more tomorrow.

I thank Senator WYDEN and Senator HATCH for moving this process forward and bringing up many amendments to debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1227 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

(Purpose: To make trade agreements work for small businesses)

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator SHAHEEN, I call up her amendment, which is amendment No. 1227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for Mrs. SHAHEEN, proposes an amendment numbered 1227 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of May 14, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 1327 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator WARREN, I call up amendment No. 1327.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for Ms. WARREN, proposes an amendment numbered 1327 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the application of the trade authorities procedures to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement that includes investor-state dispute settlement)

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT THREATEN UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if such agreement or agreements, the implementing bill, or any statement of administrative action described in subsection (a)(1)(E)(ii) proposed to implement such agreement or agreements, includes investor-state dispute settlement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

COMMEMORATING 35 YEARS SINCE THE ERUPTION OF MOUNT ST. HELENS

● Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, today marks the 35th anniversary of one of the largest and most devastating volcanic eruptions in the history of our Nation—the 1980 eruption of Mount St. Helens. Today, the people of my State continue to embrace the mountain's beauty, but retain a profound respect for its power given the potential for a recap of the 1980 eruption and the devastation that it brought.

On the morning of May 18, 1980, small eruptions and earthquakes finally culminated in a destructive eruption that changed surrounding geography and rendered the neighboring ridges void of life. David Johnston, a scientist with the U.S. Geological Survey was conducting measurements on the mountain. At 8:32 a.m., as an earthquake brought magma to St. Helens surface, Johnston sent the now infamous radio transmission: ''Vancouver, Vancouver. This is it!'' Sadly, just seconds later, Johnston was engulfed by the explosion and the ensuing landslide that swept laterally from the mountain at speeds as high as 670 miles per hour. Tragically, 57 lives were lost as a result of the eruption and 200 homes were destroyed along with bridges, roads, and railways in the vicinity. And the blast incinerated 100-year-old trees and all forms of plant life within the blast zone. Estimates put the total loss of trees at 4 billion board feet.

In the 35 years since the eruption, the private sector and the Federal Government's approach to forestry has changed significantly. Following the eruption, Congress directed the Forest Service to embark on a new approach to forest management. In 1982, Congress created the Mount Saint Helens National Volcanic Monument. This 110,000 acre designation has created a kind of ''biological laboratory'' at the site of the eruption to let nature take its course. That foresight has allowed ecologists to learn that forests didn't regenerate from clearings the way scientists had believed for almost a century. We also learned the importance of leaving behind a legacy of dead trees to serve as homes for birds and that patches of remnant areas existed which supported sporadic groups of live trees. The learnings from this natural disaster shaped the forest policy that we see throughout much of Washington and the country today.

Now, as residents in Washington and around the country are witnessing unusually large forest fires—the Federal Government needs to take the lessons learned following the Mount St. Helens eruptions and apply them to this new challenge. The government needs to do its part to rapidly provide the emergency services communities need after large fire and natural disasters. But we also need to stabilize slopes to prevent mudslides through investments in seismic monitoring equipment and Light Detection and Ranging or LiDAR. Just as we learned in the Mount St. Helens experiment, a great deal of wildlife thrive in the early forest conditions that come after a wildfire. Those areas need to be considered as managers look at what's the best for our Federal lands. And what better place to visit that conversation, than on the National Forest that houses the ecological record of the Mount St. Helens eruption of 35 years ago.

Seismic activity in the Pacific Northwest isn't just a once in a generation event, but an ever present reality in Washington State. The eruption of Mount St. Helens provides a clear reminder of the value of early earthquake monitoring and warning systems. The Pacific Northwest Seismic Network offers early warning systems and comprehensive seismic monitoring that can warn communities up to a minute before an earthquake occurs, or even future volcanic eruptions. With constant seismic activity throughout much of Washington State, including at volcanos such as Glacier Peak in the Cascades, we must continue to make the vital investments in these early warning systems.

I look forward to taking lessons learned on Mount St. Helens and applying them to a new approach to forest policy. I have also called for us as legislators and constituents to begin a conversation around what we want our national forests to look like over the next 50 years. What is working well, and what problems we do not want to see as we think about our 21st century vision for our national forests.

As we reflect today on the tragic and watershed event that happened on Mount St. Helens 35 years ago, we must work to put our forests on a long-term track to successfully delivering the things we expect from them—quality recreation, clean water, clean air, wildlife habitat, and a sustainable supply of wood products.●

TRIBUTE TO WALTON GRESHAM

● Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to commend Walton Gresham of Indianola, MS, for his service and contributions to the State of Mississippi while serving as the 79th president of the Delta Council. This important organization was formed in 1935 and has grown into a widely respected economic development group representing the business, professional, and agricultural interests of the Mississippi Delta. I am grateful to Delta Council for its continuous role in meeting the economic and quality of life challenges in this unique part of our country.

Walton Gresham's tenure as council president began soon after Congress enacted the Agricultural Act of 2014, and his effective leadership has helped Mississippi producers adapt to the new federal agriculture policies established by this new farm bill. Mr. Gresham has been an active leader on transportation issues in our State, and he is constructively engaged as Congress prepares to consider legislation to reauthorize Federal spending on highway and public transportation programs that are vitally important to the Mississippi Delta and its future. Mr. Gresham's dedication to confronting health care disparities and higher education needs in our State should also be commended. Through its work with Delta Council, Mr. Gresham's family has improved Mississippi's workforce training and readiness.

In addition to his role as president of Delta Council, Mr. Gresham has been active in the Mississippi Propane Gas Association, the National Propane Gas Association, the Petroleum Marketers Association of America, the Mississippi Petroleum Marketers and Convenience Stores Association, and the Mississippi Economic Council. He serves on the board of directors of Planters Bank, Propane Energy Group, Delta Terminal, Gresham-McPherson Oil Company, DoubleQuick, and Indianola Insurance Agency. He is a past president of the Indianola Rotary Club and Indianola Country Club.

Walton Gresham is a respected businessman and his performance as president of Delta Council will complement his well-earned reputation for unselfish service to improve the quality of life for those who live and do business in the Mississippi Delta region. His dedication to the future of the delta and all of those who live there is sincere. I am pleased to join the people of my State in commending Walton Gresham and sharing our appreciation with his wife Laura and their children Lenore and Elizabeth as they prepare for the 80th annual meeting of the Delta Council organizational membership, at which time, he will reflect on his successful tenure before passing the torch to a new president.●

CONGRATULATING TIM WILSON

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate Mr. Timothy P. Wilson on receiving the Gerda Haas Award for Excellence in Human Rights Education and Leadership from the Holocaust and Human Rights Center of Maine.

The Gerda Haas Award recognizes and honors individuals who demonstrate excellence and initiative in human rights education and leadership. In the late 1970s, Gerda Haas was appointed to the Maine State School Board of Education and while serving on the board learned that students were not being taught about the Holocaust in Maine schools. Gerda identified this critical educational void and took action to remedy it, establishing the Holocaust and Human Rights Center of Maine with the goal of combating prejudice and discrimination while encouraging individuals to reflect and act upon their ethical and moral responsibilities in the modern world.

Tim Wilson certainly lives up to this philosophy. Over the course of his vibrant life as a teacher, coach, philanthropist, consultant, government official, husband, father, and grandfather, Tim has dedicated his time to serving

others both at home in Maine and in the international community.

After graduating from Slippery Rock University and the University of Washington, where he was certified to teach English as a second language, Tim served in the Peace Corps in Thailand from 1962 to 1965. When he returned to the U.S., Tim took over as the head coach of the Dexter High School football team leading them to two Class C co-state championships and two Little Ten Conference titles. Over the course of his coaching career Tim has been a mentor to hundreds, if not thousands of students throughout Maine advocating education and sportsmanship.

One of Tim's greatest legacies is his work with Seeds of Peace. This student exchange program is focused on bringing young people from conflict zones around the world together in order to build lasting relationships and develop the skills needed to advance peace. In the program's first year, Tim managed the International Camp in Otisfield, ME where a group of 46 Israeli, Palestinian, Egyptian, and American teenagers attended the camp for the inaugural season. As Seeds of Peace grew to accommodate over 100 students every year, Tim worked as director of both the Seeds of Peace International Camp in Maine and the Seeds of Peace Center for Coexistence in Jerusalem. Currently, Tim serves as a special international advisor to Seeds of Peace which has generated over 5,000 international alumni and which continues to help young people work towards peace in international conflict areas.

Tim Wilson has worked under four Maine Governors, including myself. He has served in posts such as chair of the Maine Human Rights Commission, State ombudsman, and associate commissioner of programming for the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Corrections. He served as director of the State Offices of Energy, Community Services, and Civil Emergency Preparedness. He has also been the director of admissions at Maine Central Institute in Pittsfield, the associate headmaster at the Hyde School in Bath, ME, and the annual key note speaker at Dirigo Girls State.

In 1997, the late King Hussein of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan presented Tim with a Medal of Honor. Seeds of Peace has recognized his efforts with a Distinguished Leadership Award and the Maine Youth Camping Association honored him with the Halsey Gulick Award. Tim has also been honored with the Distinguished American Award by the Maine Chapter of the National Football Foundation. Most recently, Tim received the Franklin H. Williams Award which recognizes ethnically diverse returned Peace Corps Volunteers who exemplify a commitment to community service and the Peace Corps' goal of promoting a cultural awareness among Americans.

Tim Wilson has devoted his life to promoting peace and understanding, to educating young people, and to empowering them to make their communities—and the world—a better place. I can think of no one more deserving of the Gerda Haas Award. Tim has led a career dedicated to teaching the next generation of young people and he has done a truly spectacular job of preparing them.●

TRIBUTE TO JERRY DUNFEY

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to extend my best wishes to Jerry Dunfey on his 80th birthday this Saturday and to salute his lifetime of remarkable achievements as a business leader and political activist.

Jerry is one of 12 siblings born to Catharine and Leroy Dunfey, who emigrated from Ireland, worked in the textile mills of Lowell, MA, and later opened a small clam stand in Hampton, NH. In the years since, the Dunfeys have gone on to become one of the grand families of Granite State business and politics.

As a teenager, Jerry went to work managing Dunfey's Restaurant at Hampton Beach and then made his way through the University of New Hampshire by working at the family's restaurant in Durham. He and his brothers went on to operate other restaurants, acquired small inns across New England, and founded Dunfey Hotels, which under subsequent owners became Omni Hotels.

In 1968, they purchased the historic Parker House hotel in Boston, where they found the archives of the 19th century Saturday Club salon, which included Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and Oliver Wendell Holmes. Jerry Dunfey reincarnated this famous club by founding what would become known as the Global Citizens Circle. Since 1974, the circle has brought together elected officials, activists, and ordinary citizens to debate leading issues, advocate for civil rights, and promote peaceful change in South Africa, Northern Ireland, and across the globe. Under auspices of the circle, Jerry has brought to New Hampshire speakers ranging from Archbishop Desmond Tutu to Ambassador Andrew Young to Arn Chorn-Pond, a survivor of the Cambodian killing fields. Hundreds of circle forums have been convened in Belfast, Soweto, Jerusalem, Havana, and in cities across the United States.

Jerry and his wife Nadine Hack have a long history of engagement in the U.S. civil rights movement, including a close friendship with the family of Martin Luther King, Jr. They both served on the board of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change, read a psalm at Coretta Scott King's private family funeral, and were honorary pall bearers at her larger public funeral. They also have close ties with leaders of South Africa's liberation movement and were guests of state at Nelson Mandela's inauguration as President in 1994.

For more than six decades, the large Dunfey and Kennedy families have been closely intertwined in both friendship and politics—though Ted Kennedy used to joke that, when it came to children, ''the Dunfeys are size 12 but the Kennedys are only size 9.'' Jerry was close friends with John, Bobby, and Ted Kennedy, dating back to the 1950s, and John announced for the Presidency in 1960 at a Dunfey hotel in Manchester. In 2009, Jerry and Nadine had the singular honor of sitting in the final hour of vigil by Ted Kennedy's casket at the JFK Presidential Library.

Jerry Dunfey's activism in progressive politics has continued strongly into the second decade of the 21st century. He and Nadine have had five children and six grandchildren, and they are especially proud that all three generations of their family actively campaigned for President Barack Obama. Now on the cusp of his ninth decade, Jerry is retired but far from retiring.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said, ''Life's most persistent and urgent question is: What are you doing for others?'' Across a lifetime in public life, Jerry Dunfey has answered that question in powerful ways: fighting for civil rights, advancing the cause of social and economic justice here at home, and promoting peace and reconciliation across the globe. I congratulate Jerry on his 80th birthday and send my best wishes to Nadine, their children and grandchildren, and the entire Dunfey clan. They have contributed so much to the civic life of our State and our country. ●

TRIBUTE TO DR. NICHOLAS WOLTER

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a Montanan whose life's work is helping to improve the health of folks in my home State and across this country.

As a board-certified physician in internal medicine and pulmonary medicine, Dr. Nicholas Wolter has been dedicated to improving the health of folks in Montana for several decades. His distinguished career in Montana began more than 30 years ago at the Billings Clinic, where he now serves as the chief executive officer. Under his leadership, the Billings Clinic has become the largest health care organization in Montana, with more than 3,700 employees, including 350 physicians and 400 inpatient nurses. Dr. Wolter is known for his commitment to the people of Billings, and under his direction the clinic has provided more charity care than any other health care organization in the State and has gained a

reputation nationally as a leader in patient safety, quality, and service.

For the past decade, Dr. Wolter has been one of the most influential voices on Capitol Hill in helping to reform our fragmented health care delivery system and championing the medical-group delivery model. His successes can be seen in several pieces of legislation, including the Affordable Care Act, and have improved care for countless numbers of patients. Dr. Wolter's close partnership with our former colleague, Senator Max Baucus, resulted in Montana serving as a model for the rest of the Nation on how best to deliver care in the most rural parts of this Nation.

Dr. Wolter is a former member of the board of directors of the American Medical Group Association and the American Hospital Association. He served two terms as a Commissioner on the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, advising Congress on how to improve care and reduce costs in the health care system. Dr. Wolter was recognized by the Medical Group Management Association in 2004 as the Physician Executive of the Year and was named by Modern Healthcare as one of the 100 Most Influential People in Health Care in 2010 and 2011, and by Modern Physicians as one of the 50 Most Influential Physicians in Health Care in 2011.

Dr. Wolter has been a tireless advocate in improving our health care system and today I am delighted to recognize him as he is being entered into the American Medical Group Association's Policy Hall of Fame.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13047 OF MAY 20, 1997, WITH RESPECT TO BURMA, RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE ON MAY 15, 2015—PM 17

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared on May 20, 1997, is to continue in effect beyond May 20, 2015. The Government of Burma has made significant progress across a number of important areas, including the release of over 1,300 political prisoners, continued progress toward a nationwide cease-fire, the discharge of hundreds of child soldiers from the military, steps to improve labor standards, and expanding political space for civil society to have a greater voice in shaping issues critical to Burma's future. In addition, Burma has become a signatory of the International Atomic Energy Agency's Additional Protocol and ratified the Biological Weapons Convention, significant steps towards supporting global nonproliferation. Despite these strides, the situation in the country continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Concerns persist regarding the ongoing conflict and human rights abuses in the country, particularly in ethnic minority areas and Rakhine State. In addition, Burma's military operates with little oversight from the civilian government and often acts with impunity. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to Burma.

Despite this action, the United States remains committed to supporting and strengthening Burma's reform efforts and to continue working both with the Burmese government and people to ensure that the democratic transition is sustained and irreversible.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 2015.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 15, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate on January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 15, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 606. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

H.R. 1191. An act to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2252. An act to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2297. An act to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, May 18, 2015, he had signed the following bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 606. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

H.R. 1191. An act to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2297. An act to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1350. A bill to provide a short-term extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1357. A bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2048. An act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use

other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 611. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–47).

S. 653. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act (Rept. No. 114–48).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1360. A bill to amend the limitation on liability for passenger rail accidents or incidents under section 28103 of title 49, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and improve the Indian coal production tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1362. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAPO:

S. 1363. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress a report assessing the capability of the Department of Energy to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion and fission reactor prototypes and related demonstration facilities at sites owned by the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1364. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the payment of an additional rebate to the State Medicaid plan in the case of increase in the price of a generic drug at a rate that is greater than the rate of inflation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1365. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1366. A bill to amend the charter of the Gold Star Wives of America to remove the restriction on the federally chartered corporation, and directors and officers of the corporation, attempting to influence legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1367. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act with respect to membership eligibility of certain institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 386, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 389

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 389, a bill to amend section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that annual State report cards reflect the same race groups as the decennial census of population.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 391, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 447

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 447, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 688

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 688, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 851

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

(Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 1006

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1006, a bill to incentivize early adoption of positive train control, and for other purposes.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1126, a bill to modify and extend the National Guard State Partnership Program.

S. 1135

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

S. 1142

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1142, a bill to clarify that noncommercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not in interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

S. 1193

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1193, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent and expand the temporary minimum credit rate for the low-income housing tax credit program.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1294

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1294, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate in promoting the development of efficient, economical, and environmentally sustainable thermally led wood energy systems.

S. 1300

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa fees in certain situations.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 87, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater cooperation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 168, a resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

AMENDMENT NO. 1237

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1237 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1242

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1242 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1244

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1244 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and improve the Indian coal production tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this year marks the 10-year anniversary of the Indian coal production tax credit. This is a crucial tax incentive that levels the playing field for the future development of tribal coal resources that are currently subject to more regulatory requirements than comparable development on private, State or Federal land. The credit protects the economic viability of existing tribal coal mining projects which support much needed tribal jobs and provide a major source of non-Federal revenue for coal-producing tribes.

Over the past 10 years, the Indian production coal tax credit has proven to be an essential tool in the work of Montana tribes to achieve self-sufficiency, increase economic opportunity, and create good-paying jobs for tribal members. It also has had a significant impact on Montana's economy as a whole.

In fact, in the State of Montana, the Crow tribe relies on coal production for good-paying jobs and as much as two-thirds of the Crow Nation's annual non-Federal budget, partially funding Crow elder programs, higher education for tribal youth, and other essential services for the Crow's 13,000 enrolled members.

Current unemployment on the Crow reservation is 47 percent. It would be over 80 percent if it weren't for the coal jobs. In fact, just last month, I chaired the first ever energy and jobs Senate field hearing on the Crow reservation back in Montana. I heard firsthand how the tax credit is creating economic opportunities for members of the Crow tribe. Yet the current nature of annual reauthorization has resulted in unnecessary uncertainty.

The Crow tribe, as well as all who rely on the Indian coal production tax credit, deserve a long-term solution that provides them with the support and certainty they desperately need. In fact, at last month's hearing, Crow chairman Darrin Old Coyote testified, ''There are a few federal tax incentives that encourage investment and development in Indian country, but their utility is diminished by their short-term nature.''

For those who have spent time on the Crow reservation and throughout Southeastern Montana, the economic benefits are most evident. The Indian coal production tax credit has served as a catalyst for creating jobs and fostering tribal self-determination.

In fact, the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development recently published a study of preliminary findings which analyzed the economic effects of this tax provision. The study found that the Indian coal production tax credit contributed 1,600 jobs across Montana and generated $107 million in royalties and tax revenue for the Crow tribe in 2013 alone. In addition, the tax credit stimulates $95 million in wages for the State of Montana. The Indian coal production tax credit, which expired at the end of 2014 after a 1-year extension, continues to serve the Crow tribe as an effective mechanism for economic development. However, it is a constant source of angst due to Congress's unwillingness to adopt an extension of this provision.

The benefits of this tax credit are evident on tribal lands, especially in Montana. In fact, displayed prominently in my Washington, DC, office is a note from Crow chairman Old Coyote's daughter Evelyn. I have it framed in my office. She wrote: ''Please keep the coal tax credit going to help me and other Crow kids have a brighter future.''

A permanent extension provides much needed certainty to invest in large-scale energy production projects and provides a path forward for the long-term prosperity of our tribal nations.

Today, I am introducing much needed legislation that addresses the problem and gives our tribes certainty. I appreciate my colleague Montana Senator JON TESTER for joining me in this important effort. I wish to thank Montana Representative RYAN Zinke for introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives. I also wish to thank the bipartisan Senate team that includes Senators BARRASSO, MORAN, and HEITKAMP for sponsoring this bill. Together, we will continue to advance this legislation for the betterment of Native American tribes.

While there is still more to be done to better serve our tribes, the permanent extension of the Indian coal production tax credit is a good start. I believe this vital piece of legislation will continue to bring more good-paying jobs to Montana and to our Nation, and I strongly urge my colleagues in the Senate to support it.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1249. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1250. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1251. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

SA 1252. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1253. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1254. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1255. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1256. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1257. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1258. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1259. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1260. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1261. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1262. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1263. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1264. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1265. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1266. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1267. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1268. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1269. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1270. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1271. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1272. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1273. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1274. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1275. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1276. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1277. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1278. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1279. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1280. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1281. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1282. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1283. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1284. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1285. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1286. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1287. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1288. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1289. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1290. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1291. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1292. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1293. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1294. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1295. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1296. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1297. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1298. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1299. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BURR, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

SA 1300. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BURR, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1301. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1302. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1303. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1304. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1305. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1306. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1307. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1308. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1309. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1310. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1311. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1312. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

SA 1313. Mr. COATS (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1314. Mr. COATS (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1315. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1316. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1317. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1318. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1319. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1320. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1321. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1322. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1323. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1324. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1325. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1326. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1327. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

SA 1328. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1329. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1330. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1331. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1332. Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1333. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1334. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1335. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1336. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1337. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1338. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1339. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1340. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1341. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1342. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1343. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1344. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1345. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1346. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1347. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1348. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1349. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1350. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1351. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1352. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1353. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1354. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1355. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1356. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1357. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1358. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1359. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1360. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1361. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill

H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1362. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1363. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1364. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1365. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1249. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) ACCESS TO THE INTERNET.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the Internet shall be to preserve equal access to the Internet and to not undermine any law or regulation of the United States with respect to net neutrality.

SA 1250. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) PRIVACY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to privacy shall be to protect the privacy of data of consumers and individuals and to not reduce protections for privacy under the law and regulations of the United States.

SA 1251. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

At the end of section 107, add the following:

(c) LIMITATIONS ON ADDITIONAL COUNTRIES JOINING THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to an agreement described in subsection (a)(2) with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries only if that implementing bill covers only the countries that are parties to the negotiations for that agreement as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES TO ADDITIONAL COUNTRIES.—If a country or countries not a party to the negotiations for the agreement described in subsection (a)(2) as of the date of the enactment of this Act enter into negotiations to join the agreement after that date, the trade authorities procedures shall apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to an agreement with such country or countries to join the agreement described in subsection (a)(2) only if—

(A) the President notifies Congress of the intention of the President to enter into negotiations with such country or countries in accordance with section 105(a)(1)(A);

(B) during the 90-day period provided for under section 105(a)(1)(A) before the President initiates such negotiations—

(i) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate each certify that such country or countries are capable of meeting the standards of the Trans-Pacific Partnership; and

(ii) the House of Representatives and the Senate each approve a resolution approving such country or countries entering into negotiations to join the agreement described in subsection (a)(2);

(C) the agreement with such country or countries to join the agreement described in subsection (a)(2) is entered into before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under section 103(c); and

(D) that implementing bill covers only such country or countries.

SA 1252. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

SEC. 301. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO COOPERATE WITH A REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN A PROCEEDING.

Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(B) by striking ''ADVERSE INFERENCES.—If'' and inserting the following: ''ADVERSE INFERENCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If'';

(C) by striking ''under this title, may use'' and inserting the following: ''under this title—

''(A) may use''; and

(D) by striking ''facts otherwise available. Such adverse inference may include'' and inserting the following: ''facts otherwise available; and

''(B) is not required to determine, or make any adjustments to, a countervailable subsidy rate or weighted average dumping margin based on any assumptions about information the interested party would have provided if the interested party had complied with the request for information.

''(2) POTENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR ADVERSE INFERENCES.—An adverse inference under paragraph (1)(A) may include'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—When the'' and inserting the following: ''CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The administrative authority and the Commission shall not be required to corroborate any dumping margin or countervailing duty applied in a separate segment of the same proceeding.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) SUBSIDY RATES AND DUMPING MARGINS IN ADVERSE INFERENCE DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority uses an inference that is adverse to the interests of a party under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority may—

''(A) in the case of a countervailing duty proceeding—

''(i) use a countervailable subsidy rate applied for the same or similar program in a countervailing duty proceeding involving the same country, or

''(ii) if there is no same or similar program, use a countervailable subsidy rate for a subsidy program from a proceeding that the administering authority considers reasonable to use, and

''(B) in the case of an antidumping duty proceeding, use any dumping margin from any segment of the proceeding under the applicable antidumping order.

''(2) DISCRETION TO APPLY HIGHEST RATE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the administering authority may apply any of the countervailable subsidy rates or dumping margins specified under that paragraph, including the highest such rate or margin, based on the evaluation by the administering authority of the situation that resulted in the administering authority using an adverse inference in selecting among the facts otherwise available.

''(3) NO OBLIGATION TO MAKE CERTAIN ESTIMATES OR ADDRESS CERTAIN CLAIMS.—If the administering authority uses an adverse inference under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority is not required, for purposes of subsection (c) or for any other purpose—

''(A) to estimate what the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin would have been if the interested party found to have failed to cooperate under subsection (b)(1) had cooperated, or

''(B) to demonstrate that the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping

margin used by the administering authority reflects an alleged commercial reality of the interested party.''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITION OF MATERIAL INJURY.

(a) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES.—Section 771(7) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(J) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY.—The Commission shall not determine that there is no material injury or threat of material injury to an industry in the United States merely because that industry is profitable or because the performance of that industry has recently improved.''.

(b) EVALUATION OF IMPACT ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IN DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL INJURY.—Subclause (I) of section 771(7)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

''(I) actual and potential decline in output, sales, market share, gross profits, operating profits, net profits, ability to service debt, productivity, return on investments, return on assets, and utilization of capacity,''.

(c) CAPTIVE PRODUCTION.—Section 771(7)(C)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking the comma and inserting '', and'';

(2) in subclause (II), by striking '', and'' and inserting a comma; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 303. PARTICULAR MARKET SITUATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF ORDINARY COURSE OF TRADE.—Section 771(15) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(15)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) Situations in which the administering authority determines that the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison with the export price or constructed export price.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF NORMAL VALUE.—Section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking ''in such other country.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTED VALUE.—Section 773(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''business'' and inserting ''trade''; and

(2) By striking the flush text at the end and inserting the following:

''For purposes of paragraph (1), if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology. For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost of materials shall be determined without regard to any internal tax in the exporting country imposed on such materials or their disposition that is remitted or refunded upon exportation of the subject merchandise produced from such materials.''.

SEC. 304. DISTORTION OF PRICES OR COSTS.

(a) INVESTIGATION OF BELOW-COST SALES.—Section 773(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE OR SUSPECT.—

''(i) REVIEW.—In a review conducted under section 751 involving a specific exporter, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that are less than the cost of production of the product if the administering authority disregarded some or all of the exporter's sales pursuant to paragraph (1) in the investigation or, if a review has been completed, in the most recently completed review.

''(ii) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—In an investigation initiated under section 732 or a review conducted under section 751, the administering authority shall request information necessary to calculate the constructed value and cost of production under subsections (e) and (f) to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the cost of production of the product.''.

(b) PRICES AND COSTS IN NONMARKET ECONOMIES.—Section 773(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) DISCRETION TO DISREGARD CERTAIN PRICE OR COST VALUES.—In valuing the factors of production under paragraph (1) for the subject merchandise, the administering authority may disregard price or cost values without further investigation if the administering authority has determined that broadly available export subsidies existed or particular instances of subsidization occurred with respect to those price or cost values or if those price or cost values were subject to an antidumping order.''.

SEC. 305. REDUCTION IN BURDEN ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTARY RESPONDENTS.

Section 782(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677m(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and by moving such clauses, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking ''INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—In'' and inserting the following: ''INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In'';

(4) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), to read as follows:

''(B) the number of exporters or producers subject to the investigation or review is not so large that any additional individual examination of such exporters or producers would be unduly burdensome to the administering authority and inhibit the timely completion of the investigation or review.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DETERMINATION OF UNDULY BURDENSOME.—In determining if an individual examination under paragraph (1)(B) would be unduly burdensome, the administering authority may consider the following:

''(A) The complexity of the issues or information presented in the proceeding, including questionnaires and any responses thereto.

''(B) Any prior experience of the administering authority in the same or similar proceeding.

''(C) The total number of investigations under subtitle A or B and reviews under section 751 being conducted by the administering authority as of the date of the determination.

''(D) Such other factors relating to the timely completion of each such investigation and review as the administering authority considers appropriate.''.

SEC. 306. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

SA 1253. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 203(d)(2) and insert the following:

(2) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—Section 255(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2345(a)) is amended by striking ''$16,000,000'' and all that follows through ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2021''.

SA 1254. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) PRINCIPAL NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''principal negotiating objective'' means a mandatory negotiating objective of the United States required to be achieved by the President for an agreement to be eligible for trade authorities procedures, as defined in section 3(b).

SA 1255. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b)(1), add the following:

(C) to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of goods by—

(i) providing reasonable adjustment periods for import-sensitive products manufactured in the United States and maintaining close consultation with Congress with respect to those products before initiating negotiations for a trade agreement that reduces tariffs;

(ii) taking into account whether a party to negotiations for a trade agreement has failed to adhere to any provision of an existing trade agreement with the United States or has circumvented any obligation under any such existing trade agreement; and

(iii) taking into account whether a product is subject to market distortions by reason of—

(I) the failure of a major producing country, as determined by the President, to adhere to any provision of an existing trade agreement with the United States; or

(II) the circumvention by that country of its obligations under an existing trade agreement with the United States.

SA 1256. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(b)(4), strike subparagraph (G).

SA 1257. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(b)(4), after subparagraph (E), insert the following:

(F) strengthening the capacity of trading partners of the United States to protect the rights and interests of investors through the establishment and maintenance of fair and efficient legal proceedings consistent with the legal principles and practices of the United States;

SA 1258. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(b)(10), strike subparagraph (G).

SA 1259. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(b), add at the end the following:

(21) RULES OF ORIGIN.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to rules of origin is to ensure that the benefits of a trade agreement accrue to the parties to the agreement, particularly with respect to goods produced in the United States and goods that incorporate materials produced in the United States.

SA 1260. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 105(a), add at the end the following:

(6) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements relating to industrial products, the President shall—

(i) assess—

(I) whether there is global overcapacity in industrial products, including industrial products subject to the provisions of such agreement or agreements; and

(II) the enhanced access to the United States market that such agreement or agreements would provide; and

(ii) consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives with respect to—

(I) the potential impact of such agreement or agreements on industrial products produced in the United States;

(II) the results of the assessment conducted under clause (i)(I);

(III) whether it is appropriate for the President to agree to reduce tariffs on industrial products based on any conclusions reached in that assessment; and

(IV) how the President intends to comply with all negotiating objectives applicable to such agreement or agreements.

(B) ASSESSMENT.—The assessment conducted under subparagraph (A)(i) shall include, at a minimum, an assessment of the following industrial products:

(i) Steel and steel products.

(ii) Aluminum and aluminum products.

(iii) Solar products.

(iv) Glass, including flat glass and glassware.

(v) Cement.

(vi) Wood.

(vii) Paper products.

SA 1261. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 106(b), add at the end the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES THAT DO NOT PROTECT RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements with a country that does not protect religious freedoms, as determined in the most recent report on international religious freedom under section 102(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)).

SA 1262. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 106(b), add at the end the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS WITH NONMARKET ECONOMY COUNTRIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements with a nonmarket economy country, as defined in section 771(18) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(18)).

SA 1263. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 106(b), add at the end the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES CLASSIFIED AS TAX HAVENS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements with a country—

(A) that is classified as a tax haven by the Government Accountability Office; and

(B) with which the United States does not have a tax treaty in force.

SA 1264. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 104(a)(3), add at the end the following:

(D) SUBMISSION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDELINES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The United States Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a copy of the written guidelines developed under subparagraph (A)(i) and any revision to those guidelines under subparagraph (A)(ii).

(ii) IMPLEMENTATION.—The United States Trade Representative may not implement the written guidelines or revisions, as the case may be, submitted under clause (i) until the date that is 30 days after the submission of those guidelines or revisions under that clause.

SA 1265. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 107, add at the end the following:

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON NONMARKET ECONOMY COUNTRIES.—Nothing in this Act, or negotiations for an agreement that were commenced before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be construed to suggest that any country that is a nonmarket economy country, as defined in section 771(18) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(18)), on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act has transitioned to a market economy for purposes of accession to the World Trade Organization.

SA 1266. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 107, add at the end the following:

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TREATMENT OF CHINA.—It is the sense of Congress that the People's Republic of China may not join negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership until the President certifies to Congress that China—

(1) has not manipulated the exchange rate of its currency for a period of not less than one year preceding the certification; and

(2) has fully transitioned to a market economy country.

SA 1267. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 107, add the following:

(c) LIMITATION ON ADDITIONAL COUNTRIES JOINING THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply with respect to an agreement described in subsection (a)(2) with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries if a country that is not a party to the negotiations for that agreement as of the date of the enactment of this Act joins those negotiations.

(2) APPROVAL BY CONGRESS.—This section shall apply to an agreement described in subsection (a)(2) with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries if, for each country that joins the negotiations for the agreement after the date of the enactment of this Act, the House of Representatives and the Senate each approve a resolution approving that country joining the negotiations.

(3) CERTIFICATION.—Before a resolution described in paragraph (2) with respect to a country may be voted on by the House of Representatives or the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Finance of the Senate, as the case may be, shall certify that the country meets the standards for the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

SA 1268. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 104(a)(2) and insert the following:

(2) CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO FORCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to exchanging notes providing for the entry into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(B) VOTE BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS AND COMMITTEE ON FINANCE BEFORE ENTRY INTO FORCE.—

(i) NOTICE.—Not later than 90 days before a trade agreement enters into force, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Members of Congress and the committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by the agreement written notice that the agreement will enter into force.

(ii) VOTE BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS AND COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—Not later than 30 days after receiving notice under clause (i) that a trade agreement will enter into force, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall each meet and vote on whether or not each country that is a party to the agreement meets the standards of the agreement.

SA 1269. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 104(d), add at the end the following:

(5) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF NEGOTIATING PROPOSALS.—The United States Trade Representative shall make available to the public each proposal made by the United States in negotiations for a trade agreement conducted under this Act on the day on which the Trade Representative shares the proposal with any other party to the negotiations.

SA 1270. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 104(d), add at the end the following:

(5) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN TRADE NEGOTIATIONS.—The United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) make available to the public each proposed chapter of a trade agreement being negotiated under this Act; and

(B) provide for a period for public comment on each such chapter.

SA 1271. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 106(b)(2) and insert the following:

(2) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTIONS.—(A) Procedural disapproval resolutions—

(i) in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules;

(III) may not be amended by either Committee; and

(IV) shall be discharged from both such Committees on the day on which not less than one-third of the Members of the House become cosponsors of the resolution; and

(ii) in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance;

(III) may not be amended; and

(IV) shall be discharged from the Committee on Finance on the day on which not less than one-third of the Members of the Senate become cosponsors of the resolution.

(B) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to a procedural disapproval resolution introduced with respect to a trade agreement if no other procedural disapproval resolution with respect to that trade agreement has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, and if no resolution described in clause (ii) of section 5(b)(3)(B) with respect to that trade agreement has been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) of such section.

SA 1272. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 23, beginning on line 14, strike ''(as defined in'' and all that follows through line 20 and insert ''or its labor laws, or''.

SA 1273. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. REPORT ON IMPACT OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ON PUBLIC HEALTH.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make available to the public an assessment of the anticipated impact of each trade agreement subject to section 103 on access to medicines in the United States.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment shall include, for each trade agreement, the following:

(1) An estimate of the implications of applicable elements of the trade agreement for the cost of medical tools and technologies.

(2) An estimate of any delays of limits to generic competition for medical products that may arise as a result of the trade agreement above and beyond existing rules in the United States and in United States trading partners.

SA 1274. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 17, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 18, line 4, and insert the following:

(C) to respect—

(i) the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted by the World Trade Organization at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar on November 14, 2001;

(ii) the bipartisan congressional agreement on trade policy relating to trade agreements with Peru, Colombia, and Panama, dated May 10, 2007 (commonly referred to as the ''May 10 agreement'');

(iii) the World Intellectual Property Organization Development Agenda, adopted in 2007; and

(iv) World Health Organization Resolution 61.21 (2008); and

(D) to ensure that trade agreements protect all public health intellectual property flexibilities afforded by the agreements specified in subparagraph (C) and all other current and subsequent related agreements, included the flexibility to define the scope of patentability nationally, to foster patient-driven innovation, and to promote access to medicines for all people.

SA 1275. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 65, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(g) PUBLICATION OF VISITORS TO THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—The United States Trade Representative shall publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative a list of all individuals who visit that Office and are not employees of the Federal Government to facilitate the ability of the public to identify individuals and entities that are seeking to influence trade negotiations.

SA 1276. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. ASSESSMENT OF FOOD SAFETY SYSTEMS OF TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall jointly submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report assessing the food safety systems of the countries involved in the negotiations for a Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include, with respect to each country involved in the negotiations for a Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, the following:

(1) An assessment of the following:

(A) The food safety legal and regulatory system in place in that country.

(B) The microbiological and chemical contaminant standards used by that country, as compared to such standards in the United States.

(C) The frequency of testing conducted for microbiological and chemical contaminants by the government of that country.

(D) The food safety laboratory capacity for that country.

(E) The food safety inspection system used by that country and the frequency of such inspections.

(F) Whether that country has a formal food safety equivalency agreement or a similar agreement in effect with the United States.

(G) The volume of food products imported into the United States from that country, expressed in pounds amd broken down by classification under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, for each of the 5 years preceding the date of the report.

(H) The amount of each such food product that received physical inspection at United States ports of entry each year during the 5-year period preceding the date of the report, expressed as a percentage of the total number of pounds imported from that country during that 5-year period.

(I) The amount of each such food product that received laboratory analysis by United States food safety authorities each year during that 5-year period, expressed as a percentage of the total number of pounds imported from that country during that 5-year period.

(2) A list of food products that country rejected for exportation to the United States during that 5-year period.

(3) A description of any incidents that led to complete bans of food products from being exported to the United States from that country during that 5-year period and the reasons for such bans.

(4) A description of any incidents in which that country has been found to have transshipped food products the importation of which is prohibited by the United States from other foreign countries for exportation to the United States.

(5) A description of major food safety incidents within that country during the 5 years preceding the date of the report that have raised concerns about the food safety system of the country.

SA 1277. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON CLASSIFICATION OF DOCUMENTS RELATING TO TRADE NEGOTIATIONS.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the classification by the United States Trade Representative of documents relating to trade negotiations, including an assessment of whether or not the classification levels are appropriate, consistent with historical practices, consistent with other the practices of other Federal agencies, and consistent with the practices of trading partners of the United States.

SA 1278. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 54, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(C) ACCESS OF CONGRESSIONAL STAFF.—In developing guidelines under subparagraph (A), the United States Trade Representative may not require a staff member of a Member of Congress with a proper security clearance described in subparagraph (B)(ii) to be accompanied by the Member of Congress to have access to documents related to trade negotiations.

SA 1279. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 65, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(g) REPORT ON CLASSIFICATION OF NEGOTIATING PROPOSALS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) describing the policy of the Trade Representative with respect to the classification of proposed text for trade agreements and the use of other methods for limiting access to such text; and

(2) providing a justification for that policy.

SA 1280. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 65, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(g) LIMITATION ON EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE ACTING AS FOREIGN AGENTS.—Section 141 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) An individual who serves as employee of the Office of the United States Trade Representative may not register as an agent of a foreign principal under section 2 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 612) until the date that is 3 years after the date on which the employment of the individual with the Office terminates.''.

SA 1281. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, strike lines 1 through 14 and insert the following:

(8) STATE-OWNED AND STATE-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISES.—The principle negotiating objectives of the United States regarding competition by state-owned and state-controlled commercial enterprises, including those enterprises for which the share of the enterprise owned by the country is less than 50 percent, are—

(A) to require each state-owned or state-controlled enterprise to act solely in a manner consistent with commercial considerations in all investments, operations, and other activities of the enterprise in the territory of a country that is a party to the trade agreement and is not the country that owns or controls the enterprise;

(B) to prohibit each country that is a party to the trade agreement from providing to an enterprise that is owned or controlled by that country any subsidies or other benefits—

(i) that are not generally available on commercial terms; and

(ii) that provide an advantage to the enterprise or its operations with respect to any investment, operation, or other activity in the territory of another country that is a party to the trade agreement;

(C) to not restrict temporary measures taken by a country that is a party to the trade agreement that the country determines are necessary to safeguard an essential economic or security interest of that country;

(D) to require each country that is a party to the agreement to make public an annual report with respect to each enterprise that is owned or controlled by that country and that invests in or conducts operations or other activities in the territory of another country that is a party to the trade agreement that—

(i) describes in detail the governing structure of the enterprise;

(ii) identifies the share of the interests in the capital structure of the enterprise that are held by the government of that country;

(iii) identifies the members of the board of directors of the enterprise; and

(iv) identifies the annual revenue and total assets of the enterprise;

(E) to subject all state-owned or state-controlled enterprises in a country that is a party to the trade agreement to dispute settlement mechanisms in enforcing the trade agreement; and

(F) to preserve the ability of state-owned or state-controlled enterprises to provide legitimate public services.

SA 1282. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 33, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(H) to incorporate into the agreement the due process protections of the Constitution of the United States and provisions of the Constitution relating to access to documents, open hearings, transparency, and fair and impartial tribunals;

(I) to require that any dispute settlement panel, including an appellate panel, considering a dispute relating to intellectual property rights or environmental, health, labor, or other related issues include panelists with expertise in the issues that are the subject of the dispute; and

(J) to require that dispute resolution proceedings be open to the public and provide timely public access to information regarding enforcement of the agreement, disputes under the agreement, and ongoing negotiations relating to disputes under the agreement.

SA 1283. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 73, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(6) REPORT ON FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days before the President initiates negotiations for a trade agreement with a foreign country, the President shall submit to Congress and make available to the public a report on the foreign country that includes an assessment of whether the foreign country—

(i) has a democratic form of government;

(ii) has adopted the core labor standards into the laws and regulations of the foreign country and effectively enforces those standards as reflected in reports by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards, and the Committee on Freedom of Association of the International Labour Organization;

(iii) respects fundamental human rights, as reflected in the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices of the Department of State;

(iv) is designated as a country of particular concern for religious freedom under section 402(b)(1) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)(1));

(v) is included on the list described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)) (commonly known as tier 2 and tier 3 of the Trafficking in Persons Report of the Department of State);

(vi) complies with the multilateral agreements relating to the environment to which the foreign country is a party;

(vii) has adequate environmental laws and regulations, has devoted sufficient resources to implementing those laws and regulations, and has an adequate record of enforcement of those laws and regulations;

(viii) enforces the rights and flexibilities provided under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(15)); and

(ix) provides for government transparency, due process of law, and respect for international agreements.

(B) REPORT ON ONGOING NEGOTIATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress and make available to the public a report on each foreign country with which negotiations for a trade agreement are ongoing on such date of enactment that includes the matters required to be included in the report under paragraph (1) with respect to that foreign country.

(C) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SA 1284. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 103 and insert the following:

SEC. 103. TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY.

(a) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the President determines that one or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President—

(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries before July 1, 2018; and

(B) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), proclaim—

(i) such modification or continuance of any existing duty,

(ii) such continuance of existing duty free or excise treatment, or

(iii) such additional duties,
as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement.
Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall notify Congress of the President's intention to enter into an agreement under this subsection.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) reduces any rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad valorem on the date of the enactment of this Act) to a rate of duty which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) reduces the rate of duty below that applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreements or a successor agreement, on any import sensitive agricultural product; or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that applied on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—

(A) AGGREGATE REDUCTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of 1/10 of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—No staging is required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a duty reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States. The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under this subparagraph.

(5) ROUNDING.—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of reductions under paragraph (4), the President may round an annual reduction by an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this paragraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B) ½ of 1 percent ad valorem.

(6) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—A rate of duty reduction that may not be proclaimed by reason of paragraph (3) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 106 and that bill is enacted into law.

(7) OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B), (3)(A), (3)(C), and (4) through (6), and subject to the consultation and layover requirements of section 115 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3524), the President may proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX, as defined in section 2(5) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(5)), if the United States agrees to such modification or staged rate reduction in a negotiation for the reciprocal elimination or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the World Trade Organization.

(8) AUTHORITY UNDER URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority provided to the President under section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(b) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF AND NONTARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) If the President determines that—

(i) 1 or more existing duties or any other import restriction of any foreign country or the United States or any other barrier to, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States or adversely affects the United States economy, or

(ii) the imposition of any such barrier or distortion is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or effect,
and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President may enter into a trade agreement described in subparagraph (B) during the period described in subparagraph (C).

(B) The President may enter into a trade agreement under subparagraph (A) with foreign countries providing for—

(i) the reduction or elimination of a duty, restriction, barrier, or other distortion described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the prohibition of, or limitation on the imposition of, such barrier or other distortion.

(C) The President may enter into a trade agreement under this paragraph before July 1, 2018.
Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) CONDITIONS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(3) BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this title referred to as ''trade authorities procedures'') apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this title be referred to as an ''implementing bill''.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(c) COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—In order to contribute to the continued economic expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102.

SA 1285. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 107, add the following:

(c) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ON AUTOMOBILE SUPPLY CHAINS.—The United States Trade Representative shall make available to all Members of Congress and their staff with proper security clearances upon request and in a timely and comprehensive manner—

(1) an analysis of the supply chains in each of the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries with respect to automobiles and the estimated impact that the rules of origin proposal with respect to automobiles by the United States for the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement will have on those supply chains; and

(2) a comparison of the rules of origin with respect to automobiles under the North American Free Trade Agreement to the rules of origin proposal with respect to automobiles by the United States for the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement and an analysis of the effect of each of the rules on the supply chain in the United States with respect to automobiles.

SA 1286. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 107, add the following:

(c) REPORT BY SECRETARY OF LABOR ON LABOR LAWS OF TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP COUNTRIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall submit to Congress a report on the labor laws of the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of whether the labor laws of each of the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries comply with the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

(B) If those laws are not in compliance with that agreement, a description of the steps each such country would be required to take to comply with the agreement during the following periods:

(i) Before the agreement is signed.
(ii) Before the agreement is implemented.
(iii) After the agreement takes effect.
(C) An assessment of the monitoring, investigatory, and enforcement mechanisms that each such country has in place to ensure continued compliance with the labor standards under that agreement.

SA 1287. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON COMPLIANCE WITH AND ENFORCEMENT OF LABOR PROVISIONS OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every two years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on compliance by trading partners of the United States with, and enforcement by Federal agencies of, labor provisions of trade agreements to which the United States is a party.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall assess the status of the implementation by trading partners of the United States of labor provisions of trade agreements to which the United States is a party during the period covered by the report, including—

(1) a description of the steps that trading partners have taken, including any assistance provided by the United States to carry out those steps, to implement those provisions and any other labor initiatives, including the results of those steps;

(2) a description of any submission accepted by the Department of Labor regarding a possible violation of a labor provision of a trade agreement to which the United States is a party and any issues relating to the submission process in general, as determined by the Comptroller General; and

(3) an assessment of the extent to which Federal agencies monitor and enforce the implementation by trading partners of the United States of labor provisions of trade agreements to which the United States is a party and report the results of that monitoring and enforcement to Congress.

SA 1288. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON INVESTOR-STATE CASES BROUGHT AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) each case brought against the Government of the United States under investor-state dispute settlement procedures;

(2) the outcome of each such case; and

(3) the resources of the Government of the United States expended on each such case.

SA 1289. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. ANNUAL REPORT BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE ON UNITED STATES IMPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register a report on imports into the United States.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall identify, for the year covered by the report, disaggregated by country of origin of the import—

(1) the industry sectors in the United States with the most imports;

(2) the industry sectors in the United States with the largest increase in imports as compared to the previous year; and

(3) the trade agreements, if any, under which imports described in paragraph (1) or (2) were imported into the United States and the impact of those imports on employment in the United States.

SA 1290. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 21, strike lines 5 through 14 and insert the following:
and interoperable standards, as appropriate; and

SA 1291. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, strike line 21 and insert the following:
practices; and
(vii) the prevention of conflicts of interest in the development of regulations;

SA 1292. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, line 24, insert ‘‘, including public and civil society stakeholders,’’ after ‘‘parties’’.

SA 1293. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, strike lines 20 through 24 and insert the following:
(iii) recognizing that laws and rules that distinguish the availability, acquisition, scope, maintenance, use, and enforcement for medical products are not discriminatory and the legal rights of trading partners to implement safeguards for the protection of access to medicines and public health, in accordance with the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (known as the ‘‘TRIPS Agreement’’), signed in Marrakesh, Morocco, on April 15, 1994;

SA 1294. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, line 12, strike ‘‘United States’’ and insert ‘‘international’’.

SA 1295. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 9, insert ‘‘ensure that workers in the United States benefit equally from international trade,’’ after ‘‘United States,’’.

SA 1296. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 13, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 14, line 2, and insert the following:
(D) establishing standards for expropriation that require compensation when a government seizes or appropriates an investment for its own use or the use of a third party but that do not require compensation when a government regulates an investment

in a nondiscriminatory manner that does not transfer ownership or control of the investment;

SA 1297. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 104, strike subsection (d) and insert the following:

(d) CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.—

(1) TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the United States Trade Representative shall make available to Members of Congress and the public, through means including publication on a publicly available Internet website, all formal proposals advanced by the United States in negotiations for a trade agreement pursuant to this title not later than 5 calendar days after the earliest of—

(i) the date on which the proposal is shared with another party to the negotiations;

(ii) the date on which the proposal is submitted to an advisory committee established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155); or

(iii) the date on which the proposal is cleared through the interagency process established to approve official positions in trade negotiations.

(B) CLASSIFIED PROPOSALS SHARED WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.—If text proposed by the United States Trade Representative to be included in a trade agreement is classified and is shared with any official of a foreign government, that text shall be declassified when the text is shared with that official and made available to Members of Congress and the public in accordance with subparagraph (A).

(C) EXCEPTIONS.—The Trade Representative shall not be required to make available under subparagraph (A)—

(i) any formal proposal advanced by the United States in negotiations for a trade agreement that is intended to be contained in the provisions of the agreement relating to market access for goods and relates to such market access; or

(ii) subject to subparagraph (B), any classified information that does not constitute a formal proposal advanced by the United States in negotiations for a trade agreement.

(D) FORMAL PROPOSAL DEFINED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term ''formal proposal advanced by the United States in negotiations for a trade agreement''—

(I) means any proposed language, position paper, summary of position, or other document that—

(aa) includes analysis or other language intended to inform negotiations for a trade agreement;

(bb) is offered or intended to be offered on behalf of the United States to any party to the negotiations; and

(cc) reflects the official position of the United States with respect to the negotiations; and

(II) includes any communication regarding the negotiations that is shared with other parties to the negotiations after being cleared through the interagency process established to approve official positions in trade negotiations or that is submitted to an advisory committee established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155).

(ii) EXCLUSION.—The term ''formal proposal'' does not include any communication between negotiators or other officials participating in negotiations for a trade agreement that is not intended to reflect the official position of the United States, including any communication not cleared through the interagency process described in clause (i)(II).

(E) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of this paragraph apply with respect to negotiations for a trade agreement initiated on or after or pending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) PENDING TRADE AGREEMENTS.—In the case of a trade agreement pending on the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, not more than 30 calendar days after such date of enactment, make available to Members of Congress and the public all formal proposals that have been advanced by the United States in negotiations for that trade agreement in accordance with this paragraph.

(F) SHARING OF INFORMATION WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND STAFF.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent or otherwise limit the sharing of classified or unclassified information with Members of Congress and staff in accordance with subsections (a) and (b).

(2) GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the requirements of paragraph (1), the United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) PURPOSES.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) facilitate transparency;

(ii) encourage public participation; and

(iii) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(C) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall include procedures that—

(i) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(ii) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(D) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

SA 1298. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—AGRICULTURAL EXPORT EXPANSION

SEC. 301. PRIVATE FINANCING OF SALES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (other than section 908 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7207), as amended by subsection (c)), a person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States may provide payment or financing terms for sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba or an individual or entity in Cuba.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ''agricultural commodity'' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) FINANCING.—The term ''financing'' includes any loan or extension of credit.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 908 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7207) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**AND FINANCING**'';

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''PROHIBITION'' and all that follows through ''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding'' and inserting ''IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively, and by moving those subsections, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left; and

(4) by striking ''paragraph (1)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (a)''.

SA 1299. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BURR, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

In section 102(b), strike paragraph (11) and insert the following:

(11) CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency exchange practices is to target protracted large-scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets by a party to a trade agreement to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to the agreement, by establishing strong and enforceable rules against exchange rate manipulation that are subject to the same dispute settlement procedures and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement and are consistent with existing principles and agreements of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization. Nothing in the previous sentence shall be construed to restrict the exercise of domestic monetary policy.

SA 1300. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BURR, Mr.

TOOMEY, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2015''.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE NEED FOR A MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) As of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States imposes duties on imported goods for which there is no domestic availability or insufficient domestic availability.

(2) The imposition of duties on such goods creates artificial distortions in the economy of the United States that negatively affect United States manufacturers and consumers.

(3) It is in the interests of the United States to update the Harmonized Tariff Schedule every 3 years to eliminate such artificial distortions by suspending or reducing duties on such goods.

(4) The manufacturing competitiveness of the United States around the world will be enhanced if Congress regularly and predictably updates the Harmonized Tariff Schedule to suspend or reduce duties on such goods.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, to remove the competitive disadvantage to United States manufactures and consumers resulting from an outdated Harmonized Tariff Schedule and to promote the competitiveness of United States manufacturers, Congress should consider a miscellaneous tariff bill not later than 180 days after the United States International Trade Commission and the Department of Commerce issue reports on proposed duty suspensions and reductions under this title.

SEC. 303. PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to establish a process by the appropriate congressional committees, in conjunction with the Commission pursuant to its authorities under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332), for the submission and consideration of proposed duty suspensions and reductions.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than October 15, 2015, and October 15, 2018, the appropriate congressional committees shall establish and, on the same day, publish on their respective publicly available Internet websites a process—

(1) to provide for the submission and consideration of legislation containing proposed duty suspensions and reductions in a manner that, to the maximum extent practicable, is consistent with the requirements described in subsection (c); and

(2) to include in a miscellaneous tariff bill those duty suspensions and reductions that meet the requirements of this title.

(c) REQUIREMENTS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) INITIATION.—Not later than October 15, 2015, and October 15, 2018, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission a notice requesting members of the public to submit to the Commission during the 60-day period beginning on the date of such publication—

(A) proposed duty suspensions and reductions; and

(B) Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions.

(2) REVIEW.—

(A) COMMISSION SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—As soon as practicable after the expiration of the 60-day period specified in paragraph (1), but not later than 15 days after the expiration of such 60-day period, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the proposed duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(A) and the Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(B).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF PROPOSED DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS.—Not later than 15 days after the expiration of the 60-day period specified in paragraph (1), the Commission shall publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission the proposed duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(A) and the Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(B).

(C) COMMISSION REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of publication of the proposed duty suspensions and reductions under subparagraph (B), the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each proposed duty suspension or reduction submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(1) or paragraph (1)(A) that contains the following information:

(i) A determination of whether or not domestic production of the article that is the subject of the proposed duty suspension or reduction exists and, if such production exists, whether or not a domestic producer of the article objects to the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(ii) Any technical changes to the article description that are necessary for purposes of administration when articles are presented for importation.

(iii) The amount of tariff revenue that would no longer be collected if the proposed duty suspension or reduction takes effect.

(iv) A determination of whether or not the proposed duty suspension or reduction is available to any person that imports the article that is the subject of the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(3) PROCEDURES.—The Commission shall prescribe and publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission procedures for complying with the requirements of this subsection.

(4) AUTHORITIES DESCRIBED.—The Commission shall carry out this subsection pursuant to its authorities under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332).

(d) DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of publication of the proposed duty suspensions and reductions under subsection (c)(2)(B), the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each proposed duty suspension and reduction submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(1) or (c)(1)(A) that includes the following information:

(1) A determination of whether or not domestic production of the article that is the subject of the proposed duty suspension or reduction exists and, if such production exists, whether or not a domestic producer of the article objects to the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(2) Any technical changes to the article description that are necessary for purposes of administration when articles are presented for importation.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A proposed duty suspension or reduction submitted under this section by a Member of Congress shall receive treatment no more favorable than the treatment received by a proposed duty suspension or reduction submitted under this section by a member of the public.

SEC. 304. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1, 2018, and May 1, 2020, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the effects on the United States economy of temporary duty suspensions and reductions enacted pursuant to this title, including a broad assessment of the economic effects of such duty suspensions and reductions on producers, purchasers, and consumers in the United States, using case studies describing such effects on selected industries or by type of article as available data permit.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall also solicit and append to the report required under subsection (a) recommendations with respect to those domestic industry sectors or specific domestic industries that might benefit from permanent duty suspensions and reductions or elimination of duties, either through a unilateral action of the United States or though negotiations for reciprocal tariff agreements, with a particular focus on inequities created by tariff inversions.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 305. JUDICIAL REVIEW PRECLUDED.

The exercise of functions under this title shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. 306. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the United States International Trade Commission.

(3) COMMISSION DISCLOSURE FORM.—The term ''Commission disclosure form'' means, with respect to a proposed duty suspension or reduction, a document submitted by a member of the public to the Commission that contains the following:

(A) The contact information for any known importers of the article to which the proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(B) A certification by the member of the public that the proposed duty suspension or reduction is available to any person importing the article to which the proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(4) DOMESTIC PRODUCER.—The term ''domestic producer'' means a person that demonstrates production, or imminent production, in the United States of an article that

is identical to, or like or directly competitive with, an article to which a proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(5) DUTY SUSPENSION OR REDUCTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''duty suspension or reduction'' means an amendment to subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that—

(i)(I) extends an existing temporary duty suspension or reduction of duty on an article under that subchapter; or

(II) provides for a new temporary duty suspension or reduction of duty on an article under that subchapter; and

(ii) otherwise meets the requirements described in subparagraph (B).

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—A duty suspension or reduction meets the requirements described in this subparagraph if—

(i) the duty suspension or reduction can be administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(ii) the estimated loss in revenue to the United States from the duty suspension or reduction does not exceed $500,000 in a calendar year during which the duty suspension or reduction would be in effect, as determined by the Congressional Budget Office; and

(iii) the duty suspension or reduction is available to any person importing the article that is the subject of the duty suspension or reduction.

(6) MEMBER OF CONGRESS.—The term ''Member of Congress'' means a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress.

(7) MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL.—The term ''miscellaneous tariff bill'' means a bill of either House of Congress that contains only—

(A) duty suspensions and reductions that—

(i) meet the applicable requirements for—

(I) consideration of duty suspensions and reductions described in section 303; or

(II) any other process required under the Rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate; and

(ii) are not the subject of an objection because such duty suspensions and reductions do not comply with the requirements of this title from—

(I) a Member of Congress; or

(II) a domestic producer, as contained in comments submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, the Commission, or the Department of Commerce under section 303; and

(B) provisions included in bills introduced in the House of Representatives or the Senate pursuant to a process described in subparagraph (A)(i)(II) that correct an error in the text or administration of a provision of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

SA 1301. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 203(c) and insert the following:

(c) REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)(B)(ii), by striking ''$50,000'' and inserting ''$55,000''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''June 30, 2021''.

SA 1302. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. RESTORATION OF BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS INTERNATIONAL PRICE PROGRAM EXPORT PRICE INDICES.

The Secretary of Commerce shall restore the activities of the Bureau of Labor Statistics International Price Program relating to export price indices.

SA 1303. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 103 and insert the following:

SEC. 103. TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY.

(a) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the President determines that one or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this Act will be promoted thereby, the President—

(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries before January 19, 2017; and

(B) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), proclaim—

(i) such modification or continuance of any existing duty,

(ii) such continuance of existing duty free or excise treatment, or

(iii) such additional duties,

as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement.

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after January 19, 2017, shall not be eligible for approval under this Act.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall notify Congress of the President's intention to enter into an agreement under this subsection.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) reduces any rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad valorem on the date of the enactment of this Act) to a rate of duty which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) reduces the rate of duty below that applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreements or a successor agreement, on any import sensitive agricultural product; or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that applied on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—

(A) AGGREGATE REDUCTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of 1/10 of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—No staging is required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a duty reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States. The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under this subparagraph.

(5) ROUNDING.—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of reductions under paragraph (4), the President may round an annual reduction by an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this paragraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B) ½ of 1 percent ad valorem.

(6) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—A rate of duty reduction that may not be proclaimed by reason of paragraph (3) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 6 and that bill is enacted into law.

(7) OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B), (3)(A), (3)(C), and (4) through (6), and subject to the consultation and layover requirements of section 115 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3524), the President may proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX, as defined in section 2(5) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(5)), if the United States agrees to such modification or staged rate reduction in a negotiation for the reciprocal elimination or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the World Trade Organization.

(8) AUTHORITY UNDER URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority provided to the President under section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(b) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF AND NONTARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Whenever the President determines that—

(i) 1 or more existing duties or any other import restriction of any foreign country or the United States or any other barrier to, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States or adversely affects the United States economy, or

(ii) the imposition of any such barrier or distortion is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or effect,

and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this Act will be promoted thereby, the President may enter into a trade agreement described in subparagraph

(B) during the period described in subparagraph (C).

(B) The President may enter into a trade agreement under subparagraph (A) with foreign countries providing for—

(i) the reduction or elimination of a duty, restriction, barrier, or other distortion described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the prohibition of, or limitation on the imposition of, such barrier or other distortion.

(C) The President may enter into a trade agreement under this paragraph before January 19, 2017.

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after January 19, 2017, shall not be eligible for approval under this Act.

(2) CONDITIONS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 4 and 5.

(3) BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this Act referred to as ''trade authorities procedures'') apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this Act be referred to as an ''implementing bill''.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(c) COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—In order to contribute to the continued economic expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the negotiating objectives set forth in section 2.

SA 1304. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 103, add the following:

(e) TERMINATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY IF AN AGREEMENT INCREASES THE TRADE DEFICIT.—The authority to enter into trade agreements under this section shall terminate on the date on which the Secretary of Commerce determines that the United States annual bilateral trade deficit with any country that is a party to a trade agreement entered into under this section after the date of the enactment of this Act increases by more than 10 percent after that agreement enters into force.

SA 1305. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 103, add the following:

(e) TERMINATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR COMMITMENTS.—The authority to enter into trade agreements under this section shall terminate if—

(1) the Secretary of Labor receives a submission from an organization alleging that a country that is a party to a trade agreement entered into under this section is not fulfilling its labor commitments under that agreement; and

(2) the Secretary does not issue, by the date that is one year after the date on which the Secretary receives that submission, a publicly available report that—

(A) summarizes the investigation of the Secretary with respect to the allegations in the submission; and

(B) sets forth any findings and recommendations of the Secretary based on that investigation, including any recommendation that the United States request consultations with that country under the agreement.

SA 1306. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. CONTINUED OPERATION OF BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS MASS LAYOFF STATISTICS PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Commerce shall ensure that the Bureau of Labor Statistics Mass Layoff Statistics program, including the collection of data on plant closings, receives funding sufficient to ensure that the program continues operating.

SA 1307. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 65, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(g) COMMUNICATIONS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES MADE PUBLIC.—The President shall ensure that any communications made by an advisory committee established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) with respect to negotiations under this title are made available to the public if more than 50 percent of the members of the advisory committee represent industry interests, as determined by the United States Trade Representative.

SA 1308. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) PROTECTING CLEAN AIR, WATER, AND FOOD.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to clean air, clean water, and food safety are to preserve the rights of all governments to regulate and enact laws providing for public health and environmental protections and to ensure the rights of all governments to exercise any legal rights or safeguards, including under any existing law or regulation, to protect and provide clean air, clean water, and safe food without the threat of trade-related penalties.

SA 1309. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(a), add the following:

''(13) to ensure that trade policies and trade agreements contribute to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.''.

SA 1310. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 301. ENFORCEMENT UNDER TITLE III OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACTS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES RELATING TO THE ENVIRONMENT.

Section 301(d)(3)(B) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411(d)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in clause (iii)(V), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) constitutes a persistent pattern of conduct by the government of the foreign country under which that government—

''(I) fails to effectively enforce the environmental laws of the foreign country,

''(II) waives or otherwise derogates from the environmental laws of the foreign country or weakens the protections afforded by such laws,

''(III) fails to provide for judicial or administrative proceedings giving access to remedies for violations of the environmental laws of the foreign country,

''(IV) fails to provide appropriate and effective sanctions or remedies for violations of the environmental laws of the foreign country, or

''(V) fails to effectively enforce environmental commitments under agreements to which the foreign country and the United States are a party.''.

SA 1311. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—ENGAGEMENT ON CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES

SEC. 311. ENHANCEMENT OF ENGAGEMENT ON CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES WITH CERTAIN MAJOR TRADING PARTNERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) MAJOR TRADING PARTNER REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the macroeconomic and currency exchange rate policies of each country that is a major trading partner of the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain—

(i) for each country that is a major trading partner of the United States—

(I) that country's bilateral trade balance with the United States;

(II) that country's current account balance as a percentage of its gross domestic product;

(III) the change in that country's current account balance as a percentage of its gross domestic product during the 3-year period preceding the submission of the report;

(IV) that country's foreign exchange reserves as a percentage of its short-term debt; and

(V) that country's foreign exchange reserves as a percentage of its gross domestic product; and

(ii) an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and exchange rate policies for each country—

(I) that is a major trading partner of the United States;

(II) the currency of which is persistently and substantially undervalued;

(III) that has—

(aa) a significant bilateral trade surplus with the United States; and

(bb) a material global current account surplus; and

(IV) that has engaged in persistent one-sided intervention in the foreign exchange market.

(B) ENHANCED ANALYSIS.—Each enhanced analysis under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall include, for each country with respect to which an analysis is made under that subparagraph—

(i) a description of developments in the currency markets of that country, including, to the greatest extent feasible, developments with respect to currency interventions;

(ii) a description of trends in the real effective exchange rate of the currency of that country and in the degree of undervaluation of that currency;

(iii) an analysis of changes in the capital controls and trade restrictions of that country; and

(iv) patterns in the reserve accumulation of that country.

(b) ENGAGEMENT ON EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the President, through the Secretary, shall commence enhanced bilateral engagement with each country for which an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and currency exchange rate policies is included in the report submitted under subsection (a), in order to—

(A) urge implementation of policies to address the causes of the undervaluation of its currency, its bilateral trade surplus with the United States, and its material global current account surplus, including undervaluation and surpluses relating to exchange rate management;

(B) express the concern of the United States with respect to the adverse trade and economic effects of that undervaluation and those surpluses;

(C) develop measureable objectives for addressing that undervaluation and those surpluses; and

(D) advise that country of the ability of the President to take action under subsection (c).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may determine not to enhance bilateral engagement with a country under paragraph (1) for which an enhanced analysis of macroeconomic and exchange rate policies is included in the report submitted under subsection (a) if the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes how the currency and other macroeconomic policies of that country are addressing the undervaluation and surpluses specified in paragraph (1)(A) with respect to that country, including undervaluation and surpluses relating to exchange rate management.

(c) REMEDIAL ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, on the date that is one year after the commencement of enhanced bilateral engagement by the President with respect to a country under subsection (b)(1), the country has failed to adopt appropriate policies to correct the undervaluation and surpluses described in subsection (b)(1)(A) with respect to that country, the President may take one or more of the following actions:

(A) Prohibit the Overseas Private Investment Corporation from approving any new financing (including any insurance, reinsurance, or guarantee) with respect to a project located in that country on and after such date.

(B) Except as provided in paragraph (2), and pursuant to paragraph (3), prohibit the Federal Government from procuring, or entering into any contract for the procurement of, goods or services from that country on and after such date.

(C) Instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to call for additional rigorous surveillance of the macroeconomic and exchange rate policies of that country and, as appropriate, formal consultations on findings of currency manipulation.

(D) Instruct the United States Trade Representative to take into account, in consultation with the Secretary, in assessing whether to enter into a bilateral or regional trade agreement with that country or to initiate or participate in negotiations with respect to a bilateral or regional trade agreement with that country, the extent to which that country has failed to adopt appropriate policies to correct the undervaluation and surpluses described in subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The President may not apply a prohibition under paragraph (1)(B) with respect to a country that is a party to the Agreement on Government Procurement or a free trade agreement to which the United States is a party.

(3) CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—Before applying a prohibition under paragraph (1)(B), the President shall consult with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to determine whether such prohibition would subject the taxpayers of the United States to unreasonable cost.

(B) CONGRESS.—The President shall consult with the appropriate committees of Congress with respect to any action the President takes under paragraph (1)(B), including whether the President has consulted as required under subparagraph (A).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT.—The term ''Agreement on Government Procurement'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(17)).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(3) COUNTRY.—The term ''country'' means a foreign country, dependent territory, or possession of a foreign country, and may include an association of 2 or more foreign countries, dependent territories, or possessions of countries into a customs union outside the United States.

(4) REAL EFFECTIVE EXCHANGE RATE.—The term ''real effective exchange rate'' means a weighted average of bilateral exchange rates, expressed in price-adjusted terms.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 312. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE RATE POLICY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established an Advisory Committee on International Exchange Rate Policy (in this section referred to as the ''Committee'').

(2) DUTIES.—The Committee shall be responsible for advising the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the impact of international exchange rates and financial policies on the economy of the United States.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall be composed of 9 members as follows, none of whom shall be employees of the Federal Government:

(A) Three members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon the recommendation of the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(B) Three members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives upon the recommendation of the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(C) Three members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members shall be selected under paragraph (1) on the basis of their objectivity and demonstrated expertise in finance, economics, or currency exchange.

(3) TERMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Members shall be appointed for a term of 2 years or until the Committee terminates.

(B) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member may be reappointed to the Committee for additional terms.

(4) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) DURATION OF COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act unless renewed by the President for a subsequent 2-year period.

(2) CONTINUED RENEWAL.—The President may continue to renew the Committee for successive 2-year periods by taking appropriate action to renew the Committee prior to the date on which the Committee would otherwise terminate.

(d) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall hold not less than 2 meetings each calendar year.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall elect from among its members a chairperson for a term of 2 years or until the Committee terminates.

(2) REELECTION; SUBSEQUENT TERMS.—A chairperson of the Committee may be reelected chairperson but is ineligible to serve consecutive terms as chairperson.

(f) STAFF.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Committee such staff, information, personnel, administrative services, and assistance as the Committee may reasonably require to carry out the activities of the Committee.

(g) APPLICATION OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the Committee.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Meetings of the Committee shall be exempt from the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of section 10 and section 11 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (relating to open meetings, public notice, public participation, and public availability of documents), whenever and to the extent it is determined by the President or the Secretary of the Treasury that such meetings will be concerned with matters the disclosure of which—

(A) would seriously compromise the development by the Government of the United States of monetary or financial policy; or

(B) is likely to—

(i) lead to significant financial speculation in currencies, securities, or commodities; or

(ii) significantly endanger the stability of any financial institution.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury for each fiscal year in which the Committee is in effect $1,000,000 to carry out this section.

SA 1312. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

(a) PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND REPORTING.—Section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723) is amended by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

''(b) PLAN REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall develop a plan for the purpose of negotiating and entering into one or more free trade agreements with all sub-Saharan African countries and ranking countries or groups of countries in order of readiness.

''(2) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required by paragraph (1) shall include, for each sub-Saharan African country, the following:

''(A) The steps such sub-Saharan African country needs to be equipped and ready to enter into a free trade agreement with the United States, including the development of a bilateral investment treaty.

''(B) Milestones for accomplishing each step identified in (A) for each sub-Saharan African country, with the goal of establishing a free trade agreement with each sub-Saharan African country not later than 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Trade Act of 2015.

''(C) A description of the resources required to assist each sub-Saharan African country in accomplishing each milestone described in subparagraph (B).

''(D) The extent to which steps described in subparagraph (A), the milestones described in subparagraph (B), and resources described in subparagraph (C) may be accomplished through regional or subregional organizations in sub-Saharan Africa, including the East African Community, the Economic Community of West African States, the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa, and the Economic Community of Central African States.

''(E) Procedures to ensure the following:

''(i) Adequate consultation with Congress and the private sector during the negotiations.

''(ii) Consultation with Congress regarding all matters relating to implementation of the agreement or agreements.

''(iii) Approval by Congress of the agreement or agreements.

''(iv) Adequate consultations with the relevant African governments and African regional and subregional intergovernmental organizations during the negotiation of the agreement or agreements.

''(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Trade Act of 2015, the President shall prepare and transmit to Congress a report containing the plan developed pursuant to subsection (b).''.

(b) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—Section 104(a)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

''(G) a free trade agreement with the United States, in accordance with section 116(b);''.

(c) MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE COMPACTS.—After the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative and Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall consult and coordinate with the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation regarding countries that have entered into a Millennium Challenge Compact pursuant to section 609 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7708) that have been declared eligible to enter into such a Compact for the purpose of developing and carrying out the plan required by subsection (b) of section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723), as amended by subsection (a).

(d) COORDINATION OF USAID WITH FREE TRADE AGREEMENT POLICY.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to the United States Agency for International Development under section 496 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293) may be used in consultation with the United States Trade Representative—

(A) to carry out subsection (b) of section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723), as amended by subsection (a), including for the deployment of resources in individual eligible countries to assist such country in the development of institutional capacities to carry out such subsection (b); and

(B) to coordinate the efforts of the United States to establish free trade agreements in accordance with the policy set out in subsection (a) of such section 116.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ELIGIBLE COUNTRY.—The term ''eligible country'' means a sub-Saharan African country that receives—

(i) benefits under for the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.); and

(ii) funding from the United States Agency for International Development.

(B) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''sub-Saharan African country'' has the meaning given that term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3706).

SA 1313. Mr. COATS (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative

appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 112. OFFICIAL DEDICATED TO HEALTH CARE ISSUES IN THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Health care accounts for almost $6,000,000,000,000 of the global economy and is expected to grow even more in the years ahead.

(2) The United States is the global leader in the health sector, including pharmaceuticals, medical devices, health information technology systems, insurance, and health care delivery.

(3) By some estimates, the health sector is the largest private sector employer in the United States.

(4) Because of the size and complexity of the health sector, a dedicated health official is needed in the Office of the United States Trade Representative to coordinate policy on health care-related trade issues with industry, health care workers, other offices within the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and other Federal agencies, as well as to promote United States health exports.

(b) OFFICIAL DEDICATED TO HEALTH CARE ISSUES IN THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Section 141 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) OFFICIAL DEDICATED TO HEALTH CARE ISSUES.—The United States Trade Representative shall ensure that there is within the Office of the United States Trade Representative an official dedicated to health care issues. That official shall be responsible for coordinating policy on health care-related trade issues with industry, health care workers, other offices within the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and other Federal agencies, and for promoting United States health exports.''.

SA 1314. Mr. COATS (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. ELIMINATION OF TARIFFS ON CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL DEVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 85 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 8543.70.94 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 8543.70.92:

''	8543.70.94	Electronic educational devices designed or intended primarily for children	Free	35% ''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) applies to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1315. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Enforcing Orders and Reducing Customs Evasion Act of 2015''.

SEC. 302. PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATING CLAIMS OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting after section 516A (19 U.S.C. 1516a) the following:

''SEC. 517. PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATING CLAIMS OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.—The term 'administering authority' has the meaning given that term in section 771(1).

''(2) COMMISSIONER.—The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection, acting pursuant to the delegation by the Secretary of the Treasury of the authority of the Secretary with respect to customs revenue functions (as defined in section 415 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 215)).

''(3) COVERED MERCHANDISE.—The term 'covered merchandise' means merchandise that is subject to—

''(A) an antidumping duty order issued under section 736;

''(B) a finding issued under the Antidumping Act, 1921; or

''(C) a countervailing duty order issued under section 706.

''(4) ENTER; ENTRY.—The terms 'enter' and 'entry' refer to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse for consumption, of merchandise in the customs territory of the United States.

''(5) EVASION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term 'evasion' refers to entering covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of any document or electronically transmitted data or information, written or oral statement, or act that is material and false, or any omission that is material, and that results in any cash deposit or other security or any amount of applicable antidumping or countervailing duties being reduced or not being applied with respect to the merchandise.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR CLERICAL ERROR.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term 'evasion' does not include entering covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of—

''(I) a document or electronically transmitted data or information, written or oral statement, or act that is false as a result of a clerical error; or

''(II) an omission that results from a clerical error.

''(ii) PATTERNS OF NEGLIGENT CONDUCT.—If the Commissioner determines that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of a clerical error referred to in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) and that the clerical error is part of a pattern of negligent conduct on the part of that person, the Commissioner may determine, notwithstanding clause (i), that the person has entered such covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

''(iii) ELECTRONIC REPETITION OF ERRORS.—For purposes of clause (ii), the mere nonintentional repetition by an electronic system of an initial clerical error does not constitute a pattern of negligent conduct.

''(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A determination by the Commissioner that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States by means of a clerical error referred to in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) rather than through evasion shall not be construed to excuse that person from the payment of any duties applicable to the merchandise.

''(6) INTERESTED PARTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'interested party' means—

''(i) a manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler in the United States of a domestic like product;

''(ii) a certified union or recognized union or group of workers that is representative of an industry engaged in the manufacture, production, or wholesale in the United States of a domestic like product;

''(iii) a trade or business association a majority of whose members manufacture, produce, or wholesale a domestic like product in the United States;

''(iv) an association, a majority of whose members is composed of interested parties described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) with respect to a domestic like product; and

''(v) if the covered merchandise is a processed agricultural product, as defined in section 771(4)(E), a coalition or trade association that is representative of either—

''(I) processors;

''(II) processors and producers; or

''(III) processors and growers,

but this clause shall cease to have effect if the United States Trade Representative notifies the administering authority and the Commission that the application of this clause is inconsistent with the international obligations of the United States.

''(B) DOMESTIC LIKE PRODUCT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'domestic like product' means a product that is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, covered merchandise.

''(b) INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 10 business days after receiving an allegation described in paragraph (2) or a referral described in paragraph (3), the Commissioner shall initiate an investigation if the Commissioner determines that the information provided in the allegation or the referral, as the case may be, reasonably suggests that covered merchandise has been entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

''(2) ALLEGATION DESCRIBED.—An allegation described in this paragraph is an allegation that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion that is—

''(A) filed with the Commissioner by an interested party; and

''(B) accompanied by information reasonably available to the party that filed the allegation.

''(3) REFERRAL DESCRIBED.—A referral described in this paragraph is information submitted to the Commissioner by any other Federal agency, including the Department of Commerce or the United States International Trade Commission, that reasonably suggests that a person has entered covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

''(4) CONSOLIDATION OF ALLEGATIONS AND REFERRALS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner may consolidate multiple allegations described in paragraph (2) and referrals described in paragraph (3) into a single investigation if the Commissioner determines it is appropriate to do so.

''(B) EFFECT ON TIMING REQUIREMENTS.—If the Commissioner consolidates multiple allegations or referrals into a single investigation under subparagraph (A), the date on which the Commissioner receives the first such allegation or referral shall be used for purposes of the requirement under paragraph (1) with respect to the timing of the initiation of the investigation.

''(5) INFORMATION-SHARING TO PROTECT HEALTH AND SAFETY.—If, during the course of conducting an investigation under paragraph (1) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner has reason to suspect that such covered merchandise may pose a health or safety risk to consumers, the Commissioner shall provide, as appropriate, information to the appropriate Federal agencies for purposes of mitigating the risk.

''(6) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADVICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon request, the Commissioner shall provide technical assistance and advice to eligible small businesses to enable such businesses to prepare and submit allegations described in paragraph (2), except that the Commissioner may deny assistance if the Commissioner concludes that the allegation, if submitted, would not lead to the initiation of an investigation under this subsection or any other action to address the allegation.

''(B) ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS DEFINED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term 'eligible small business' means any business concern that the Commissioner determines, due to its small size, has neither adequate internal resources nor the financial ability to obtain qualified outside assistance in preparing and filing allegations described in paragraph (2).

''(ii) NON-REVIEWABILITY.—The determination of the Commissioner regarding whether a business concern is an eligible small business for purposes of this paragraph is not reviewable by any other agency or by any court.

''(c) DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 calendar days after the date on which the Commissioner initiates an investigation under subsection (b) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner shall make a determination, based on substantial evidence, with respect to whether such covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

''(2) AUTHORITY TO COLLECT AND VERIFY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—In making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner may collect such additional information as is necessary to make the determination through such methods as the Commissioner considers appropriate, including by—

''(A) issuing a questionnaire with respect to such covered merchandise to—

''(i) an interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise;

''(ii) a person alleged to have entered such covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

''(iii) a person that is a foreign producer or exporter of such covered merchandise; or

''(iv) the government of a country from which such covered merchandise was exported; and

''(B) conducting verifications, including on-site verifications, of any relevant information.

''(3) ADVERSE INFERENCE.—If the Commissioner finds that a party or person described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of paragraph (2)(A) has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of the party or person's ability to comply with a request for information, the Commissioner may, in making a determination under paragraph (1), use an inference that is adverse to the interests of that party or person in selecting from among the facts otherwise available to make the determination.

''(4) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 5 business days after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner—

''(A) shall provide to each interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise a notification of the determination and may, in addition, include an explanation of the basis for the determination; and

''(B) may provide to importers, in such manner as the Commissioner determines appropriate, information discovered in the investigation that the Commissioner determines will help educate importers with respect to importing merchandise into the customs territory of the United States in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

''(d) EFFECT OF DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commissioner makes a determination under subsection (c) that covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, the Commissioner shall—

''(A)(i) suspend the liquidation of unliquidated entries of such covered merchandise that are subject to the determination and that enter on or after the date of the initiation of the investigation under subsection (b) with respect to such covered merchandise and on or before the date of the determination; or

''(ii) if the Commissioner has already suspended the liquidation of such entries pursuant to subsection (e)(1), continue to suspend the liquidation of such entries;

''(B) pursuant to the Commissioner's authority under section 504(b)—

''(i) extend the period for liquidating unliquidated entries of such covered merchandise that are subject to the determination and that entered before the date of the initiation of the investigation; or

''(ii) if the Commissioner has already extended the period for liquidating such entries pursuant to subsection (e)(1), continue to extend the period for liquidating such entries;

''(C) notify the administering authority of the determination and request that the administering authority—

''(i) identify the applicable antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rates for entries described in subparagraphs (A) and (B); or

''(ii) if no such assessment rate for such an entry is available at the time, identify the applicable cash deposit rate to be applied to the entry, with the applicable antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rate to be provided as soon as that rate becomes available;

''(D) require the posting of cash deposits and assess duties on entries described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) in accordance with the instructions received from the administering authority under paragraph (2); and

''(E) take such additional enforcement measures as the Commissioner determines appropriate, such as—

''(i) initiating proceedings under section 592 or 596;

''(ii) implementing, in consultation with the relevant Federal agencies, rule sets or modifications to rules sets for identifying, particularly through the Automated Targeting System and the Automated Commercial Environment authorized under section 13031(f) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)), importers, other parties, and merchandise that may be associated with evasion;

''(iii) requiring, with respect to merchandise for which the importer has repeatedly provided incomplete or erroneous entry summary information in connection with determinations of evasion, the importer to deposit estimated duties at the time of entry; and

''(iv) referring the record in whole or in part to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement for civil or criminal investigation.

''(2) COOPERATION OF ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving a notification from the Commissioner under paragraph (1)(C), the administering authority shall promptly provide to the Commissioner the applicable cash deposit rates and antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rates and any necessary liquidation instructions.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR CASES IN WHICH THE PRODUCER OR EXPORTER IS UNKNOWN.—If the Commissioner and the administering authority are unable to determine the producer or exporter of the merchandise with respect to which a notification is made under paragraph (1)(C), the administering authority shall identify, as the applicable cash deposit rate or antidumping or countervailing duty assessment rate, the cash deposit or duty (as the case may be) in the highest amount applicable to any producer or exporter, including the 'all-others' rate of the merchandise subject to an antidumping order or countervailing duty order under section 736 or 706, respectively, or a finding issued under the Antidumping Act, 1921, or any administrative review conducted under section 751.

''(e) INTERIM MEASURES.—Not later than 90 calendar days after initiating an investigation under subsection (b) with respect to covered merchandise, the Commissioner shall decide based on the investigation if there is a reasonable suspicion that such covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion and, if the Commissioner decides there is such a reasonable suspicion, the Commissioner shall—

''(1) suspend the liquidation of each unliquidated entry of such covered merchandise that entered on or after the date of the initiation of the investigation;

''(2) pursuant to the Commissioner's authority under section 504(b), extend the period for liquidating each unliquidated entry of such covered merchandise that entered before the date of the initiation of the investigation; and

''(3) pursuant to the Commissioner's authority under section 623, take such additional measures as the Commissioner determines necessary to protect the revenue of the United States, including requiring a single transaction bond or additional security or the posting of a cash deposit with respect to such covered merchandise.

''(f) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 business days after the Commissioner makes a determination under subsection (c) with respect to whether covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, a person determined to have entered such covered merchandise through evasion or an interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise may file an appeal with the Commissioner for de novo review of the determination.

''(2) TIMELINE FOR REVIEW.—Not later than 60 business days after an appeal of a determination is filed under paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall complete the review of the determination.

''(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 business days after the Commissioner completes a review under subsection (f) of a determination under subsection (c) with respect to whether covered merchandise was entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion, a person determined to have entered such covered merchandise through evasion or an interested party that filed an allegation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) that resulted in the initiation of an investigation under paragraph (1) of that subsection with respect to such covered merchandise may commence a civil action in the United States Court of International Trade by filing concurrently a summons and complaint contesting any factual findings or legal conclusions upon which the determination is based.

''(2) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In a civil action under this subsection, the court shall hold unlawful any determination, finding, or conclusion found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO OTHER CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS.—No determination under subsection (c) or action taken by the Commissioner pursuant to this section shall be construed to limit the authority to carry out, or the scope of, any other proceeding or investigation pursuant to any other provision of Federal or State law, including sections 592 and 596.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1581(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or 517'' after ''516A''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to implement the amendments made by this section.

(e) APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

SEC. 303. ANNUAL REPORT ON PREVENTION AND INVESTIGATION OF EVASION OF ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 15 of each calendar year that begins on or after the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the efforts being taken to prevent and investigate the entry of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) for the calendar year preceding the submission of the report—

(A) a summary of the efforts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and investigate the entry of covered merchandise into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

(B) the number of allegations of evasion received under subsection (b) of section 517 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 302 of this Act, and the number of such allegations resulting in investigations by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or any other agency;

(C) a summary of investigations initiated under subsection (b) of such section 517, including—

(i) the number and nature of the investigations initiated, conducted, and completed; and

(ii) the resolution of each completed investigation;

(D) the number of investigations initiated under that subsection not completed during the time provided for making determinations under subsection (c) of such section 517 and an explanation for why the investigations could not be completed on time;

(E) the amount of additional duties that were determined to be owed as a result of such investigations, the amount of such duties that were collected, and, for any such duties not collected, a description of the reasons those duties were not collected;

(F) with respect to each such investigation that led to the imposition of a penalty, the amount of the penalty;

(G) an identification of the countries of origin of covered merchandise determined under subsection (c) of such section 517 to be entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion;

(H) the amount of antidumping and countervailing duties collected as a result of any investigations or other actions by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or any other agency;

(I) a description of the allocation of personnel and other resources of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to prevent and investigate evasion, including any assessments conducted regarding the allocation of such personnel and resources; and

(J) a description of training conducted to increase expertise and effectiveness in the prevention and investigation of evasion; and

(2) a description of processes and procedures of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and investigate evasion, including—

(A) the specific guidelines, policies, and practices used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to ensure that allegations of evasion are promptly evaluated and acted upon in a timely manner;

(B) an evaluation of the efficacy of those guidelines, policies, and practices;

(C) an identification of any changes since the last report required by this section, if any, that have materially improved or reduced the effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in preventing and investigating evasion;

(D) a description of the development and implementation of policies for the application of single entry and continuous bonds for entries of covered merchandise to sufficiently protect the collection of antidumping and countervailing duties commensurate with the level of risk of not collecting those duties;

(E) a description of the processes and procedures for increased cooperation and information sharing with the Department of Commerce, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and any other relevant Federal agencies to prevent and investigate evasion; and

(F) an identification of any recommended policy changes for other Federal agencies or legislative changes to improve the effectiveness of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in preventing and investigating evasion.

(c) PUBLIC SUMMARY.—The Commissioner shall make available to the public a summary of the report required by subsection (a) that includes, at a minimum—

(1) a description of the type of merchandise with respect to which investigations were initiated under subsection (b) of section 517 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 302 of this Act;

(2) the amount of additional duties determined to be owed as a result of such investigations and the amount of such duties that were collected;

(3) an identification of the countries of origin of covered merchandise determined under subsection (c) of such section 517 to be entered into the customs territory of the United States through evasion; and

(4) a description of the types of measures used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent and investigate evasion.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''covered merchandise'' and ''evasion'' have the meanings given those terms in section 517(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as added by section 302 of this Act.

SA 1316. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TAX CREDIT FOR APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 45S. CREDIT FOR APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM EXPENSES.

''(a) TAX CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of an employer, the apprenticeship program credit determined under this section for any taxable year is an amount equal to—

''(A) with respect to each qualified individual in a qualified apprenticeship program, the lesser of—

''(i) the amount of any wages (as defined in section 51(c)(1)) paid or incurred by the employer with respect to such qualified individual during the taxable year, or

''(ii) $5,000, and

''(B) with respect to each qualified individual in a qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program, the lesser of—

''(i) an amount equal to the product of—

''(I) the total number of hours of work performed by such qualified individual for such employer during such taxable year, multiplied by

''(II) $3, or

''(ii) $5,000.

''(2) ESTABLISHED APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The apprenticeship program credit determined under this section for the taxable year shall only be applicable to the number of qualified individuals employed by the employer through a qualified apprenticeship program or a qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program which are in excess of the apprenticeship participation average for such employer (as determined under subparagraph (B)).

''(B) APPRENTICESHIP PARTICIPATION AVERAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the apprenticeship participation average shall be equal to the average of the total number of qualified individuals employed by the employer through a qualified apprenticeship program or qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program for—

''(i) the 3 preceding taxable years, or

''(ii) the number of taxable years in which the qualified apprenticeship program or the qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program was in existence, whichever is less.

''(3) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—No deduction or any other credit shall be allowed under this chapter for any amount taken into account in determining the credit under this section.

''(4) ELECTION NOT TO CLAIM CREDIT.—This section shall not apply to a taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer elects to have this section not apply for such taxable year.

''(5) LIMITATION.—The apprenticeship program credit under this section shall not be allowed for more than 3 taxable years with respect to any qualified individual.

''(b) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified individual' means, with respect to any taxable year, an individual who is an apprentice and—

''(A) is participating in a qualified apprenticeship program or a qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program with an employer that is subject to the terms of a valid apprenticeship agreement (as defined in the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the 'National Apprenticeship Act'; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.)),

''(B) has been employed under a qualified apprenticeship program or a qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program for a period of not less than 7 months that ends within the taxable year,

''(C) is not a highly compensated employee (as defined in section 414(q)), and

''(D) is not a seasonal worker (as defined in section 45R(d)(5)(B)).

''(2) TRAINING RECEIVED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—An employer shall consider and may accept, in the case of a qualified individual participating in a qualified apprenticeship program or a qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program, any relevant training or instruction received by such individual while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, for the purpose of satisfying the applicable training and instruction requirements under such qualified apprenticeship program.

''(c) QUALIFIED APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM AND QUALIFIED MULTI-EMPLOYER APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM.—

''(1) QUALIFIED APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified apprenticeship program' means a program registered under the National Apprenticeship Act, whether or not such program is sponsored by an employer, which—

''(i) provides qualified individuals with on-the-job training and instruction for a qualified occupation with the employer,

''(ii) is registered with the Office of Apprenticeship of the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor or a State apprenticeship agency recognized by such Office of Apprenticeship,

''(iii) maintains records relating to the qualified individual, in such manner as the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, may prescribe, and

''(iv) satisfies such other requirements as the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, may prescribe.

''(B) QUALIFIED OCCUPATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), the term 'qualified occupation' means a skilled trade occupation in a high-demand mechanical, technical, healthcare, or technology field (or such other occupational field as the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, may prescribe) that satisfies the criteria for an apprenticeable occupation under the National Apprenticeship Act.

''(2) QUALIFIED MULTI-EMPLOYER APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM.—The term 'qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program' means an apprenticeship program described in paragraph (1) in which multiple employers are required to contribute and that is maintained pursuant to 1 or more collective bargaining agreements between 1 or more employee organizations and such employers.

''(d) APPRENTICESHIP AGREEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'apprenticeship agreement' means an agreement between a qualified individual and an employer that satisfies the criteria under the National Apprenticeship Act.

''(2) CREDIT FOR TRAINING RECEIVED UNDER APPRENTICESHIP AGREEMENT.—If a qualified individual has received training or instruction through a qualified apprenticeship program or a qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program with an employer which is subsequently unable to satisfy its obligations under the apprenticeship agreement, such individual may transfer any completed training or instruction for purposes of satisfying any applicable training and instruction requirements under a separate apprenticeship agreement with a different employer.

''(e) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES.—For purposes of this section, all persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52, or subsections (m) or (o) of section 414, shall be treated as a single person.

''(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

''(g) TERMINATION.—This section shall not apply with respect to any wages paid to or any hours of work performed by a qualified individual after December 31, 2020.''.

(b) CREDIT TO BE PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Section 38(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (35), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (36) and inserting '', plus'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(37) the apprenticeship program expenses credit determined under section 45S(a).''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 45S. Credit for apprenticeship program expenses.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) RULE FOR EMPLOYMENT CREDITS.—Section 280C(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''45S(a),'' after ''45P(a),''.

(2) EXCLUSION FOR DETERMINATION OF CREDIT FOR INCREASING RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—Clause (iii) of section 41(b)(2)(D) of such Code is amended by inserting ''the apprenticeship program credit under section 45S(a) or'' after ''in determining''.

(e) EVALUATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committees on Finance and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives that contains an evaluation of the activities authorized under this Act, including—

(1) the extent to which qualified individuals completed qualified apprenticeship programs and qualified multi-employer apprenticeship programs;

(2) whether qualified individuals remained employed by an employer that received an apprenticeship program credit under section 45S of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the length of such employment following expiration of the apprenticeship period;

(3) whether qualified individuals who completed a qualified apprenticeship program or a qualified multi-employer apprenticeship program remained employed in the same occupation or field; and

(4) recommendations for legislative and administrative actions to improve the effectiveness of the apprenticeship program credit under section 45S of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. _____. ENCOURAGING MENTORS TO TRAIN THE FUTURE.

(a) EARLY DISTRIBUTIONS FROM QUALIFIED RETIREMENT PLANS.—Section 72(t)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (vii);

(B) by striking the period at the end of clause (viii) and inserting '', or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(ix) made to an employee who is serving as a mentor.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(H) DISTRIBUTIONS TO MENTORS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'mentor' means an individual who—

''(i) has attained 55 years of age,

''(ii) is not separated from their employment with a company, corporation, or institution of higher education,

''(iii) in accordance with such requirements and standards as the Secretary determines to be necessary, has substantially reduced their hours of employment with their employer, with the individual to be engaged in mentoring activities described in clause (iv) for not less than 20 percent of the hours of employment after such reduction, and

''(iv) is responsible for the training and education of employees or students in an area of expertise for which the individual has a professional credential, certificate, or degree.''.

(b) DISTRIBUTIONS DURING WORKING RETIREMENT.—Paragraph (36) of section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(36) DISTRIBUTIONS DURING WORKING RETIREMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A trust forming part of a pension plan shall not be treated as failing to constitute a qualified trust under this section solely because the plan provides that a distribution may be made from such trust to an employee who—

''(i) has attained age 62 and who is not separated from employment at the time of such distribution, or

''(ii) subject to subparagraph (B), is serving as a mentor (as such term is defined in section 72(t)(2)(H)).

''(B) LIMITATION ON DISTRIBUTIONS TO MENTORS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the amount of the distribution made to an employee who is serving as a mentor shall not be greater than the amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

''(i) the amount of the distribution that would have been payable to the employee if such employee had separated from employment instead of reducing their hours of employment with their employer and engaging in mentoring activities, in accordance with clauses (iii) and (iv) of section 72(t)(2)(H), by

''(ii) the percentage equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

''(I) the sum of—

''(aa) the number of hours per pay period by which the employee's hours of employment are reduced, and

''(bb) the number of hours of employment that such employee is engaging in mentoring activities, by

''(II) the total number of hours per pay period worked by the employee before such reduction in hours of employment.''.

(c) ERISA.—Subparagraph (A) of section 3(2) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(2)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', or solely because such distribution is made to an employee who is serving as a mentor (as such term is defined in section 72(t)(2)(H) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(d) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015 and before January 1, 2021.

SA 1317. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 33, strike line 10 and all that follows through page 34, line 4, and insert the following:

(16) TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws are the following:

(A) To preserve the ability of the United States to enforce vigorously its trade laws, including antidumping and countervailing duty and safeguard laws, and not to enter into agreements that lessen in any respect the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines—

(i) on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies, or

(ii) that address import increases or surges, such as under the safeguard remedy, in order to ensure that United States workers, farmers and agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions.

(B) To eliminate the underlying causes of unfair trade practices and import surges, including closed markets, subsidization, government practices promoting, enabling, or tolerating anticompetitive practices, and other forms of government intervention that generate or sustain excess, uneconomic capacity.

SA 1318. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES THAT CRIMINALIZE HOMOSEXUALITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 3(b) with a country the government of which criminalizes homosexuality or persecutes or otherwise punishes individuals on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, as identified by the Secretary of State in the most recent annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices under section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n).

SA 1319. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. NOTIFICATION OF WAIVERS OF DOMESTIC CONTENT RESTRICTIONS.

The Office of Federal Procurement Policy shall notify the public each time the application of a law, regulation, procedure, or practice regarding Government procurement is waived under section 301 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2511) to permit a entity organized under the laws of a country with which the United States enters into a free trade agreement under section 103(b) to compete for a Federal procurement contract.

SA 1320. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 36, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(21) MANUFACTURING JOBS AND WAGES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to manufacturing jobs and wages is to ensure that a trade agreement benefits the parties to the agreement, particularly with respect to resulting in net increases in manufacturing jobs and wages in the United States.

SA 1321. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 50, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(e) PROHIBITION ON WAIVING DOMESTIC CONTENT RESTRICTIONS.—The President may not designate, under subsection (b) of section 301 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2511), a country with which the United States enters into a trade agreement under this section for purposes of exercising the waiver authority provided under such section 301.

SA 1322. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 90, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(5) LIMITATION ON EFFECT OF AGREEMENTS WITH PRIORITY FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—Any agreement entered into under section 103(b) with a country that has been identified as a priority foreign country under section 182(a)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242(a)(2)) during each of the 3 years preceding the date on which the agreement was entered into shall not enter into force with respect to the United States until the date that is 3 years after the most recent date on which that country was so identified.

SA 1323. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

(13) to oppose any attempts to weaken in any respect the trade remedy laws of the United States.

SA 1324. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the ''Environmental Improvement Trust Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''Trust Fund''), consisting of such amounts as may be transferred to the Trust Fund under subsection (b) and any amounts that may be credited to the Trust Fund under subsection (d)(3).

(b) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Trust Fund, from the general fund of the Treasury, amounts determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to amounts received in the general fund that are attributable to the duties collected, during the period specified in paragraph (3), pursuant to a countervailing duty order or an antidumping duty order under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or a finding under the Antidumping Act, 1921 (title II of the Act of May 27, 1921; 42 Stat. 11, chapter 14) on articles produced by manufacturers in the following industries, as determined by the Secretary:

(A) Food and beverages.
(B) Textiles.
(C) Lumber.
(D) Paper and printing.
(E) Chemicals.
(F) Plastics and rubber.
(G) Nonmetallic minerals.
(H) Primary metals.
(I) Fabricated metals.
(J) Machinery and equipment.
(K) Electronic equipment.
(L) Transportation equipment.
(M) Any other manufacturing industry if domestic manufacturers in that industry are required to purchase new equipment or hire new employees in order to comply with regulations promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to improving overall environmental quality.

(2) DETERMINATION.—In determining if domestic manufacturers are required to purchase new equipment or hire new employees in order to comply with regulations under paragraph (1)(M), the Secretary shall consult with the Administrator.

(3) PERIOD SPECIFIED.—The period specified in this paragraph begins on January 1, 2016, and ends on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS IN TRUST FUND.—

(1) AVAILABILITY FOR ASSISTING DOMESTIC MANUFACTURERS.—Amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available to the Administrator, as provided by appropriation Acts—

(A) to assist any domestic manufacturer in an industry specified in subsection (b)(1) if that domestic manufacturer is required to purchase new equipment or hire new employees in order to comply with any regulations promulgated by the Administrator relating to improving overall environmental quality, as determined by the Administrator; and

(B) to cover administrative costs incurred by the Administrator in carrying out subparagraph (A).

(2) DISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall distribute amounts available for assistance under paragraph (1)(A) among domestic manufacturers in the industries specified in subsection (b)(1) in proportion to the estimated impact of regulations described in such paragraph on the prices in the United States of articles produced by domestic manufacturers in such industries, as determined by the Administrator.

(B) EXCLUSION.—Of the amounts distributed under subparagraph (A), 75 percent of those amounts shall be distributed to domestic manufacturers that are small or medium sized enterprises, as determined by the Administrator.

(d) INVESTMENT OF TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Trust Fund as is not required to meet current withdrawals in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

(2) OBLIGATIONS.—

(A) ACQUISITION.—The obligations specified in paragraph (1) may be acquired on original issue at the issue price or by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price.

(B) SALE.—Any obligation acquired by the Trust Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

(3) INTEREST AND PROCEEDS FROM SALE OR REDEMPTION OF OBLIGATIONS.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Trust Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Trust Fund.

(e) DOMESTIC MANUFACTURER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''domestic manufacturer'' means a person that produces articles in the United States.

SA 1325. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—EXPANSION OF ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 481(b), by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) For purposes of parts D and E, the term 'eligible program' includes a program of not less than 250 clock hours of instruction, offered during a minimum of 5 weeks of instruction that leads an industry-recognized credential.

''(B) In this paragraph, the term 'industry-recognized credential' means an industry-recognized credential that—

''(i) is demonstrated to be of high quality by the institution offering the program in the program participation agreement under section 487;

''(ii) meets the current, as of the date of the determination, or projected needs of a local or regional workforce for recruitment, screening, hiring, retention, or advancement purposes—

''(I) as determined by the State in which the program is located, in consultation with business entities; or

''(II) as demonstrated by the institution offering the program leading to the credential; and

''(iii) is, where applicable, endorsed by a nationally recognized trade association or organization representing a significant part of the industry or sector.''; and

(2) in section 487(a), by adding at the end the following:

''(30) In the case of an institution that offers a program of not less than 250 clock hours of instruction, offered during a minimum of 5 weeks of instruction that leads an industry-recognized credential, as provided under section 481(b)(5), the institution will demonstrate to the Secretary that the industry-recognized credential is of high quality.''.

SA 1326. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT THREATEN UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) if—

(A) the agreement, the implementing bill, or any statement of administrative action described in subsection (a)(1)(E)(ii) proposed to implement the agreement, includes an investor-state dispute settlement arbitration mechanism; and

(B) any other party to the agreement has opted out of all or part of the arbitration mechanism.

SA 1327. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to

provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT THREATEN UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if such agreement or agreements, the implementing bill, or any statement of administrative action described in subsection (a)(1)(E)(ii) proposed to implement such agreement or agreements, includes investor-state dispute settlement.

SA 1328. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE THE FINANCIAL STABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if such agreement or agreements include provisions relating to financial services regulation.

SA 1329. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 3, add the following:

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC AGENCY WORKERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 247 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2319) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''The'' and inserting ''Subject to section 222(d)(5), the''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or service sector firm'' and inserting '', service sector firm, or public agency''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(19) The term 'public agency' means a department or agency of a State or local government or of the Federal Government, or a subdivision thereof.''.

(b) GROUP ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2272) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) ADVERSELY AFFECTED WORKERS IN PUBLIC AGENCIES.—A group of workers in a public agency shall be certified by the Secretary as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under this chapter pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 if the Secretary determines that—

''(1) a significant number or proportion of the workers in the public agency have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

''(2) the public agency has acquired from a foreign country services like or directly competitive with services which are supplied by such agency; and

''(3) the acquisition of services described in paragraph (2) contributed importantly to such workers' separation or threat of separation.'';

(3) in subsection (d) (as redesignated), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) REFERENCE TO FIRM.—For purposes of subsections (a) and (b), the term 'firm' does not include a public agency.''; and

(4) in paragraph (2) of subsection (e) (as redesignated), by striking ''subsection (a) or (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (a), (b), or (c)''.

SA 1330. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 14, strike lines 3 through 6 and insert the following:

(E) ensuring foreign investors have access to justice to seek relief from harms inflicted in the territory of or by the United States' trading partners;

SA 1331. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 36, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(21) PUBLIC HEALTH.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to public health are—

(A) to strengthen the commitments made in the bipartisan congressional agreement on trade policy relating to trade agreements with Peru, Colombia, and Panama, dated May 10, 2007 (commonly referred to as the ''May 10 agreement'');

(B) to ensure that a party to a trade agreement with the United States adopts and maintains current rights and obligations under—

(i) the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted by the World Trade Organization at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar, on November 14, 2001;

(ii) the World Intellectual Property Organization Development Agenda, adopted in 2007; and

(iii) World Health Organization Resolution 61.21 (2008);

(C) to ensure that no provision of a trade agreement imposes upon the United States or any other party to the agreement any rule that may be interpreted as undermining or limiting access to medical tools and technologies, including pharmaceutical products, diagnostics, vaccines, or other medical devices, or the practice of medicine; and

(D) to recognize the right of all governments to regulate and enact laws in the interest of public health and the right of all governments to exercise any legal rights or safeguards to protect public health without the threat of trade-related penalties.

SA 1332. Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) DEMOCRACY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to democracy is to require the trading partners of the United States to maintain open and free democratic elections at all levels of government.

SA 1333. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(a), add the following:

(13) to preserve and grow manufacturing in the United States by recognizing the implications to the national security of the United States of the erosion of the defense industrial base and to ensure that any waiver under section 301 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2511) regarding Government procurement is exercised only if—

(A) the waiver does not cause the closure of a domestic manufacturer; and

(B) domestic manufacturers are unable to produce the item to be procured.

SA 1334. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, line 9, insert before the end period the following: ''and does not violate, weaken, or undermine the requirements of chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Buy American Act') or section 313 of title 23, United States Code''.

SA 1335. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr.

HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, lines 3 and 4, strike ''and the interests of United States consumers'' and insert ''the interests of United States consumers, and the wages, living standards, and employment prospects of United States workers''.

SA 1336. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 105(a), add at the end the following:

(6) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AUTOMOBILES AND AUTO PARTS.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements relating to automobiles and auto parts, the President shall—

(A) assess the likelihood of such agreement or agreements substantially reducing the overall global trade deficit of the United States in automobiles and auto parts;

(B) determine whether the countries participating in the negotiations maintain nontariff barriers or other policies or practices that distort trade in automobiles and auto parts and identify the impact of those barriers, policies, or practices on producers of automobiles and auto parts in the United States and the employees of those producers; and

(C) consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives with respect to—

(i) the results of the assessment conducted under subparagraph (A);

(ii) whether it is appropriate for the President to agree to reduce tariffs on automobiles or auto parts based on any conclusions reached in that assessment; and

(iii) how the President intends to comply with all negotiating objectives applicable to such agreement or agreements.

SA 1337. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 90, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(1) CERTIFICATION THAT NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES HAVE BEEN ACHIEVED.—

(A) CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS AND COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of a trade agreement under subsection (a)(1)(E), the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall each meet, consider whether or not the agreement achieves the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102, and vote on whether to certify that the agreement achieves those objectives.

(B) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement unless the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate both vote to certify under subparagraph (A) that the agreement achieves the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102.

SA 1338. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 111(6)(B), add the following:

(viii) The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

SA 1339. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT DO NOT ALLOW GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS PRICING OR SIMILAR POLICIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) unless the agreement or agreements explicitly permit parties to the agreement or agreements to price greenhouse gas emissions or adopt other policies that have substantially the same effect in reducing greenhouse gas emissions as pricing such emissions.

SA 1340. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—TRADE PREFERENCES FOR NEPAL

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Nepal Trade Preferences Act''.

SEC. 302. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may authorize the provision of preferential treatment under this title to articles that are imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States pursuant to section 303 if the President determines—

(1) that Nepal meets the requirements set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)); and

(2) after taking into account the factors set forth in paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (c) of section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2462), that Nepal meets the eligibility requirements of such section 502.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT; MANDATORY GRADUATION.—The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2462) shall apply with respect to Nepal to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions apply with respect to beneficiary developing countries under title V of that Act (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.).

SEC. 303. ELIGIBLE ARTICLES.

(a) CERTAIN MANUFACTURED AND OTHER ARTICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An article described in paragraph (2) may enter the customs territory of the United States free of duty.

(2) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An article is described in this paragraph if—

(i) the article is the growth, product, or manufacture of Nepal;

(ii) the article is imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States;

(iii) the article is described in subparagraphs (B) through (G) of subsection (b)(1) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463);

(iv) the President determines, after receiving the advice of the United States International Trade Commission in accordance with subsection (e) of that section, that the article is not import-sensitive in the context of imports from Nepal; and

(v) subject to subparagraph (C), the sum of the cost or value of the materials produced in, and the direct costs of processing operations performed in, Nepal or the customs territory of the United States is not less than 35 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—An article shall not be treated as the growth, product, or manufacture of Nepal for purposes of subparagraph (A)(i) by virtue of having merely undergone—

(i) simple combining or packaging operations; or

(ii) mere dilution with water or mere dilution with another substance that does not materially alter the characteristics of the article.

(C) LIMITATION ON UNITED STATES COST.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(v), the cost or value of materials produced in, and the direct costs of processing operations performed in, the customs territory of the United States and attributed to the 35-percent requirement under that subparagraph may not exceed 15 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered.

(b) TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A textile or apparel article described in paragraph (2) or (3) may enter the customs territory of the United States free of duty.

(2) TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES WHOLLY ASSEMBLED IN NEPAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A textile or apparel article is described in this paragraph if the textile or apparel article is—

(i) wholly assembled in Nepal, without regard to the country of origin of the yarn or fabric used to make the articles; and

(ii) imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States.

(B) AGGREGATE LIMIT.—The aggregate quantity of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) imported into the customs territory of the United States from Nepal during a calendar year under this subsection may not exceed one half of one percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States in the most recent 12-month period for which data are available.

(3) HANDLOOMED, HANDMADE, FOLKLORE ARTICLES AND ETHNIC PRINTED FABRICS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A textile or apparel article is described in this paragraph if the textile or apparel article is—

(i) imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States;

(ii) on a list of textile and apparel articles determined by the President, after consultation with the Government of Nepal, to be handloomed, handmade, folklore articles or ethnic printed fabrics of Nepal; and

(iii) certified as a handloomed, handmade, folklore article or an ethnic printed fabric of Nepal by the competent authority of Nepal.

(B) ETHNIC PRINTED FABRIC.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an ethnic printed fabric of Nepal is fabric—

(i) containing a selvedge on both edges and having a width of less than 50 inches;

(ii) classifiable under subheading 5208.52.30 or 5208.52.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States;

(iii) of a type that contains designs, symbols, and other characteristics of Nepal—

(I) normally produced for and sold in indigenous markets in Nepal; and

(II) normally sold in Nepal by the piece as opposed to being tailored into garments before being sold in indigenous markets in Nepal;

(iv) printed, including waxed, in Nepal; and

(v) formed in the United States from yarns formed in the United States or formed in Nepal from yarns originating in either the United States or Nepal.

(4) QUANTITATIVE LIMITATION.—Preferential treatment under this subsection shall be extended in the 1-year period beginning January 1, 2016, and in each of the succeeding 10 1-year periods, to imports of textile and apparel articles from Nepal under this subsection in an amount not to exceed one half of one percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States in the most recent 12-month period for which data are available.

(5) VERIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO TRANSSHIPMENT FOR CERTAIN APPAREL ARTICLES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, July 1, October 1, and January 1 of each year, the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall verify that textile and apparel articles imported from Nepal to which preferential treatment is extended under this subsection are not being unlawfully transshipped into the United States.

(B) REPORT TO PRESIDENT.—If the Commissioner determines pursuant to subparagraph (A) that textile and apparel articles imported from Nepal to which preferential treatment is extended under this subsection are being unlawfully transshipped into the United States, the Commissioner shall report that determination to the President.

(C) AUTHORITY TO REDUCE QUANTITATIVE LIMITATION.—If, in any 1-year period with respect to which the President extends preferential treatment to textile and apparel articles under this subsection, the Commissioner reports to the President pursuant to subparagraph (B) regarding unlawful transshipments, the President—

(i) may modify the quantitative limitation under paragraph (4) as the President considers appropriate to account for such transshipments; and

(ii) if the President modifies that limitation under clause (i), shall publish notice of the modification in the Federal Register.

(6) SURGE MECHANISM.—The provisions of subparagraph (B) of section 112(b)(3) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)) shall apply to textile and apparel articles imported from Nepal to which preferential treatment is extended under this subsection to the same extent and in the same manner that such provisions apply to textile and apparel articles described in such section 112(b)(3) and imported from a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country.

(7) SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY RULES; PROTECTIONS AGAINST TRANSSHIPMENT.—The provisions of subsection (e) of section 112 and section 113 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721 and 3722) shall apply to textile and apparel articles imported from Nepal to which preferential treatment is extended under this subsection to the same extent and in the same manner that such provisions apply to textile and apparel articles imported from beneficiary sub-Saharan countries to which preferential treatment is extended under such section 112.

SEC. 304. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

The President shall monitor, review, and report to Congress, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the implementation of this title and on the trade and investment policy of the United States with respect to Nepal.

SEC. 305. TERMINATION OF PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

No preferential treatment extended under this title shall remain in effect after December 31, 2025.

SEC. 306. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this title shall take effect on January 1, 2016.

SA 1341. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. ELIMINATION OF CONSUMPTIVE DEMAND EXCEPTION TO PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION OF GOODS MADE WITH CONVICT LABOR, FORCED LABOR, OR INDENTURED LABOR; REPORT.

(a) ELIMINATION OF CONSUMPTIVE DEMAND EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) is amended by striking ''The provisions of this section'' and all that follows through ''of the United States.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date that is 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on compliance with section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) that includes the following:

(1) The number of instances in which merchandise was denied entry pursuant to that section during the 1-year period preceding the submission of the report.

(2) A description of the merchandise denied entry pursuant to that section.

(3) Such other information as the Commissioner considers appropriate with respect to monitoring and enforcing compliance with that section.

SA 1342. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE [____]—DETERRING LABOR SLOWDOWNS

SEC. [____]. DETERRING LABOR SLOWDOWNS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT.—The National Labor Relations Act is amended—

(1) in section 1 (29 U.S.C. 151), by adding at the end the following:

''International trade is one of the most important components of the economy of the United States and will likely continue to grow in the future. In order to remain competitive in an increasingly competitive global economy, it is essential that the United States possess a highly efficient and reliable public and private transportation network. The ports of the United States are an increasingly important part of such transportation network. Experience has demonstrated that frequent and periodic disruptions to commerce in the maritime industry in the form of deliberate and unprotected labor slowdowns at the ports of the United States have led to substantial and frequent economic disruption and loss, interfering with the free flow of domestic and international commerce and threatening the economic health of the United States, as well as its citizens and businesses. Such frequent and periodic disruptions to commerce in the maritime industry hurt the reputation of the United States in the global economy, cause the ports of the United States to lose business, and represent a serious and burgeoning threat to the financial health and economic stability of the United States. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes and mitigate the effects of such disruptions to commerce in the maritime industry and to provide effective and prompt remedies to individuals injured by such disruptions.'';

(2) in section 2 (29 U.S.C. 152), by adding at the end the following:

''(15) The term 'employee engaged in maritime employment' has the meaning given the term 'employee' in section 2(3) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 902(3)).

''(16) The term 'labor slowdown'—

''(A) includes any intentional effort by employees to reduce productivity or efficiency in the performance of any duty of such employees; and

''(B) does not include any such effort required by the good faith belief of such employees that an abnormally dangerous condition exists at the place of employment of such employees.'';

(3) in section 8(b) (29 U.S.C. 158(b)), by adding at the end the following:

''(8) in representing, or seeking to represent, employees engaged in maritime employment, to engage in a labor slowdown at any time, including when a collective-bargaining agreement is in effect.'';

(4) in section 9 (29 U.S.C. 159), by adding at the end the following:

''(f) EFFECT OF LABOR SLOWDOWNS.—If a labor organization has been found, pursuant to a final order of the Board, to have violated section 8(b)(8), the Board shall—

''(1) revoke the exclusive recognition or certification of the labor organization, which shall immediately cease to be entitled to represent the employees in the bargaining unit of such labor organization; or

''(2) take other appropriate disciplinary action.''; and

(5) in section 10(1) (29 U.S.C. 160(1)), in the first sentence, by striking ''or section 8(b)(7)'' and inserting ''or paragraph (7) or (8) of section 8(b)''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO THE LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947.—Section 303 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 187) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''in section 8(b)(4)'' and inserting ''under paragraph (4) or (8) of section 8(b)'';

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting '', including reasonable attorney fees for a violation under section 8(b)(8) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(b)(8))'' before the period; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) In an action for damages resulting from a violation of section 8(b)(8) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(b)(8)), it shall not be a defense that the injured party has, in any manner, waived, or purported to waive, the right of such party to pursue monetary damages relating to the labor slowdown at issue—

''(1) in connection with a contractual grievance alleging a violation of a clause prohibiting a strike, or a similar clause, in a collective-bargaining agreement; or

''(2) in connection with an action for a breach of such a clause under section 301.''.

SA 1343. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROTECTING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE.

(a) MORATORIUM ON CLOSING OR CONSOLIDATING POSTAL FACILITIES.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Postal Service may not close or consolidate any processing and distribution center, processing and distribution facility, network distribution center, or other facility that is operated by the United States Postal Service, the primary function of which is to sort and process mail.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF OVERNIGHT SERVICE STANDARDS.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Postal Service shall apply the service standards for first-class mail and periodicals under part 121 of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, that were in effect on July 1, 2012.

SA 1344. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. WITHDRAWAL OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT FROM THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

Notwithstanding the provisions of title I of the Act to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, and to establish a framework for relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China (Public Law 106–286; 114 Stat. 880), or any other provision of law, effective on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) normal trade relations treatment shall not apply pursuant to section 101 of that Act to the products of the People's Republic of China;

(2) normal trade relations treatment may thereafter be extended to the products of that country only in accordance with the provisions of chapter 1 of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), as in effect with respect to the products of the People's Republic of China on the day before the effective date of the accession of the People's Republic of China to the World Trade Organization; and

(3) the extension of waiver authority that was in effect with respect to the People's Republic of China under section 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1)) on the day before the effective date of the accession of the People's Republic of China to the World Trade Organization shall, upon the enactment of this Act, be deemed not to have expired, and shall continue in effect until the date that is 90 days after the date of such enactment.

SA 1345. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—UNITED STATES EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP BANK

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''United States Employee Ownership Bank Act''.

SEC. 302. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) between January 2000 and February 2015, the manufacturing sector lost 4,963,000 jobs;

(2) as of February 2015, only 12,321,000 workers in the United States were employed in the manufacturing sector, lower than July 1941;

(3) at the end of 2014, the United States had a trade deficit of $505,047,000,000, including a record-breaking $342,632,500,000 trade deficit with China;

(4) preserving and increasing decent paying jobs must be a top priority of Congress;

(5) providing loan guarantees, direct loans, and technical assistance to employees to buy their own companies will preserve and increase employment in the United States; and

(6) the time has come to establish the United States Employee Ownership Bank to preserve and expand jobs in the United States through Employee Stock Ownership Plans and worker-owned cooperatives.

SEC. 303. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term ''Bank'' means the United States Employee Ownership Bank, established under section 304;

(2) the term ''eligible worker-owned cooperative'' has the meaning given that term in section 1042(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(3) the term ''employee stock ownership plan'' has the meaning given that term in section 4975(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(4) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 304. ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP BANK WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF BANK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the United States Employee Ownership Bank to foster increased employee ownership of United States companies and greater employee participation in company decision-making throughout the United States.

(2) ORGANIZATION OF THE BANK.—

(A) MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall appoint a Director to serve as the head of the Bank, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary.

(B) STAFF.—The Director may select, appoint, employ, and fix the compensation of the employees that are necessary to carry out the functions of the Bank.

(b) DUTIES OF BANK.—The Bank is authorized to provide loans, on a direct or guaranteed basis, which may be subordinated to the interests of all other creditors—

(1) to purchase a company through an employee stock ownership plan or an eligible worker-owned cooperative, which shall be not less than 51 percent employee-owned, or will become not less than 51 percent employee-owned as a result of financial assistance from the Bank;

(2) to allow a company that is less than 51 percent employee-owned to become not less than 51 percent employee-owned;

(3) to allow a company that is not less than 51 percent employee-owned to increase the level of employee ownership at the company; and

(4) to allow a company that is not less than 51 percent employee-owned to expand operations and increase or preserve employment.

(c) PRECONDITIONS.—Before the Bank makes any subordinated loan or guarantees a loan under subsection (b)(1), a business plan shall be submitted to the Bank that—

(1) shows that—

(A) not less than 51 percent of all interests in the company is or will be owned or controlled by an employee stock ownership plan or eligible worker-owned cooperative;

(B) the board of directors of the company is or will be elected by shareholders on a 1 share to 1 vote basis or by members of the eligible worker-owned cooperative on a 1 member to 1 vote basis, except that shares held by the employee stock ownership plan will be voted according to section 409(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, with participants providing voting instructions to the trustee of the employee stock ownership plan in accordance with the terms of the employee stock ownership plan and the requirements of that section 409(e); and

(C) all employees will receive basic information about company progress and have the opportunity to participate in day-to-day operations; and

(2) includes a feasibility study from an objective third party with a positive determination that the employee stock ownership plan or eligible worker-owned cooperative will generate enough of a margin to pay back any loan, subordinated loan, or loan guarantee that was made possible through the Bank.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a loan that is provided or guaranteed under this section shall—

(1) bear interest at an annual rate, as determined by the Secretary—

(A) in the case of a direct loan provided under this section—

(i) sufficient to cover the cost of borrowing to the Department of the Treasury for obligations of comparable maturity; or

(ii) of 4 percent; and

(B) in the case of a loan guaranteed under this section, in an amount that is equal to the current applicable market rate for a loan of comparable maturity; and

(2) have a term of not more than 12 years.

SEC. 305. EMPLOYEE RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL BEFORE PLANT OR FACILITY CLOSING.

Section 3 of the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (29 U.S.C. 2102) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting: ''**; EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS OR ELIGIBLE WORKER-OWNED COOPERATIVES**'' after ''layoffs''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS AND ELIGIBLE WORKER-OWNED COOPERATIVES.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—If an employer orders a plant or facility closing in connection with the termination of operations at the plant or facility, the employer shall offer its employees an opportunity to purchase the plant or facility through an employee stock ownership plan (as that term is defined in section 4975(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) or an eligible worker-owned cooperative (as that term is defined in section 1042(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that is not less than 51 percent employee-owned. The value of the company that is to be the subject of the plan or cooperative shall be the fair market value of the plant or facility, as determined by an appraisal by an independent third party jointly selected by the employer and the employees. The cost of the appraisal may be shared evenly between the employer and the employees.

''(2) EXEMPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply—

''(A) if an employer orders a plant closing but will retain the assets of the plant to continue or begin a business within the United States; or

''(B) if an employer orders a plant closing and the employer intends to continue the business conducted at the plant at another plant within the United States.''.

SEC. 306. REGULATIONS ON SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS AND PREVENTING COMPETITION WITH COMMERCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to implement this title and the amendments made by this title, including—

(1) regulations to ensure the safety and soundness of the Bank; and

(2) regulations to ensure that the Bank will not compete with commercial financial institutions.

SEC. 307. COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT CREDIT.

Section 804 of the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (12 U.S.C. 2903) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ESTABLISHMENT OF EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS AND ELIGIBLE WORKER-OWNED COOPERATIVES.—In assessing and taking into account, under subsection (a), the record of a financial institution, the appropriate Federal financial supervisory agency may consider as a factor capital investments, loans, loan participation, technical assistance, financial advice, grants, and other ventures undertaken by the institution to support or enable employees to establish employee stock ownership plans or eligible worker-owned cooperatives (as those terms are defined in sections 4975(e) and 1042(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, respectively), that are not less than 51 percent employee-owned plans or cooperatives.''.

SEC. 308. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title—

(1) $500,000,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

(2) such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

SA 1346. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 105(a), insert the following:

(6) REPORT ON POTENTIAL UNITED STATES TRADING PARTNERS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than 45 days prior to the date the President initiates negotiations for a trade agreement with a country, the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission shall prepare and submit to Congress a report on market access opportunities and challenges arising from such trade agreement.

(B) CONTENT.—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall assess—

(i) tariff and nontariff barriers, policies, and practices of the government of the country;

(ii) expected opportunities for United States exports to the country if such tariff and nontariff barriers are eliminated; and

(iii) the potential impact of the trade agreement on aggregate employment and job displacement of workers in the United States and the country.

(C) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall be made available to the public.

SA 1347. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 106, insert the following:

SEC. 107. WITHDRAWAL FROM TRADE AGREEMENTS THAT LEAD TO OUTSOURCING OF MANUFACTURING JOBS.

(a) NOTIFICATIONS OF DECREASE IN MANUFACTURING EMPLOYMENT BY CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall notify Congress if, at any time during the 3-year period beginning on the date on which a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) enters into force, the Director determines that manufacturing employment in the United States has decreased by 100,000 jobs or more since the entry into force of the agreement.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—The United States shall withdraw from a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) on the date of the enactment of a joint resolution of withdrawal under subsection (c) with respect to that agreement.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTION OF WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF WITHDRAWAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''joint resolution of withdrawal'', with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b), means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the United States withdraws from the trade agreement with _____.'', with the blank space being filled with the country or countries that are parties to the agreement.

(2) INTRODUCTION.—During the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the Director submits to Congress a notification under subsection (a), any Member of the House or Senate may introduce a joint resolution of withdrawal.

(3) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of withdrawal shall not be referred to a committee in the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to a joint resolution of withdrawal to the same extent such provisions apply to joint resolutions under subsection (a) of that section.

SA 1348. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) WORST FORMS OF CHILD LABOR.—The principal negotiating objectives of the

United States with respect to the worst forms of child labor are—

(A) to prevent distortions in the conduct of international trade caused by the use of the worst forms of child labor, in whole or in part, in the production of goods for export in international commerce; and

(B) to redress unfair and illegitimate competition based upon the use of the worst forms of child labor, in whole or in part, in the production of goods for export in international commerce, including by—

(i) promoting universal ratification and full compliance by all trading partners of the United States with ILO Convention No. 182 Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor;

(ii) clarifying the right under subsections (a) and (b) of Article XX of GATT 1994 to enact and enforce national measures that are necessary to protect public morals or to protect human, animal, or plant life or health, including measures that limit or ban the importation of goods or services that are produced through the use of the worst forms of child labor;

(iii) ensuring that any multilateral or bilateral trade agreement that is entered into by the United States requires all parties to such agreement to enact and enforce laws that satisfy their international legal obligations to prevent the use of the worst forms of child labor, especially in the conduct of international trade; and

(iv) providing for strong enforcement of laws that require all trading partners of the United States to prevent the use of the worst forms of child labor, especially in the conduct of international trade, through accessible, expeditious, and effective civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement mechanisms, including procedures to impound at the border or otherwise refuse entry of goods made, in whole or in part, through the use of the worst forms of child labor.

SA 1349. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(b)(1)(A), after ''global value chains,'' insert ''especially those global value chains established under existing trade agreements,''.

SA 1350. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b)(10), add the following:

(J) to ensure that each party to a trade agreement implements all measures to bring its environmental laws and regulations into compliance with the agreement before the agreement enters into effect.

SA 1351. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b)(10), add the following:

(J) to ensure that each party to a trade agreement implements all measures to bring its labor laws and regulations into compliance with the agreement before the agreement enters into effect.

SA 1352. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) LIMITATIONS ON PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES THAT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST LGBT INDIVIDUALS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country that discriminates against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) individuals.

SA 1353. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 105(f), add the following:

(4) REPORT ON FAIR TRADE INDEX.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report on each foreign country with which the United States has conducted negotiations under this title that—

(i) analyzes the acts, policies, and practices of such foreign country that negatively impact the trade relationship of the United States with such foreign country;

(ii) analyzes the adherence of such foreign country to international trade norms;

(iii) assesses the compliance of such foreign country with fair trade factors (including the factors specified in subparagraph (B)); and

(iv) ranks each such foreign country in order from most to least egregious violator of those fair trade factors.

(B) FAIR TRADE FACTORS.—The fair trade factors for each foreign country included in the report under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of the extent to which that country manipulates the exchange rate for its currency, including an assessment of the following:

(I) Whether that country had a current account surplus during the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(II) Whether that country increased its foreign exchange reserves during that period.

(III) Whether the amount of foreign exchange reserves of that country is more than the total value of exports from that country during a 3-month period.

(IV) Such other factors as the United States Trade Representative considers appropriate.

(ii) An assessment of the localization barriers to trade with that country, including an assessment of the following:

(I) Whether that country has formal legal and regulatory measures designed to protect, favor, or stimulate industries, service providers, or intellectual property from that country at the expense of goods, services, or intellectual property from other countries, including local content requirements, subsidies, or other preferences available only if producers use local goods, locally-owned service providers, or locally-owned or developed intellectual property.

(II) Any requirements in that country to provide services using local facilities or infrastructure.

(III) Any measures taken by that country to promote the transfer of technology or intellectual property from foreign entities to domestic entities.

(IV) Any requirements in that country to comply with standards specific to that country or region that create unnecessary obstacles to trade.

(V) Any requirements in that country to conduct duplicative conformity assessment procedures that the United States Trade Representative considers unjustified.

(VI) Such other factors as the United States Trade Representative considers appropriate.

(iii) An assessment of any other barriers to trade with that country, including considering the ranking of that country in the National Trade Estimate submitted to Congress under section 181(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2241(b)).

(iv) An assessment of the extent to which that country protects intellectual property rights, including considering whether that country is identified by the United States Trade Representative under section 182 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242) as a country that denies adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights or denies fair and equitable market access to United States persons that rely upon intellectual property rights protection.

(v) An assessment of the extent to which that country exhibits discriminatory preferences for domestic production, including considering any findings of the Trade Policy Review Body of the World Trade Organization with respect to that country.

(vi) An assessment of the labor rights and labor practices in that country, including the findings with respect to that country included in the report on labor rights required by subsection (d)(3).

SA 1354. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an

administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 36, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new principal negotiating objective:

(21) ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE.—All trade agreements to which the United States is a party shall recognize the right of all governments to regulate and enact laws in the interest of addressing climate change and the rights of all governments to exercise any legal rights or safeguards to reduce greenhouse gas emissions without the threat of trade-related penalties.

SA 1355. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(I) ensuring that the procedures for resolving investor-state disputes involving claims for expected future profits or similar compensation related to the exercise by the United States or a State of any legal rights or safeguards to protect or provide for clean air, clean water, or safe food, including actions under any existing or future law or regulation, occur under the jurisdiction of a court of the United States or a State and not through the dispute settlement mechanism.

SA 1356. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(I) ensuring that the procedures for resolving investor-state disputes involving claims for expected future profits or similar compensation related to the exercise by the United States or a State of any legal rights or safeguards to provide for reductions in children's exposure to carcinogens and toxic substances in toys and other consumer products, including actions under any existing or future law or regulation, occur under the jurisdiction of a court of the United States or a State and not through the dispute settlement mechanism.

SA 1357. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(I) ensuring that the procedures for resolving investor-state disputes involving claims for expected future profits or similar compensation related to the exercise by the United States or a State of any legal rights or safeguards to provide for reductions in exposure to substances that are known to cause cancer or other serious health impacts, including actions under any existing or future law or regulation, occur under the jurisdiction of a court of the United States or a State and not through the dispute settlement mechanism.

SA 1358. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(I) ensuring that the procedures for resolving investor-state disputes involving claims for expected future profits or similar compensation related to the exercise by the United States or a State of any legal rights or safeguards to provide for reductions in the pesticide residue levels on food, including actions under any existing or future law or regulation, occur under the jurisdiction of a court of the United States or a State and not through the dispute settlement mechanism.

SA 1359. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(I) ensuring that the procedures for resolving investor-state disputes involving claims for expected future profits or similar compensation related to the exercise by the United States or a State of any legal rights or safeguards to provide for the reductions in the emission of, or exposure to, toxic air pollutants, including actions under any existing or future law or regulation, occur under the jurisdiction of a court of the United States or a State and not through the dispute settlement mechanism.

SA 1360. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(I) ensuring that the procedures for resolving investor-state disputes involving claims for expected future profits or similar compensation related to the exercise by the United States or a State of any legal rights or safeguards to provide for the reductions in the exposure to asbestos, including actions under any existing or future law or regulation, occur under the jurisdiction of a court of the United States or a State and not through the dispute settlement mechanism.

SA 1361. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country that has a minimum wage that is less than $1.00 an hour, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

SA 1362. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(I) ensuring that the procedures for resolving investor-state disputes involving claims for expected future profits or similar compensation related to the exercise by the United States or a State of any legal rights or safeguards to provide for reductions in contaminants harmful to public health in drinking water, including actions under any existing or future law or regulation, occur under the jurisdiction of a court of the United States or a State and not through the dispute settlement mechanism.

SA 1363. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Tax Credit for Apprenticeship Programs

SEC. 301. CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEES PARTICIPATING IN QUALIFIED APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 45S. EMPLOYEES PARTICIPATING IN QUALIFIED APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, the apprenticeship credit determined under this section for the taxable year is an amount equal to the sum of the applicable credit amounts (as determined under subsection (b)) for each of apprentice of the employer that exceeds the applicable apprenticeship level (as determined under subsection (e)) during such taxable year.

''(b) APPLICABLE CREDIT AMOUNT.—For purposes of subsection (a), the applicable credit amount for each apprentice for each taxable year is equal to—

''(1) $1,500, in the case of an apprentice who—

''(A) has not attained 25 years of age at the close of the taxable year, or

''(B) is certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, and

''(2) $1,000, in the case of any apprentice not described in paragraph (1).

''(c) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF YEARS WHICH CREDIT MAY BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The apprenticeship credit shall not be allowed for more than 2 taxable years with respect to any apprentice.

''(d) APPRENTICE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'apprentice' means any employee who is employed by the employer—

''(1) in an officially recognized apprenticeable occupation, as determined by the Office of Apprenticeship of the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor, and

''(2) pursuant to an apprentice agreement registered with—

''(A) the Office of Apprenticeship of the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor, or

''(B) a recognized State apprenticeship agency, as determined by the Office of Apprenticeship of the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor.

''(e) APPLICABLE APPRENTICESHIP LEVEL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes this section, the applicable apprenticeship level shall be equal to—

''(A) in the case of any apprentice described in subsection (b)(1), the amount equal to 80 percent of the average number of such apprentices of the employer for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, rounded to the next lower whole number; and

''(B) in the case of any apprentices described in subsection (b)(2), the amount equal to 80 percent of the average number of such apprentices of the employer for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, rounded to the next lower whole number.

''(2) FIRST YEAR OF NEW APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS.—In the case of an employer which did not have any apprentices during any taxable year in the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, the applicable apprenticeship level shall be equal to zero.

''(f) COORDINATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The amount of credit otherwise allowable under sections 45A, 51(a), and 1396(a) with respect to any employee shall be reduced by the credit allowed by this section with respect to such employee.

''(g) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (i)(1) and (k) of section 51 shall apply for purposes of this section.''.

(b) CREDIT MADE PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Subsection (b) of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (35), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (36) and inserting '', plus'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(37) the apprenticeship credit determined under section 45S(a).''.

(c) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Subsection (a) of section 280C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''45S(a),'' after ''45P(a),''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 45S. Employees participating in qualified apprenticeship programs.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals commencing apprenticeship programs after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) LIMITATION ON GOVERNMENT PRINTING COSTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall coordinate with the heads of Federal departments and independent agencies to—

(1) determine which Government publications could be available on Government websites and no longer printed and to devise a strategy to reduce overall Government printing costs over the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015, except that the Director shall ensure that essential printed documents prepared for social security recipients, medicare beneficiaries, and other populations in areas with limited Internet access or use continue to remain available;

(2) establish government wide Federal guidelines on employee printing; and

(3) issue guidelines requiring every department, agency, commission, or office to list at a prominent place near the beginning of each publication distributed to the public and issued or paid for by the Federal Government—

(A) the name of the issuing agency, department, commission, or office;

(B) the total number of copies of the document printed;

(C) the collective cost of producing and printing all of the copies of the document; and

(D) the name of the entity publishing the document.

Subtitle B—Build America Bonds

SEC. 311. BUILD AMERICA BONDS MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 54AA(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''or during a period beginning on or after the date of the enactment of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015,'' after ''January 1, 2011,''.

(b) REDUCTION IN CREDIT PERCENTAGE TO BONDHOLDERS.—Subsection (b) of section 54AA of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the credit determined under this subsection with respect to any interest payment date for a build America bond is the applicable percentage of the amount of interest payable by the issuer with respect to such date.

''(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable percentage shall be determined under the following table:

''In the case of a bond issued during calendar year:	**The applicable percentage is:**
2009 or 2010	35
2014	31
2015	30
2016	29
2017 and thereafter	28.''.

(c) SPECIAL RULES.—Subsection (f) of section 54AA of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) APPLICATION OF OTHER RULES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a build America bond shall be considered a recovery zone economic development bond (as defined in section 1400U–2) for purposes of application of section 1601 of title I of division B of Public Law 111–5 (26 U.S.C. 54C note).

''(B) PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Recipients of any financial assistance authorized under this section that funds public transportation projects, as defined in Title 49, United States Code, must comply with the grant requirements described under section 5309 of such title.''.

(d) EXTENSION OF PAYMENTS TO ISSUERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6431 of such Code is amended—

(A) by inserting ''or during a period beginning on or after the date of the enactment of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015,'' after ''January 1, 2011,'' in subsection (a), and

(B) by striking ''before January 1, 2011'' in subsection (f)(1)(B) and inserting ''during a particular period''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (g) of section 54AA of such Code is amended—

(A) by inserting ''or during a period beginning on or after the date of the enactment of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015,'' after ''January 1, 2011,'', and

(B) by striking ''QUALIFIED BONDS ISSUED BEFORE 2011'' in the heading and inserting ''CERTAIN QUALIFIED BONDS''.

(e) REDUCTION IN PERCENTAGE OF PAYMENTS TO ISSUERS.—Subsection (b) of section 6431 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary'',

(2) by striking ''35 percent'' and inserting ''the applicable percentage'', and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'applicable percentage' means the percentage determined in accordance with the following table:

''In the case of a qualified bond issued during calendar year:	**The applicable percentage is:**
2009 or 2010	35
2014	31
2015	30
2016	29
2017 and thereafter	28.''.

(f) CURRENT REFUNDINGS PERMITTED.—Subsection (g) of section 54AA of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) TREATMENT OF CURRENT REFUNDING BONDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified bond' includes any bond (or series of bonds) issued to refund a qualified bond if—

''(i) the average maturity date of the issue of which the refunding bond is a part is not later than the average maturity date of the bonds to be refunded by such issue,

''(ii) the amount of the refunding bond does not exceed the outstanding amount of the refunded bond, and

''(iii) the refunded bond is redeemed not later than 90 days after the date of the issuance of the refunding bond.

''(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—In the case of a refunding bond referred to in subparagraph (A), the applicable percentage with respect to such bond under section 6431(b) shall be the lowest percentage specified in paragraph (2) of such section.

''(C) DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE MATURITY.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), average maturity shall be determined in accordance with section 147(b)(2)(A).

''(D) ISSUANCE RESTRICTION NOT APPLICABLE.—Subsection (d)(1)(B) shall not apply to a refunding bond referred to in subparagraph (A).''.

(g) CLARIFICATION RELATED TO LEVEES AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 54AA(g)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(including capital expenditures for levees and other flood control projects)'' after ''capital expenditures''.

(h) GROSS-UP OF PAYMENT TO ISSUERS IN CASE OF SEQUESTRATION.—In the case of any payment under section 6431(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 made after the date of the enactment of this Act to which sequestration applies, the amount of such payment shall be increased to an amount equal to—

(1) such payment (determined before such sequestration), multiplied by

(2) the quotient obtained by dividing 1 by the amount by which 1 exceeds the percentage reduction in such payment pursuant to such sequestration.

For purposes of this subsection, the term ''sequestration'' means any reduction in direct spending ordered in accordance with a sequestration report prepared by the Director of the Office and Management and Budget pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to obligations issued on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Export Promotion Reform

SEC. 321. IMPROVED COORDINATION OF EXPORT PROMOTION ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL AGENCIES THROUGH TRADE PROMOTION COORDINATING COMMITTEE.

(a) DUTIES OF COMMITTEE.—Section 2312(b) of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4727(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(4) in making the assessments under paragraph (5), review the proposed annual budget of each agency described in that paragraph under procedures established by the TPCC for such review, before the agency submits that budget to the Office of Management and Budget and the President for inclusion in the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and''.

(b) STRATEGIC PLAN.—Section 2312(c) of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (4) through (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) in conducting the review and developing the plan under paragraph (2), take into account recommendations from a representative number of United States exporters, in particular small businesses and medium-sized businesses, and representatives of United States workers;''.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Section 2312 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President shall take such steps as are necessary to provide the chairperson of the TPCC with the authority to ensure that the TPCC carries out each of its duties under subsection (b) and develops and implements the strategic plan under subsection (c).''.

(d) SMALL BUSINESS DEFINED.—Section 2312 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988, as amended by subsection (c), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) SMALL BUSINESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'small business' means a small business concern as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 25 U.S.C. 632).''.

SEC. 322. EFFECTIVE DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL SERVICE RESOURCES IN FOREIGN OFFICES.

Section 2301(c)(4) of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4721(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (F) as subparagraphs (C) through (G), respectively; and

(2) by striking ''(4) FOREIGN OFFICES.—(A) The Secretary may'' and inserting the following:

''(4) FOREIGN OFFICES.—(A)(i) In consultation with the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee established under section 2312(a), the Secretary shall, not less frequently than once every 5 years—

''(I) conduct a global assessment of overseas markets to identify those markets with the greatest potential for increasing United States exports; and

''(II) deploy Commercial Service personnel and other resources on the basis of the global assessment conducted under subclause (I).

''(ii) Each global assessment conducted under clause (i)(I) shall take into account recommendations from a representative number of United States exporters, in particular small businesses (as defined in section 2312(h)) and medium-sized businesses, and representatives of United States workers.

''(iii) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress the results of the most recent global assessment conducted under clause (i)(I) and a plan for deployment of personnel and resources under clause (i)(II) on the basis of that global assessment.

''(B) The Secretary may' ''.

SEC. 323. STRENGTHENED COMMERCIAL DIPLOMACY IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES EXPORTS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—Section 207(c) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3927(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including through the development of a plan, drafted in consultation with the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee established under section 2312(a) of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4727(a)), for effective diplomacy to remove or reduce obstacles to exports of United States goods and services''.

(b) ASSESSMENTS AND PROMOTIONS.—Section 603 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4003) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c)(1) Precepts for selection boards responsible for recommending promotions into and within the Senior Foreign Service shall emphasize performance which demonstrates the strong policy formulation capabilities, executive leadership qualities, and highly developed functional and area expertise, which are required for the Senior Foreign Service.

''(2) Precepts described in paragraph (1) related to functional and area expertise shall include, with respect to members of the Service with responsibilities relating to economic affairs, expertise on the effectiveness of efforts to promote the export of United States goods and services in accordance with a commercial diplomacy plan developed pursuant to section 207(c).''.

(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Section 209(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3929(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) the effectiveness of commercial diplomacy relating to the promotion of exports of United States goods and services; and''.

Subtitle D—STEM Education

SEC. 331. GRANTS FOR STEM EDUCATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to improve student academic achievement in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including computer science, by—

(1) improving instruction in such subjects through grade 12;

(2) improving student engagement in, and increasing student access to, such subjects;

(3) improving the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction by recruiting, training, and supporting highly rated teachers and providing robust tools and supports for students and teachers in such subjects; and

(4) closing student achievement gaps, and preparing more students to be college and career ready in such subjects.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) TERMS IN THE ESEA.—The terms ''elementary school'', ''secondary school'', ''Secretary'', and ''State educational agency'' shall have the meanings given the terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means—

(A) a State educational agency; or

(B) a State educational agency in partnership with 1 or more State educational agencies.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) any of the 50 States;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Bureau of Indian Education; or

(D) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(c) RESERVATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From the amounts appropriated for this section for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve—

(A) not more than 2 percent to provide technical assistance to States under this section;

(B) not more than 5 percent for State capacity-building grants under this section, if the Secretary is awarding such grants in accordance with paragraph (2); and

(C) 10 percent for STEM Master Teacher Corps programs described under subsection (g)(2).

(2) CAPACITY-BUILDING GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In any year for which funding is distributed competitively, as described in subsection (e)(1), the Secretary may award 1 capacity-building grant to each State that does not receive a grant under subsection (e), on a competitive basis, to enable such State to become more competitive in future years.

(B) DURATION.—Grants awarded under subparagraph (A) shall be for a period of 1 year.

(d) FORMULA GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year for which the amount appropriated to carry out this section, and not reserved under subsection (c)(1), is equal to or more than $300,000,000, the Secretary shall award grants to States, based on the formula described in paragraph (2) to carry out activities described in subsection (g)(1).

(2) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall allot to each State—

(A) an amount that bears the same relationship to 35 percent of the excess amount described in paragraph (1) as the number of individuals ages 5 through 17 in the State, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data, bears to the number of those individuals in all such States, as so determined; and

(B) an amount that bears the same relationship to 65 percent of the excess amount as the number of individuals ages 5 through 17 from families with incomes below the poverty line in the State, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data, bears to the number of those individuals in all such States, as so determined.

(3) FUNDING MINIMUM.—No State receiving an allotment under this subsection may receive less than ½ of 1 percent of the total amount allotted under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year.

(4) PUERTO RICO.—The amount allotted under paragraph (2) to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for a fiscal year may not exceed ½ of 1 percent of the total amount allotted under paragraph (1) for such fiscal year.

(5) REALLOTMENT OF UNUSED FUNDS.—If a State does not successfully apply, the Secretary shall reallot the amount of the State's allotment to the remaining States in accordance with this subsection.

(e) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year for which the amount appropriated to carry out this section, and not reserved under subsection (c)(1), is less than $300,000,000, the Secretary shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to enable such eligible entities to carry out the activities described in subsection (g)(1).

(2) DURATION.—Grants awarded under this subsection shall be for a period of not more than 3 years.

(3) RENEWAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible entity demonstrates progress on the performance metrics established under subsection (h)(1), the Secretary may renew a grant for an additional 2-year period.

(B) REDUCED FUNDING.—Grant funds awarded under subparagraph (A) shall be awarded at a reduced amount.

(f) APPLICATIONS.—Each eligible entity or State desiring a grant under this section, whether through a competitive grant under subsection (e) or through an allotment under subsection (d), shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require.

(g) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State or eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall use such grant funds to carry out activities to promote the subject fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics in elementary schools and secondary schools.

(2) STEM MASTER TEACHER CORPS.—The Secretary shall use funds reserved in accordance with subsection (c)(1)(C) to establish STEM Master Teacher Corps programs, which shall be programs that—

(A) elevate the status of the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teaching profession by recognizing and rewarding outstanding teachers in those subjects; and

(B) attract and retain effective science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers, particularly in high-need schools, by offering them additional compensation, instructional resources, and instructional leadership roles.

(h) PERFORMANCE METRICS AND REPORT.—

(1) PERFORMANCE METRICS.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall establish performance metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities carried out under this section.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Each State or eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Secretary, which shall include information relevant to the performance metrics described in paragraph (1).

(i) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall—

(1) acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, and in consultation with the Director of the National Science Foundation—

(A) evaluate the implementation and impact of the activities supported under this section, including progress measured by the metrics established under subsection (h)(1); and

(B) identify best practices to improve instruction in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics subjects; and

(2) disseminate, in consultation with the National Science Foundation, research on best practices to improve instruction in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics subjects.

SEC. 332. INNOVATIVE INSPIRATION SCHOOL GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) LOW-INCOME STUDENT.—The term ''low-income student'' means a student who is eligible for a free or reduced price lunch under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

(3) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term ''secondary school'' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Education.

(5) STEM.—The term ''STEM'' means science, technology, engineering (including robotics), or mathematics, and includes the field of computer science.

(6) NON-TRADITIONAL STEM TEACHING METHOD.—The term ''non-traditional STEM teaching method'' means a STEM education method or strategy such as incorporating self-directed student learning, inquiry-based learning, cooperative learning in small groups, collaboration with mentors in the field of study, and participation in STEM-related competitions.

(b) GOALS OF PROGRAM.—The goals of the Innovation Inspiration grant program are—

(1) to provide opportunities for local educational agencies to support non-traditional STEM teaching methods;

(2) to support the participation of students in nonprofit STEM competitions;

(3) to foster innovation and broaden interest in, and access to, careers in the STEM fields by investing in programs supported by educators and professional mentors who receive hands-on training and ongoing communications that strengthen the interactions of the educators and mentors with—

(A) students who are involved in STEM activities; and

(B) other students in the STEM classrooms and communities of such educators and mentors; and

(4) to encourage collaboration among students, engineers, and professional mentors.

(c) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants, on a competitive basis, to local educational agencies to enable the local educational agencies—

(A) to promote STEM in secondary schools and after school programs;

(B) to support the participation of secondary school students in non-traditional STEM teaching methods; and

(C) to broaden secondary school students' access to careers in STEM.

(2) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award each grant under this section for a period of not more than 5 years.

(3) AMOUNTS.—The Secretary shall award a grant under this section in an amount that is sufficient to carry out the goals of this section.

(d) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications from local educational agencies that propose to carry out activities that target—

(A) a rural or urban school;

(B) a low-performing school or local educational agency; or

(C) a local educational agency or school that serves low-income students.

(e) USES OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds for any of the following:

(A) STEM EDUCATION AND CAREER ACTIVITIES.—Promotion of STEM education and career activities.

(B) PURCHASE OF PARTS.—The purchase of parts and supplies needed to support participation in non-traditional STEM teaching methods.

(C) TEACHER INCENTIVES AND STIPENDS.—Incentives and stipends for teachers involved in non-traditional STEM teaching methods outside of their regular teaching duties.

(D) SUPPORT AND EXPENSES.—Support and expenses for student participation in regional and national nonprofit STEM competitions.

(E) ADDITIONAL MATERIALS AND SUPPORT.—Additional materials and support, such as equipment, facility use, technology, broadband access, and other expenses, directly associated with non-traditional STEM teaching and mentoring.

(F) OTHER ACTIVITIES.—Carrying out other activities that are related to the goals of the grant program, as described in subsection (b).

(2) PROHIBITION.—A local educational agency shall not use grant funds awarded under this section to participate in any STEM competition that is not a nonprofit competition.

(3) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Each local educational agency that receives a grant under this section may use not more than 2 percent of the grant funds for costs related to the administration of the grant project.

(f) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), each local educational agency that receives a grant under this section shall secure, toward the cost of the activities assisted under the grant, from non-Federal sources, an amount equal to 50 percent of the grant. The non-Federal contribution may be provided in cash or in-kind.

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive all or part of the matching requirement described in paragraph (1) for a local educational agency if the Secretary determines that applying the matching requirement would result in a serious financial hardship or a financial inability to carry out the goals of the grant project.

(g) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Grant funds provided to a local educational agency under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, funds that would otherwise be used for activities authorized under this section.

(h) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall establish an evaluation program to determine the efficacy of the grant program established by this section, which shall include comparing students participating in a grant project funded under this section to similar students who do not so participate, in order to assess the impact of student participation on—

(1) what courses a student takes in the future; and

(2) a student's postsecondary study.

Subtitle E—Extension of Tax Credit for Research Expenses

SEC. 341. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF RESEARCH CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 41(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2019''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2014.

Subtitle F—Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership

SEC. 351. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l)—

(1) for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, $192,450,000; and

(2) for fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary.

SA 1364. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. DRUG IMPORTATION.

(a) PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) until the Secretary of Health and Human Services promulgates regulations under section 804(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384(b)), as amended by subsection (b)(2).

(b) AMENDMENTS TO FFDCA.—Section 804 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''pharmacist or wholesaler'' and inserting ''pharmacist, wholesaler, or the head of a relevant agency of the Federal Government'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''from Canada'';

(3) in subsection (f), by striking ''Canada'' and inserting '' any country that is a party to the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement''; and

(4) in subsection (j)—

(A) in the heading of paragraph (3), by striking ''CANADA'' and inserting ''**A FOREIGN COUNTRY**''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking ''from Canada'' and inserting ''from a country that is a party to the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement''.

(c) PRESCRIPTION DRUG IMPORTATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding the importation of prescription drugs is to permit the importation of such drugs from any country that is a party to a trade agreement with the United States, pursuant to section 804 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384).

SA 1365. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES THAT CRIMINALIZE HOMOSEXUALITY.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) with a country the government of which criminalizes homosexuality or persecutes or otherwise punishes individuals on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, as identified by the Secretary of State in the most recent annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices under section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n).

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff of the Finance Committee be allowed on the Senate floor for the remainder of this week: Nikesh Patel and Jennifer Kay.

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

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1350, S. 1357, and H.R. 2048

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I understand there are three bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1350) to provide a short-term extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 1357) to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANKFORD. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS, THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL, AND EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 43, which is at the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds, the rotunda of the Capitol, and Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for official Congressional events surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2015

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 19; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1314; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator PORTMAN for up to 10 minutes.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

CURRENCY MANIPULATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer for allowing me to speak briefly about an amendment I am offering to the trade promotion authority legislation.

Also, I was not here earlier because I was unavoidably detained. I was on a flight to arrive at National Airport, and because of thunderstorms, they diverted us to Richmond, VA, where I spent about an hour this evening.

If I had been here, I would have voted yes on both the trade adjustment assistance legislation and also the religious freedom legislation that came before this Chamber earlier this evening.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to speak now about an amendment I am offering to the underlying legislation, the trade promotion authority.

This amendment is regarding currency manipulation, something we have talked a lot about in this Chamber over the last week. Now is the opportunity for us to speak with our votes on behalf of the people we represent, who believe that, yes, we should be trading with other countries. In fact, I strongly believe that we should be expanding our exports and, therefore, I support trade-opening agreements that could be negotiated under a trade promotion authority.

But I also believe that we need to level the playing field, so that while we are expanding trade and increasing our exports and therefore creating more jobs in my home State of Ohio and around the country, at the same time, we are able to tell those workers and farmers that other countries are going to be required to play by the rules.

There are lots of issues that get addressed here in this Chamber regarding leveling that playing field. One is to ensure that countries don't dump their products here in the United States, and we have language in the Customs bill that deals with that, to ensure that companies can indeed seek a remedy and seek help for that.

We also talk about subsidized products that come to the United States, to our shores, to compete unfairly. We have legislation to address that as well.

But there are other issues that need to be addressed to ensure that, again, countries are playing by the rules. One is currency manipulation.

We are in the process now of giving our government the ability to negotiate an agreement that could lower tariffs and nontariff barriers to our products, and that is a good thing, whether it is the agreement with Asia, the so-called TPP Agreement, or the agreement in Europe, the so-called TTIP Agreement and others.

But the reality is that we are also in a situation where, regardless of what agreements we negotiated, many of the benefits of those reductions in tariffs or nontariff barriers could immediately be countered by another country saying: Do you know what? I am going to intervene aggressively in international currency markets to lower the price, to lower the cost of my currency, so that my exports, specifically to United States, will be less expensive. And, by the way, it also affects other countries in the meantime. So relative to the dollar, their currency is lower, so, therefore, their exports are less expensive to us, and our exports to them are more expensive.

When I walk the shop floors in Ohio and I talk to workers and I talk to management about how this affects us in Ohio, what I hear very directly is: Rob, we are all for trade. We believe we can compete. But we need to be able to compete on a playing field where everybody is agreeing that there will be certain rules of the road.

There are rules of the road. The amendment that we are offering, despite what some people have been saying about it and what I have seen written even today, which is inaccurate—the rules of the road are actually set up by the International Monetary Fund and by the World Trade Organization, by reference to the IMF.

As an example, every single country we are negotiating with right now with regard to Trans-Pacific Partnership—the so-called TPP—is a signatory to this International Monetary Fund and to the WTO. Therefore, they are obliged to live with these rules.

Our amendment is very simple. All it says is that these rules apply just as they are currently provided for by the International Monetary Fund, and that countries, when they are negotiating with us in a trade agreement, need to be consistent with those obligations that they have undertaken and that there is an enforceability measure. In other words, if they don't do it, there will be some consequences. Right now, there is no enforcement penalty. This is one reason we continue to see in some cases currency manipulation, which in turn, again, hurts our workers and our farmers, who just want the chance to be able to compete—and compete fairly.

I would also say there has been some misinformation about this amendment out there regarding whether it would affect monetary policy. We will see under this amendment that we have clarified that—not that it was ever a question in my mind or of others who drafted it. We clarified that to the extent that we have actually said: This does not apply to monetary policy. It doesn't apply to macroeconomic policy, decisions that countries make.

Instead, again, it takes the very specific undertakings that the IMF has established for all these countries, which says: You cannot intervene in purchasing other currencies and doing so in a way to expand your exports unfairly.

So I think this is a very important debate we are having with regard to trade promotion authority. We need to get back in the business of expanding trade for our workers and our farmers.

The Presiding Officer's wheat farmers in Montana are looking forward to a chance to get into some of these markets where they have been essentially closed out because other countries have completed trade agreements lowering tariffs and we have not. So this will be good for the Presiding Officer's farmers and for the farmers in Ohio. One in every three acres they plant is now planted for export. It will be good for our soybean farmers in Ohio, as 50 percent of their crop is exported. It will be good for the workers of Ohio, as 25 percent of our manufacturing jobs are now export jobs.

But we are losing ground because over the last 7 years, we haven't been able to knock down these barriers because we haven't had this trade promotion authority, which is necessary in order to create the opportunity for us to export more.

Again, while we are doing that and using the leverage of our market here in the United States of America, the largest economy, we must also be sure that we are dealing with dumping, with subsidization, and, yes, with currency manipulation and other aspects of trade that simply aren't fair.

Recently, I received a letter signed by thousands of Ohio auto workers, and they called currency manipulation ''the most critical barrier in the 21st century.'' They get it. These are workers who work at the transmission plant in Sharonville, OH, but I see this all over Ohio. More than 1,500 UAW workers will soon manufacture Ford's medium-duty truck in Avon Lake, OH. We are really excited about that. This is actually production that was moved from Mexico to the United States.

This is what they told me: We want to be able to compete. We want to be able to keep our jobs here at Avon Lake, OH.

They said: Currency manipulation hurts American competitiveness here at home and export markets where we compete around the world.

This assembly plant's mission is to provide our customers with the highest quality, and the safest, most reliable automotive products and services, while also fostering continuous growth and prosperity for our families and the surrounding communities. That is why they say that we must ensure that trade policies do not undermine this progress in the U.S. auto industry and in U.S. manufacturing.

By the way, this letter was jointly signed not just by UAW members but also by the plant manager and other members of management at this company. Why? Because they get it. If they are working hard, making concessions, becoming more efficient to be more competitive, they are willing to do it. They know they have to. They get it. We are an international marketplace now. There is global competition. But they want to be darn sure that they aren't having an unfair advantage weighed against them because another government, as they say, cheated on their currency.

Given what we are hearing from these American workers, I have introduced this bipartisan amendment with Senator STABENOW, cracking down on currency manipulation. I have been on the floor a number of times to talk about this. I want to be sure that we have the opportunity to be able to move forward with this amendment. We also have a number of other cosponsors, including Senators BURR, BROWN, GRAHAM, CASEY, COLLINS, SCHUMER, SHAHEEN, HEITKAMP, BALDWIN, KLOBUCHAR, MANCHIN, WARREN, and DONNELLY.

We are pleased that our work here is backed up—yes—by the auto companies, including GM, Chrysler, Ford, but also by U.S. Steel, Nucor Steel, AK Steel, and others. This very idea of enforceable currency disciplines in trade has been backed up again and again. It has been endorsed by 60 Senators on the floor of the Senate through either votes or letters that they have signed and by 230 Members of the House.

Again, what it does is it gives teeth to the existing IMF and WTO rules against currency manipulation.

Some have said: Well, this is kind of a stretch. Why are we dealing with currency manipulation in this legislation? Let me remind them that the TPA bill being considered today—the one without this amendment in it, the one that was offered by Chairman HATCH, my friend ORRIN HATCH, and supported by Treasury Secretary Jack Lew—so the administration—includes a negotiating objective to address currency concerns.

So this notion that we shouldn't have this involved in the trade agreement—it is in the underlying TPA. The problem is it is not enforceable. So we say that we agree that currency manipulation is a bad thing because it distorts trade and it distorts free markets.

I am a conservative. I believe we shouldn't be encouraging distortion.

The difference between the negotiating objective in the bill and the one I am proposing is that ours is actually enforceable. It gives us the opportunity to actually make a difference in this debate, to be able to ensure that countries do indeed abide by the rules they have promised to follow as members of the International Monetary Fund.

Some have said this is a poison pill for trade. I don't quite get that. Again, trade promotion authority already includes currency manipulation. The question is whether it should be enforceable. If we believe, as we say we do, that this is wrong, why wouldn't we want to have some ability to enforce it?

As I said earlier, this legislation specifically excludes domestic monetary policy. It is now in the text of the amendment itself, which is different than it was in committee.

So I very much appreciate being allowed to speak on this tonight. I appreciate the opportunity for me to offer this amendment that I have drafted with Senators STABENOW and others. I look forward to talking more about this issue later this week. I do believe it is important that we move forward on providing the opportunity for the workers I represent, the farmers I represent, and the service providers in Ohio to expand their exports. It creates not just more jobs but good-paying jobs. On average, those jobs pay 15 to 18 percent more—and better benefits. That is important. America needs to get back in the business of expanding exports. For 7 years we haven't had that and other countries have, through hundreds of trade agreements that left us out and lowered the barriers between their countries. That hurts us. We want that market share. We don't want to lose it.

But, again, as we do that, let's be darned sure that we are giving our workers and our farmers a fair shake so they have the opportunity. If they play by the rules and they work hard, they become more efficient, they make the concessions, and they know this is going to be something where they have the opportunity to excel, to compete, and ultimately to help create jobs and opportunity here in this country.

Just as we are encouraging other countries to take on our free enterprise system and our values we hold so dear, we should also encourage them to take on these rules of fairness, including prohibiting the manipulation of currency that is explicitly directed at increasing our costs and decreasing their costs as they send exports to us.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight.

VOTE EXPLANATION

I would reiterate that I support the Brown amendment No. 1242. I was not able to be here for the vote because I was unavoidably detained and was diverted from National Airport.

I also want to say that I support the Lankford amendment No. 1237, again, regarding the religious freedoms and making that a part of trade negotiation objectives as well.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:57 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO VITILIGO MONTH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Vitiligo is an autoimmune disorder that affects over three million Americans with no known cure to combat this disorder which causes a loss of pigment cells in humans; and

Whereas, Vitiligo Bond, Inc., is an organization that continues to serve those who live with or are affected by the autoimmune disorder Vitiligo, by empowering patients, bringing attention to the disease, and leading the way to find a cure through research; and

Whereas, today millions of Americans gather to raise awareness and funds to assist individuals living with Vitiligo; and

Whereas, this unique organization has given of themselves tirelessly and unconditionally to advocate for our citizens and their families who battle Vitiligo; and

Whereas, Vitiligo Bond and other organizations have vowed to serve our district, state and nation by being the sword and shield for those who live with Vitiligo, encouraging better treatments, funding research and educating people about the disease to help heal families and strengthen our resolve to find a cure; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the millions of people who are living with Vitiligo and those who are leading the fight for the cure to end Vitiligo; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim the month of June as Vitiligo Awareness Month in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 1st day of June, 2015.

HONORING THE RANCOCAS VALLEY REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL NAVY JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable and distinguished group of young men and women from my district, The Rancocas Valley Regional High School Navy Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (NJROTC). The Rancocas Valley Regional High School NJROTC has been recognized for four consecutive years as a Distinguished Unit, and has received academic honors twice.

The Rancocas Valley Regional High School NJROTC battalion has completed almost 2,600 hours of community service and over 2,000 hours of school support. Led by 18 senior members this group has embraced and lived the Navy core values of Honor, Courage, and Commitment. Thank you to the Rancocas Valley NJROTC for your hard work and for your dedication to your community.

A TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT TREVOR IMM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Trevor Imm of Boy Scout Troop 208 in Clive, Iowa, for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout. The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained for more than a century.

Trevor Imm, now a 14-year old freshman at Prairieview School in Waukee, has been a member of the Scouts since he was a Tiger Cub with Pack 181 at Walnut Hills Elementary School in Urbandale. His parents, Mark and Rachael Imm, were his Den Leaders for four years during Cub Scouts. After earning the Arrow of Light Award, the highest award as a Webelos Scout, Trevor crossed over to Boy Scouts with Troop 208 in Clive, Iowa, where his Dad joined him as an Assistant Scoutmaster. Trevor has served in several leadership roles for the Troop and was elected by his fellow Scouts in Troop 208 to the Order of the Arrow, where he became a Brotherhood Member with the Mitigwa Lodge.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, Trevor was required to pass specific tests that are organized by objectives and merit badges, and complete an Eagle Project to benefit the community. Trevor's Eagle Project was centered around Ashworth Road Baptist Church in West Des Moines. His plans included remodeling their "For Kid's Sake Foster Family Clothing Closet." Trevor organized the remodel so that it included a fresh coat of colorful paint, new clear bins for a more organized system of storing and displaying items, the installation of new wall shelving for donated shoes, and the construction of freestanding shelves for jeans. He even led the creation of a safe play area for young children to play while parents shop.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his family in serving their community demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Trevor and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him on reaching the rank of Eagle Scout, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 2015, I inadvertently voted "nay" on Roll Call 232. I intended to vote "aye". This amendment, offered by Chairman MCCAUL of Texas, would include counterterrorism and border security activities in the list of preferred applications which the Department of Defense considers when transferring excess property to other federal agencies. This is a strong amendment, and I want the RECORD to reflect my support of it.

TRIBUTE TO MS. WINIFRED PIERCE

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, thirty-four years ago a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve as a teacher and professional educator; and

Whereas, Ms. Winifred L. Pierce has enhanced the academic curriculum of Public Schools in North Carolina, Texas and Georgia, and has increased the goodwill of the schools in my district in Gwinnett and DeKalb Counties. Her work resonates throughout the community and she has created a legacy for students through scholarships and servitude; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents as a friend, a fearless leader and a servant to ensure that all students receive the best education and skills to become outstanding leaders of our communities and nation; and

Whereas, Ms. Winifred L. Pierce is a cornerstone in our community who has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of my District and our Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Winifred L. Pierce on her retirement and to wish her well in her new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim May 23, 2015 as Ms. Winifred L. Pierce Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 23rd day of May, 2015.

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP OF TONY FRANSETTA

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tony Fransetta for a lifetime of service and leadership. Tony was born in Kimball, West Virginia. He served in the U.S. Navy for four years earning the United Nations Service Medal, Korean Service Medal, and the Good Conduct Ribbon.

Tony began working for Ford Motor Company in 1956, and stayed with the company until his retirement in 1990. During his employment with Ford Motor Company, Tony represented 15,000 employees in contract negotiations and chaired programs involving quality control, employee involvement, insurance benefits, drug treatment, and employee education. Tony also co-chaired a national joint mortality study on cancer and heart disease in the industrial workplace that was published in professional journals.

Since his retirement, Tony has served on several advisory councils for hospitals and health networks such as Kaiser Health Foundation, Southwest General Hospital, Wellington Regional Medical Center, and the Regional Medicare Advisory Council for Southeast Florida.

Currently, Tony serves as the President of the Florida Alliance for Retired Americans, an advocacy group for working and retired Americans with over 200,000 members. Tony is also the Chairman for the area Auto Retiree Council, U.A.W. Florida Retiree C.A.P., representing 26,000 retirees in Florida, Vice President of the Executive Board for Florida AFL–CIO, and General Policy Board Member for the National Alliance for Retired Americans.

In 2005, Tony was appointed as a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging (WHCOA). In 2011, Tony received the Alliance for Retired Americans President's Award. The Award read, ''presented to Tony Fransetta, President, Florida Alliance for Retired Americans, for his lifetime of public service on behalf of older Americans and for guiding and growing the Alliance for Retired Americans''.

Tony was happily married to his wife, Lena, for 49 years until she passed away in 2008. Together, they raised two beautiful daughters and have five grandchildren.

I am honored to recognize Tony Fransetta for his leadership and service to his community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call #233 for passage of Rohrabacher Amendment #51, Roll Call #234 for passage of Lamborn Amendment #312, Roll Call #235 for passage of Blumenauer Amendment #246, Roll Call #236 for passage of Lucas Amendment #119, Roll Call #237 for passage of Nadler Amendment #272, Roll Call #238 for passage of the Democrat Motion to Recommit, and Roll Call #239 for final passage of H.R. 1735 which took place Friday, May 15, 2015, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted Aye on Roll Call #233, the Rohrabacher Amendment #51, on Roll Call #234, the Lamborn Amendment #312, on Roll Call #236, the Lucas Amendment #119, and on Roll Call #239 for final passage of H.R. 1735. I would have voted Nay on Roll Call #235, the Blumenauer Amendment #246, on Roll Call #237, the Nadler Amendment #272, and on Roll Call #238 against the Motion to Recommit.

HONORING JARED DILELLO OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable and distinguished gentleman, Mr. Jared Dilello. Mr. Dilello has been employed by the United States Postal Service for the past two years.

On November 21, 2014 Mr. Dilello was working on his normal route in Willingboro, NJ. Mr. Dilello found that one of his customers was unconscious on the ground next to a vehicle along the route. With the assistance of the 911 operator, Mr. Dilello was able to revive the gentleman and extend his life. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. Dilello for his hard work and congratulate him for his dedication to the community.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. KATRICE WALKER

HON. HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called upon to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, Mrs. Katrice Stephenson Walker has answered that call by giving of herself as a secretary at Dunaire Elementary School, and as a beloved wife, daughter and friend; and

Whereas, Mrs. Walker has been chosen as the 2015 Educational Support Professional of the Year, representing Dunaire Elementary School; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents for the betterment of our community and our nation through her tireless works, unyielding support and words of encouragement; and

Whereas, Mrs. Walker is a virtuous woman, a courageous woman and a fearless leader who has shared her vision, talents and passion to help ensure that our children receive the support and education that is relevant not only for today, but well into the future, because she truly understands that our children are the future; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Katrice Stephenson Walker for her leadership and service for our District and in recognition of this singular honor as the 2015 Educational Support Professional of the Year at Dunaire Elementary School; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim May 6, 2015 as Mrs. Katrice Stephenson Walker Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 6th day of May, 2015.

JOE KECK TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Joe Keck. As the director of the Small Business Development Center in Southwest Colorado, Mr. Keck has played a vital role in enhancing the lives of the citizens in the Four Corners region.

A graduate of Fort Lewis College, Mr. Keck has been an inspiring and impactful force to the small business community of Southwest Colorado since 1975. Joe assisted the Ute Mountain Ute and Southern Ute Indian Tribes in a planning and economic advisory capacity before becoming a small business owner himself in 1993. Today, he and his wife carry on that tradition as joint-owners of Susie's Hallmark in Cortez. By providing counseling, training and other program services tailored to the individual needs of small businesses, Joe has helped many businesses manage the uneasiness of the startup phase so that they may then grow and prosper.

A tireless and dedicated pillar of the community, Mr. Keck's role as a public servant spans across multiple organizations. Including a lengthy stint of eight years of service on the Cortez City Council, Joe has sat on the Colorado Aeronautical Board and Region 9 Economic Development District Board. To ensure fair representation of Western Colorado in the legislature, he has been an active member of Club 20 and worked vigorously as a member of its board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Keck's selfless work and dedication to serving his community is truly to be admired. I stand with the residents of Southwest Colorado in thanking Joe and congratulating him on a remarkable career of public service. I'm honored to know Joe and even though he is retiring from his post as the director of SBDC, he leaves with us an enriched Southwestern community situated for a successful future.

A TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT MASON JEFFRIES

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mason Jeffries of Boy Scout Troop 208 in Clive, Iowa, for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout. The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained for more than a century.

Mason joined Cub Scout Pack 181 in 2007 as a first grader at Walnut Hills Elementary School in Urbandale. He became the Pack's Top Popcorn Salesman for four consecutive years—reaching sales records above $3,000 a year—and even earning a college scholarship. He earned Cub Scout's highest award, the Arrow of Light, as a Webelos Scout before crossing over to Boy Scout Troop 208 in Clive, where his parents, Pete and Kristin Jeffries, are active in Troop Leadership.

As a Boy Scout, Mason has volunteered in the community with the Variety Telethon, Waukee Food Pantry, Clive Greenbelt Park, Meals for the Heartland, Vacation Bible School, and various other Eagle Scout projects. Due to his dedication to the community, he was honored by his fellow Scouts in Troop 208 who elected him to serve in the Order of the Arrow, where he became a Brotherhood Member with the Mitigwa Lodge. Mason has held a number of leadership roles in Troop 208, including Senior Patrol Leader, Assistant Senior Patrol Leader, Librarian, Scribe, and twice as Patrol Leader.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout must pass specific tests organized by requirements and merit badges, and complete an Eagle Project to benefit the community. For his Eagle Scout Service Project, Mason refurbished the front of the Waukee Public Library after the construction of the facility's new addition in 2014. He led a group of Scouts and adults in pulling up all the existing shrubs, bushes and plants, adding metal edging, planting over 30 grasses, shrubs and plants, and finishing the landscaping with new mulch and decorative rocks.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his family's service to their community demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent Mason and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him on reaching the rank of Eagle Scout, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

CELEBRATING THE GRAND OPENING OF THE SHELBYVILLE-BEDFORD COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to recognize the grand opening of the Shelbyville-Bedford County Public Library, formerly the Argie Cooper Public Library.

In any community, libraries serve an extremely important role by operating as a point of access for literary classics, promoting educational opportunities for local citizens, and fostering a love for reading in both children and adults. The Shelbyville-Bedford County Public Library has done all of these things, both meeting and exceeding our community's demands for educational resources and programs.

The new library is a tremendous asset to Bedford County and is the result of decades of a lot of good people doing great things for their community. We are all very excited to see a long-awaited dream become a beautiful reality, possessing a sense of the past while embracing the future.

I wish the best and look forward to the library's many years of service to Bedford County and its residents.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. BENITA OSBEY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of Mrs. Benita Ann Robinson Osbey, she gave of herself to better our community and the causes that were near and dear to her heart; and

Whereas, Mrs. Osbey's work is present in DeKalb County, Georgia for all to see, being an advocate for the youth, education, ovarian cancer support and research; and

Whereas, this remarkable woman gave of herself, her time, her talent and her life; never asking for fame or fortune but only to uplift those in need; and

Whereas, Mrs. Benita Ann Robinson Osbey led by doing, behind the scenes, as well as front and center for the city of Los Angeles, California, DeKalb County, Georgia, the Georgia Ovarian Cancer Alliance, her beloved church Saint Phillip African Methodist Episcopal Church, and for her beloved Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.; and

Whereas, this virtuous Proverbs 31 woman was a wife, daughter, niece, sister, aunt and a friend; she was a warrior, a matriarch, and a woman of great integrity; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional recognition on Mrs. Benita Ann Robinson Osbey for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens of Georgia and throughout the Nation; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Mrs. Benita Ann Robinson Osbey of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor."

Mrs. Benita Ann Robinson Osbey, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 3rd day of May, 2015.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SSGT FALEAGAFULU ILAOA

HON. AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Staff Sergeant (SSGT) Faleagafulu Ilaoa, who lost his life while serving our great nation.

Ilaoa, whose parents hailed from the village of Leone, American Samoa was born on April 6, 1948, in San Francisco, CA, SSGT Ilaoa spent his youth like many of us do . . . dreaming of one day serving his country in our armed forces. Never to be deterred from his goals; following graduation from high school, Ilaoa joined the Air Force as a Military Policeman. These men not only serve as police officers to their fellow service members, but also participated in rescue operations, often in hostile territory.

On Monday, May 13, 1975, the U.S. merchant ship *Mayaguez* was seized by Khmer Rouge forces off the coast of Cambodia. The following evening a rescue operation to save those on board the merchant vessel was launched by the Air Force's 56th Security Police Squadron (SPS).

At around 8:30 in the evening, on route to the *Mayaguez*, the Chinook helicopter carrying the 23 security police operators, including SSGT Ilaoa disappeared from radar approximately 40 miles from their base in a remote area of Northwest Thailand. To this day, the cause of the crash, whether it was mechanical malfunction, pilot error or enemy fire, is not known.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to join me recognizing the sacrifice of all who lost their lives on this mission and I personally would like to salute SSGT Ilaoa for his service to our nation and the proud legacy he left for all American Samoans.

HONORING THE BRAUN FAMILY

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a family whose commitment to service and Jewish prayer, study and music at my own synagogue, Valley Beth Shalom, spans more than six decades. The Braun family's dedication to Valley Beth Shalom has enriched the lives of our congregation and strengthened our community.

In 1960, Dick and Barbara Braun became members of Valley Beth Shalom. During the past fifty-five years, five generations of the Braun family have been involved in Valley Beth Shalom synagogue life. This includes, in addition to Dick and Barbara, Dick's mother Elisabeth, Dick and Barbara's four children and their spouses—Jon and Lynn, David and Sherri (of blessed memory) and Ellen, Robert and Sandra, Sarah and Shai, as well as their nine grandchildren and their spouses, and finally a great grandchild.

The contributions of the Braun family to Valley Beth Shalom are legend. Dick has sung in the congregational choir and served as Hazzan Sheyni since 1968. He has served on the Valley Beth Shalom Board of Directors for more than 40 years and also served on the Executive Committee. Barbara is also a long time member of the synagogue choir, and was an involved member of the Sisterhood and a member of the first class of the Valley Beth Shalom Counseling Center where she served for over 20 years. Jon and his wife Lynn have also served on the Valley Beth Shalom Board of Directors, and Lynn has chaired the Annual Gala Event and served on the Executive Committee of the synagogue. David is a member of the Valley Beth Shalom Board, the Board of the Schulweis Institute and is a Vice-President-elect of the congregation. Nate, one of the grandchildren, is secretary of the synagogue's Board, and his wife, Effie, is a Board member. In addition to all of the family's leadership contributions to the synagogue, members of the Braun family have also been generous benefactors of Valley Beth Shalom in support of all of its enriching programs.

The Braun family's contributions to the community reach farther than just our congregation: Dick is a general surgeon, who for many years was the chief of surgery at Kaiser Permanente in Panorama City. Barbara was an elementary school teacher. Among the four children and their spouses are four physicians, a mental health therapist, an attorney, a teacher and a rabbi. Dick is also the founder and chairman of the Jewish Music Commission of Los Angeles, which brings new Jewish music into the life of the community. Lynn visits my Washington, D.C. office every year to meet with me as an advocate for the American Academy of Ophthalmology.

I am proud to be part of a synagogue that values these contributions by honoring the Braun family in their Family of the Year Celebration. They are living the legacy of our teacher and late rabbi, Rabbi Harold M. Schulweis. I thank the Braun family for their significant contributions towards bettering our synagogue and our community.

TRIBUTE TO MR. BOBBY LEE GLEATON, JR.

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals and families whose loved ones have given the "last full measure of devotion" by serving our country; and

Whereas, Mr. Bobby Lee Gleaton, Jr., an American hero, grew up and was educated in the Fourth District; and

Whereas, Bobby Lee Gleaton, Jr., who led an exemplary life, was born October 17, 1989 and received his education from Cedar Grove Elementary, Cedar Grove Middle School and Cedar Grove High School where he received a full band scholarship to Morris Brown College and ultimately became a member of the Purple Haze Drum Line; and

Whereas, he enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserve as a Medical Logistics Specialist (E4) that was assigned to the 384th Medical Logistics Company in Fort Gillem, GA; and

Whereas, he faithfully served his Country until April 4th, 2015 when he departed this life as we know it; and

Whereas, this remarkable young man gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life as a soldier, a son, a brother, a servant of the Lord, a musician-drum major and friend to many; and

Whereas, this nation owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to him and his family who made a great sacrifice to serve this Country and;

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Mr. Bobby Lee Gleaton, Jr., as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Mr. Bobby Lee Gleaton, Jr., is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor" by declaring Mr. Bobby Lee Gleaton, Jr., U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 9th day of April, 2015.

HONORING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF GLADYS AGATHA MORTON

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to recognize Gladys Agatha Morton and the many contributions she has made as she prepares to celebrate her 90th birthday. Gladys is a consummate community leader, a kind and generous person who has been dedicated to her family and the City of Saint Paul, Minnesota throughout her life. She has made a lasting and positive impact on Saint Paul families and neighborhoods.

Born in Ramsey County, Minnesota on May 31, 1925 to Eli and Christine Preble, Gladys has always considered the East Side of Saint Paul home. In 1953 she married Russell Morton and raised a son named Philip. Like many East Siders, Gladys became a valued employee at 3M, serving as a Payroll Manager.

Soon Gladys found herself very busy outside of work and family too—volunteering and serving on behalf of her community. Her work ethic, knowledge and commitment to the city earned her appointment to numerous leadership positions. She served on the Board of Zoning Appeals for 40 years, the Saint Paul Planning Commission for 23 years, the Saint Paul Charter Commission and even as an interim Ward 7 Saint Paul City Councilmember in 1997. In 2000, Gladys earned a place in U.S. history serving as a Minnesota Elector for the 2000 Presidential Election.

Gladys had a hand in shaping every neighborhood in Saint Paul, but her passion has always been rooted in the East Side. She chaired numerous local task forces and the North East Neighborhoods Development Corporation. Her guidance helped develop Saint Paul into the beautiful and economically vibrant community that we enjoy today. Few can match her expertise and knowledge on municipal zoning, planning regulations and economic development.

Now Gladys spends much of her time with the people who give her the greatest joy in life: her granddaughter Lisette, and her husband Hugh, and great-granddaughter Elissa. It is no surprise that Gladys' enthusiasm for public service has been passed on to Lisette. I know that she is very proud of her granddaughter's own public service career, which began with my friend and predecessor, the late Congressman Bruce Vento, and continues today serving as Legislative Director for Congressman JERROLD NADLER of New York.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in rising to honor Gladys Agatha Morton on her 90th birthday. As many family and admirers prepare to gather and wish her well, we can all recognize the great inspiration her service is to all of us who strive to make our country better.

A TRIBUTE TO JERRY CLARK

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jerry Clark for his many years of service on the Guthrie County Fair Board.

Mr. Clark represented Dodge Township for more than 40 years on the fair board, just like his father had done before him. His grandson, Collin Clark, has now stepped into the role and will continue the family's hard work on the Guthrie County Fair Board that began 50 years ago with his great-grandfather.

I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress join me in commending Mr. Jerry Clark for his service to Guthrie County and wish him the best following his retirement from his duties. It is an honor to represent Iowans like him in Congress, and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO LATOYA JOWERS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, our greatest and most valuable assets are our children. Our children are the future and are educated and guided by our teachers; and

Whereas, Ms. LaToya Jowers is a teacher in DeKalb County, Georgia and an educator at Dunaire Elementary School, who has demonstrated fifteen years of leadership and service to our children and our district; and

Whereas, Ms. Jowers has been awarded the honor of Teacher of the Year 2015, representing Dunaire Elementary School; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman is not only active at Dunaire Elementary School, but also in our community, her sorority, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., and her church, Greater Travelers Rest Baptist Church in Decatur, Georgia; and

Whereas, Ms. Jowers can be described as a Proverbs 31 woman. She is devoted to serving our community daily as an educator who imparts knowledge and skills for the success of our children. She is a motivator, an innovator and a model citizen who gives and ask for nothing in return; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. LaToya Jowers for her leadership and service for our District and in recognition of this singular honor as 2015 Teacher of the Year at Dunaire Elementary School; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim May 6, 2015 as Ms. LaToya Jowers Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 6th day of May, 2015.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILIES OF THE MARINES THAT DIED IN THE HELICOPTER CRASH IN NEPAL ON MAY 12, 2015

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as the co-chair of the Congressional Nepal Caucus and as an ardent supporter of the U.S. Military, to express my deepest condolences to the families of the six U.S. Marines and two Nepali soldiers, who died in the helicopter crash last Tuesday, May 12, 2015 in Nepal.

As we all know, Nepal suffered from the catastrophic 7.8 magnitude earthquake that hit Saturday, April 25, 2015, as well as many large aftershocks, including a 7.3 magnitude aftershock on May 12, 2015. Reports indicate that more than 8,000 people have been killed and 17,000 people have been injured in this poor and fragile country.

Among the first responders to this crisis were our dedicated men and women of the U.S. Marine Corps. America has a long and honorable history of humanitarian assistance during worldwide disasters and conflicts, and our men and women in uniform have consistently put themselves in harm's way to protect America and to protect our allies during times of need.

On this occasion, the eight were aboard a UH–1Y Huey helicopter that disappeared over northern Nepal, during a trip to fly relief materials to stricken villages.

Capt. Dustin R. Lukasiewicz of Nebraska; Capt. Christopher L. Norgren of Kansas; Sgt. Ward M. Johnson IV of Florida; Sgt. Eric M. Seaman of California; Cpl. Sara A. Medina of Illinois, and Lance Cpl. Jacob A. Hug of Arizona have paid the ultimate sacrifice for the sake of the Nepalis, and they make me proud, once again, to be an American.

I am grateful for the leadership and dedication of Ambassador Bodde, the U.S. Embassy team in Nepal, the Department of Defense, and our service men and women for their efforts and their sacrifices to aid Nepal. To the people of Nepal, the United States stands with you during this difficult time. To the families of the six Marines, we thank you for paying the ultimate sacrifice, and our prayers are with you during this time of loss and immeasurable sadness.

HONORING SENIOR CORPS WEEK AND THE SERVICE OF OLDER AMERICANS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of national Senior Corps week.

Older Americans bring a lifetime of skills and experience as parents, workers, and citizens that can be tapped to meet challenges in our communities.

For more than four decades Senior Corps, and its three programs—RSVP, Senior Companions, and Foster Grandparents—have proven to be a highly effective way to engage Americans ages 55 and over in meeting national and community needs.

Each year Senior Corps provides opportunities for nearly 330,000 older Americans across the nation, including approximately 450 in Southern Arizona, to serve their communities. Foster Grandparents serve one-on-one as tutors and mentors to young Arizonans who have special needs. Senior Companions help homebound Arizona seniors and other adults maintain independence in their own homes. RSVP volunteers conduct safety patrols for local police departments, protect the environment, tutor and mentor youth, respond to natural disasters, and provide other services through more than 130 groups across Arizona.

Senior Corps volunteers last year provided more than 96.2 million hours of service, helping to improve the lives of our most vulnerable citizens, strengthen our educational system, protect our environment, provide independent living services, and contribute to our public safety.

Senior Corps volunteers build a capacity of organizations and communities by serving through more than 65,000 nonprofit, community, educational, and faith-based community groups nationwide.

At a time of mounting social needs and growing interest in service by older Americans, there is an unprecedented opportunity to harness the talents of 55-plus volunteers to address community challenges.

Service by older Americans helps volunteers by keeping them active, healthy, and engaged; helps our communities by solving local problems, and helps our nation by saving taxpayer dollars, reducing healthcare costs, and strengthening our democracy.

The sixth annual Senior Corps Week, taking place May 18–22, 2015, is a time to thank Senior Corps volunteers for their service and recognize their positive impact and value to our communities and nation.

HONORING DR. ROY GLEN BROWER

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor my constituent, Dr. Roy Glen Brower, Professor of Medicine and the Medical Director of the Medical Intensive Care Unit at Johns Hopkins Hospital, on the occasion of his receipt of the American Thoracic Society's Assembly on Critical Care 7th Annual Lifetime Achievement Award.

Originally from Kingston, New York, Dr. Brower graduated from Cornell University in 1972 and the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine in 1976. He subsequently completed his Internship and Residency in Internal Medicine at Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1979.

Feeling the need for one last adventure, Dr. Brower traveled to Keams Canyon, Arizona, with his wife, Theresa Brower, in 1979. He became a Medical Officer in the Indian Health Service, working at the Keams Canyon Indian Hospital and Clinics.

After returning to Baltimore in 1981 and completing his Fellowship in Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine at the Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Brower began what has become a long and illustrious career at the Johns Hopkins Hospital. While his accomplishments and contributions to critical care medicine are too numerous to list here, several deserve special mention.

In 1988, Dr. Brower became the Director of the Critical Care Medicine Program in the Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine and the Medical Director of the Medical Intensive Care Unit, positions he continues to hold and excel at to this day.

In 2000, Dr. Brower and his colleagues in the Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) Network published ''Ventilation with Lower Tidal Volumes as Compared with Traditional Tidal Volumes for Acute Lung Injury and the Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome'' in the New England Journal of Medicine. Dr. Brower served as the Chair of the Protocol and Writing Committees for this study, which reduced fatalities of Intensive Care Unit patients with ARDS by 9 percent. Dr. Brower's study became the second most cited medical publication for a decade.

Dr. Brower is a devoted and loving husband, father, son, brother, and friend. His research has saved the lives of thousands and advanced the field of medicine all over the world. He has been called the foundation of the Johns Hopkins critical care group, a role model for his division and beyond, and an outstanding teacher. His family and colleagues have no doubt that he fights for the best in science and medicine. He is in the right war at the right time.

TRIBUTE TO CROSSROADSNEWS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, CrossRoadsNews began publishing in 1995, bringing a much-needed voice to and for the citizens of South DeKalb County; and

Whereas, Jennifer and Curtis Parker—journalists extraordinaire—published the first issue of CrossRoadsNews on their personal computer in their Decatur home with the desire and vision to touch the lives of thousands in their community by informing, educating and enlightening their neighbors on issues that affect the quality of life, county services and economic impact of businesses in South DeKalb. The first 3,000 copies were circulated among twenty eight subdivisions along Kelly Chapel and Wesley Chapel roads; and

Whereas, in 2001, CrossRoadsNews was publishing twice per month with a circulation of 15,000; In 2005, CrossRoadsNews was publishing weekly and has since been publishing in print and online reaching an audience of more than 188,000 with 28,000 copies published weekly; and

Whereas, with the power of the pen and the consensus of the community, CrossRoadsNews is keeping the community active with its award-winning reporting, community health fairs and educational panels thanks to a stellar team of editors, reporters and employees; and

Whereas, CrossRoadsNews is a great example of the American Dream writ large, a family-owned operation providing excellent service, employment opportunities and top-notch journalism that "keeps America honest" and thus contributes to the local and state economy; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia is today, officially honoring, recognizing and congratulating CrossRoadsNews, on their twenty (20th) year anniversary as a business anchor in our District; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim April 25, 2015 as CrossRoadsNews, Inc. Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of April, 2015.

HONORING WALTER ROGER JOHNSON, SR. FOR HIS SERVICE TO OUR NATION

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 2015, Americans celebrated the 70th anniversary of V–E Day, the day that the United States and its allies accepted the unconditional surrender of Nazi Germany—and celebrated the end of World War II (WWII) in Europe. I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring and celebrating the life of Walter Roger Johnson, Sr., an American hero, for his significant accomplishments and service to the United States during WWII. Mr. Johnson not only served his country as a "Buffalo Soldier" in both the U.S. 10th and 28th Horse Cavalry Regiments, he also served as a soldier on the "Red Ball Express" in the 3825th Quartermaster Truck Company while overseas.

Walter Roger Johnson, Sr., a native Washingtonian, was fascinated by the colored soldiers he saw riding horseback trot past his home, on D.C.'s then dirt roads. His admiration of the soldiers prompted him to run away and join the Cavalry, but at age 15 he was sent home. In February 1943, Mr. Johnson enlisted in the army at Ft. Myer, Virginia. He served in the 10th Horse Cavalry Regiment and finally in the 28th Horse Cavalry at Camp Lockett, CA, the U.S.'s final Horse Cavalry Regiment. The 28th served double duty as the southern defense for the Western Defense Command. It's there that he earned the rankings of a rifle "sharpshooter" and an "expert" with a .45 pistol. Mr. Johnson would jokingly say, "I hit hard, shoot straight, and cut deep!"

In March 1944, the 28th was shipped to North Africa, inactivated, and converted into a Combat Service Support Troop. Mr. Johnson was assigned to the 3825th Quartermaster Truck Company, which later became a part of WWII's most massive logistics operation, the "Red Ball Express," an operation primarily manned by colored soldiers. Mr. Johnson served as a "Red Ball Express" truck driver—in which he, along with his unit, hauled supplies, 24/7, to the First and Third Armies so that the Army could continue their advancement across France.

A proud descendant of Native Americans and African Africans, Mr. Johnson never faltered in telling his proud story of being an American soldier, American champion, and champion of liberty, equality, and dignity. Like millions of nameless, faceless colored men, Mr. Johnson was an American war hero who helped win wars for this great country, but was unable to win the fight for freedom right here at home.

Mr. Johnson was decorated with the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the WWII Victory Medal, and the Lapel Button. He was honorably discharged in November of 1945 at Camp Campbell, Kentucky.

In the summer of 2014, coinciding with the 70th anniversary of D-Day, June 6, 1944, Mr. Johnson's story was published in the following three publications, "The Rocket," "Dispatches," and "Aspirations" under the title "World War II Soldier Remembered: From Buffalo Soldier to Red Ball Express Soldier."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House join me in honoring Walter Roger Johnson, Sr., for his service to our Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE SPORTS SHOOTING TEAM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Southwestern Community College Sport Shooting team for winning the Iowa Collegiate Shooting Sports Conference Championship.

The SWCC Spartans won the championship by more than 90 targets, and claimed individual titles in the male division, by Brandon Dvorsky, and the female division, by Shelby Woods. Their performance in the Conference Championship capped off a great season that included being the Iowa Collegiate Shooting Sports Conference Champions and the Iowa Department of Natural Resources State Champions. They finished the season undefeated in all conference competitions, and placed sixth at the National competition.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by these students and coaches demonstrates that hard work, dedication, and perseverance deliver results. I am honored to represent them in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating the SWCC Sports Shooting team on their accomplishments this year. I wish nothing but continued success to the dedicated members of this team and Southwestern Community College moving forward.

THANKING ANDREW STRAUGHAN FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank Andrew Straughan from Maryland's Fifth District who will be retiring in June after more than thirty-three years of outstanding service to this House in a number of administrative and support roles. I am proud to represent him in Congress.

Andrew began his career with the House in 1982 as a laborer, delivering furniture to Members' offices and Committee rooms for the Office of the Clerk. By the following year, he was appointed as an inventory control clerk, conducting inventory of office furnishings, assisting in storeroom management, and helping to create a report for the General Services Administration.

When the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer was created, Mr. Straughan was named Assistant Supervisor of the Asset Management Division, requiring him to act as a liaison between the Department of Office Furnishings and the House Information Systems. His abilities caught the attention of management, and in 1994 he was named Manager of Logistics and Central Receiving and Warehousing, where he oversaw the Office Supply Warehouse.

From 2008 to 2010, Andrew was detailed as the manager of the Logistics Department, where he developed policies and oversaw a staff of more than forty employees. He then returned to his role as Manager of Central Receiving and Warehousing, the position he currently holds.

Among his proudest accomplishments are being a member of the Source Selection Team for FAIMS, a governmental computer program, and choosing the vendors for purchasing. He was named the Contracting Office Representative for both the Warehousing Contract and the Temporary Labor Contract for temporary staff hired during Congressional transitions.

Andrew's father, Walter Straughan, also spent his career with the House as an electrician, and his brother, Danny Straughan, currently works for the Senate's Electrical Department.

I congratulate Andrew, and I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him for his distinguished service to the House and to our country. I wish him and his family all the best as Andrew begins a new chapter in his life.

CELEBRATING THE BIRTH OF JAMES HENRY JACKSON

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Megan Spindel Jackson and her husband, Kyle Jackson, on the birth of their son, James Henry Jackson.

Henry was born at 11:38 a.m. on Saturday, May 16, 2015. Weighing in at 7lbs, 15oz, Henry has his parents beaming with pride.

With Megan, my Legislative Director/Deputy Chief of Staff as his mother, and Kyle, Congressman JEB HENSARLING's (TX–05) Legislative Director/Deputy Chief of Staff as his father, I trust Henry will be climbing the Capitol Hill ladder in no time at all.

Megan has been an integral part of my office's legislative operation since I first came to Washington, and I am excited to witness her grow into her most important role yet—a Mom. I have no doubt that Megan and Kyle will be phenomenal parents, who are devoted to Henry's well-being and bright future.

Congratulations and best wishes to the Spindel and Jackson families.

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR ULYSSES PONDER

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, Pastor Ulysses Ponder has given of himself to lead Poplar Springs Baptist Church these past twenty-seven (27) years; and

Whereas, Pastor Ponder under the guidance of God has pioneered and sustained Poplar Springs Baptist Church as a known crowned jewel in our district for years, enriching the lives of thousands; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has shared his time and talents for the betterment of our community over the past twenty-seven (27) years by preaching the gospel, teaching the gospel and living the gospel; and

Whereas, Pastor Ponder serves as a man of the cloth in the church, community and family: he is always teaching the Word and he puts the Word into action daily; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Pastor Ulysses Ponder for his leadership and service for our District as he celebrates his 27th Pastoral anniversary; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim May 3, 2015 as Pastor Ulysses Ponder Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 3rd day of May, 2015.

CONGRATULATING THE GRAND HAVEN VFW POST ON 10 SUCCESSFUL YEARS OF RIB FEST

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Grand Haven VFW Post 2326 for their efforts to assist veterans and their families through their annual "Rib Fest" fundraiser event.

Celebrating its 10th year, the Rib Fest event brings together West Michigan restaurants to compete in an event that raises funds for veterans and their families as well as maintaining the group's individual VFW post.

The event's most significant community contribution is the Ward-Goff Scholarship Fund established by VFW members in honor of Elwin Ward and Richard Goff. The Ward-Goff Scholarship is awarded to a child, grandchild or great-grandchild of a good-standing member of the Grand Haven VFW post. Each year the award is given in remembrance of these two American patriots who gave their lives for their country during the Vietnam War.

Through their events like the annual Rib Fest, or many other areas of community involvement, the Grand Haven VFW Post 2326 continues to prove to future generations the values that make America great. I wish the 2015 Rib Fest all of the best, and look forward to sharing a meal with our veterans.

RECOGNIZING NOAH MASIH, WINNER OF NATIONAL NUMBER KNOCKOUT

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Noah Masih, a 6th grader from Clearwater, Minnesota. Noah is a national champion, having recently won the National Number Knockout.

The National Number Knockout is a math competition for students ages 9–14, and competitors play to improve their calculating speed. The competition involves a board of 36 numbers and use of dice to create an additional variable. Noah beat out 15 other finalists to claim the title.

I am always awestruck by those who find their passion in numbers. Noah's feat is nothing short of impressive, and is a testament to a fantastic homeschooling program.

I know I speak for the 6th District when I say we are so proud of Noah and his accomplishments, and I look forward with eager anticipation to seeing what the future holds for this bright young scholar.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this body join me in congratulating Noah Masih on his success in mathematics.

A TRIBUTE TO ELLEN LEMKE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ellen Lemke of Bedford, Iowa on the celebration of her 100th birthday today, on May 18, 2015.

Ellen is a pillar of her community and has a legacy of service to others that we should all aspire to. She is still an active member in her community who volunteers her time at the local nursing home where, as she says, she likes to "read to the old folks." She also stays involved in her church and other community organizations like the Community Singers, a group that travels to nine surrounding communities to perform to nursing homes. She was awarded the 2013 Iowan of the Day award, an honor that is bestowed to Iowans who have truly made a difference in their communities. She continues to write a weekly news column for the local paper, the Bedford Times Press.

She has exhibited the integrity, Iowa pride, hard work and dedication that make all of us proud. She has left an incredible legacy to her family that includes her children Rita and Henry, and her community as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Ellen in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Ms. Lemke on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her continued health and happiness in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I will be absent from the House May 18th through May 21st to attend my daughter's wedding.

TRIBUTE TO REV. NIOLENE A. DURHAM

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, twenty years ago a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to preach and teach the gospel of Jesus Christ at Amanda Flipper African Methodist Episcopal Church in Decatur, Georgia; and

Whereas, the Reverend Niolene A. Durham under the guidance of God has pioneered and sustained Amanda Flipper African Methodist Episcopal Church as an instrument in our community that uplifts the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman of God has shared her time and talents for the betterment of our community and our nation through her inspiration, words of encouragement, tireless works, and outreach ministries, that have been and continue to be a beacon of light to those in need; and

Whereas, Pastor Durham is a spiritual warrior, a woman of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all she is a visionary who impacted and transformed our society as a whole by sharing the gospel of Jesus Christ with not only her Church, but with also our District and the world; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Pastor Niolene A. Durham for her outstanding leadership and service to our District; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim April 25, 2015 as Reverend Niolene A. Durham Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of April, 2015.

HONORING JOSHUE LEYVA FOR HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND UNWAVERING DEDICATION TO SERVING HIS COMMUNITY AND THE COACHELLA VALLEY

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Mr. Joshue Leyva, a mature young pre-medical student. Joshue's talent, integrity, dedication and passion for community service are indications that he unquestionably will fulfill his goal of becoming a doctor and serve the underserved communities of the Coachella Valley.

Joshue, a second generation immigrant, is a shining example of how migrant families contribute to and make our great nation stronger. When Joshue's family arrived in the U.S. in 1980, they came with nothing, searching for a new beginning and a better life for their children. Overcoming hardship through hard work, their son Joshue became the first in his family to graduate from a university, my own alma mater, the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA).

Despite his young age, Joshue has an extensive list of accomplishments. He was one of the first student participants in the Future Physician Leaders (FPL) mentorship program, created to address the physician shortage crisis in our communities. In 2011 Joshue showcased his leadership, becoming the founder of "A Healthier Future," a community outreach program to provide health education and medical screenings to the most vulnerable populations in the Coachella Valley. He was also a lead research and volunteer coordinator for the Coachella Valley Healthcare Initiative. Joshue's dedication to community service also crossed national borders when he became a volunteer for the Ministerio de Salud, a program that every year gives free medical care to vulnerable populations in the city of Guadalajara, Mexico.

Joshue Leyva has been an integral and essential part of my District staff, committed to excellence in public service for the betterment of our communities. As he leaves my office to pursue his dreams—an American Dream—I wish him well and look forward to reading about his future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALEXANDER H. ISAAC, JR. FOR HIS OUTSTANDING MILITARY SERVICE ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives join me in recognizing Lieutenant Colonel Alexander H. Isaac, Jr., for his 22 years of distinguished military service and to congratulate him on his retirement from the United States Armed Forces.

Lieutenant Colonel Alexander H. Isaac, Jr. has been decorated with numerous medals, awards and service distinctions. It is my honor to recognize such a distinguished citizen.

LTC Isaac began serving his nation in the United States Army in 1993 with the 3rd Battalion, 14th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade, 10th Mountain Division (Light Infantry). Here he served as a Rifle Platoon Leader, Assistant Operations Officer, and as a Rifle Company Executive Officer. During his time with the "Golden Dragons," LTC Isaac had multiple deployments throughout the United States, Central America, and a deployment to Haiti as part of Operation UPHOLD DEMOCRACY. In 1999, LTC Isaac assumed command of A Company, 2–2 Infantry, and his company was deployed to Kosovo in support of Operation JOINT GUARDIAN.

In 2001, LTC Isaac was assigned to Military District of Washington as a project officer where he designed the command's centralized Cyber Operations Center. In 2003, LTC Isaac was selected to support the Coalition Provisional Authorities' staff as Special Projects Liaison between the Iraqi Ministry of Communications and U.S. Embassy in Iraq.

In 2010, LTC Isaac was selected as the Task Force liaison to the National Counterterrorism Center in McLean, Virginia. In 2011, LTC Isaac was one of three officers responsible for the establishment of a robust data analytics program within Special Operations Command as well as implementing a next-generation visualization system for the Joint Interagency Task Force—National Capital Region, a subordinate unit within Joint Special Operations Command.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Lieutenant Colonel Alexander H. Isaac, Jr. and extend my heartfelt appreciation to him for his years of service to our great country.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEAD START PROGRAMS

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Head Start program. Since its enactment, Head Start has helped more than 30 million families prepare for a lifetime of learning. Last year, nearly 36 thousand children in my district were a part of this program.

Head Start's fundamental purpose is to ensure that every child starts life on an equal playing field, regardless of their parents' income, country of origin, or zip code. It provides hard-working families access to comprehensive preschool programs that include nutritional, social and other services critical to early childhood development. Education is our nation's great equalizer—and few investments are more meaningful and have a larger return to society than programs like Head Start.

It's simple: when children receive quality, early childhood education, we give them the best chance to succeed. Studies have shown that kids who have been through Head Start are healthier, more academically accomplished, and more likely to make positive contributions to society.

My family understands first-hand just how life changing this program is. Head Start gave my family the tools we needed to succeed; tools that stretched well beyond the classroom. I would not be here today if it were not for the life changing resources and quality education that Head Start provided. On this 50th anniversary of Head Start, I renew my commitment to strengthening and extending this vital program, so that every child—regardless of their circumstance—has the best opportunity and chance to succeed in life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, – Friday, May 15, 2015 I was away from the Capitol to attend my daughter's graduation from the University of Missouri Medical School. Due to this event, I was unable to vote on any legislative measures on this date.

On the amendment of Mr. ROHRABACHER of California, Amendment No. 23 to H.R. 1735, Rollcall Vote No. 233, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On the amendment of Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado, Amendment No. 27 to H.R. 1735, Rollcall Vote No. 234, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On the amendment of Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon, Amendment No. 32 to H.R. 1735, Rollcall Vote No. 235 to H.R. 1735, had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

On the amendment of Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Amendment No. 38 to H.R. 1735, Rollcall Vote No. 236, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On the amendment of Mr. NADLER of New York, Amendment No. 41 to H.R. 1735, Rollcall Vote No. 237 to H.R. 1735, had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

On Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 1735, Rollcall Vote No. 238, had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

On Passage of H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, Rollcall Vote No. 239, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

RECOGNIZING FOSTER CARE MONTH

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Foster Care Month and acknowledge the foster parents, family members, volunteers, mentors, policymakers, child welfare professionals, and other community members who ensure that every child has an opportunity for a brighter future.

I am honored to be a founding member of the Congressional Caucus for Foster Youth, a caucus that allows Members to gain a better understanding of the current state of foster care throughout the nation and identify potential federal policy modifications that could improve outcomes for the children in our country's foster care systems.

In my home state of Texas there are more than 69,000 children in foster care, which is nearly 14.9 percent of the 463,000 children and youth in foster care nationally.

Nearly two of every three (65%) of children who are not placed in a permanent home emancipate themselves from the system and are often left unemployed, without a place to live and resort to homeless shelters.

2015 marks the 103rd anniversary of the Children's Bureau which works to support, assist, and improve the lives of children in foster care.

Throughout its history, the Children's Bureau has published the Minimum Standards of Child Welfare, which acknowledges the importance of keeping children in their own homes or providing a ''home-life'' experience with foster families as well as overseeing the temporary placement of 8,000 European children in WWII.

Before the creation of the Children's Bureau, children in foster care would often be placed in the hands of private religious organizations.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we continue to create more programs, and hold more events and activities to educate and inform Americans about children successfully placed in permanent homes, debunk myths about the process, and acknowledge the thousands of children who could potentially become a part of these statistics.

Through these efforts we can increase the rate of adoption, decrease the rate of homelessness among the youths in this group, and help develop future leaders and innovative thinkers of tomorrow.

I would like to take a moment to recognize the families who have opened their hearts and homes to foster children.

Foster parents play a critical role in the lives of some of the most vulnerable youth in Texas and across the country.

They help hold our nation's social fabric together by ensuring that thousands of young people in this country stay on track towards successful futures.

This month, we celebrate them and their efforts to change the lives of these children.

National Foster Care Month is an appropriate time to recognize and commend all those who are helping to improve the lives of children in foster care.

But it also serves as a reminder that more must be done.

These children deserve to grow up in a loving home that is safe, happy, and most importantly one they can call their own.

HONORING DANIEL J. FELIX ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor District Chief Daniel J. Felix as he retires after more than 30 years of firefighting service to our nation, the majority of those years dedicated to protecting the beautiful mountains of San Bernardino and San Jacinto, located in California's 36th District.

In 1983, Mr. Felix started his firefighting career as an intern on the Superior National Forest Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness in Minnesota. After obtaining his Masters of Science in Resource Management from the University of Wisconsin—Madison, Mr. Felix volunteered for the Superior National Forest.

Mr. Felix was later hired on by the Superior National Forest in Minnesota and the Olympic National Forest in Washington State. Two years later, Mr. Felix came to the San Bernardino National Forest Heart Bar Station, where he spent his first year fighting fire with the Forest Service.

In 1997 Mr. Felix was promoted to Captain at the Kenworthy Station of the San Jacinto Ranger District. He went on to be promoted to Battalion Chief of San Jacinto Ranger District in 2001, promoted to Forest Fuels Officer on San Bernardino National Forest in 2007, and in 2010 promoted to District Fire Management Officer in the San Jacinto Ranger District.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Felix's dedication to the protection of our forests and the safety of our residents deserves acknowledgment. On behalf of all the mountain communities and the residents of California's 36th Congressional District, I would like to thank and congratulate Mr. Felix for his service and wish him well in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately was unable to be present for several votes taken on the House floor on April 30 and May 1, 2015, missing Roll Call Votes #192 through #215. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Roll Call #192: YEA.
Roll Call #193: NAY.
Roll Call #194: NAY.
Roll Call #195: NAY.
Roll Call #196: YEA.
Roll Call #197: NAY.
Roll Call #198: YEA.
Roll Call #199: NAY.
Roll Call #200: NAY.
Roll Call #201: YEA.
Roll Call #202: YEA.
Roll Call #203: YEA.
Roll Call #204: YEA.
Roll Call #205: NAY.
Roll Call #206: NAY.
Roll Call #207: NAY.
Roll Call #208: NAY.
Roll Call #209: NAY.
Roll Call #210: NAY.
Roll Call #211: NAY.
Roll Call #212: NAY.
Roll Call #213: NAY.
Roll Call #214: YEA.
Roll Call #215: NAY.

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL JACOBS

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today, I attended the funeral of Rachel Jacobs, a wife, mother, daughter and a native Michigander, who was taken far too soon. Rachel's parents

are friends of many of us in the Michigan Congressional Delegation and we watched her mature into an incredible young woman.

Last week, Rachel was on her way home to New York to her husband and two-year-old son when her Amtrak train derailed in Philadelphia, killing Rachel and seven other passengers.

This was a senseless tragedy.

Rachel's life was cut short when she was just making her mark on this world. She had recently started a job as CEO of an education software startup and was enjoying the success of running her own company.

Rachel was an incredible businesswoman, but more than that, she was kind, generous, compassionate, caring and a true advocate for priorities she cared about. She touched countless lives from Michigan to New York.

This weekend at a Memorial Service in New York City, her friends called her a ''beacon of light.'' Those sentiments were echoed today at her funeral in Southfield, Michigan.

Her friends spoke of her zest for life and her infectious energy and enthusiasm.

Rachel used that energy and enthusiasm to give back to the hometown she loved. She founded the non-profit, Detroit Nation, to bring together former Detroit residents in support of the economic development and cultural innovation of the region.

Rachel lived a life worth celebrating. No words can make this better for her family or loved ones, and no action can bring her back. Her parents today were torn by grief and looking for answers they could not find.

All of us in this chamber have a moral responsibility to do what we can to understand what happened to cause that accident on the railways and ensure a tragedy like this never happens again.

We must hold ourselves accountable for fixing this—for ensuring the transportation systems America depends on are safe and secure and no more families or friends are robbed of the people they love and no more communities are left with a hole of losing someone who was the glue for so many.

We owe it to Rachel and her family, and to all those who lost loved ones in this senseless tragedy, to understand the problem and pledge to never let this happen again.

TRIBUTE TO SAMI ANDERSON

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sami Anderson of Champaign, Illinois on being selected as a 2015 Elizabeth Dole Foundation Fellow. This program recognizes military and veteran caregivers who go above and beyond to advocate on behalf of our nation's 5.5 million parents, spouses, children and other loved ones caring for our nation's wounded warriors.

Sami has exemplified extraordinary commitment to veterans throughout her personal and professional life. In 2005 her husband, U.S. Army Sergeant Garrett Anderson, lost his arm and suffered a traumatic brain injury when an improvised explosive device detonated under his Humvee during a patrol mission in Iraq. Demonstrating great perseverance, together they were able to overcome many challenges on the way to Garrett's successful recovery.

After leaving the Army, Garrett continued to serve his country as a part of my staff where he was responsible for outreach and constituent service to his fellow veterans. During his tenure with my office I also had the privilege of seeing Sami's efforts first hand.

As part of her fellowship, she will have the opportunity to talk with leaders in Washington, D.C. to address the challenges faced by our veterans and their caregivers. I have no doubt that she will be an effective advocate.

It is my goal to ensure we provide our veterans with the benefits and care that they deserve. I thank Sami and the Elizabeth Dole Foundation for their part in fulfilling that goal.

COMMENDING VALERIE S. VELEZ FOR COORDINATING THE PEER LEADERS UNITING STUDENTS PROGRAM (PLUS) TO ADVOCATE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PREVENTION POLICIES AND TO REDUCE TOBACCO USE AMONG YOUTH

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to recognize Health Education Program Specialist, Valerie S. Velez for her tireless efforts to preserve the Peer Leaders Uniting Students (PLUS) program that engages student leaders to address the social issues in their community. This year they have chosen to focus on eliminating social disparities in tobacco use in the local community of Hemet, California.

Ms. Velez has been working as a Health Education Program Specialist at the Hemet Unified School District (HUSD) since 1992. She earned a Master's degree in Public Health from U.C. Berkeley and B.S. from U.C. Davis in Applied Behavioral Sciences. In addition, Ms. Velez has been responsible for coordinating a wide variety of programs, including health education and safe school climate programs for HUSD; federal initiatives from the U.S. Department of Education, and the State Tobacco Use Prevention Education grant.

The PLUS program engages middle and high school students as peer leaders promoting mutual understanding and respect on their campuses, working toward innovating solutions that create more welcoming, positive and connected school environments in which students can thrive socially and academically.

In 2014, almost 100 students from the HUSD began collaborating with the Hemet Community Action Network and the California Department of Public Health to improve social disparities in tobacco use in the local community through youth advocacy. Students also made a presentation to the City Council to demonstrate the detrimental health effects of second hand smoke and tobacco waste. Soon after, the City Council adopted a landmark ordinance for the City of Hemet that bans tobacco use in parks.

I am pleased to recognize Ms. Velez for her service and for being a champion for the PLUS program, in the face of budget obstacles.

For her work and on behalf of the HUSD students, I applaud Ms. Velez on her dedication to make our community better and look forward to even more accomplishments in the future.

200 YEARS OF EXEMPLARY SERVICE FROM MOBILE DISTRICT, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1815, the Chief of Engineers issued orders to Lieutenant Hipolite Dumas, which began the long and proud history of engineering service to the Gulf Coast and Mobile.

Mobile District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is celebrating 200 years of exemplary service to the Southeast region, the U.S. military and the Nation.

For its first 70 years in Mobile and along the Gulf Coast, these engineers surveyed and fortified the southern coast from St. Marks River in Florida to Lake Pontchartrain to the west. Forts were the key elements of the coastal defense system, but complementary structures such as lighthouses and towers were also constructed. In addition to the coastal fortifications, Gulf Coast engineers also began surveys to look at connecting the inland waterways with the Tennessee-Coosa River canal study.

Following the Civil War, in 1870, an engineer office was opened in Mobile, Alabama. Eighteen years later the Mobile District was officially established in a formal reorganization of operations at the national level.

The nation turned toward rebuilding the economy after the Civil War and developing the nation's transportation system became a positive, tangible means of measuring progress. Major navigation surveys were conducted on Southeastern rivers such as the Coosa River, the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee Flint, the Black Warrior, Tennessee-Tombigbee, and the Alabama River between 1870 and 1879.

When Mobile District was established in 1888, the District's boundaries were from the Escambia River westward to the East Pearl River. Montgomery District had responsibilities from the Escambia River eastward to St. Marks River in Florida. In 1933 the two districts merged into one, the Mobile District. The District also was also given responsibilities for all military construction for the Army and Army Air Corps in Mississippi, Tennessee and Alabama.

The 1930's were a busy time for the Motile District. Modernization of the Black Warrior River system began, taking the number of locks required to transit the waterway from 17 to 5. Construction of Brookley Field, the Southeast Army Air Depot and the Mobile Air Service Command during World War II began. The Flood Control Act of 1936 set into motion

a national flood protection plan and gave the Corps jurisdiction over federal flood control protection investigation and river improvements.

As busy as the 1930's were, World War II resulted in the largest wartime mobilization effort ever for the United States. The magnitude of Mobile District's work can be judged by expenditure for construction. Between December 1941 and December 1943, nearly $1 billion was expended in the District on facilities that included 32 Army airfields, an ordnance training center, two arsenals, three Army ground force depots, five harbor defense installations, nine Civil Aviation Administration airfields, two Army Air Force supply depots, one Army Air Force cantonment, six Ordnance manufacturing plants, nine Army ground force cantonments and six special installations.

In the 1950's construction of Buford Dam in Georgia was initiated, Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam was completed, Walter F. George Lock and Dam construction began and the Army Ballistic Missile Agency was established at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Alabama in 1956.

In 1959 NASA was established at Redstone Arsenal for the Saturn Project. The construction of facilities for the Saturn project, a rocket program that was the work of the von Braun team at Redstone, was one of Mobile District's biggest projects. The District was responsible for the testing facilities at Redstone Arsenal associated with the Saturn booster, and eventually one of the major construction projects of the post Korean War period, the Mississippi Test Facility.

In the 1960's, the District continued the legacy of improving and developing the Nation's inland waterway transportation system. West Point Dam was authorized, Carters Dam on the Coosawattee River and Millers Ferry Lock and Dam on the Alabama River began. Construction of the Claiborne Lock and Dam and Robert F. Henry Lock and Dam also began in the 60's.

In the 1970's Mobile again took on new responsibilities. Construction responsibility for Cape Canaveral District was shifted to Mobile. Military construction in Florida, the Panama Canal activities and Central/South America programs were also shifted to Mobile. The 1970's also saw construction begin on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, at the time the largest Civil Works project in Corps history.

The 70's ended with Hurricane Fredric hitting Mobile on September 12, 1979. Under Public Law 84–99 the Corps was authorized to provide emergency assistance during disasters. The States of Alabama, Florida and Mississippi were all declared Federal disaster areas. Mobile District has been a national leader in emergency response actions for the Corps. Through the District's innovation the Corps developed a national-level Detachable Tactical Operations System to provide immediate support to disaster stricken areas. This was never more evident than after 9/11 when the District supported the New York City police and fire departments with these units.

The 80's saw innovation within the Corps, with Mobile District once again leading the way. Life Cycle/Project Management was first tested and then established in Mobile District. It has now become the standard for Corps management. This decade also saw the opening of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway to navigation, creating the transportation artery from the Gulf Coast to the Nation's mid-section first envisioned in the mid 1800's. Base Realignment and Closure also began in the 80's. Mobile District has been involved in all the BRAC National Environmental Policy Act requirements for BRAC from 1988 until the present.

The closing decade of the 1900's once again revealed Mobile's innovation. In 1994 the Scanning Hydrographic Operational Airborne Lidar Survey, or SHOALS, was first tested. This innovative 3–D technology was adapted for underwater mapping. When later combined with the U.S. Navy's CHARTS system, the team became a world leader in underwater mapping. The 1990s also saw the completion of the J–6 Large Rocket Test Facility, the completion of the John J. Sparkman Center located at the U.S. Army Arsenal at Redstone, Alabama. The Sparkman Center and follow on phases, encompasses more than 1 million square feet and is one of the most modern military facilities in the world.

As the Nation entered the new century Mobile District continued its record of excellence. The Von Braun Center at Redstone Arsenal was completed in 2014 and is home to the Space and Missile Defense Command and the Missile Defense Agency. The District responded to and assisted in recovery operations when four hurricanes struck the State of Florida in 2004. In 2005, Mobile District began a comprehensive analysis and design for the Mississippi coastal counties to make them more resilient and less susceptible to risk from hurricane and storm damage following the devastating landfall of Hurricane Katrina along the Mississippi coast. From this analysis came the Mississippi Coastal Improvement Program, an innovative approach to achieving the goal of a more resilient coast.

Since 2000, Mobile has also completed four Headquarters complexes for major key commands, U.S. Central Command, U.S. Southern Command, U.S. Army Material Command and the U.S. Special Operations Command. They also were the design and construction agent for the new cantonment area and training ranges for the 7th Special Forces Group (Airborne) which relocated from Fort Bragg, North Carolina to Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. They are also responsible for the construction of various facilities at Eglin Air Force Base to support the Joint Strike Fighter program.

Mobile District continues to serve a variety of programs and missions in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee and Central and South America. While I know my colleagues from these States are as appreciative as I am for their work, I am especially proud to have the District Headquarters in my District and in Mobile.

It is with pride that I say, Happy Birthday to Mobile District on your two hundred years of exemplary, innovative and dedicated service. On behalf of a grateful Nation, thank you to all the civilian and military members of the Mobile District for all you have done.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of Head Start, which provides children from low-income families access to comprehensive preschool programs and prepares children for success in kindergarten and beyond.

On May 18, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson launched Project Head Start as an eight-week summer demonstration project to teach low-income students needed skills before they started kindergarten. Over the past 50 years, Head Start has served 30 million children and families across the country who earn less than 100 percent of the federal poverty line or who have a disability.

Head Start is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and directly supports local agencies delivering services. The services Head Start children and their families receive include education, nutrition, dental, health, mental health transition, parental involvement and complete social service support. This strong support network provides the tools families need for their children to succeed upon entering primary school.

Continued access to the Early Head Start and Head Start programs helps ensure that children develop the academic and life skills they need to succeed in their academic careers. Head Start alumni are more likely to finish high school, go to college, and be in good health, and are less likely to commit a crime. In 2012, HHS conducted a study that by the end of the 3rd grade, children who participated in the program were more likely to have favorable social emotional developmental outcomes and favorable cognitive impacts.

For 50 years, this program has given children the tools to succeed by ensuring a high quality education and access to healthcare and social services. The Head Start program represents a critical investment in the education of our nation's children.

In 2014, local affiliates like Neighbors in Need of Services Inc. (NINOS) and Community Action Corporation of South Texas (CACOST) served over 8,000 children in the 34th District of Texas. These organizations help improve the lives of children and their families in South Texas. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Head Start on its 50th Anniversary today, and I wish continued success to all the Head Start staff and volunteers who are helping people, changing lives, and building communities.

RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEAD START PROGRAM

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the

50th Anniversary of Head Start. "Project Head Start" was launched by President Lyndon B. Johnson on May 18, 1965. Originally designed as an eight week summer demonstration project, Head Start has expanded into an array of preschool programs that provides children from low-income families with a comprehensive array of services to prepare them for successful entry into kindergarten and illuminates the pathway for a brighter future.

In the State of Texas, 71,465 children and pregnant women were benefitted by Head Start last year. 4,068 of those served were from the 30th Congressional District of Texas—the district that I serve. Head Start is instrumental in uplifting families in my home state by providing resources to families who, just like you and me, want to see their children reach their full potential.

In its 50 year history, Head Start has served more than 30 million children and their families. Head Start alumni are more likely to finish high school, continue on to college and become self-reliant wage earners. This is only possible because of the access to services Head Start provides to disadvantaged children. It is important that, at this critical juncture in our nation's history, we increase our support of all Head Start programs. Every child in America should be afforded an equal opportunity to succeed, regardless of their socio-economic background.

President Obama recently called upon all Americans, including leaders of private and philanthropic organizations, communities and governments at every level, to make investments in our next generation of thinkers, dreamers and doers. Investing in early childhood education is one of the best investments we can make as a nation. There is no better way to strengthen our economy and bolster our communities.

As a body of legislators, we have an opportunity and a responsibility to lead by example. We can help hardworking, low-income families build pathways out of poverty. We owe it to our future and the future of our great nation to ensure that all of our children have all equal opportunity to succeed. If, as a society, we are serious about giving children a bright and promising future, we must increase our investment and expand the vital programs Head Start offers.

Mr. Speaker, today, as we celebrate the 50th Anniversary of Head Start, I ask, that as a body, we reaffirm our investment in the children of America. Now is the time to expand upon the vision of President Lyndon Baines Johnson and his "Great Society" programs that resulted in the creation of Head Start. I urge my colleagues to support bipartisan efforts to give all of America's children a head start in life and close the educational opportunity gap.

HONORING DR. TOMÁS MORALES ON THE OCCASION OF HIS APPOINTMENT AS NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE HISPANIC ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to recognize California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) President, Dr. Tomás Morales on his appointment to serve as National Chairman of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU).

Dr. Morales has led a life of distinguished service as an Educator and University President, and has held senior positions at three of the largest public universities in the nation, including California State University (CSU), The State University of New York (SUNY) and the City University of New York (CUNY). Among his many contributions to higher education, Dr. Morales has also served as Co-Chair of the National Task Force on College Readiness for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, creating a roadmap for K–12 school systems to prepare students for college upon graduation.

Born in Puerto Rico and raised in New York, Dr. Morales knows firsthand the struggles our youth face as they strive to achieve the American Dream through higher education. Growing up, Dr. Morales worked hard by delivering newspapers and cleaning apartment floors before realizing his own dreams through education.

Overcoming adversity, Dr. Morales went on to earn a bachelor's degree in history from SUNY New Paltz and a master's degree and doctorate in educational administration and policy studies from SUNY Albany.

I am proud to recognize Dr. Morales' nearly four decades of service and look forward to seeing the vision and leadership he will bring to the National Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities and their mission to promote the development of member colleges and universities to improve the access to and the quality of post-secondary educational opportunities for Hispanic students.

For his work on behalf of aspiring students, I congratulate Dr. Morales on his appointment to serve as the President of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities and look forward to his future success.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Monday, May 18, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 19

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, focusing on air traffic control modernization and reform.

SR–253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 562, to promote exploration for geothermal resources, S. 822, to expand geothermal production, S. 1026, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to repeal a provision prohibiting Federal agencies from procuring alternative fuels, S. 1057, to promote geothermal energy, S. 1058, to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, S. 1103, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Clark Canyon Dam, S. 1104, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam, S. 1199, to authorize Federal agencies to provide alternative fuel to Federal employees on a reimbursable basis, S. 1215, to amend the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000 to provide for the development of methane hydrate as a commercially viable source of energy, S. 1222, to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for reports relating to electric capacity resources of transmission organizations and the amendment of certain tariffs to address the procurement of electric capacity resources, S. 1224, to reconcile differing Federal approaches to condensate, S. 1226, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands to promote a greater domestic helium supply, to establish a Federal helium leasing program for public land, and to secure a helium supply for national defense and Federal researchers, S. 1236, to amend the Federal Power Act to modify certain requirements relating to trial-type hearings with respect to certain license applications before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, S. 1264, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a renewable electricity standard, S. 1270, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, S. 1271, to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations to prevent or minimize the venting and flaring of gas in oil and gas production operations in

the United States, S. 1272, to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the effects of forward capacity auctions and other capacity mechanisms, S. 1276, to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to increase energy exploration and production on the outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico, S. 1278, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the conduct of certain lease sales in the Alaska outer Continental Shelf region, to make certain modifications to the North Slope Science Initiative, S. 1279, to provide for revenue sharing of qualified revenues from leases in the South Atlantic planning area, S. 1280, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish an annual production incentive fee with respect to Federal onshore and offshore land that is subject to a lease for production of oil or natural gas under which production is not occurring, S. 1282, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to consider the objective of improving the conversion, use, and storage of carbon dioxide produced from fossil fuels in carrying out research and development programs under that Act, S. 1283, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to repeal certain programs, to establish a coal technology program, S. 1285, to authorize the Secretary of Energy to enter into contracts to provide certain price stabilization support relating to electric generation units that use coal-based generation technology, S. 1294, to require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate in promoting the development of efficient, economical, and environmentally sustainable thermally led wood energy systems, and S. 1304, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a pilot competitive grant program for the development of a skilled energy workforce.

SD–366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife

To hold hearings to examine S. 1140, to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States''.

SD–406

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine how to safely reduce reliance on foster care group homes.

SD–215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, focusing on examining EEOC's enforcement and litigation programs.

SD–430

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016''.

SD–124

Committee on the Budget

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Congressional Budget Office.

SD–608

2 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine proposed environmental regulation's impacts on America's small businesses.

SR–428A

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2016''.

SD–138

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine body cameras, focusing on whether technology can increase protection for law enforcement officers and the public.

SD–226

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

2:45 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Mileydi Guilarte, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, Jennifer Ann Haverkamp, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, and Brian James Egan, of Maryland, to be Legal Adviser, both of the Department of State, Marcia Denise Occomy, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years, and Sunil Sabharwal, of California, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of two years.

SD–419

MAY 20

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight

To hold an oversight hearing to examine scientific advisory panels and processes at the Environmental Protection Agency, including S. 543, to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation.

SD–406

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Cuban relations, focusing on the way forward.

SD–419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on exploring institutional risk-sharing.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine 21st century ideas for the 20th century Federal civil service.

SD–342

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.

SH–216

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 1331, to help enhance commerce through improved seasonal forecasts, S. 1297, to update the Commercial Space Launch Act by amending title 51, United States Code, to promote competitiveness of the U.S. commercial space sector, S. 1326, to amend certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, S. 1040, to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Academy of Sciences to study the vehicle handling requirements proposed by the Commission for recreational off-highway vehicles and to prohibit the adoption of any such requirements until the completion of the study, S. 1359, to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, S. 806, to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for preemployment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers and for other purposes, S. 1315, to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions, S. 1334, to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, S. 1335, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, S. 1251, to implement the Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, as adopted by Lisbon, Portugal on September 28, 2007, S. 1336, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Auckland on November 14, 2009, H.R. 1020, to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation, H.R. 710, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and the nominations of Daniel R. Elliott III, of Ohio,

to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for a term expiring December 31, 2018, Mario Cordero, of California, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 2019, and a routine list in the Coast Guard.

SR–253

11 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To receive a closed briefing on Syria.

SVC–217

2:15 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine addressing the needs of Native communities through Indian Water Rights Settlements.

SD–628

Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine solutions to the hospital observation stay crisis.

SD–562

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard
To hold hearings to examine improvements and innovations in fishery management and data collection.

SR–253

Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Gregory T. Delawie, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kosovo, Ian C. Kelly, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Georgia, Nancy Bikoff Pettit, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Latvia, and Azita Raji, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Sweden, all of the Department of State.

SD–419

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on the Constitution
To hold hearings to examine taking sexual assault seriously, focusing on the rape kit backlog and human rights.

SD–226

MAY 21

9:15 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider S. 802, to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, S. 868, to establish a fund to make payment to the Americans held hostage in Iran, and to members of their families, who are identified as members of the proposed class in case number 1:00-CV–03110 (ESG) of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, S. Res. 87, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater cooperation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism, the nominations of Charles C. Adams, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland, Cassandra Q. Butts, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, Paul A. Folmsbee, of Oklahoma, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, Stafford Fitzgerald Haney, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Costa Rica, Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, and Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service, all of the Department of State, Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

SD–419

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine understanding America's long-term fiscal picture.

SD–342

10 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Business meeting to consider pending legislation, and the nomination of Jeffrey Michael Prieto, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

SR–328A

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, ''The Financial Regulatory Improvement Act of 2015''.

SD–538

Committee on the Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–226

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Business meeting to consider the fiscal year 2016 302(b) allocations, an original bill entitled, ''Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2016'', and an original bill entitled, ''Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016''.

SH–216

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold hearings to examine S. 160, and H.R. 373, to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, S. 365, to improve rangeland conditions and restore grazing levels within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Utah, S. 472, to promote conservation, improve public land, and provide for sensible development in Douglas County, Nevada, S. 583, to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, S. 814, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, S. 815, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and S. 1240, to designate the Cerro del Yuta and Rio San Antonio Wilderness Areas in the State of New Mexico.

SD–366

Select Committee on Intelligence
To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

JUNE 4

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 454, to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, S. 784, to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish microlabs to improve regional engagement with national laboratories, S. 1033, to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to replace the current requirement for a biennial energy policy plan with a Quadrennial Energy Review, S. 1054, to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small-and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, S. 1068, to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system from cyber security threats, S. 1181, to expand the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program to include commercial trucks and United States flagged vessels, to return unspent funds and loan proceeds to the United States Treasury to reduce the national debt, S. 1187, to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, S. 1216, to amend the Natural Gas Act to modify a provision relating to civil penalties, S. 1218, to establish an interagency coordination committee or subcommittee with the leadership of the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, focused on the nexus between energy and water production, use, and efficiency, S. 1221, to amend the Federal Power Act to require periodic reports on electricity reliability and reliability impact statements for rules affecting the reliable operation of the bulk-power system, S. 1223, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to improve the loan guarantee program for innovative technologies, S. 1229, to require the Secretary of Energy to submit a plan to implement recommendations to improve interactions between the Department of Energy and National Laboratories, S. 1230, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program under which the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall enter into memoranda of understanding with States providing for State oversight of oil and gas productions activities, and S. 1241, to provide

for the modernization, security, and resiliency of the electric grid, to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs for research, development, demonstration, and information-sharing for cybersecurity for the energy sector.

SD–366

POSTPONEMENTS

MAY 19

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the rising tide of extremism in the Middle East.

SD–419

SENATE—*Tuesday, May 19, 2015*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Gracious God of all, we have heard glorious things about Your goodness. Let Your glory be over all the Earth. Our hearts make melodies to You because of Your exceeding greatness. Thank You for Your faithfulness that endures forever.

Today, give us steadfast hearts that we may honor You with our lives. Be near to our Senators, giving them a powerful awareness of Your presence. Lord, increase in them such knowledge, love, and obedience that they may grow daily in Your likeness. Grant us wisdom and courage for the living of these challenging days as You surround us with Your divine favor.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today we will continue our work on the trade legislation, which is before us. I know Senators on both sides are eager to offer amendments. Yesterday was a good start. We voted on a few amendments. We have a half dozen more pending, but we need to keep the ball moving. So let me again encourage Members of both parties to offer those amendments that they may have. Let me again encourage Members to work with the bill managers to get the amendments moving.

We want to process as many amendments as we can. We know we already lost a week to needless filibustering and delaying of this bill, which means one less week to have amendments considered. So we need cooperation from the leadership across the aisle to ensure we do not lose any more time.

Our friends on the other side seem quite eager to let everyone know how uninterested they are in obstruction these days. You will not find a happier guy than me if that turns out to be true. So we will see if they demonstrate the spirit of cooperation they keep telling us about as we continue to debate trade.

Either way, Members on both sides who recognize the benefits of trade to their constituents are determined to pass important export and jobs legislation this week. I hope to see it pass by the same kind of overwhelming, bipartisan margin we saw in the Finance Committee a few weeks ago, because voting to improve this bill is one way to prove you care about the middle class. It is one way to prove you care about American jobs and American workers.

One study tells us that knocking down unfair trade barriers in places such as Europe and the Pacific could boost our economy by as much as $173 billion and that it could support as many as 1.4 million additional American jobs.

In Kentucky, the study says it could bring almost $3 billion in new investment and support more than 18,000 additional jobs. That is in my State alone. We know a lot in the Commonwealth about the benefits of trade. More than half a million Kentucky jobs are already related to international trade. We know that those kinds of jobs typically pay more than other jobs.

Kentuckians also know that a lot of rhetoric on the other side of this issue does not always ''stand the test of fact and scrutiny,'' as President Obama put it.

The 7,000 workers at the Toyota plant in Georgetown, KY, might agree. Following a trade agreement we recently enacted with South Korea, they are now working hard to export Camrys—Camrys—made in Kentucky to Korean consumers. Given some of the overheated language surrounding that U.S.-Korea trade agreement, you may be surprised to hear about these automotive workers in my State who are building Camrys in Kentucky and sending them to Korea. But the truth is that just about every serious public official knows that eliminating the restrictions that hurt American workers and American goods is good for our country.

It is something Republicans have long believed. It is an area where President Obama now agrees, as well. It is an area where many serious Democrats also agree. So I hope we can join together to score a victory for American workers. To get there, let's work now to offer amendments, to get them pending, and to engage in substantive debate rather than more pointless delay for its own sake.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 2 years ago the American people first became aware that the National Security Agency was collecting private information about their phone calls. This is called the Snowden revelation.

Under the banner of national security, the National Security Agency was mining information about home phone calls and how long they lasted. They found out whom they were calling—and not only that. They found out whom the call was between. They also determined how long that call lasted.

NSA essentially was conducting a dragnet, without first attempting to determine whether that information was relevant to a national security problem. NSA ran this program under the authorities granted to them by section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, which expires on June 1 of this year. The American people were outraged by these revelations and Congress rightly acted.

Last year, the House passed a bill by a vote of 303 to 121 to end the NSA's so-called bulk metadata collection program and reform and extend the authority for this program.

I brought a similar bill to the floor authored by Senators LEAHY and LEE. There was a bipartisan group of Senators who joined them to call for its passage. But sadly, the majority leader—at that time the minority leader—stood in the way of bipartisan reform. Instead of passing meaningful reform, he led a Republican filibuster of this bill. That was one of a couple hundred that was led by my friend.

This year, Senators LEAHY and LEE worked again with the Chairman and ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee on the USA FREEDOM Act, which ends the National Security Agency's bulk collection program and extends and reforms the authorities under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

There have been bipartisan and bicameral calls for the Senate to take up that legislation. Yet again, instead of committing to bringing up this bipartisan bill, last month the senior Senator from Kentucky introduced a bill

that would extend the authorities for the National Security Agency's bulk collection program for 5½ years. Then the Second Circuit, almost simultaneously—within 24 hours of that decision by the majority leader—found the bulk collection illegal.

In reaction to the court's decision, the House last week passed the USA FREEDOM Act by a vote of 338 to 88. By a four-to-one margin, the House voted to end the National Security Agency's illegal bulk data collection program and reform its practices.

But even in the face of that court's decision, the majority leader stood once again against bipartisan reform. Instead of heeding the Republican-controlled House's calls for reform, the majority leader introduced a bill that would extend the authorities for the National Security Agency's illegal program for 2 more months.

Congressman GOODLATTE, the chair of the Judiciary Committee in the House, said they will not accept a short-term extension of the bill. This morning, Leader MCCARTHY, the second ranking Republican in the House, said they will not accept any extension. That is exactly what the Speaker, Congressman BOEHNER, said.

If we squander this opportunity to deliver sound reforms to this illegal program, we are handling our duties irresponsibly here in the Senate.

To stand in the way of reforming these practices is to ignore the voice of the American people. Just yesterday, a new poll commissioned by the American Civil Liberties Union showed that 82 percent of Americans are concerned that the Federal Government is collecting and storing the personal information of Americans, and they do not like it.

If we are unable to reform these practices, we are ignoring the ruling of the Second Circuit, which rejected the National Security Agency's bulk collection program, and we are not allowing the American people's voice to be heard.

I think, most importantly, if the senior Senator from Kentucky does not allow this commonsense reform simply with a vote on the Senate floor about what happened in the House, they are ignoring the rare bipartisan support that we have.

Just last week, 190 House Republicans voted to end the National Security Agency's illegal program. There is bipartisan consensus in favor of ending this program. Many of the Republican leader's own colleagues have called for it as well.

Last week, Attorney General Loretta Lynch and James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence, wrote a letter to Senator LEAHY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. Both the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence voiced their support for the USA FREEDOM Act, saying:

> Overall, the significant reforms contained in this legislation will provide the public greater confidence in how our intelligence activities are carried out and in the oversight of those activities, while ensuring vital national security authorities remain in place.

I agree with that statement. But sadly, the majority leader continues to stand in the way of bipartisan reform to end these illegal practices. As we face the June 1 expiration of these authorities, the majority leader still offers no viable alternative.

We cannot allow this program to be extended. The majority leader should listen to the American people because we cannot extend an illegal act. That is what the majority leader is asking us to do.

The majority leader should listen to the American people, consider the action of his Republican colleagues, and respect the expertise of the intelligence community.

The Senate should act now on the USA FREEDOM Act before it leaves for the Memorial Day recess and restore the confidence of the American people.

NOMINATIONS AND HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have heard so much about how great the Republicans are doing here, about how well things are working now. We are doing no nominations—none. We are 5 months into this Congress, and we basically approved virtually no one. It is interesting to say there are not many names on the calendar to bring up. Why? Because they are not even holding hearings on all the nominations. We always hear about the need for jobs—but not from my Republican colleagues. We hear from us. One of the prime examples of that is the highway bill. It is about to expire. What are we going to do? Nothing. There is no program to extend this bill. It has already been extended short term 33 times. Think about that. We used to do bills here for 5 years, 6 years so that the directors of transportation and all of these States around the country could plan ahead.

We are being penny-wise and pound-foolish. We are having these short-term extensions, which are very expensive, creating no jobs. For every $1 billion we spend on these highway programs, we create 47,500 jobs. My Republican colleagues are ignoring this.

What is the business of the day, Mr. President?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, and the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the second half.

The assistant Democratic leader.

DACA AND DAPA PROGRAMS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 14 years ago, I introduced a bill known as the DREAM Act. My friend and colleague Senator LEAHY was the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and for the last 14 years we have tried to pass this basic law, and here is what it says: If you were brought to the United States as a child, and you were undocumented in America, but you have lived here without committing any serious crime and finished high school, we will give you a chance. If you will agree to at least complete 2 years of college or enlist in America's military, we will give you a path to citizenship.

I offered this legislation because so many young people—about 2½ million—living in this country were brought here when they were infants, small children. They didn't have any voice in the matter, their parents decided. They came to the United States. They have lived here as Americans. They stood in their classroom every single day and put their hand on their heart and pledged allegiance to that flag. That was their flag. What they didn't know or didn't understand was that they were undocumented. They don't have a country. The laws of the United States are very clear. If you are one of those people, you have to leave. You have to leave for at least 10 years and then apply to come back in. I didn't think that was fair.

I introduced the DREAM Act. In fact, I had the support of the senior Senator from Utah as my cosponsor when I first introduced it. We could not pass it and make it the law of the land. So the day came when I appealed to the President of the United States, my former colleague from the Senate and the State of Illinois. He was a sponsor of the DREAM Act. I appealed to the President to give these young people a chance. He took his power as President and issued an Executive order, and that Executive order said that if these young people would come forward, pay a substantial fee for processing, show that they have no serious criminal record and can show they had come to the United States years before, they would be given a chance to stay without fear of deportation. It is called DACA.

Well, the President waited and challenged Congress to do something about it—pass the DREAM Act, pass comprehensive immigration reform. Even though it passed in the Senate, with 68 votes on a bipartisan rollcall vote, the

Republican House of Representatives refused to even call the measure for a vote.

One year passed, 2 years have passed, and here we are—no action by the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives or, for that matter, in the Senate to move comprehensive immigration reform. The President said: I am going to step up with my power as President and do what I can to deal with this issue. He said: Let's have some standards. I will not allow anyone to step forward and ask for temporary status in this country unless they have been here at least 5 years. If they step forward, they have to pay a filing fee for us to process their application, and they have to submit themselves to a criminal and national security background check. We don't want anybody in this country who is a danger to America. If they flunk that part of the test, they are finished and deported. And then they have to put their names on the books to pay their taxes in the United States of America while they are working. Under those circumstances, we will give them the temporary renewable right to stay and work without fear of deportation, and then several years later repeat it, submit an application again. The President believes, and I share the belief, we will be a safer nation if we do that.

There could be as many as 11 million undocumented people in this country who would qualify for what we call DAPA. They would have to pay a fee, pay their taxes, go through this background check, and be subject to renewal on a regular basis.

Well, today, May 19, 2015, was supposed to be the first day people would be allowed to apply for this new program—this DAPA Program, but unfortunately it has been stopped cold. It has been stopped by the Republican Party in the House and Senate and stopped by their efforts in court to stop this President. Oh, they have an alternative. They stated their alternative. Their alternative is for these people to leave the United States. Their candidate for President, Governor Romney, said as much when he ran last time. They have no alternative plan. They want these people—millions of them—to leave the United States through voluntary deportation, as they call it.

Well, the sad reality is that is not going to happen, and obviously the Republicans are not going to do anything to deal with our broken immigration system. There are casualties with this decision. One of them is Naomi Florentino. This attractive young woman was brought to the United States from Mexico when she was 10 years old. She grew up in Smyrna, TN. She was an amazing student and active in her community.

In high school, she was a member of the National Honor Society, and she received the Student of the Year Awards for algebra and art. She served on the student council and played on the varsity soccer and track and field teams, where she was a shot-putter and discus thrower.

Naomi's dream is to become a robotics engineer. In high school, she was a member of the robotics team, participated in NASA's Science, Engineering, Mathematics and Aerospace Academy, and she performed so well she won the Next Generation Pioneer Award. Naomi graduated from high school with an honor's diploma, but Naomi's immigration status limited her options. The college counselor refused to help. The college counselor at her high school told her that since she was undocumented, she was on her own.

She didn't quit. She took mechanical engineering courses at Lipscomb University in Nashville. She then went on to community college. These undocumented kids cannot get help while they are going to school. They do not qualify for the Pell grant or government loans. She was determined. She was not going to quit.

At the community college, where she will be graduating this spring, she has an associate's degree in mechatronics technology, a field that combines mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, telecommunications engineering, control engineering, and computer engineering. This fall Naomi will begin to work on her bachelor's degree in engineering at Middle Tennessee State University. Remember what I said. She is on her own. She gets no help from the government to do this because she is undocumented.

In her spare time—if you can imagine she has any—she continues to be very involved in her community. For 6 years, she was judge and mentor in engineering and robotics competitions. Since 2008, she has volunteered as a college mentor with the YMCA Latino Achievers Program in Tennessee. Despite everything this young woman has achieved in her life, her future is totally uncertain.

In 2012, President Obama said that under the DACA Program we are going to protect Naomi, and people just like her, from deportation. We will not give her government assistance to go to school, but at least she knows she will not be deported as long as she passes the test I mentioned earlier.

She is now part of the work-study program at Nissan North America's Smyrna, TN, plant. They want her. Wouldn't you? This is the largest automotive manufacturing plant in the United States.

As a maintenance intern, she assists with troubleshooting on their most sophisticated equipment—this young lady with 2 years of community college.

She wrote me a letter, and here is what she said about the DACA Program:

DACA has meant the opportunity of a lifetime for my academic and professional career. As a student at Smyrna High School, driving past the Nissan plant motivated me to be a better student—with hopes of, one day, being part of a company that is highly-regarded in my community. However, without proper work authorization, that goal seemed far-fetched. Today, it is a reality for me. I have learned that, given the opportunity, hard work, patience and perseverance can pay off.

Naomi and 600,000 DREAMers like her have stepped forward under President Obama's program. They are not going to be given any kind of award. They will just be given a chance.

I don't understand the Republican point of view. The Republicans would have us deport this young woman. Their attitude is: Send her back to Mexico. We don't need her.

She, unfortunately, came here because her parents decided to bring her here, and now she has to pay the price for her parents' decision. Is that what America is all about? Is that what our system of justice is all about?

Naomi will be an important part of our future, and thousands like her deserve that chance. That is why today is a sad day. The President's efforts to extend this program and help others—parents of young DREAMers like this have been stopped cold by the courts and stopped cold by the Republican leadership.

President Abraham Lincoln once said, ''We cannot escape history,'' and history is very clear, we are a nation of immigrants. My mother was an immigrant to this country, and I stand here today as a Senator from the great State of Illinois. I am very proud of what she and her family did when she came to this country.

Let us reward those who are willing to come to America to work and make it better. Let us give these young people a chance. Let us, once and for all, say this Nation of immigrants is proud of our heritage and prouder still of what immigrants can mean to our future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I just wish to praise the senior Senator from Illinois. He has been consistent on this issue since he came here. He was one of the architects of a major overhaul of our immigration system a year and a half ago, which passed by a two-thirds majority, by Republicans and Democrats alike.

We have gone such a long way toward solving this problem. The Republican leadership in the House—even though the votes were there to pass it in the House—refused to bring it up.

I am proud to align myself as a follower of the leadership of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, on this issue.

With the way we apply the laws now, I wonder whether my grandparents

would have been able to come to Vermont from Italy and see their grandson become a U.S. Senator or would have seen their highly decorated son serve in World War II. I wonder if my wife's parents would have been able to come from Canada so she could be born in Vermont.

Come on. We are a nation of immigrants. Let's welcome them. They can often make our country much stronger than it was before.

I applaud the Senator from Illinois.

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. LEAHY. On another issue, in just 12 days, section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act, along with two other surveillance authorities, will expire. And once again, the Senate Republican leadership is scrambling at the last minute to avoid a crisis of its own making.

Last year, we had a chance to pass the USA FREEDOM Act of 2014, and I urged the Senate to pass it. A majority of Senators, but not 60, voted for it because we all knew the expiration date for these surveillance authorities was right around the corner. We knew May 31 would arrive quickly in the new Congress.

I did not want our intelligence community to face a period of uncertainty leading up to the sunset, and I also didn't want the American people to have billions of their phone records stocked away in a government database any longer—especially as we have seen, in the case of Edward Snowden, just how insecure that database can be.

That is why we spent months holding six public hearings in the Judiciary Committee and even more months negotiating a bipartisan bill, which got the support of the administration, the intelligence community, privacy groups, and the technology industry. I think that is the first time we have had all of them together.

Unfortunately, my attempts to avoid this last-minute chaos were blocked by the Republican leader last year. He said this was a matter that could wait for the new Congress. He said the new Republican majority would have a rigorous committee process for important issues.

Well, five months into the new Republican majority, and with the deadline looming, the Republican leader has just now turned his attention to this issue.

The Republican-led Senate committees have not taken steps toward reauthorization or reform. Instead, the majority leader now proposes a 60-day extension of a program that a Federal court of appeals just ruled is unlawful. The court ruled unanimously that it is unlawful, and they are saying, well, let's just extend the bulk collection program for another 60 days.

The majority leader apparently wants to do this to allow one of his committee chairmen to develop a last-minute ''back-up plan.'' This is why we tried to pass legislation a year ago.

The House of Representatives is not going to pass a 60-day extension, nor should it. We should not extend this illegal program for one more day, and we do not need to do so. After all, we have a solution in hand. Why try to ignore reality and go on with something else?

We have a responsible solution. In fact, it is the only responsible solution. Broad consensus has developed around the bipartisan USA FREEDOM Act of 2015.

The Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence wrote a letter in support of the bill. The FBI Director told me he supports it. This past weekend, the former chairman and ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee advocated for passage of this legislation in an article in the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 15, 2015]

INTELLIGENCE REFORM BILL IS IMPORTANT TO SAFEGUARDING OUR SECURITY AND PRIVACY

(By C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger and Mike Rogers)

The USA Freedom Act will protect our security and privacy.

A recent Baltimore Sun editorial described legislation to reform the government's collection of Americans' phone and email data as a sign that ''bipartisan cooperation in Congress is not completely dead'' (''Reining in the surveillance state,'' May 5). We'd like to remind The Sun that similar legislation to end the mass storage of this data passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan majority—it garnered more than 300 votes, in fact—over a year ago.

In our role as leaders on the House Intelligence Committee, we drafted and introduced last year's bill together with our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, Reps. Bob Goodlatte and John Conyers. Our success provided the foundation for the legislation that passed the House by an even larger margin on Wednesday. The USA Freedom Act ends the bulk collection of what we now know as ''metadata''—that big database up at the National Security Agency that contains the phone numbers of millions of Americans will go away. The government will now have to seek court approval before petitioning private cell phone companies for records. The court will have to approve each application, except in emergencies, and major court decisions will be made public.

We need this reform to keep our country safe. Section 215 of the Patriot Act, which is the part that legalizes much of NSA's critical work to protect us from terrorists, expires in less than three weeks on June 1. If we do not reauthorize it with the reforms demanded by the public, essential capabilities to track legitimate terror suspects will expire, too.

That couldn't happen at a worse time—we live in a dangerous world. The threats posed by ISIS and other terror groups are just the tip of the iceberg. We also need strong defenses against increasingly aggressive cyber terrorists and the ''lone wolf'' terrorists who are often American citizens, for example.

This bill restores Americans' confidence that the government is not snooping on its own citizens by improving the necessary checks and balances essential to our Democracy. We helped write it last year, we support it this year and we hope Republicans and Democrats continue working together on common sense reforms to protect our national security and our civil liberties.

MAY 11, 2015.

Senator PATRICK J. LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Senator MIKE S. LEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND LEE: Thank you for your letter of May 11, 2015, asking for the views of the Department of Justice and the Intelligence Community on S. 1123, the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. We support this legislation.

This bill is the result of extensive discussion among the Congress, the Administration, privacy and civil liberties advocates, and industry representatives. We believe that it is a reasonable compromise that preserves vital national security authorities, enhances privacy and civil liberties and codifies requirements for increased transparency. The Intelligence Community believes that the bill preserves the essential operational capabilities of the telephone metadata program and enhances other intelligence capabilities needed to protect our nation and its partners. In the absence of legislation, important intelligence authorities will expire on June 1. This legislation would extend these authorities, as amended, until the end of 2019, providing our intelligence professionals the certainty they need to continue the critical work they undertake every day to protect the American people.

The USA FREEDOM Act bans bulk collection under Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act, FISA pen registers, and National Security Letters, while providing a new mechanism to obtain telephone metadata records to help identify potential contacts of suspected terrorists inside the United States. The Intelligence Community believes, based on the existing practices of communications providers in retaining metadata, that these provisions will retain the essential operational capabilities of the existing bulk telephone metadata program while eliminating bulk collection by the government.

The bill also codifies requirements for additional transparency by mandating certain public reporting by the government, authorizing additional reporting by providers, and establishing a statutory mechanism for declassification and release of FISA Court opinions consistent with national security. It establishes a process for appointment of an amicus curiae to assist the FISA Court and FISA Court of Review in appropriate matters. It provides reforms to national security letters, requiring review of the need for their secrecy. The bill also closes potential gaps in collection authorities and increases the maximum criminal penalty for materially supporting a foreign terrorist organization.

Overall, the significant reforms contained in this legislation will provide the public greater confidence in how our intelligence activities are carried out and in the oversight of those activities, while ensuring vital national security authorities remain in place. You have our commitment that we will notify Congress if we find that provisions of this law significantly impair the Intelligence Community's ability to protect

national security. We urge the Congress to pass this bill promptly.

Sincerely,

LORETTA E. LYNCH,
Attorney General.
JAMES R. CLAPPER,
Director of National Intelligence.

Mr. LEAHY. But even more importantly, last week the House of Representatives passed the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 with an overwhelming vote of 338 to 88. At a time when the public says Congress is locked in partisan gridlock, look at this overwhelming vote of Republicans and Democrats for the USA FREEDOM Act. Well, the Senate ought to do the same thing the House did.

We can keep our country safe without a government database of billions of Americans' phone records. I think about Richard Clarke, who is a former counterterrorism official. He spent six months examining this program as a member of the President's Review Group. He concluded the program has ''no benefit.'' We do not need it, and, more importantly, Americans do not want it.

I fear that if Congress does not end this bulk collection program, it will only open the door to the next dragnet surveillance program. Next time it will not just be phone records. It might be location information or medical records or credit card records. That is why it is so important to stop it now.

Some will say Congress doesn't need to act because the Second Circuit has already ruled that this program is illegal. I have read the court's decision, I agree with it, and I hope this panel decision will ultimately be upheld by the Supreme Court. But there are other pending lawsuits and it could be months or even years before we know how the courts will ultimately rule on this issue.

In addition, the USA FREEDOM Act doesn't just end bulk collection under section 215 and the other national security authorities; it also contains other important reforms that cannot be won through legal challenges, such as new transparency measures and a panel of experts from which the FISA Court can draw on for amicus support. So the courts made it very clear Congress has to act.

Congress has spent years working on these issues, with numerous hearings. The Senate last year came up with basically the same bill the House has just overwhelmingly passed. We shouldn't be staying around here talking about whether we are going to go over the brink. We are going to put our intelligence community under pressure.

The USA FREEDOM Act is a responsible solution that can pass both Chambers today, including with a majority vote for it in this body today. Its enactment will ensure that these expiring provisions do not sunset. I urge Senators to support it.

Let us not play politics with the security of this country. Let us talk about what really can be done, what has been done in a responsible, bipartisan way in the other body, and let us step up and do the same in the Senate. That is what I would urge, not this brinkmanship which will actually bring about the end of all of these provisions. Maybe some would like that. I think we have a better balance here with the USA FREEDOM Act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the two parties.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO SONNY DIXON

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, it is not often that anyone comes to the floor of the Senate to praise a journalist one way or another; but in Georgia, on the 31st of May of this year, Sonny Dixon of Savannah, GA, will retire after 18 years of being the anchor at WTOC in Savannah, GA.

Sonny Dixon is a rare breed indeed in terms of political reporters because he has actually been in elected office, serving for years in the Georgia Legislature, some of those years with me. I know him as a friend, I know him as a professional, and I know him as coastal Georgia's best anchorman, period.

He was awarded the Edward R. Murrow Award and the Associated Press award for best anchor in Georgia. He has been recognized by everyone who can do so for his professionalism, his knowledge, his skill, and his talent.

It is a privilege for me to acknowledge today on the floor of the Senate his 18 years of service as an anchor, his 10 years of service in the Georgia Legislature, and his lifetime of commitment to the greatest State of all, the State of Georgia, to the betterment of his community, to the betterment of Savannah, the first capital of the State.

So as we take this moment in time to pause, I want to congratulate Sonny Dixon on a great career and a great recognition that is well earned.

TRIBUTE TO ROY ROBERTS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I would like to talk about Roy Roberts from Walton County, GA. It is not often that a Senator from Georgia rises to pay tribute to a Kentucky basketball player, but Roy Roberts played for the famous Adolf Rupp in the 1960s and was an All-SEC basketball player for the University of Kentucky. He was a great player and made many all-star teams and received many awards, but he came back to Georgia to ranch and farm 1,000 acres, raise Hereford cows, and, with his two brothers, make Walton County, GA, the centerpiece of our State.

He has annually participated in many things that involve politics and public involvement in Walton County and has helped to lead Walton County to be one of the leading Republican counties in the State of Georgia.

Most notable is the Roy Roberts annual barbecue, which takes place next Tuesday in Walton County, GA, where over 1,000 Georgians and Presidential candidates from all over the country will come to meet at Roy Roberts' farm, enjoy a little barbecue, and enjoy the best of grassroots politics.

Were it not for people like Roy Roberts, we wouldn't have the body politic we have, we wouldn't have the democracy we have, and Georgia would not be the great State it is.

I am pleased to rise today and commend to everyone the work of citizen Roy Roberts, a great American, a great Georgian, and a pretty doggone good basketball player for the University of Kentucky.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it was just a few weeks ago that the Senate took up and passed S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. This bill took us a while to get through but ultimately garnered unanimous support from this Chamber with a vote of 99 to 0. I am happy to report that the House of Representatives will take up and pass this bill later on today, and this vital legislation will then head to the President for his signature.

I thank my colleague and friend and fellow Texan, Representative TED POE of Houston, for serving as the chief House sponsor for this legislation. I also express my gratitude to the House leadership team and Chairman GOODLATTE of the House Judiciary Committee for their important work on this issue.

This legislation, as we said before, will provide victims of sexual exploitation, slavery, and human trafficking in the United States with an avenue to find healing and restoration. Most importantly, the victims, who are often children, will have access to additional

resources to ensure that they get the shelter and the services they need. I am thankful that Members from both Chambers and from both sides of the aisle were able to recognize the urgency of the matter and get the job done.

While this bill represents a step forward, there is more we need to do and more we will do to continue to fight the scourge of human trafficking. In the coming years, we will look back on this moment as a time when our country finally began to get serious about this problem and heard the voices of the thousands of American victims in our own backyard.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this Chamber has now turned its consideration to trade promotion authority, or TPA. I am a supporter of this legislation because my State is the largest exporting State in the country, and I think our economy and the number of jobs that are created in Texas are reflective of our strong commitment to international trade.

We simply find the point inarguable that to open new markets to the products that our agricultural sectors grow, our ranchers raise, and our manufacturers make seems to be such an obvious thing to do. That is why I am a big supporter of this legislation.

It is not something that just helps businesses; it helps consumers, too. Reducing the protections for domestically produced goods helps consumers most dramatically. It helps with their cost of living and helps make their daily or weekly or monthly paycheck go a little bit further.

Earlier this week, the Wall Street Journal reported that U.S. exports to trade-pact countries were growing at a far higher rate than exports to nontrade-pact countries. So if we get this TPA passed and the United States enters into one of these agreements under negotiation, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, we could see American exports to the region skyrocket. This region in particular involves 11 other countries and makes up about 40 percent of the world's economy, and, of course, it would be a ready-market for U.S. products, from beef to electronics.

The reason why trade promotion authority is so important is because it makes no sense—in fact, I think it is almost impossible—to negotiate a trade deal with 535 Members of Congress. Congress gives the President the authority within very firm and clear directives on how the President's U.S. trade administration should negotiate this. Frankly, I think this is one area where we have bipartisan agreement that this is good. So why wouldn't we work together in the best interests of the American people and our economy?

Trade doesn't just help businesses, as I have said; trade and TPA also help the consumer by driving down prices they pay every day at the drugstore, the grocery store, the hardware store—you name it. This legislation is good for American exporters and good for American consumers. Put simply, trade is good for America.

Let me reiterate that this bill is not filled with partisan rhetoric. It is actually a very simple trade tool that will give Congress the authority to examine any upcoming trade deal the President is trying to cut and make sure the American people get a fair shake.

I have heard several of our colleagues say they have gone down to a room to look at what has so far been negotiated on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. That is a good thing, but the fact is that negotiations aren't complete. That is not the whole deal; it is just a start.

Many of the provisions in the TPA are just commonsense proposals. For example, if passed, TPA would give Congress the authority to access the full text of the trade agreement. Of course, it is hard to get more straightforward than that. It would also make sure there is greater transparency and accountability in the negotiation process, with regular briefings by the administration to Congress and Members allowed to actually attend the negotiations.

In short, this trade legislation will provide Congress the needed oversight of the trade negotiations and will act as a safeguard for American interests to make sure our markets and our goods and services remain competitive in the global marketplace.

Finally, I would like to say that this is a reminder of how the Senate should function—as a deliberative body that votes regularly on a bipartisan basis to do something important to help hard-working American families. We vote.

I hope we will have a series of votes later this afternoon. I think having an open amendment process, as the majority leader has promised, is something that has been found to be a welcome development not just for the majority but also for the minority, which I know wants to participate in the process and thus represent their constituents to the best of their ability. Although some of my colleagues from across the aisle do not support this legislation, I hope they don't block it and prevent those of us who are interested in passing a good trade promotion authority piece of legislation from working productively.

I would encourage all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to offer their amendments so that the Senate can debate them and vote on them. That is our job as the elected representatives of the American people.

I see TPA as a real opportunity to help American workers earn higher wages and send more American-made products around the world. I encourage our colleagues to support this bill and in doing so to lend support to the hard-working Americans who increasingly rely on trade to support their families.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLARIFYING THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE BORDER PATROL AGENT PAY REFORM ACT OF 2014

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2252, which has been received from the House.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2252) to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 2252) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of trade adjustment assistance, which is included in the bill we are now considering. I urge my colleagues to oppose any attempt to curtail this vital program.

Trade adjustment assistance—better known as TAA—plays an essential role in helping hard-working Americans who through no fault of their own lose their jobs as the result of what is often unfair foreign competition. TAA programs enable displaced workers to acquire the new skills, the new training necessary to prepare for jobs in other industries.

I am proud to have authored the bipartisan legislation with Senator RON WYDEN to reauthorize TAA that is included in the bill before us. Our legislation forms the basis of the TAA provisions that are included in this bill.

Maine workers have been hit particularly hard by mill closures and shuttered factories. In the last 15 years,

Maine has lost 38 percent of its manufacturing jobs, nearly 31,000 jobs in total. While not all of those job losses are due to increased and unfair foreign competition, there is no doubt that workers in the manufacturing sector in Maine have been harmed by the outsourcing of their good-paying jobs to countries with much lower wages and environmental standards.

This last year was particularly difficult for workers in Maine's pulp and paper industry. In just the past year alone, the communities of Lincoln, East Millinocket, and Bucksport have all experienced devastating job losses due to the closures of paper mills. Those mills have been the financial anchors of those small towns, providing good jobs for generations of families. The second- and third-order economic effects on other businesses and their employees in those small communities are also significant.

In times of such great upheaval, laid-off employees need the time, the support, and the resources to learn the skills that will enable them to seek and secure new employment opportunities. These are skilled Americans who are eager to get back to work and who, with the right training, support, and opportunity, can find new jobs in in-demand fields.

Just this spring, I visited the Eastern Maine Community College in Bangor. I had the opportunity to talk with a group of students who are former employees of the Verso paper mill in Bucksport, which closed down last year completely unexpectedly. It was a huge and terrible surprise to the workers and to the community and surrounding area. But because of trade adjustment assistance, these former workers with whom I talked are now enrolled in a fine-furniture making program and are learning new skills for new jobs.

I was so impressed with their determination and their attitude. It is very difficult, if you have not been in school for decades, to enroll in a whole new field of study, but that is exactly what these laid-off workers were doing. Their determination to start new careers after years of working at the mill in Bucksport was inspiring. Each of them was enrolled thanks to the support provided by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. Without that program, they would not have had the funding, the support, and the resources necessary to enable them to do a mid-life career change.

Similarly, last year in Lincoln, ME, I met a woman who had spent many years working at the local tissue mill. This mill had a cycle of ups and downs over the years. When it was closed for a time years ago, this woman was thrown out of work, but her story had a happy ending. Through TAA, she was able to learn new skills and find employment as a nursing home administrator, where she has been happily employed for a decade. It took a lot of courage for this woman who had been employed as a mill worker for many years to go into an entirely new career field, but she did so. She encouraged her fellow workers to recognize that through the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, they too could find new skills, retrain in an area completely different from the work they had been doing, and have a happy ending.

Her story was inspiring. Because of TAA, for 10 years she has been providing for her family and contributing to her community. What a great return on investment. It would not have been possible without TAA. There are many more success stories like this one.

I thank Secretary Perez for expediting the TAA assistance these workers who are newly displaced have needed.

I would also note that since Maine is the State with the oldest median age in the Nation, this woman really picked a very good field in which to enroll. As a nursing home administrator, her skills are going to be in demand as we see the changing demographics not only of the State of Maine but of our Nation.

TAA programs have made a tremendous difference in the lives of those I have described, in the lives of those working in trade-affected industries in Maine, such as pulp and paper manufacturing, textile, and shoe production.

In fiscal year 2013 alone, more than 700 Mainers have benefited from the TAA programs, and more than 70 percent of the TAA participants in Maine have found employment within 3 months of completing their retraining programs made possible by TAA. Even more encouraging, of these participants who found employment, more than 90 percent were still employed in their new jobs 6 months later. Without TAA, it is very unlikely that would have happened.

Assisting American workers who are negatively affected by international trade—particularly when they are competing with workers with lower wages in countries with lower wages and lower environmental standards or none at all—is vitally important and the right thing to do.

In Maine, the effects of free-trade agreements have been decidedly mixed. While some past agreements have brought benefits to my State in the form of lowered tariffs on Maine products such as potatoes, lobster, and wild blueberries, jobs in many other industries have suffered terrible losses as a result of unfair foreign competition.

Our workers are the best in the world, and they can compete when there is a level playing field, but oftentimes they are competing against industries in developing countries that are paying lower wages, that don't have to comply with any kind of environmental standards, and that are often subsidized by those governments—and that is not fair.

The least we can do is to reauthorize the trade adjustment programs which are successfully helping to retrain and reemploy American workers. That is a commonsense way we can help workers recover from the blows inflicted by some unfair trade agreements, so these Americans can start new jobs and new lives with fresh skills.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of trade adjustment assistance and to oppose any amendments to end these vital programs.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1314, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Pending:

Hatch amendment No. 1221, in the nature of a substitute.

Hatch (for Flake) amendment No. 1243 (to amendment No. 1221), to strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program.

Hatch (for Inhofe/Coons) modified amendment No. 1312 (to amendment No. 1221), to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to require the development of a plan for each sub-Saharan African country for negotiating and entering into free trade agreements.

Hatch (for McCain) amendment No. 1226 (to amendment No. 1221), to repeal a duplicative inspection and grading program.

Stabenow (for Portman) amendment No. 1299 (to amendment No. 1221), to make it a principal negotiating objective of the United States to address currency manipulation in trade agreements.

Brown amendment No. 1251 (to amendment No. 1221), to require the approval of Congress before additional countries may join the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

Wyden (for Shaheen) amendment No. 1227 (to amendment No. 1221), to make trade agreements work for small businesses.

Wyden (for Warren) amendment No. 1327 (to amendment No. 1221), to prohibit the application of the trade authorities procedures to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement that includes investor-state dispute settlement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as we resume consideration of our TPA bill, I want to delve a little deeper into the process of considering and approving trade agreements.

Throughout the debate surrounding this bill, I have heard the term ''fast-track'' used quite a few times. There was, in fact, a time when trade promotion authority was commonly referred to as ''fast-track.'' Now, only TPA opponents use that term.

They want the American people to believe that under TPA, trade agreements come to Congress and are passed in the blink of an eye. Sometimes they use the term ''rubberstamp'' as if under TPA Congress wielding ultimate authority over a trade agreement—the power to reject it entirely—is a mere administrative act.

There is a reason the term ''fast-track'' isn't used anymore. It is because those who are being truly honest know the process is anything but fast.

I think it would be helpful for me to walk through the entire process Congress must undertake before rendering a final judgment on a trade agreement, to show how thoroughly these agreements are vetted before they ever receive a vote.

Before I do, though, I will note for my colleagues that this bill adds more transparency, notice, and consultation requirements than any TPA bill before it. This bill guarantees that Congress has all the information we need to render an informed up-or-down verdict on any trade agreement negotiated using the procedures in this bill. Congress's oversight of any trade agreement starts even before the negotiations on that agreement begin.

Under this bill, the President must not only notify Congress that he is considering entering into negotiations with our trading partners but also what his objectives for those negotiations are. Specifically, this has to happen 3 months before the President can start negotiating. That is 3 months for Congress to consult on and shape the negotiations before they even begin.

Congress's oversight continues as negotiations advance.

This bill requires the U.S. Trade Representative to continuously consult with the Senate Finance Committee and any other Senate committee with jurisdiction over subject matter potentially affected by a trade agreement. Moreover, the USTR, the U.S. Trade Representative, must, upon request, meet with any Member of Congress to consult on the negotiations, including providing classified negotiating text.

The bill also establishes panels to oversee the trade negotiations. These panels, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations and the designated congressional advisers, consult with and advise the USTR on the formulation of negotiating positions and strategies. Under the bill, members of these panels would be accredited advisers to trade negotiating sessions involving the United States.

Congressional oversight intensifies as the negotiations near conclusion. At least 6 months before the President signs a trade agreement, he must submit a report to Congress detailing any potential changes to U.S. trade remedy laws.

Then, 3 months before the President signs a trade agreement, he must notify Congress that he intends to do so. At the same time, the President is required to submit details of the agreement to the U.S. International Trade Commission. The ITC is tasked with preparing an extensive report for Congress on the potential costs and benefits the agreement will have on the U.S. economy, specific economic sectors, and American workers.

I want to focus on the next step required by this bill because it is a new requirement never before included in TPA. Sixty days before the President can sign any trade agreement, he must publish the full text of the agreement on the USTR Web site so that the public can see it. This ensures an unprecedented level of transparency for the American people and gives our constituents the material and time they need to inform us of their views.

Only after the President has met these notification and consultation requirements, only after he has provided the required trade reports, and only after he has made the agreement available to the American people, may he finally sign the agreement.

The process this bill requires before an agreement is even signed is obviously quite complex, full of checks and balances, and provides unprecedented transparency for the American public.

However, once the President does sign the agreement, his obligations continue. Sixty days after signing the agreement, the President must provide Congress a description of changes to U.S. law he considers necessary. This step gives Congress time to begin considering what will be included in the legislation to implement the trade agreement.

This is also the time when the Finance Committee holds open hearings on the trade agreement in order to gather the views of the administration and the public.

Following these hearings, one of the most important steps in this entire process occurs, the so-called informal markup. The informal markup is not always well understood, so I will take a minute to describe it.

The informal markup occurs before the President formally submits the trade agreement to Congress. As with any markup of legislation, the committee reviews and discusses the agreement and implementing legislation, has the opportunity to question witnesses about the agreement, and can amend the legislation.

In the event of amendments, the Senate can proceed to a mock conference with the House to unify the legislation. The practice of the informal markup produces or provides Congress an opportunity to craft the legislation implementing a trade agreement as it sees fit and to direct the President on the final package to be formally submitted to Congress.

While the informal markup is well established in practice, this bill, for the first time in the history of the TPA, specifies that Congress will receive the materials it needs in time to conduct an informal markup. It requires that 30 days before the President formally submits a trade agreement to Congress, he or she must submit the final legal text of the agreement and a statement specifying any administrative action he will take to implement the agreement.

The bill therefore ensures that Congress will have all the materials it needs in time to conduct a thorough markup. Only at this point may the President formally submit legislation implementing a trade agreement to Congress, and only at this point do the TPA procedures, first established in the Trade Act of 1974, kick in.

Once a bill implementing a trade agreement is formally submitted to Congress, a clock for consideration of that bill starts. This clock gives Congress 90 days in session to consider and roll out a bill. As everyone here knows, 90 legislative days takes a lot longer than 90 calendar days. When I hear my colleagues talk about ''fast-track,'' I think this is where they start the clock.

They are disregarding the years of oversight and consultations that occurred during trade negotiations. They are ignoring the many months of congressional consideration of trade legislation that occurs before the President ever formally submits that legislation to Congress. They are discounting that by this point in the process, Congress has held hearings on the agreement, received views from the public, and extensively reviewed the agreement and the implementing legislation through an informal markup. Calling this part of the process fast-track is like skipping to the end of a book and saying the author did not develop a plot.

As I said, even here at the end of the process, the bill provides more than 3 months for hearings, committee action, floor debate, and votes. Sometimes I think that only a United States Senator could argue that more than 3 months to formally consider legislation—legislation that has already been thoroughly debated, vetted, and reviewed—is making decisions too fast.

When Congress votes on an implementing bill, it is only after years of

oversight and months of formal review. So I have to ask, does this process seem fast to you? If TPA is not fast, then what does TPA do? Put simply, TPA guarantees a vote. TPA says to the world that when they sign an agreement with the United States, Congress promises to say yes or no to that agreement. Most importantly, TPA guarantees that Congress will have the information in the time we need to make that decision.

Without TPA, we are essentially telling the President to try to negotiate the price of a house, and then after buying that home, we are asking to renegotiate with the sellers. This would be absurd and rob Americans of financial opportunities, employment, and a fair world marketplace they can only get from free-trade agreements.

Once again, I urge all my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss two amendments that are pending to the trade bill. I want to begin by thanking Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN, as well as Senators MCCONNELL and REID, for working with me to make these amendments pending.

I believe it is important that we have an amendment process as we consider granting trade promotion authority to the President. Enacting the bill before us will have major impacts on our Nation's economy for years to come, and Senators should have an opportunity to improve the product reported by the Committee on Finance.

The trade promotion authority bill by its very nature demands that Senators be able to debate and vote on key trade issues. That is because the trade promotion authority bill creates a process by which trade agreements are submitted to Congress for approval without the opportunity to change them on the House or Senate floor. So it is critical that we utilize the opportunity we have now to set the rules of the road for future trade agreements and to enact important trade reforms.

Today, I would like to discuss two amendments I believe will strengthen the trade package.

AMENDMENT NO. 1227

As ranking member of the small business committee, it is my responsibility to look at bills on the Senate floor and ask: How does this affect small businesses? How will they benefit or be harmed? How can we improve this bill so that small businesses have a seat at the table?

I think that is especially important as we talk about trade. Trade has become increasingly vital for small businesses that are looking to diversify and grow. Yet, even though 95 percent of the world's customers live outside of the United States, less than 1 percent of our small- and medium-sized businesses are exporting to global markets. By comparison, over 40 percent of large businesses sell their products overseas. As we consider this trade package, we must make sure small businesses have a seat at the table and the resources they need to sell overseas.

The amendment I filed incorporates bipartisan, commonsense measures that will help small businesses take advantage of trade opportunities. It reauthorizes the SBA's State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program. This program, known as STEP, was created as a pilot program to help States work with small businesses to succeed in the international marketplace. In just a few years, STEP has been a great success. Since 2011, it has supported over $900 million in U.S. small business exports, producing a return on investment of 15 to 1 for taxpayers.

It has helped small businesses such as Corfin Industries, located in Salem, NH. Before STEP, Corfin's international sales were just 2 percent. Now they are up to 12 percent. As a result, the company has added 22 employees. That is the kind of job growth we will see in our small businesses when we make sure they are part of our trade agenda.

Reauthorizing the successful STEP Program is a commonsense way to make sure our small businesses can benefit from trade, and it builds on bipartisan legislation that was first introduced by Senator CANTWELL, who was just on the floor, Senator COLLINS, and me.

The amendment also takes a number of steps to make it easier for small businesses to access export services provided by the Federal Government. It encourages those Federal agencies, such as the Small Business Administration and the Department of Commerce, to work hand in hand with State trade agencies that have on-the-ground knowledge of local needs.

Finally, the amendment makes sure we understand how trade agreements negotiated under trade promotion authority will affect small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to support this small business amendment, and I hope we can reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank so that our small businesses can access that funding and get into those international markets.

AMENDMENT NO. 1226

The second amendment I would like to discuss is an amendment Senator MCCAIN, who is on the floor, and I have filed to repeal a harmful, job-killing program—the USDA Catfish Inspection Program. This is something Senator MCCAIN has been working on for years. I have joined him in recent years to try to address the concerns I have heard from companies in New Hampshire that are going to be affected by that new USDA Catfish Inspection Program.

Back in 2008, a provision was added to the farm bill that transferred the inspection of catfish—only catfish—from the FDA, which inspects all foreign and domestic fish products, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It required USDA to set up a new, separate program to inspect catfish alone.

I think this is a wasteful, duplicative program that will hurt seafood-processing businesses across the country. There is no scientific or food safety benefit here. In fact, officials from FDA and USDA have explicitly stated that catfish is a low-risk food. In nine separate reports, the Government Accountability Office has recommended eliminating this program.

Even worse, this program is actually a thinly disguised trade barrier against foreign catfish. We are facing an immediate 5- to 7-year ban on imported catfish as soon as the USDA program is up and running. As a result, our trading partners are explicitly threatening retaliation. And since there is no scientific basis for this program, any WTO nation that currently exports catfish to the United States could challenge it and secure WTO-sanctioned trade retaliation against a wide range of U.S. export industries, including beef, soy, poultry, pork, grain, fruit, or cotton. The program is becoming a major issue of concern in Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations.

The only other time the Senate has voted on this issue was in 2012 when we voted to repeal it in a bipartisan voice vote. But since then, we have been denied the opportunity to address this issue on the floor. I think it is very important that we have an opportunity to vote on this amendment because the USDA is poised to begin its inspection of catfish very soon. This may be our last chance to solve this problem before the program's harmful effects begin.

Again, we need an opportunity to vote on this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it and to repeal the duplicative USDA Catfish Inspection Program.

I look forward to hearing what my colleague Senator MCCAIN has to say.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her support and continuing efforts to get rid of this wasteful, pork barrel, outrageous program that has cost the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars and with regard to the catfish office alone, about $20 million to date. As the Senator from New Hampshire pointed out, this could put the entire TPP—Trans-Pacific Partnership—Agreement in jeopardy. So this has a lot more to do with just catfish here; it has a lot to do with our international relations and the prospects of concluding or not concluding one of the most important trade agreements arguably of the 21st century, obviously.

I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senators SHAHEEN, AYOTTE, ISAKSON, KIRK, CRAPO, RISCH, CASEY, REED, PETERS, WYDEN, WARNER, CANTWELL, and MCCASKILL, in introducing this amendment, which has already been made pending to the trade promotion authority act, which would repeal a proposed Catfish Inspection Program at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The amendment would end the waste of taxpayer money pouring into the creation of a USDA catfish office, which is about $20 million to date. It would also save American farmers and livestock growers from potentially losing billions of dollars in lost market access to Asian nations.

As the Senator from New Hampshire pointed out, I have been fighting this catfish battle for a long time. I first tried to kill an old catfish-labeling program in the 2002 farm bill. Later, during the Senate's debate on the 2012 farm bill, I offered a similar amendment to repeal this new catfish program, which was adopted by voice vote. But when the Senate took up the 2014 farm bill after failing to pass it in 2012, I was blocked from having a vote by the Democratic manager despite her assurances that my amendment would receive a vote.

I note that my dear friend from Mississippi is here, and I know there may be others who will want to preserve this $14 to $20 million waste of taxpayer dollars. All I want is a vote. All I am asking for is an up-or-down vote on whether we should continue to squander millions of taxpayer dollars on a program that is not only duplicative but endangers the entire Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement we are discussing today.

American agriculture is the heart of our efforts to pass TPA, particularly as negotiators move closer to completing the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. TPA can put wind in the sails of the 12-nation TPP, which will promote hundreds of billions of dollars of American exports, including beef, pork, poultry, soy, wheat, vegetables, and dairy products. The TPP covers an area of the world that accounts for about 40 percent of global GDP and one-third of all trade. The TPP will strengthen our security relationships with countries such as Japan, Malaysia, Vietnam, and Australia, and provide a strategic counterweight to Chinese protectionist influence. So it is our responsibility to pass a trade promotion authority that signals to Asian trading partners that we are serious about free trade.

Free trade is good for America. I am a representative of a State that has immeasurably benefited from the North American Free Trade Agreement.

By the way, many of the same interests and people who opposed that are opposing this now—i.e., primarily the labor unions.

Here, that means eliminating this catfish program, which is one of the most brazen and reckless protectionist programs that I have encountered in my time in the Senate. The purpose of the USDA catfish office is purportedly to make sure catfish is safe for human consumption. I am all in favor of ensuring that American consumers enjoy wholesome catfish. The problem is that the Food and Drug Administration already inspects all seafood, including catfish.

The true purpose of the catfish program is to create a trade barrier to protect a small handful of catfish farmers in two or three Southern States. Let's be clear about what this is all about—protecting catfish farmers in two or three Southern States. Yet, we are endangering the entire agreement here. That is not right, and it is not right for the American people.

In classic farm bill politics, southern catfish farmers worked up some specious talking points—which will probably be repeated here today—about how Americans need a whole new government agency to inspect catfish imports. As a result, USDA will soon hire and train roughly 95 catfish inspectors to work right alongside the FDA inspector doppelgangers in seafood-processing plants across the Nation. Experts say it could take as long as 5 to 7 years for foreign catfish exporters to duplicate USDA's new program, which would give southern catfish farmers a lock on the American seafood market.

Growing government is not cheap. To date, the USDA has spent $20 million to set up the catfish office without inspecting a single catfish. I am not making that up. Moving forward, the USDA estimates it will spend around $14 million a year once the program is operational.

GAO has investigated this catfish office and warned Congress in nine different reports—nine different reports to GAO, which is probably clearly the most trusted organization here—nine different reports. The catfish office should be repealed. It is wasteful and duplicative. The FDA already inspects seafood. It fragments our food inspection system. Nine different reports. One GAO report is simply titled ''Responsibility for Inspecting Catfish Should Not Be Assigned to USDA.'' The Government Accountability Office has repeatedly found that catfish inspectors are a phony issue and warned that implementing the USDA program might actually make food less safe for Americans by fragmenting seafood inspections across two Federal agencies.

Here are a few GAO excerpts.

GAO, May 2012:

USDA uses outdated and limited information as its scientific basis for catfish inspection. The cost effectiveness of the catfish inspection program is unclear because USDA would oversee a small fraction of all seafood imports while FDA, using its enhanced authorities, could undertake oversight of all imported seafood.

GAO, February 2013:

Congress should consider repealing provisions of the Farm Bill that assigned USDA responsibility for examining and inspecting catfish.

GAO, April 2014:

We suggested that Congress consider repealing these provisions of the 2008 Farm Bill. However, the 2014 Farm Bill instead modified these provisions to require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Commissioner of FDA that would ensure that inspection of catfish conducted by the FSIS and FDA are not duplicative. We maintain that such an MOU does not address the fundamental problem, which is that FSIS's catfish program, if implemented, would result in duplication of activities and an inefficient use of taxpayer funds. Duplication would result if facilities that process both catfish and other seafood were inspected by both FSIS and FDA.

Even if my colleagues do not care about ballooning government spending and taxpayer waste, then consider the risk this catfish program presents to jobs and agriculture exports from their home States to an area of the world that accounts for 40 percent of the world's GDP and one-third of its trade.

Ten Asian-Pacific nations have sent letters to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative warning that this USDA catfish office is hurting TPP negotiations. At least one nation—Vietnam—has threatened trade retaliation if the program comes online.

American trade experts are equally outraged. In a legal opinion written by the former chief judge at the World Trade Organization—the chief judge at the World Trade Organization said:

The United States would face a daunting challenge in defending the catfish rule . . . there was, and still is, no meaningful evidence that catfish—domestic or imported—posed a significant health hazard when Congress acted in 2008 . . . the complete lack of scientific evidence to justify the catfish rule combines with substantial evidence of protectionist intent.

He further notes that when it came to creating the USDA Catfish Inspection Program in the dead of night using a farm bill conference report—that is interesting, my colleagues; a farm bill conference report was how this whole thing came about—''Congress shot first and asked questions later.''

This is perhaps Mr. Bacchus's most poignant warning:

If Congress continues to mandate the transfer of jurisdiction over catfish, it will not only be inviting a WTO challenge to the rule; it will be giving other nations an opening to enact ''copycat legislation'' which will disadvantage our exports. Moreover, if the United States somehow prevails in defending the catfish measure in a WTO case, it will truly be ''open season'' in the rest of the world for new restrictions on U.S. agriculture exports of all kinds.

Mr. Bacchus is not alone in his assessment. The Wall Street Journal has covered this catfish debacle over the years. The Wall Street Journal has editorialized and reported on this many times.

This past weekend, the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal penned an editorial entitled ''Congress's Catfish Trade Scam.''

The Wall Street Journal, lead editorial, ''Congress's Catfish Trade Scam.''

''The U.S. slams a trade partner and raises prices for Americans.''

''Senate Democrats dealt a blow to economic growth Tuesday by refusing to advance . . . Japan, Vietnam,'' et cetera.

The problem dates to 2002, when Congress barred Vietnamese exporters from marketing as ''catfish'' an Asian cousin known as pangasius with similar taste, texture and whiskers. But that failed to curb American enthusiasm for the cheaper foreign creature, which is common in fish sticks and often called ''basa'' or ''swai'' on menus. So in 2003 Washington slapped tariffs on the Vietnamese fish, claiming they were ''dumped'' into the U.S. market at unfairly low prices.

That didn't work either, so Mississippi Republican Thad Cochran slipped a provision into the 2008 farm bill to transfer regulatory responsibility over catfish, including pangasius, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture from the Food and Drug Administration. The pretext was public health, but pangasius posed no risk, and the USDA regulates meat and poultry, not fish. The real aim was to raise costs for Vietnamese exporters and drive them from the U.S. market.

Thus was born one of Washington's most wasteful programs, which the Government Accountability Office has criticized nine times and estimated to have cost $30 million to start, plus $14 million a year to operate—as opposed to the $700,000 annual cost of the original inspection regime. This is ''everything that's wrong about the food-safety system,'' said former FDA food-safety czar David Acheson recently. ''It's food politics. It's not public health.''

Pangasius imports continue for now as the USDA sets up its expensive new office, with the fish passing cod and crab last year to become America's sixth most-popular. (Shrimp is first.) Meanwhile, Vietnam has threatened to respond to a ban by demanding the right to retaliate against U.S. beef, soybeans and other products as part of TPP negotiations and suing the World Trade Organization, where it would probably win.

Most Members of Congress understand the damage, but Mr. COCHRAN has used his seniority to block repeal. The latest effort at repeal, sponsored by JOHN MCCAIN and nine other Republicans and Democrats, could get a vote when the Senate reconsiders the trade-promotion bill, then would have to go through the House. Ending catfish protectionism would be a sign that at least some in Washington are serious about free trade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the aforementioned Wall Street Journal editorial.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 14, 2015]

CONGRESS'S CATFISH TRADE SCAM

Senate Democrats dealt a blow to economic growth Tuesday by refusing to advance the trade-promotion bill needed to complete the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade pact (TPP). Now Japan, Vietnam and other negotiating partners will look to see if Washington can salvage its trade agenda. They'll also be watching Congressional jockeying over catfish. Allow us to explain.

The problem dates to 2002, when Congress barred Vietnamese exporters from marketing as ''catfish'' an Asian cousin known as pangasius with similar taste, texture and whiskers. But that failed to curb American enthusiasm for the cheaper foreign creature, which is common in fish sticks and often called ''basa'' or ''swai'' on menus. So in 2003 Washington slapped tariffs on the Vietnamese fish, claiming they were ''dumped'' into the U.S. market at unfairly low prices.

That didn't work either, so Mississippi Republican Thad Cochran slipped a provision into the 2008 farm bill to transfer regulatory responsibility over catfish, including pangasius, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture from the Food and Drug Administration. The pretext was public health, but pangasius posed no risk, and the USDA regulates meat and poultry, not fish. The real aim was to raise costs for Vietnamese exporters and drive them from the U.S. market.

Thus was born one of Washington's most wasteful programs, which the Government Accountability Office has criticized nine times and estimated to have cost $30 million to start, plus $14 million a year to operate—as opposed to the $700,000 annual cost of the original inspection regime. This is ''everything that's wrong about the food-safety system,'' said former FDA food-safety czar David Acheson recently. ''It's food politics. It's not public health.''

Pangasius imports continue for now as the USDA sets up its expensive new office, with the fish passing cod and crab last year to become America's sixth most-popular. (Shrimp is first.) Meanwhile, Vietnam has threatened to respond to a ban by demanding the right to retaliate against U.S. beef, soybeans and other products as part of TPP negotiations and suing at the World Trade Organization, where it would probably win.

Most Members of Congress understand the damage, but Mr. Cochran has used his seniority to block repeal. The latest effort at repeal, sponsored by John McCain and nine other Republicans and Democrats, could get a vote when the Senate reconsiders the trade-promotion bill, then would have to go through the House. Ending catfish protectionism would be a sign that at least some in Washington are serious about free trade.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article dated June 27, 2014, entitled ''U.S. Catfish Program Could Stymie Pacific Trade Pact, 10 Nations Say''; a letter by Jim Bacchus dated May 14, 2015; a letter dated May 13, 2015, from the National Taxpayers Union, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Taxpayers Protection Alliance, and Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, all of them urging Congress to repeal the catfish program in TPA; a letter dated May 14, 2015, from the National Restaurant Association; and a letter dated April 22, 2015, from the Vietnamese Ambassador to the Senate Finance Committee.

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

[From the New York Times, June 27, 2014]

U.S. CATFISH PROGRAM COULD STYMIE PACIFIC TRADE PACT, 10 NATIONS SAY

(By Ron Nixon)

WASHINGTON.—Ten Asian and Pacific nations have told the Office of the United States Trade Representative that the Agriculture Department's catfish inspection program violates international law, and their objections could hamper Obama administration efforts to reach a major Pacific trade agreement by the end of next year.

They say that the inspection program is a trade barrier erected under the guise of a food safety measure and that it violates the United States' obligations under World Trade Organization agreements. Among the countries protesting are Vietnam and Malaysia, which are taking part in talks for the trade agreement—known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership—and have the ability to derail or hold up those negotiations.

The complaints are outlined in a May 28 letter signed by diplomats from the 10 countries. The letter does not threaten retaliation, but it emphasizes that the American catfish program stood in the way of the trade talks.

Vietnam, a major catfish producer, has long complained about the program, but it has never before won international support for its fight. Several of the countries whose representatives signed the letter—including the Philippines, Myanmar, Thailand and Indonesia—do not have catfish industries to protect and are not involved in the trans-Pacific trade talks.

But the letter expresses the concern that the inspection program could lead the Agriculture Department to expand its ability to regulate seafood exports to the United States, catfish or not.

''Many of these countries are looking to see what happens to Vietnam on the catfish issues, and what precedents it might set for other trade deals in the region,'' said Jeffrey J. Schott, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington and the co-author of a book on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. The United States and 11 countries on both sides of the Pacific—as well as Australia, New Zealand and Brunei—are still negotiating the trade pact, which has been repeatedly delayed over various disputes.

The Vietnam Association of Seafood Exporters and Producers recently hired James Bacchus, a former chairman of the World Trade Organization's appeals panel, to prepare a possible legal challenge to the catfish inspection program.

Mr. Bacchus said in an interview that only governments have standing to bring a case before the trade organization, but that the export group was working closely with Vietnamese officials to monitor the catfish inspection program.

''I'm confident that Vietnam would have a case before the W.T.O. if they decided to bring one,'' said Mr. Bacchus, a former United States House member from Florida who is now a lawyer with Greenberg Traurig in Washington.

The inspection program was inserted into the 2008 farm bill at the urging of catfish farmers, who have been hurt by competition from both Vietnam and China and by the rising cost of catfish feed. The domestic catfish industry has shrunk by about 60 percent since its peak about a decade ago, and in the past few years about 20 percent of American catfish farming operations have closed.

The catfish industry and lawmakers led by Senator Thad Cochran, Republican of Mississippi, fought for the new office, saying it

was needed to protect Americans from eating fish raised in unsanitary conditions or contaminated with drugs. The Food and Drug Administration has a similar program, but it inspects less than 2 percent of food imports, and advocates of the Agriculture Department program said that was not good enough.

The Agriculture Department has traditionally inspected meat and poultry, while the F.D.A. has been responsible for all other foods, including seafood.

Agriculture Department inspections are more stringent than those conducted by the F.D.A. The Agriculture Department also requires nations that export beef, pork and poultry to the United States to set up inspections that are equivalent to the agency's program—an expensive and burdensome regulation that Vietnam says is unnecessary for catfish. A Government Accountability Office report in May 2012 called imported catfish a low-risk food and said an Agriculture Department inspection program would ''not enhance the safety of catfish.''

The Agriculture Department said it had spent $20 million since 2009 to set up its office, which has a staff of four, although it has yet to inspect a single catfish. The department said it expected to spend about $14 million a year to run the program; the F.D.A., by comparison, spends about $700,000 annually on its existing seafood inspection office.

Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona, and other critics say the Agriculture Department program is a waste of money, and Mr. McCain sponsored an amendment in the latest farm bill that would have killed the program. But the measure was never brought up for a vote. The Obama administration has also called for eliminating the Agriculture Department program.

MAY 14, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Majority Leader.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Senate Minority Leader.

SENATORS MCCONNELL AND REID: As the Senate considers Trade Promotion Authority, Trade Adjustment Assistance, and related legislation, I wanted to make certain that you have the facts about the USDA Catfish Inspection Program and its implications for the United States in the world trading system. In particular, I want to make sure you are aware that the United States would face a daunting challenge in defending the catfish rule.

As background, I am a former Member of Congress, from Florida; a former international trade negotiator for the United States; and the former Chairman of the Appellate Body—the chief judge—for the World Trade Organization. In nearly a decade of service to the Members of the WTO as one of the seven founding judges on the highest global tribunal for world trade, from 1995 through 2003, I judged many of the most notable WTO trade disputes and wrote the legal opinions in many of the WTO trade judgments on issues relating to numerous aspects of both agricultural trade and food safety. Currently, I chair the global practice of the Greenberg Traurig law firm, for which I am writing in my capacity as counsel to the National Fisheries Institute.

As you will recall, the 2008 and 2014 Farm Bills contained language that would shift inspection of catfish from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to the United States Department of Agriculture's Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS). FDA currently regulates all seafood, and FSIS regulates beef, pork, and poultry. Supporters of the transfer of jurisdiction have reassured Senators that the USDA program would not create a problem for the United States under WTO rules because imported catfish would be subject to the same standards as American catfish.

This is not so. The legal test of whether a measure, as written or as applied, is consistent with WTO obligations is not whether it imposes the same standard on like domestic and imported products. The legal test in the WTO is whether such a measure, as written or as applied, denies an equal competitive opportunity to the like imported products in the domestic marketplace. The catfish measure promises to fail this fundamental legal test under international law.

It is not my intent here to list the entire catalogue of claims that would be likely to be brought against the United States in a ease in WTO dispute settlement by Vietnam and possibly by other affected Members of the WTO following implementation of the catfish measure by the USDA. There will be more than ample opportunity for doing so later in Geneva if the catfish measure is not repealed.

Suffice it to say that, if the catfish measure is not repealed, and if it is implemented by USDA as currently contemplated, quite a few strong claims could very likely be made in WTO dispute settlement by the affected trading partners of the United States under both the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (the GATT) and the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement), which are both part of the overall WTO treaty.

Because WTO litigation is intensely fact-specific, and requires painstaking and extensive development and analysis of the measures being challenged, I am always reluctant to express a definitive opinion about a potential WTO case. Having judged so many WTO cases, I am less inclined than others to predict their outcome. This case, however, stands out for the egregiousness of its inconsistencies with WTO obligations. Quite rightly, the Congressional Research Service has quoted approvingly a Wall Street Journal opinion article that described the treatment of Vietnamese catfish in this measure as ''protectionism at its worst.''

Nothing good can result for the United States from applying the catfish measure.

Continuing with the implementation of the catfish measure would further complicate the efforts of US trade negotiators to secute significant concessions from Vietnam and others on other issues of considerable importance to US businesses and workers in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Losing a WTO case that challenged the catfish measure would, if the United States chose not to comply with the WTO ruling, give the complaining countries the right to retaliate against American agricultural and other products bound for their markets.

Perhaps worst of all for the United States would be winning a WTO case that challenged the catfish measure.

The United States has a long and contentious history of trying to overcome European and Asian trade barriers to our agricultural and food products that are justified as ''food safety'' measures but are in fact intended to block entirely safe American food exports. For this reason, the United States has long been the leading advocate for a strong SPS agreement that ensures that food safety measures will be based on real scientific evidence, including a serious risk assessment.

If Congress continues to mandate the transfer of jurisdiction over catfish, it will not only be inviting a WTO challenge to the rule; it will be giving other nations an opening to enact ''copycat legislation'' which will further disadvantage our exports. Moreover, if the United States somehow prevails in defending the catfish measure in a WTO case, it will truly be ''open season'' in the rest of the world for new restrictions on US agricultural exports of all kinds.

Sincerely,

JAMES BACCHUS,
Chair, Global Practice.

MAY 13, 2015.

DEAR SENATOR MCCAIN: The undersigned groups representing millions of taxpayers and allied educational bodies write in support of your efforts to repeal the duplicative catfish inspection program at the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) in S. 995, the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015. The undersigned groups have been vocal critics of the catfish inspection program that has spent $20 million over four years and not inspected a single fish. The Government Accountability Office has nine times listed the program as ''wasteful and duplicative;'' and it is one that the former Chief Judge of the highest court of international trade says will result in not just a trade war but also a lawsuit the U.S. will lose. Right now the program is on track to spend $15 million annually for the USDA to do a job the FDA is already doing.

Specifically on the issue of trade, according to an April 24, 2012 bipartisan letter to Senate Agriculture, Nutrition & Forestry Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow (D–Mich.), ''And beyond the fiscal implications, the catfish program has caused considerable concern among trade experts. According to them, the program would create a discriminatory de facto ban on exports from key trading partners and expose us to retaliation. . . . We are aware that no scientific data that catfish, imported or domestic, pose any greater food safety risk than other farmed seafood—all of which will remain under FDA regulation.''

Eliminating the duplicative USDA catfish inspection office was agreed to by voice vote in the 2013 Senate farm bill debate, yet inexplicably the Senate was never granted an opportunity to debate the merits of including this program in the 2014 farm bill. But now with Trade Promotion Authority, there is an opportunity to finally implement the will of the Senate and end the duplicative waste that the USDA catfish inspection program has continued to foster. We support your efforts to repeal the program restoring some measure of fiscal discipline and we urge your colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

Sincerely,

Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, National Taxpayers Union, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2015.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the National Restaurant Association, I strongly urge you to support the bipartisan McCain-Shaheen catfish amendment to the Senate's pending trade related legislation. This amendment supports our nation's businesses, farmers, customers and taxpayers by removing funding for the duplicative U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) catfish inspection program.

During the 2008 Farm Bill Conference, language was added to transfer the responsibility for catfish inspections from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to the USDA.

The USDA has already spent $20 million drafting regulations and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) estimates that the USDA will spend $170 million over the next decade implementing the program. The GAO also found that implementation of the USDA catfish program will cost American taxpayers millions annually to provide a duplicative service because the FDA currently inspects all seafood, including catfish. Every U.S. facility that processes, handles, or distributes catfish would now be subject to duplicative regulation by both FDA and USDA.

As members of the foodservice industry, we are committed to food safety. However, this new program would provide no benefit. In fact, the USDA itself has stated that its Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) would not provide additional food safety protection. The Agency's cost-benefit analysis also found no significant safety benefit in creating the program.

Finally, implementation of this program could strongly impact U.S. agricultural relations with key trading partners. This program would create a potential trade barrier to catfish imports and could violate the World Trade Organization Sanitary and Phyto-Sanitary agreement. It could also make U.S. agricultural exports susceptible to trade retaliation.

For these reasons, we encourage you to help our nation's businesses, farmers, customers and taxpayers by supporting the bipartisan McCain-Shaheen amendment.

Sincerely,

MATT WALKER,
Vice President, Government Affairs, National Restaurant Association.
LAURA ABSHIRE,
Director of Sustainability & Government Affairs, National Restaurant Association.

THE AMBASSADOR,
EMBASSY OF VIETNAM,
Washington, DC, April 22, 2015.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, Washington, DC.

YOUR HONORABLE: As ambassador of Vietnam to the United States, I am writing to bring to your attention to the concern of the Vietnamese Government related to the discussion on the TPA/TPP at the Senate Finance Committee under your leadership and seek your kind assistance on the matter.

The concern is related to the so-called ''catfish inspection program'' being transferred from the FDA to USDA, for the following reasons:

The USDA program is duplicative with the FDA and National Marine Fisheries Service.

It costs much more the U.S. tax payers and imposes unnecessary regulatory complexity for seafood processors, which in turn adds burden to the U.S. customers.

It adds nothing more to ensuring the safety of the products.

It creates an inappropriate trade barrier that violates the World Trade Organization (WTO) rules.

In particular, this provision is not in line with what is to be achieved for the TPP, which is based on high standards, including on trade liberalization.

The Government of Vietnam strongly urges that an amendment to be set up to repeal the above-mentioned provision in the process of consideration and approval of the TPA/TPP.

I count on your support in this regard. Please, accept, Your Honorable, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,

PHAM QUANG VINH.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the National Restaurant Association sent a letter:

On behalf of the National Restaurant Association, I strongly urge you to support the bipartisan McCain-Shaheen catfish amendment to the Senate's pending trade related legislation. . . . As members of the food service industry, we are committed to food safety. However, this new program would provide no benefit. In fact, the USDA itself has stated that its Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) would not provide additional food safety protection.

Finally, implementation of this program could strongly impact U.S. agricultural relations with key trading partners.

The Taxpayers Protection Alliance:

We support your efforts to repeal the program restoring some measure of fiscal discipline and we urge your colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

Mr. President, I understand that the parliamentary situation is that we have a number of pending amendments and that probably it is very likely that a cloture motion will be filed. That, of course, would then mean I would not be allowed to have this amendment.

If we do not allow this amendment, I have to say that we will be really showing a degree of contempt and arrogance for the taxpayers of America. I have watched this program and this incredible—I have seen $14 million wasted. I have seen an example of protectionism.

I was told in the last bill on agriculture that I would receive a vote on my amendment. All I am asking for is a straight up-or-down vote so we can save the taxpayers $14 million, $20 million, $30 million, $40 million on a program that is both wasteful and not needed.

I understand my colleagues from Mississippi and other Southern States want to protect their catfish industry, which I have enjoyed many samples of over the years. I do not understand the rationale for continuing—particularly under conditions of sequestration—any program that costs the taxpayers unending millions of dollars per year.

I urge my colleagues to demand a vote. All I am asking for is an up-or-down vote on an amendment that is clearly relevant to the consideration of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I want to add my support to the amendment Senator MCCAIN has just spoken to and my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN.

Absolutely we should have a vote on eliminating this duplicative inspection of catfish, what the Wall Street Journal is calling one of Washington's most wasteful programs, calling it the catfish scam.

In fact, we had testimony before the small business committee the other day, and I asked the representative of the FDA whether we need duplicative inspections of catfish because right now the FDA is inspecting catfish for $700,000 a year, and this duplicative inspection of it is estimated to cost over $14 million a year. In fact, there was already a study done by the National Fisheries Institute that the USDA had spent more than $20 million to have a duplicative inspection regime. As Senator MCCAIN mentioned, there are nine GAO reports about the fact that we are wasting taxpayer dollars on a duplicative inspection regime that we should eliminate.

The fact that we cannot get a vote on the Senate floor on such a wasteful use of taxpayer dollars—this is why people get frustrated with Washington when it is sitting right before us, and it is so obvious that we should not waste their money when we already have a perfectly good inspection regime that costs so much less versus this added inspection regime, which in the end is going to hurt jobs across this country, including jobs in New Hampshire, because it is going to create not only a duplicative program that wastes taxpayer dollars that common sense would tell us we should have a vote to eliminate, but it is also going to eliminate the opportunity for trade. The free-trade agreements that are currently being negotiated could mean over 8,200 jobs in my State.

James Bacchus, the former chief judge on the highest international tribunal of world trade and former Member of Congress, said this program will result not just in a trade war but also a lawsuit, and the United States will lose. Not only will we lose taxpayer dollars by not having a vote on this program and wasting money, but we will also create an unnecessary trade barrier that could impede future trade agreements and American jobs that can be created.

I offer my support for this amendment, and I do believe we should have a vote on this amendment. Why wouldn't we have a vote on a program that has demonstrated—by nine GAO reports—it has wasted millions of dollars which could otherwise be used to pay down our debt or put to good use in programs that are worthwhile. Yet here we are. We cannot even get a vote.

I share my colleague's concern. I thank Senator MCCAIN and Senator SHAHEEN for bringing this important amendment forward, and I hope we will have a vote to eliminate the wasteful money going into the USDA inspection regime of catfish.

How many times do we need our catfish inspected? It is absurd and time to end this waste and quit wasting taxpayer dollars.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I understand that Senator WYDEN has priority recognition at this time. I have been informed he does not object to me entering into the debate at this moment.

May I proceed on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, there are a couple of objectives this McCain amendment would accomplish. For one thing, it was in the 2008 farm bill. The current move to change the inspection from the FDA to the Department of Agriculture is in the current farm bill, and it is about to take place, so it would revisit the last two farm bills. I do not think we should be doing that in a trade promotion authority piece of legislation. Also, it is absolutely not duplicative. It can be said on the floor of the Senate 100 times, but the fact is that the USDA Catfish Inspection Program is not duplicative. It transfers inspection from the FDA to the USDA and the USDA has testified before Congress that when the program is operational, as it is about to be, the FDA program would be eliminated.

Why move it from the FDA to the USDA? Here is the reason: There are a few of us—under controlled situations—who grow most of the catfish that is produced in the United States on farms, including the State of Mississippi and the State of Arkansas.

My distinguished colleagues from Arkansas and Mississippi will speak on this issue in a few moments, I hope.

This is about food safety for Americans in 50 States who deserve to know that the fish they are eating—the product they are eating—is unadulterated.

Here are the facts: Under the current FDA program, only about 2 percent of the billions of pounds of imported catfish are inspected—only about 2 percent. The other 98 percent of this large quantity come in uninspected. Now, that gives me pause as a consumer. It should give residents of all 50 States pause that 98 percent of the catfish which comes into our country is not inspected.

Here is what we do know about the 2 percent we look at under the FDA program: An alarming volume of the catfish inspected by the FDA already failed to meet standards. They failed to meet consumer safety standards. Many overseas productions are simply not operated under the sanitary conditions that we insist upon in the United States with our farm-raised catfish.

The FDA program does not ensure that trade partners have sufficient health standards nor does it inspect any overseas agriculture operations. They don't go over to Vietnam and look at the operations there and see the safety standards that cause the health risks.

What kind of health risks are we talking about? We are talking about cancer. I have in my hand a page from a draft rule by the Department of Agriculture, dated February 10, 2009. This is a draft rule from the Food Safety and Inspection Service. It turns out—and the GAO has been mentioned here—that the GAO got OMB to ask the FSIS to rework this statement and make it a little softer so we would not go so hard on imported Vietnamese catfish.

Here is what the Department of Agriculture report, which has now been buried, says as to whether or not the Agency used random or risk-based samplings: Applying the Food Safety Inspection Service program to imported catfish yielded a reduction of approximately 175,000 lifetime cancers for Americans—I want that kind of reduction from carcinogens coming into the United States—and 0.79 percent acute toxicities. Using random sampling in the Agency's program yielded a reduction of 91.8 million exposures to antimicrobials and 23.28 million heavy metal exposures. We are talking about carcinogens, we are talking about improper antimicrobials that the USDA program would catch, and over 23 million exposures to heavy metals that we don't need in the United States. Using risk-based sampling yielded a reduction of 95.1 million exposures to antimicrobials.

We are talking about a program that is not going to be duplicative because it is going to move—according to the last two farm bills—from the FDA to the USDA. This excessive government waste we have heard about will not exist, but we will have better safety for the consumers of the United States of America. That is why we do not need to revisit this issue, and that is why the McCain amendment should be rejected. That is why we should take every precaution we can to protect the American consumer, whether in their home kitchens or restaurants.

I yield the floor. Perhaps other of my colleagues would like to address this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the Senate has made clear the authority of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for imported catfish inspections. It has been debated and resolved in two previous farm bills; first, in 2008 and again in 2014. The USDA catfish inspection is about protecting the health and safety of American consumers. The 2008 and 2014 farm bills required catfish inspection responsibilities to be transferred from the Food and Drug Administration to the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service upon publication of final regulations.

The need for this regulatory clarification is clear: American consumers could be exposed to dangerous chemicals and unapproved drugs in the imported catfish they eat. According to the Government Accountability Office, about half of the seafood imported into the United States comes from farm-raised fish. Fish grown in confined areas have been shown to contain bacterial infections. The FDA's oversight program to ensure the safety of imported seafood from residues of unapproved drugs is limited, especially as compared with the practices of other developed countries.

According to the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, the Food and Drug Administration inspects only 1 percent of all imported seafood products. This is just not acceptable. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, on the other hand, inspects 100 percent of farm-raised meat products that enter the country, which illustrates why the Department of Agriculture is the appropriate Agency for farm-raised catfish inspections.

Following enactment of the catfish mandate in the 2008 farm bill, the Department of Agriculture conducted risk assessments on the dangers of exposure to foreign agriculture drugs and determined that moving catfish inspections under the USDA inspection system would result in a reduction of 175,000 lifetime cancers, 95 million exposures to antimicrobials, and 23 million heavy metal exposures.

The Catfish Inspection Program will enhance consumer safety but will not result in duplication activities by U.S. government agencies. Upon issuance of final regulations, catfish inspection responsibilities will be transferred to and not shared with the Department of Agriculture.

In order to address perceived concerns regarding duplication, a provision was included in the 2014 farm bill that required the FDA and USDA to enter into a memorandum of understanding to establish clear jurisdictional boundaries.

We consider that this is a time to resolve this issue and put this matter to rest. International equivalence is a concept that originated with the WTO and is regarded as a way to encourage the development of international food safety standards and will help this issue to be balanced fairly among all Members and facilitate our trade with other countries.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Portman-Stabenow amendment.

First, I wish to say a word in support of the efforts by Senator COCHRAN and Senator WICKER. I was a partner with

Senator COCHRAN in the 2014 farm bill. I support their position as it relates to the catfish provision. Hopefully, we will be able to retain that provision.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator HIRONO as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1299.

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated September 23, 2013, signed by 60 U.S. Senators, that calls on the administration to include strong and enforceable currency provisions in all future trade agreements.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, September 23, 2013.

Secretary JACK LEW,
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC.
Ambassador MICHAEL FROMAN,
Office of the United States Trade Representative, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY LEW AND AMBASSADOR FROMAN: We agree with the Administration's stated goal that the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) has ''high standards worthy of a 21st century trade agreement.'' To achieve this, however, we think it is necessary to address one of the 21st century's most serious trade problems: foreign currency manipulation.

Currency is the medium through which trade occurs and exchange rates determine its comparative value. It is as important to trade outcomes as is the quality of the goods or services traded. Currency manipulation can negate or greatly reduce the benefits of a free trade agreement and may have a devastating impact on American companies and workers.

A study by the Peterson Institute for International Economics found that foreign currency manipulation has already cost between one and five million American jobs. A free trade agreement purporting to increase trade, but failing to address foreign currency manipulation, could lead to a permanent unfair trade relationship that further harms the United States economy.

As the United States negotiates TPP and all future free trade agreements, we ask that you include strong and enforceable foreign currency manipulation disciplines to ensure these agreements meet the ''high standards'' our country, America's companies, and America's workers deserve.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Graham; Rob Portman; Debbie Stabenow; Ron Wyden; Jeff Merkley; Christopher Murphy; John Boozman; Elizabeth Warren; Al Franken; Jay Rockefeller; Barbara A. Mikulski; Benjamin L. Cardin; Tom Udall; Amy Klobuchar; Charles E. Schumer; Joe Manchin III; Robert Menendez; Heidi Heitkamp; Claire McCaskill; Jeanne Shaheen; Mark Begich; Roy Blunt; Edward J. Markey; James M. Inhofe; Jeff Sessions; Kirsten E. Gillibrand; Saxby Chambliss; Robert P. Casey, Jr.; Christopher A. Coons; Carl Levin; Richard Burr; Jerry Moran; Patrick J. Leahy; Daniel Coats; James E. Risch; John Hoeven; Jack Reed; Tom Harkin; Tammy Baldwin; Joe Donnelly; Mark Pryor; Sheldon Whitehouse; Sherrod Brown; Susan M. Collins; Martin Heinrich; Bill Nelson; Richard Blumenthal; David Vitter; Bernard Sanders; Jon Tester; Angus S. King, Jr.; Richard Durbin; Brian Schatz; Mazie K. Hirono; Pat Roberts; Kay R. Hagan; Mary L. Landrieu; Chuck Grassley; Barbara Boxer; Tom Coburn.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before speaking specifically to our amendment, I wish also to indicate that there are a number of very important amendments coming before us in this open debate process. I am pleased we have a number of amendments pending that, hopefully, will be offered and voted on that relate to other very important topics.

One of those topics is an amendment currently pending offered by Senator BROWN. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of that amendment. It will clarify the process for new countries to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership and to ensure that additional countries, including China, cannot join the agreement without congressional approval. So I hope we will get a vote on that amendment, which is certainly part of this whole discussion on currency manipulation when we look at Asia, when we look at Japan now, and when we look at China. This is an important amendment.

I also wish to indicate that I have terrific respect for the chairman of the Finance Committee. I wish to address an amendment that I believe will be offered as a side-by-side to the Portman-Stabenow amendment. I urge colleagues to reject what is essentially nothing more than a rewrite of pretty much the same weak language that exists in the underlying bill. It changes some words around. It basically would not put us on record as 60 Members of the Senate to make sure we have enforceable currency provisions in this trade agreement moving forward.

At this point in time, when we look at currency manipulation, it is the most significant 21st century trade barrier there is. To quote the vice president of international government affairs for Ford Motor Company in the Wall Street Journal:

Currency manipulation is the mother of all trade barriers. We can compete with any car manufacturer in the world, but we can't compete with the Bank of Japan.

We want our businesses and we want our workers to have a level playing field in a global economy. When we are giving instructions—when we are giving up the right to amend the Trans-Pacific Partnership through this fast-track process involving 40 percent of the global economy—we have the right and obligation to make sure we have a negotiating principle in there. We are not mandating exactly what it looks like. We are just applying a negotiating principle that addresses the No. 1 trade barrier right now to American businesses, which is currency manipulation. By some estimates, it has cost the United States 5 million jobs. If we don't address it in this reasonable way, it will cost us millions more.

Our people, our workers, and our businesses are the best in the world. We know that, but they have to have a level playing field. Currency manipulation is cheating—plain and simple. A strong U.S. dollar against a weak foreign currency, particularly one that is artificially weak due to government manipulation, means that foreign products are cheaper here and U.S. products are more expensive there.

One U.S. automaker estimates the weak yen gives Japanese competitors an advantage of anywhere from $6,000 to $11,000 in the price of a car, not because of anything they are doing other than cheating by manipulating their currency. It is hard to compete with those kinds of numbers: $6,000 to $11,000 difference in the price of an automobile. At one point it was calculated that one of the Japanese company's entire profit on a vehicle was coming from currency manipulation.

Frankly, this is not about competing between—the U.S. going into Japan—that has also been a red herring. It is about the United States and Japan competing against each other in a global economy for the business of the developing countries. For instance, we are talking about Brazil having 200 million people. We are competing for that business. India has a population of 1.2 billion people. We are competing—Japan and the United States—for everything in between, everything else. That is what this is about, and it is about whether they are going to continue to be able to cheat.

Also, it is not just the auto industry. It is other manufacturers, as well. This is also about companies that are making washing machines or all kinds of equipment or refrigerators and all of the other products that we make and create using good middle-class jobs here in America.

It also affects agriculture. Anything that impacts the distortions in the economy affects agriculture and every other part of the economy.

So what we are asking for is something very simple and straightforward—very simple—which is that just as we have negotiating objectives in the TPA fast-track for the environment, for labor standards, and for intellectual property rights, we should have a negotiating objective that is enforceable regarding currency manipulation. We are not suggesting what that would look like in a trade agreement, any more than we are specifying exactly what the other provisions would look like. We are saying it is important enough that if we are giving up our right to amend a trade agreement—we are giving fast-track authority—currency manipulation is the No. 1 trade distortion, trade barrier right now in terms of the global marketplace, so we should make sure there is a negotiating principle there. We also say that

it is consistent with existing International Monetary Fund commitments and it does not affect domestic monetary policy.

I have heard over and over that somehow what we do through the Fed is impacted. That is not accurate. We are looking, in fact, at over 180 countries that signed up under the International Monetary Fund, saying: We won't manipulate our currency. Yet, even though that has happened—we have seen, in fact, in the case of Japan, for the last 25 years, they have manipulated their currency 376 times. We should say enough is enough.

Now, I also understand we are hearing from the administration. By the way, I am very supportive of their efforts, this current administration's time on trade enforcement efforts. They have won a lot of excellent cases. I wish to commend them for that. I disagree with them on this one position, because they are saying, first of all, that Japan is no longer manipulating their currency—the Bank of Japan. OK, fine. The administration says if we put a negotiating objective into fast-track authority, Japan will walk away. Why would they walk away if they are not doing it anymore? Maybe they want to do it again right after we sign the TPP. Maybe they will do it again, and it will be 377 times. If they aren't doing it anymore, why should they care? It makes no sense.

Either we can trust them and they are no longer manipulating their currency or we can't trust them and we need this provision. It can't be both. Right now, what they are talking about makes no sense. Again, we are not talking about domestic policy; we are talking about direct intervention in foreign currency markets, and that if there is direct intervention in foreign currency markets, we would like to see meaningful consequences that fit with the IMF definitions that countries have all signed up for saying they will not manipulate their currency and that it should comply with WTO enforcement, as we do for every other trade distorting policy, every other trade barrier.

This is actually very straightforward. I am very surprised that it has not been accepted. Frankly, I would have gone further. In the Finance Committee I had an amendment I would love to do which says that TPP doesn't get fast-track authority unless it is clear that there are strong, enforceable provisions on currency in the agreement. This doesn't say that. This is a reasonable middle ground to say, for the first time, that currency manipulation is important, it is a negotiating principle, and we leave flexibility in terms of how that is designed, just as we do with other provisions.

We have strong bipartisan support for this amendment. I wish to thank Senators BROWN and WARREN, Senators BURR and CASEY and SCHUMER, Senators GRAHAM, SHAHEEN, MANCHIN, KLOBUCHAR, COLLINS, BALDWIN, HIRONO, FRANKEN, MENENDEZ, and HEITKAMP for understanding and supporting this amendment. We have other support as well. I wish to thank Senator GRAHAM. He made a comment, because we care deeply—we were so pleased to get the Schumer-Graham-Brown-Stabenow and others' efforts in the Customs bill related to China and currency, which is so important and which we also need to get all the way to the President's desk. But we know that if we don't put language in the negotiating document we give to the White House, then we are not really serious. Senator GRAHAM said: This amendment is the real deal. That is firing with real bullets.

So if we are serious, if the 60 people who signed the letter are serious—and I hope and believe we are—then we need to make sure the negotiating position we take is to ask—and to direct—the administration to put this in the final negotiations on TPP.

We have, as I mentioned before, enforceable standards language on labor and environment and intellectual property rights. This is not complicated. We need to make sure we are clear on currency manipulation. The IMF has rules about what is and what is not direct currency manipulation. They are clear rules. There are 187 countries, in addition to Japan, that have already signed up saying they will abide by that definition. We just don't enforce it, and we have lost millions of jobs. Again, Japan, after signing, has intervened—the Bank of Japan has intervened 376 times in the last 25 years. We are being asked to rely on a handshake and good-faith assurances that there won't be 377 times. But we are being told if we even put language requiring a negotiating principle into this document, that somehow Japan will walk away. This makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. We have a responsibility, if we are giving up our rights to amend a document, to amend a trade agreement. If we are giving up our rights to require a supermajority vote in Congress, if we are doing that, we have a responsibility to the people we represent to make sure we have given the clearest possible negotiating objectives to the administration as to what we can expect to be in a trade agreement. That is what TPA is all about. If, in fact, currency manipulation is the mother of all trade barriers, why in the world would we not make it clear that currency manipulation should be a clear negotiating objective for the United States of America?

Let me just say again that we can compete with anybody and win. Our workers, our businesses, our innovation can compete with anybody and win. But it is up to us in Congress, working with the White House, to make sure the rules are fair. I hope colleagues will join us in passing the Portman-Stabenow amendment to make it clear we understand in a global economy what is at stake and that we are going to vote on the side of American businesses and American workers.

Thank you, Mr. President.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the Presiding Officer being my colleague from my State of Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 1251

Mr. President, with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, we are considering the largest trade deal in our Nation's history. Forty percent of GDP is affected by the Trans-Pacific Partnership. We have a responsibility to ensure this deal does not get any bigger without congressional approval. That is why I am offering this amendment, the so-called docking amendment, along with many of my colleagues, to prevent the Trans-Pacific Partnership from being a backdoor trade agreement with China. What does that mean? Right now, there is nothing in this trade legislation—nothing—that we are considering to prevent the People's Republic of China from joining the TPP at a later date. Without a formal process requiring congressional input and approval for countries like China to join the TPP, we might as well be talking about the China free-trade agreement.

This amendment spells out in law a detailed, important process, step by step, for future TPP partners to join the agreement. It does not say they cannot join; it just says here is how they join—because TPP and TPA seem to be silent on that.

Here is how it works. The President would be required to notify Congress of his or her intent to enter into negotiations with a country that wants to join the TPP. The notice period would be 90 days. During that time, the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee would have to vote to certify that the country considering joining the TPP is capable of meeting the standards of the agreement. It would stop sort of backdoor Presidential authority, whether it is President Obama or the next President making that decision. After that, both the Senate and

the House would have to pass a resolution within the 90-day window approving that country joining the negotiations.

So if the President decides that he or she wants China to join these 12 Trans-Pacific Partnership countries, the President cannot do that unilaterally. The President needs to go through this process and ultimately bring it to a vote by Congress. Then the American people can have their say. If it is just done unilaterally and quickly and maybe even kind of quietly by the President, the public would have no input. But if it goes through the congressional process, the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee—I do not think we speak to the order of that—the notice period would be 90 days, so the country would then have 90 days to speak its mind about what we all think, we 300-some million people in this country think about this new country—not just China. That is obviously the most important, the most salient, the one we pay the most attention to—the second largest economy in the world. The implementing bill for that country to join the TPP would be subject to fast-track authority only if TPA were still in effect at that time. This process is vital to ensuring a public debate on what would be one of the most consequential economic decisions in a decade.

TPP, as we all know, already affects 40 percent of the world's GDP. If China piggybacks on this agreement, we will be looking at a sweeping agreement that will encompass the two largest economies on Earth. In fact, it would then perhaps be three; it would be the United States, then China, then Japan. A deal of that scale demands public scrutiny. A deal of that scale demands congressional input. A deal of that scale demands that the American public weigh in.

We know China already expressed interest in joining the agreement at the end of last year. News reports indicate they are monitoring these talks closely. Of course they are. We also know China manipulates its currency, even though Presidents Obama and Bush would not say that. We know they manipulate their currency. We know China floods our market with subsidized and dumped steel imports. We know China pursues an industrial policy designed to undercut American manufacturing.

Sitting in front of me is the junior Senator from the State of Washington, who has worked so hard and is on this floor to make sure it happens, that we reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. We know what China has done there to sort of end run the United States and what the failure of our doing that here would mean to even give greater advantages to China.

Mr. President, 2016 will mark China's 15-year anniversary in the World Trade Organization. We saw what happened after Congress, in 1999, 2000—that period—normalized trade relations with China. China became a member of the World Trade Organization. Fifteen years ago, our trade deficit with China was not much more than $15 billion a year. Today, our trade deficit with China is $25 billion a month. So it went from $15 billion to a factor of $300 billion—all in the space of 15 years. Think about that.

We know what Presidents over time have said about trade deficits—that when we have a trade deficit of $1 billion, what that means for lost jobs. It means we are buying $1 billion worth of goods more than we are selling to that country. Every day with China, we buy $1 billion more of goods—every day almost $1 billion—$900 million, roughly, more than we sell to China every day. We know what that means on job loss. We are not making it in the United States. They will make it in China. The workers in China are making it, not the workers in the United States. So that trade gap with China represents a huge percentage of our total U.S. trade deficit. Meanwhile, China continues to thwart the rules with impunity.

We have focused on integrating China into the international system—something we want to do—but we only hope it will comply with the rules we should follow. We give China chance after chance, pushing for increased engagement. China continues to play by its own rules. Currency manipulation is a good example.

I appreciate the Presiding Officer's work on that issue, on currency manipulation. That should be voted on in this body in the next, I assume, 48 years.

Year after year, the U.S. Treasury says China's currency is significantly undervalued. Year after year, we give China a chance—another chance, another chance—to change its monetary policy, but we will not call China a currency manipulator. President Bush would not do it. President Obama would not do it. Up to 5 million American workers have lost their jobs. Our trade deficit has grown by hundreds of billions of dollars due to currency manipulation.

We have clear evidence that China disregards international trade laws. Why would we think it would be any different if they get a backdoor entry into the Trans-Pacific Partnership? That is why we cannot allow TPP to become a backdoor way to pass a free-trade agreement with China without a vote in Congress.

I know Senator MENENDEZ has raised these concerns for a while. I appreciate that support and the support of our other cosponsors on this issue.

This amendment is not a poison pill. All this amendment does is clarify the process for new countries to join the TPP, should it pass. It does not say we cannot bring in new countries. It does say that Congress has to vote on it. Congressional approval is not required for additional non-Communist countries to join WTO agreements after the United States enters into them. We need this amendment to prevent that same so-called docking process from being used with the TPP. China and those countries like China that are not market economies are differently structured economies, different kinds of countries. We are not saying: No, never. You cannot enter into the TPP. We are simply saying Congress should have a say in it and, most importantly, the public should be able to speak out on this and have a period of time to talk to their Members of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join me in adopting this critical amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following Senator WARREN's remarks, I be recognized.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to start by saying thank you to Senator BROWN for his extraordinary leadership on this issue and his determination that voices be heard around this country on this trade debate, that the people who are actually affected be heard from. I say thank you very much to Senator BROWN for all he has done here.

AMENDMENT NO. 1327

Mr. President, I join with Senator HEITKAMP, Senator MANCHIN, and a number of other Senators to propose a simple change to the fast-track bill, a change that would prevent Congress from using this expedited process on any trade deal that includes so-called investor-state dispute settlement provisions. I come to the floor to urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

ISDS is an obscure process that allows big companies to go to corporate-friendly arbitration panels that sit outside any court system in order to challenge laws they don't like. These panels can force taxpayers to write huge checks to those big corporations, with no need to file a suit in court, no appeals, and no judicial review.

Most Americans don't think the minimum wage or antismoking regulations are trade barriers, but a foreign corporation used ISDS to sue Egypt after Egypt raised its minimum wage. Tobacco giant Philip Morris went after Australia and Uruguay to stop their rules to cut smoking rates. Under the TPP, corporations can use these corporate-friendly panels to challenge rules right here in America.

It wasn't always this way. ISDS has been around for a while, and from 1959

to 2002 there were fewer than 100 claims in the whole world. But, boy, has that changed. In 2012 alone, there were 58 cases. Corporate lawyers have started figuring out just how powerful a tool these panels can be for corporate clients. The huge financial penalties that these cases can impose on taxpayers have already caused New Zealand to give up on some tough antismoking rules. It has already caused Germany to pull back from clean water protections, and it has caused Canada to stand down on environmental protections.

If that worries you, you are not alone. Experts from all over the political spectrum—conservatives and liberals, economists and legal scholars on the left and the right, opponents of trade deals and supporters of trade deals—have all argued that these corporate-friendly panels should be dropped from our future trade deals.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said that we should not give ''investors the power to sue foreign governments to weaken their environmental and public health rules.''

Nobel Prize-winning economist Joe Stiglitz, Harvard law professor Laurence Tribe, and other top American legal experts noted that ''the threat and expense of ISDS proceedings have forced nations to abandon important public policies'' and that ''laws and regulations enacted by democratically elected officials are put at risk in a process insulated from democratic input.''

The head of the trade policy program at the conservative CATO Institute has said that ISDS ''raises serious questions about democratic accountability, sovereignty, checks and balances, and the separation of powers''—concerns that ''libertarians and other free market advocates should share.''

ISDS is a major part of the reason why, no matter what promises are made, huge trade deals often just tilt the playing field further in favor of big multinational corporations. If a country wants to adopt strong new protections for workers, such as an increase in the minimum wage, a corporation can use these corporate-friendly panels to seek millions—or billions—in taxpayer compensation because the new rules might eat into the company's profits.

But, boy, it doesn't work in the other direction. If a country wants to undermine worker rights by allowing child labor or slave labor or paying workers pennies an hour, there is no special worker-friendly process for challenging that. Instead, advocates for workers are stuck begging their governments to bring enforcement actions and protect their rights. That process can take years, if the government responds at all. In fact, just yesterday my office released a 15-page report detailing how for decades both Republican and Democratic Presidents made the same promises over and over and over again about how good these deals would be for workers, and both Republican and Democratic Presidents failed to enforce the labor standards promises in those trade agreements.

Giving corporations special rights to challenge our laws outside our legal system is a terrible idea. Experts from every place on the political spectrum have concluded that it is unfair, it undermines the rule of law, it threatens American sovereignty, and it creates an end-run around the democratic process. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so we can keep these corporate-friendly panels out of future trade agreements.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 1312

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, last week the Senate voted 97 to 1 to reauthorize the African Growth and Opportunity Act—AGOA—for 10 years. It was first enacted in 2000, so the 10 years were up and we had to get it reinstated. It provides the African countries with duty-free access on most of their exports to the United States.

I have long been a supporter of AGOA. The program has done a lot to improve our trade relationship with the continent of Africa, primarily sub-Saharan Africa. Since 2002, annual trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has increased by almost 50 percent. So it is very successful. It has also been estimated by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that it has had the effect of increasing 300,000 jobs in sub-Saharan Africa and 100,000 jobs here in the United States.

Trade with Africa is important because many of the world's fastest growing economies are in Africa. According to an analysis that was done for The Economist magazine, six of the world's fastest growing economies were in sub-Saharan Africa in the 10 years it has been in effect.

This is going to continue. I have seen it firsthand. Every time I go to Ethiopia, Rwanda, Tanzania or many of the other countries in Africa, I see more and more cranes going up and bigger and better buildings. It is really a live spot in the world. The infrastructure in places like Rwanda and Tanzania is high quality. People who go to Rwanda come back with memories of something that is a modern city, not a Third World country, as it has been in the past.

So we have really good things going on there, and we need to continue to build on their trade, infrastructure, roads, highways, seaports, railways, and airports to help their economies grow.

For too long sub-Saharan Africa has been ignored as a trading partner by the United States. I have been to Africa probably more than any other Members have. In fact, there was something very critical of me just last weekend in the press—if I can find it here I will state what it was—anyway, they were critical of the attention I have been paying to Africa.

I can remember when the United States had the same problem. We ignored Africa. Back when we were going into Bosnia, I was kind of leading the effort to keep Americans from going into Bosnia. This was during the Clinton administration. The excuse they were using was that we had to get into Bosnia because of ethnic cleansing. I said on the Senate floor, for every person who has been ethnically cleansed in Bosnia, there are 100 in West Africa.

Just last weekend, ''Vice,'' a satirical show on HBO, tried to connect me to a law drafted by the Parliament in Uganda that was antigay. I have always opposed this law and had nothing to do with it. However, there are things that are going on in all these countries that need to be looked into.

My work in Uganda started many years ago to help bring an end to the Lord's Resistance Army. A lot of people are fully aware of the LRA now, but they weren't back then. There was one individual, Joseph Kony, who was going into the various areas of Northern Uganda and was kidnapping the little kids. They called them ''the children's army.'' The young people would be kidnapped out of their village and then be forced to learn to join their little army, to kidnap other people. If they refused, they were forced to go back to their villages and murder their parents. That is the LRA, and we finally are making progress there.

Other countries around the world are not ignoring Africa's potential as we have been. Brazil and China have secured preferential trade agreements with Africa. Every time you see something new and shiny in Africa, it comes from China. Economic Partnership Agreements of the European Union have also been signed. So we are kind of left out. This AGOA has been a worthwhile program.

We need to start looking ahead to the future. Nearly a billion people who live in sub-Saharan Africa and individual countries over the next decade or two will reach the point where they are competing head-to-head with many other countries around the world.

Our thinking about trade with Africa needs to be mature as their economies grow. That is why Senator COONS and I have offered the African Free Trade Initiative Act, amendment No. 1312 to the trade promotion authority act. We are doing it jointly. This amendment requires the President to establish a plan to negotiate and enter into free-trade agreements with our friends in sub-Saharan Africa. African nations want to enter into free-trade agreements with us. When I was in Tanzania

earlier this year, I met with Richard Sezibera. Richard Sezibera is the Secretary General of the East African Community, which is made up of Rwanda, Uganda, Burundi, Tanzania, and Kenya. Richard Sezibera told me he wants their Eastern African Community to enter into a free-trade agreement with the United States—just those five countries. This makes sense because FTAs bind business communities together and can pay long-term national security and foreign policy dividends.

While some in our government may not deem sub-Saharan African countries ''ready'' for an FTA with us, our amendment requires the administration to articulate what each country needs to do to get ready. It is not enough for them just to say they are not ready to be associated with us in this type of a treaty. The amendment also requires the administration to determine what kind of resources might be needed to help the countries get ready for an FTA with us. Between the Millenium Challenge Corporation and USAID, we have had a lot of resources going into sub-Saharan African countries to help their economies develop, and many outside aid organizations and other countries do as well. It makes sense to identify which of these resources could be channeled for the purpose of developing a free-trade agreement with us.

We had a great guy. Unfortunately, he is leaving USAID. His name is Raj Shah. He has taken a personal interest in Africa, in developing relations with Africa.

USAID has a large trade focus, but much of its work is geared toward helping small businesses in places like Tanzania grow their exports. Now, this is good. It is a good thing to do, but they should also be working at higher levels to improve the trade activities of these economies as a whole. They can do this by working with our African friends, helping them prepare for a broader trade relationship with the United States, either by helping them identify how they can improve their agriculture safety regulations or general private property rights. To that end, our amendment authorizes USAID to use its appropriations to help implement the strategy that will be developed under this amendment.

The Senate just reauthorized AGOA for another 10 years. In the next 10 years, we should be considering one or more free-trade agreements with our partners in sub-Saharan Africa. Our amendment will help this desire become a reality.

As I said, our government and the media have to get beyond their opposition to Africa, and hopefully we will be able to be doing that before long. If we don't make free-trade agreements with Africa a priority, then I think we will find ourselves here in 10 years and see a much stronger, highly competitive African economy. We will be reauthorizing AGOA again and asking ourselves: Why didn't we push to enact free-trade agreements with these countries? We would rather not find ourselves there. If we don't do it, China will, and we should be the ones writing the rules for trade in Africa, just as we are trying to do in Asia.

So I appreciate the support of Senator COONS and others on this amendment, and hopefully it can be adopted to the free-trade promotion authority bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, as we continue to debate and file amendments to the trade promotion authority, the fast-track legislation, I ask unanimous consent to make two amendments pending and ask that the pending amendment be set aside and call up my amendment No. 1233 and amendment No. 1234.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I was under the impression that we would be able to have discussion and debate on the legislation before us. My two amendments would deal with two very serious issues. I am disappointed that we have an objection.

My first amendment, 1233, would ensure that any changes to U.S. law or policy are passed by Congress. Specifically, if implementing legislation allowed future changes to be made to a trade agreement that could affect or overrule existing U.S. law without Congressional approval, then that legislation could not be fast-tracked. The implementing legislation would have to guarantee that all future changes would have to be approved by Congress. I think that is perfectly appropriate, and it is an absolute responsibility of Congress to ensure its own authority in matters of these kind.

Indeed, the Constitution gives plenary authority to Congress over immigration law and trade. Under this amendment that I have offered, Congress cannot delegate the power to change U.S. law to the Executive—Congress cannot do that and must not do that—or to some international body that would be created if this trade agreement—the Trans-Pacific Partnership—enters into force. This is not made clear under the current bill.

Colleagues, we need to think about this commission—an international commission—that will be created with 11 trading partners in the TPP. This commission will be given power, and our trading partners will be given powers if Congress approves this, presumably. Under the TPP, that commission is given the authority to amend the trade agreement that is initially passed if they find that circumstances have changed and they desire to change it.

This is called the 'living agreement' provision. The 'living agreement' provision explicitly states these things in this trade agreement. The term 'living agreement' should make our hair stand up on the backs of our necks because this is a dangerous thing. What it means is that the commission can alter the agreement. We want to be sure that if this commission alters the agreement—assuming the TPP enters into force—that it is not given the power to change U.S. law, even if the President agrees.

There is another question. Senator BROWN, I think, has offered an amendment on this question, and my amendment would also fix it. It deals with the admission of new countries into the 11 party—12, counting the United States—TPP trade agreement. It is pretty clear. This commission has the power to admit new members. It says: With regard to the amendment process of the commission, that the process will look similar to that of the World Trade Organization. We have shared this with Senator HATCH and his fine staff. I think they understand what we are talking about here.

This suggests that TPP procedures are likely to mirror WTO procedures. Well, the United States has had a long-term problem with the World Trade Organization because we approved the World Trade Organization and passed legislation implementing that agreement, and we did not realize it allowed new members to be admitted without a vote of Congress. So under TPP, if it mirrors the WTO rules for amendments and accessions, the new members—it appears quite plain to me—could be admitted by just 8 of the 12 TPP members—not a unanimous vote as NATO requires or the European Union requires.

At one point, the TPP says there must be ''consensus,'' but then it talks about WTO. WTO does not require consensus on everything. So I have to say, colleagues, that, first and foremost, I do not know why we have to create a new commission—a transnational commission that has the ability to discipline the United States, to impose penalties on the United States by what might be a two-thirds vote under a number of circumstances, and create additional constraints on the ability of this great Nation to function.

I do not know why we would not be better off dealing—as we have done with other countries—with bilateral trade agreements between the two of us, not creating some international body such as the United Nations, the WTO, or as Europe has done with the European Union.

So I am disappointed that we are not going to be able to have my amendment to address this called up now, because if they can block this amendment from being called up, this amendment can be shut out altogether. That is the fact. The train would be advancing without real debate and without a real opportunity for this concept to be addressed and voted on by Members of Congress. I am sure people would rather not have it come up—would rather not have questions about this agreement be raised. I think it is a legitimate question. I would urge my colleagues to continue to evaluate the amendment and to see if we cannot get it up pending. Let's have a vote on it, and let's adopt it.

Now, I also have offered amendment No. 1234. First, my previous amendment was No. 1233. This would be 1234. It would hold the Obama administration and the United States Trade Representative to their assurances that no trade agreement will be used to change U.S. immigration law or policy. This has been done in the past to a significant degree. It resulted in Chairman SENSENBRENNER and ranking member CONYERS writing a letter saying: Never again should any trade agreement amend immigration law.

That is the province of the Congress, according to the Constitution. In 2003, I offered a resolution after a past trade agreement did just that—bypassed Congress' authority over immigration law. The resolution passed unanimously. Senator FEINSTEIN and other Democrats signed on. It said: Never again will immigration law be amended as part of a trade agreement. Trade agreements are not the way to change law of the United States, especially when you have a President who is rewriting immigration law, enforcing immigration law that Congress explicitly rejected through his Executive amnesty.

So my amendment is modeled after the Congressional Responsibility for Immigration Act of 2003, a bill sponsored by our Democratic colleagues, Senators LEAHY, FEINSTEIN, and Kennedy—former Senator Kennedy, our former colleague. It would prohibit the application of fast-track authority procedures to any implementing bill that affects U.S. immigration law or policy or the entry of aliens, if an implementing bill or trade agreement violates those terms.

Then, any Member could raise a point of order against the implementing bill, ensuring that the bill is considered under regular Senate procedures allowing amendment and debate. Look, now they tell us that we should not be concerned. Colleagues, we have heard it said that this will not happen—no future trade agreements will affect U.S. immigration law. All right, but I am a little nervous about that. I have been watching the language on this. Senator GRASSLEY, at the Finance Committee hearing a few weeks ago, asked the Trade Representative, Mr. Froman, this:

> My question: Could you assure the committee that the TPP agreement or any side agreement does not and will not contain any provision relating to immigration, visa processing or temporary entries of persons?

That is a good question—simple question. They have been indicating not. His answer sounds good at first blush.

> Thank you, Senator Grassley. And the answer is yes, I can assure you that we are not negotiating anything in TPP that would require any modifications of the U.S. immigration laws or system, any changes of our existing visa system, and in fact the TPP explicitly states that it will not require any changes in any party's immigration law or procedures. Now the 11 other TPP countries are making offers to each other in the area of temporary entry, but we have decided not to do so. So I appreciate the opportunity to clarify that.

So we have decided not to do so—now, at this moment, before the trade agreement is up for approval by Congress, knowing it would be controversial if the implementing bill included immigration changes. But that does not mean we are not party to any immigration provisions in the TPP that could be used to make changes later. One of the chapters in the agreement deals with immigration and temporary entry. I do not see anything that would prohibit the current administration or a new administration from trying to use this trade agreement to advance an immigration agenda.

So if the Trade Representative really means it when he assures us there will be no changes in the future, then I would suggest my amendment would be something that Ambassador Froman would be delighted to support to keep us from having this problem and to remove this potential controversy from the legislation. I think it would also—for those who want to see it passed—enhance the opportunity to pass the legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, this week we are considering legislation that could have real importance for our country over the next several years on the economic front and also on the national security front. That legislation is trade promotion authority.

Trade promotion authority helps the United States negotiate strong trade deals that benefit American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers and expand opportunities for American workers. Under TPA, Congress sets guidelines for trade negotiations and outlines the priorities the administration must follow. In return, Congress promises a simple up-or-down vote on the resulting trade agreement, instead of a long amendment process that could leave the final deal looking nothing like what was originally negotiated.

The promise of that up-or-down vote sends a powerful message to our negotiating partners that Congress and U.S. trade negotiators are on the same page, which gives other countries the confidence they need to put their best offers on the table.

That, in turn, allows the United States to secure trade deals that are favorable to U.S. workers and to businesses and to open new markets to products that are marked ''Made in the U.S.A.'' Almost every one of the 14 trade agreements to which the United States is a party was negotiated using trade promotion authority. Currently, the administration is negotiating two major trade agreements that have the potential to vastly expand the market for American goods and services in the EU and in the Pacific.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is being negotiated with a number of Asia-Pacific nations, including Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, and Vietnam. If this agreement is done right, it will benefit a number of industries, including an industry that is very important to my State; that is, agriculture.

Currently, American agricultural products face heavy tariffs in many Trans-Pacific Partnership countries. Poultry tariffs, for example, in TPP countries go up to a staggering 240 percent. That is a tremendous obstacle for American producers. Reducing the barriers that American agricultural products face in these countries would have enormous benefits for American farmers and ranchers in my home State of South Dakota and across the country.

In fact, one pork producer in my State contacted me to tell me that a successful TPP deal could increase U.S. pork exports to just one of the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries by hundreds of millions of dollars. I know that is important in my State, important in the Presiding Officer's State, and important in every agricultural State across this Nation.

That is why former Agriculture Secretaries from both parties, representing every administration going back to President Carter, issued a joint letter in February emphasizing the importance of trade to farmers and ranchers and urging passage of trade promotion authority. They wrote in that letter:

> Access to export markets is vital for increasing sales and supporting farm income at home. Opening markets helps farm families and their communities prosper.

It is not every day that you see former members of both Democratic and Republican administrations coming together to advocate a particular policy.

I would say that this is the free and fair trade for a healthy economy that describes precisely what it is that we are talking about. We are talking about more exports for American agricultural products, manufactured goods,

digital goods—you name it, across the board. What that means is more jobs and higher take-home pay for American workers.

The bipartisan agreement isn't limited to former Agriculture Secretaries who have come out in support of it. Ten former Treasury Secretaries—again, representing administrations of both political parties—came together to draft their own letter, stressing the importance of trade promotion authority and securing favorable agreements for our country. They said:

Our support for open trade agreements is based on a simple premise. Expanding the size of the market where American goods and services can compete on a level playing field is good for American workers and their families. Expanded international trade means more American jobs and higher American incomes. It means greater access for American businesses to markets and consumers around the world, and it means lower prices for American families here at home.

That is from former Treasury Secretaries of this country representing both political parties.

Still another bipartisan group of former administration officials came together this month to urge support for trade promotion authority. This time it was seven former Secretaries of Defense, as well as a number of retired military leaders.

Their letter emphasizes another important aspect of trade that often gets overlooked in these discussions, and that is its national security implications. Discussions of the benefits of trade tend to focus on the economic benefits, of which there are many. So it is with good reason that we talk about the economy, jobs, and higher wages. But the new trade agreements have the potential to result not only in economic gains for American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers but in national security gains for our country.

When we make trade deals with other countries, we are not just opening new markets for our goods. We are also developing and cementing alliances. Trade agreements build bonds. They build bonds of friendship with other nations that extend not only to cooperation on economic issues but to cooperation on security issues as well.

Two major trade agreements the United States is currently considering, the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, have the potential to provide significant strategic benefits for our country.

These agreements—these are the Defense Secretaries writing—''would reinforce important relationships with important allies and partners in critical regions of the world. By binding us closer together with Japan, Vietnam, Malaysia, and Australia, among others, TPP would strengthen existing and emerging security relationships in the Asia-Pacific. . . . In Europe, TTIP would reinvigorate the transatlantic partnership and send an equally strong signal about the commitment of the United States to our European allies.''

That is again from the letter coming from seven former Defense Secretaries representing administrations of both political parties.

The Secretaries go on to note:

The successful conclusion of TPP and TTIP would also draw in other nations and encourage them to undertake political and economic reforms. The result will be deeper regional economic integration, increased political cooperation, and ultimately greater stability in the two regions of the world that will have the greatest long-term impact on U.S. prosperity and security.

In other words, these agreements will not only provide our Nation with significant economic benefits, they will also make a crucial contribution to our national security. The Defense Secretaries and military leaders also highlight another key point. Just because the United States isn't negotiating trade agreements doesn't mean other countries won't be.

The fact that the United States hasn't signed a single trade agreement over the past 5 years hasn't prevented other countries from signing numerous trade agreements over the same period. In fact, there are more than 260 trade agreements in effect around the globe today, but the United States is only a party to 14 of those.

If America fails to lead on trade, other nations, such as China, are going to step in to fill the void. And these nations will not have the best interests of American workers and American families in mind.

Free and fair trade agreements are essential for growing our economy and ensuring that products marked ''Made in the U.S.A.'' can compete on a level playing field around the globe. They are also an essential tool for strengthening our relationship with our allies, which is of particular concern now with so many areas of instability around the globe. Trade promotion authority provides the best way of securing these agreements.

The bipartisan legislation that we are considering this week reauthorizes trade promotion authority and includes a number of valuable updates, such as provisions to strengthen the transparency of the negotiating process and to ensure that the American people stay informed. It also contains provisions that I have pushed forward to require negotiators to ensure that trade agreements promote digital trade as well as trade in physical goods and services.

Given the increasing importance of digitally enabled commerce in the 21st century economy, it is essential that our trade agreements include new rules that keep digital trade free from unnecessary government interference. I have previously introduced legislation to help ensure that the free flow of digital goods and services is protected, and I am pleased that the bipartisan deal that was reached includes many of the very measures I have advocated.

Democrats and Republicans in the Senate have repeatedly come together this year to pass legislation to address challenges that are facing our country. I hope we will see the same type of bipartisanship on this bill. This legislation will benefit American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers. It will help to open new markets for American workers, and it will benefit American families. And it will help make our country more secure.

The President supports this legislation. A number of Senate Democrats are working with Republicans to get this done.

I hope that the rest of the Democrats in the Senate will join us to pass this important bill for American workers and businesses and make trade promotion authority legislation our next bipartisan achievement for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT MATTHEW RYAN AMMERMAN AND CORPORAL JORDAN SPEARS

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, Memorial Day is next week, so I wish to take a moment to remember and recognize the courageous men and women of the Armed Forces who lost their lives serving in the line of duty this past year.

Indiana lost two of its own, Army SSG Matthew Ryan Ammerman and Marine Cpl Jordan Spears, two young men who selflessly chose service to their country and gave the ultimate sacrifice.

SSG Matthew Ryan Ammerman of Noblesville served three tours of duty, two in Afghanistan and one in Iraq. A decorated soldier who received multiple medals during his career, Staff Sergeant Ammerman joined the Army in July of 2004. He deployed to Iraq in 2006 and then to Afghanistan in 2009. He went on to graduate as a Special Forces communications sergeant in 2013 before deploying to Afghanistan the following year as part of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Staff Sergeant Ammerman was killed on December 3, 2014, when his unit came under fire while conducting operations in Zabul Province. He was 29 years old. He is survived by his wife and two brothers.

Cpl Jordan Spears' childhood dream was to become a marine. His dad said he was so proud to wear the Marine uniform. He was a native of Memphis, IN. Corporal Spears met with a recruiter when he was 17 and wanted to be deployed, his dad said.

He was deployed in July of 2014 to the USS *Makin Island* for U.S. military operations against ISIS. Corporal Spears was lost at sea on October 1, 2014, while

conducting flight operations in the North Arabian Gulf. He was 21 years old. He is survived by his parents and five siblings who loved him very much.

Indiana grieves for the loss of these two, extraordinary Hoosiers, as our country aches at the loss of many more husbands, wives, dads, moms, sons, and daughters. The loss of these heroes will not just be felt this Memorial Day. They will be missed at the dinner table, at birthday celebrations, at holidays, and beyond. This is a reality many military families must cope with.

Let us take a moment to stand beside every military family for the tremendous weight they often carry for their service to this great Nation.

And to the families and friends of Staff Sergeant Ammerman and Corporal Spears, we all send our continued thoughts and prayers. Hoosiers will never forget your loved one's sacrifice to this country.

Memorial Day provides us an additional opportunity to reflect on the bravery of the few who ensure the freedom, the safety, and the way of life for all of us. We will always be grateful to America's heroes, the service men and women in the Armed Forces, and their loved ones.

As a Senator for Indiana and on behalf of all Hoosiers, let us thank all the men and women in uniform for standing the watch and honor the memory of all who are no longer with us for their bravery, their courage, and their patriotism.

God bless Indiana and God bless America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to talk about the trade debate we are having in the Senate. I know we have heard a lot of debate on both sides.

I wish first to talk about some of the background before I get to what is in front of us in terms of the process in voting, amendments, and things like that.

I represent the State of Pennsylvania, which, like many States, suffered through the devastation of not just the 1980s—when it comes to job loss in, for example, the steel industry, we know that, for example, in a very short timeframe, about 5 years, for example, the steelworkers lost half of their jobs in southwestern Pennsylvania—in just those 5 years. They went from around 90,000 steelworkers down to below 45,000 in just 5 years. That is only one example of job loss that families in southwestern Pennsylvania have lived through, as well as other examples from around the State that we don't have time to recite today.

So that is kind of the backdrop. And, thank goodness, the steel industry and the steelworkers came together and were able to recover somewhat—obviously, not fully, but they were able to recover over time. And in that time period—we are getting into the 1990s and then into the 2000s—we have had a lot of assertions made that if a trade agreement is brought into effect, we would have job growth and it would help those who had been displaced.

But, unfortunately, what has happened over time is that folks in parts of Pennsylvania have seen some of the history. Just to give some examples—and this is a Department of Labor number—525,094 workers were certified as displaced from the period 1993 to 2002 in the aftermath of the so-called NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Over a period of time between 1993 and 2010, the trade deficit with Mexico was up by some $66 billion, and that is as of 2010, over those 17 or so years.

That is the backdrop when we debate trade itself. Now, I know there have been assertions made that this agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership with 11 other countries, will be different and that there will be protections in there that weren't in earlier agreements.

I have real concerns about those assertions, and I have doubts that they will play out in that manner because, in the end, this debate is about wages and jobs. It is really, kind of, in one sense, one major issue.

Will this agreement and will the trade promotion authority that undergirds this agreement advance or hinder job growth and the growth of wages? I have real concerns about arguments that say it will, that it will advance job creation.

One of the assertions often made, as well, is that job loss over time, over several decades—it has been more than one generation now in affected States such as Pennsylvania—job loss or wage diminution is attributable to a number of factors. And there is no question about it; that is right.

But even when you are able to—or I should say especially when you are able to isolate the issue of trade, there are some data that support that as well, that you can attribute job loss or wage diminution simply to trade and not to other overarching issues. For example, the Review of Economic Statistics in October 2014, in a significant and substantial report, analyzed a number of issues that relate to trade. Here is the seminal conclusion from that report: ''Occupation switching due to trade led to real wage losses of 12 to 17 percent.'' And occupation switching is, of course, job displacement.

That covers the period from 1984 to 2002, so it covers a period prior to the North American Free Trade Agreement and, of course, about 8 years or so after the agreement was in effect. So my concern over the long term is about wages and Pennsylvania jobs.

We have a more recent example, and it isn't grounded in the arguments that relate for or against NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. Just since the South Korea trade agreement—a more recent trade agreement—has been in effect, the trade imbalance or deficit with South Korea has increased substantially. By one estimate, it is about 12 to 1—$12 billion of imports on our side to just $1 billion on their side. That is the kind of ratio we don't want. We want the ratio to be something in our favor, not 12 to 1 against it.

So what do we do? We have an opportunity over the next couple of days to continue to debate trade promotion authority. In essence, this is the last chance for Congress to have a real impact—or any impact, really—on what happens in terms of the ultimate consideration of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the trade agreement itself.

Many of us have amendments, and I would make two arguments before I relinquish the floor. One is that we should have a reasonable number of amendments and have a debate about these issues. We have had some debate already but very few votes and very few amendments. I believe we should make sure that folks for trade promotion authority or against and folks for the Trans-Pacific Partnership or against should have a chance to vote.

I will have a couple of amendments. I have filed them. I will just talk about two, and then I will conclude.

No. 1 is a ''Buy American'' amendment. It would deny trade promotion authority privileges to free-trade agreements that weaken or undermine ''Buy American'' provisions—very simple but I think very substantial in terms of the potential adverse impacts or positive protections it can provide.

We should make sure that ''Buy American'' is maintained, that trade promotion authority doesn't undermine it, and we should not allow the trade agreement itself to undermine the ''Buy American'' provision. That is one of the least things we can do in the context of this debate.

The second amendment I will highlight, among several, is congressional certification. This amendment would require certification by the two relevant committees—the Committee on Finance in the Senate and the House Ways and Means Committee—that negotiating objectives have been met, so that prior to a trade agreement going into effect and once there is a final review that those objectives the administration and every administration asserts are part of the trade agreement—that has a review and then a subsequent certification by the two relevant committees.

I know there is a lot more to debate, but I would hope that on something as

substantial and seismic in its impact on our economy and the economy of the world—40 percent of the world's GDP is contained in this agreement, TPP, and we know trade promotion authority is kind of the rule book in a sense for the Trans-Pacific Partnership—that debate we are having on trade promotion authority should allow States such as Pennsylvania or Ohio or any other State to have its voice heard, to allow the people of our States, especially folks who have concerns about these agreements, to have their voices heard. The only way their voices can be heard ultimately, in addition to their own advocacy and their own efforts to make statements to us, is here on the floor of the Senate, to have debates and then have votes on amendments, and we will see where we stand at the end of the week.

To shut off debate and to stop at this moment in time, as some seem to want to do, is contrary to what the Senate should do on something as substantial as the trade promotion authority, which will affect the trade agreement impacting 40 percent of the world's GDP, and I don't think it is asking too much to have a few more hours or even a day or two more of votes on the floor of the Senate.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2048

Mr. LEE. Madam President, free trade is of absolute importance in this country. We need free trade. I like free trade. I want trade to be as free as it possibly can be. It is not, however, as pressing as another matter that we should be considering now.

Certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act will expire a week from Sunday at midnight. This is an important issue, and it is one that deserves debate and full consideration within the Senate.

I want to point out that we have had months and months to plan for this deadline—years, in fact. During these last several months, we have worked with House Members, members of the law enforcement community, and members of the intelligence community to create a compromise bill that now enjoys the support of the Attorney General of the United States, of the Director of National Intelligence, the telecom industry, the NRA, the tech community privacy groups, and 338 Members of the House of Representatives. This is a supermajority—a superduper majority.

We have had a week since the House passed this bill, and it is time that we take it up in earnest and give it the full attention and consideration of the Senate that it deserves. Then we can return to TPA and finish it without facing expiration of a key national security tool without anything to put in its place.

This is a bill—the USA FREEDOM Act, as enacted by the House of Representatives—that represents an important compromise, represents a very careful and effective balancing between privacy and security interests, recognizing the fact that our privacy and our security are not in conflict. They are part of the same thing. We are secure in part because our privacy is respected. This bill respects both of those.

We know that it is not easy to get to 218 votes for a lot of things on this issue in the House of Representative. In fact, we know it is impossible to get to 218 votes in the House of Representatives for a clean reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act provisions in question.

We know that a lot of other things would be difficult to impossible to pass in the House. We know that one bill does enjoy a supermajority in the House of Representatives, and that is the USA FREEDOM Act. We should be taking that up now.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate set aside consideration of H.R. 1314, the TPA legislation, and move to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act, that the motion to proceed be agreed to, and that the bill be open for amendments; further, that upon disposition of H.R. 2048, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PATRIOT Act is a critical tool for our national security. The junior Senator from Utah is correct that three provisions do expire at the end of this month: the so-called roving wiretap provision that will allow intelligence professionals and law enforcement officials to track terrorists no matter what device they might use, the so-called ''lone wolf'' provision that would allow our intelligence authorities to identify and stop terrorists who are not necessarily clearly linked to an overseas terrorist organization, and, finally, section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, which has enabled our intelligence professionals at the National Security Agency to help keep our country safe in the so-called telephony metadata program, which was unlawfully disclosed by Edward Snowden 2 years ago, which is why we are able to discuss such a highly classified program.

The junior Senator from Utah and I disagree about the program and the legislation. There will be a time for that debate because it is the most important issue we could debating in the United States, our national security and the tools we need to keep our country safe.

For the time being, we are on the trade promotion authority bill. That was a decision made last week. This is maybe not the decision that the junior Senator from Utah would have made, and it is not the decision I would have made, but that is where we are. Perhaps we could have been done with the TPA bill if the other side of the aisle had allowed amendments to be processed last week and if there had not been a needless filibuster of the motion to proceed to the bill, but that is water under the bridge. We should move forward in an orderly fashion and process the amendments that are pending on the trade promotion authority bill. We should have a final vote on that bill and then we should move on to the PATRIOT Act reauthorization bill. There will be time for robust debate in public, which is exactly what so many of our Members have been doing in private, given the classified nature of these programs. If we have to work beyond Thursday, I am more than happy to do that. I will even work on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and into next week, if that is what is necessary to first process the trade bill and then finally to reauthorize the important provisions of the PATRIOT Act.

Madam President, I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I also—no matter how we vote on trade—understand the importance of it.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Utah for his statements. The fact is, a great deal of work has gone into the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. The Senator from Utah's bill and my bill is the same version as the one passed by the House. I hope people will not lose sight of the fact that the House of Representatives really did what the American public wants, by an overwhelming bipartisan majority they passed the USA FREEDOM Act. Some had been saying that the other body could not have gotten that kind of a vote, until say, the Sun rises in the East. But the House came together from across the political spectrum in both parties to pass the bill. I think we ought to respect that.

We also—as the Senator from Utah and others have said—have a unanimous decision from a three-judge panel of the Second Circuit, which declared the current program illegal. We can pass the bill, the USA FREEDOM Act, which passed in the House. It means that both sides have given a lot to get there. We ought to pass it in this body at some point—maybe when the trade legislation and the highway bill are

completed, we should just take the USA FREEDOM Act up and pass it. If there are questions once it has gone into effect, we can always come back and make other changes to the law, but we ought to pass this legislation and at least give some stability to our intelligence community. The Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General have said they support it, and we ought to accept it and go forward. The USA FREEDOM Act takes care of the questions of the courts and we should pass it.

I concur with the Senator from Utah, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask the Chair what business is pending before the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 1327

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 1314 is currently the pending bill, and amendment No. 1327 is pending.

Mr. DURBIN. Relating to the trade promotion authority bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to speak on that issue.

Madam President, we cannot ignore that more than 95 percent of the potential customers for goods and services and agricultural produce live outside the United States of America. This means that to grow our economy and to maintain our influence in the world, we clearly have to embrace trade; however, this doesn't mean we would embrace every proposed trade agreement.

I have voted for about half of the trade agreements that have come before me in the House and Senate during my congressional service. I think some of those were good, on reflection, and some of them were not. There have been proposals made for free trade which I thought speak to the basic issue: Is America competitive in the 21st century? Can we outproduce other countries in the world? I never had any doubt about that, except for some given circumstances where another country has a specialty or some particular skill. I trust the United States. I trust our economy, our workers, and our business leaders.

When it comes to a trade agreement, I think we have to answer some hard questions about the specific trade agreement, not the principle of trade. Here is something most people do not know. They have proposed this trade promotion authority so we can vote on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. This is a document that has been negotiated over many months and is available for Members of Congress to see in a secluded setting. We cannot bring in as many staff as we would like, we cannot take the document out of the room, but it is accessible to us. Here is the point that is not often made: We have been told by the administration that this is not the final draft of the trade agreement. We have been told that after we pass the trade promotion authority bill, if we do, then there will be some more amendments and changes. So what we would view today is not necessarily what will be voted on at some later date. It is incomplete. It is a work in progress.

There are some things we should know and should reflect on. First, I will look at it from a very personal perspective. I am honored to represent the State of Illinois. It is one of the largest exporting States in the Midwest, and it is the fifth largest exporting State in our Nation. Illinois exports totaled over $65 billion in 2013 and about 10 percent of my State's gross State product.

Since 2009, Illinois exports increased by 58 percent, more than the national average of 50 percent. Fifty-six percent of exported Illinois goods in 2014—about $38 billion worth of exports—went to countries currently negotiating this Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement with the United States. Is this important to my State? Is this part of the world important to my State? Of course it is. However, Illinois' success in exporting its products depends on good trade agreements that level the playing field, not just for Illinois companies but for American companies. This means we need to have strong antidumping rules that prevent companies overseas from dumping cheap, for example, steel products and other goods to undercut domestic prices and put our companies out of business. Did that happen? It sure did.

A little over 10 years ago, three countries that we trade with—Brazil, Japan, and Russia—had an idea. They figured out a way to drive American steel companies out of business. How did they do it? Were they better or more competitive? No. They dumped their steel. What does it mean to dump a product? It means to sell it in another country at lower than the cost of production in your own country. They took a loss on every ton of steel until they ran that American steel company out of business.

We saw it coming. We saw this dumping taking place. We had trade agreements, and we took them to the enforcement authorities. We said: They are killing us. They are killing these steel companies in America and the people who work there and that is not fair and it violates the trade agreement. The organizations responsible for policing these trade agreements said: We are going to put that on the docket and we will get to that in just a few months.

Well, a few months turned into a few years. We won the case. They had dumped steel in the United States, but the net result of it was not what we were looking for. The American steel companies went out of business. They could not compete against this dumped steel coming in from foreign countries.

When it comes to these agreements, we need to ask some basic questions. Is it enforceable on a timely basis? Can we stop unfair trade practices before they kill American jobs? That is pretty basic.

This steel issue continues to haunt us. Steel dumping is one of the reasons that the U.S. Steel plant in Granite City, IL, an area I grew up in, will stop production at the end of the month and put 2,080 Illinois jobs in jeopardy.

Fair trade agreements should include enforcement and they should also include enforceable currency manipulation provisions. When a country devalues its currency, the U.S.-made products, in comparison, become more expensive, and that adds to our trade deficit. It makes it difficult for U.S. companies to compete. There are a lot of ways to work on these trade agreements to the advantage of the exporting country if you break the rules.

Trade agreements should allow the United States to enact and implement consumer protection laws meant to protect the public. We don't want to go to the lowest common denominator when it comes to the basics, such as protecting consumers, protecting the environment, and protecting the workers. So whether it is food safety, environmental, public health, consumer financial protection, an investor's future products should not take priority over a country's right to protect its own people.

There is something known as the investor-state dispute settlement. It is a procedure which I want to describe to you because I think it gets to the heart of this trade agreement we are being asked to vote on. Investor-state dispute settlement procedures—often included in trade agreements and is included in several trade agreements that the United States is party to—prioritize corporate investors above almost everything.

What is it? This is how it works: It allows a corporation to challenge a law in an international court if the law, in the eyes of that corporation, violates a trade agreement and infringes on the investment made by a business. That sounds kind of theoretical. I will be specific.

We want U.S. businesses to have protections when they operate in other countries, so it appears to make sense, but corporations have gone too far. Corporations are using this dispute settlement to challenge legitimate laws in countries that protect the public, such as public health laws, environmental rules, land use, and food safety policies. More than 500 of these cases have been brought by corporations challenging the laws in various countries, including U.S. laws.

A U.S. chemical company launched a case against Canada, as a nation, when

Canada banned a toxic gasoline additive used to improve engine performance—an additive already banned in the United States. An oil company sued Ecuador after a domestic court there ruled that the company owed $9.5 billion to clean up and provide health care to the workers in Ecuador after the oil company had dumped billions of gallons of toxic water in open-air oil sludge pits in Ecuador's Amazon.

Do you get the picture? Your country passes a law to protect the people living in your country, and then a corporation that has trade business with your company sues the country where the law was passed and says that new law is going to cost them money.

Those are two examples. A toxic additive to gasoline—a corporation sues Canada and says you cannot ban that; that will cost us profits. Efforts by Ecuador to avoid toxic dumping in their own country are being sued by an oil company that says, if you do that, it will cost us money. They did not go through the court system. They went through this investor settlement dispute.

There are so many examples of corporations using investor settlement dispute to undermine, rollback or delay laws meant to protect the public. One of the most egregious examples is Philip Morris. I kind of take this personally. As long as I have been around Congress, in the House and Senate, I have had a battle with tobacco companies. It happens to be the only product which when used according to manufacturers' directions will kill you and can still be sold legally. So I don't happen to think tobacco companies are in the best interest of public health for America or any other country.

About 26 years ago, I passed a law banning smoking on airplanes. It was the first time tobacco companies ever lost. I passed it in the House, and my good friend the late Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey passed it over here. It is the law of the land. For over 25 years, nobody smokes on an airplane. Tobacco companies fought us every single step of the way.

Philip Morris, one of the largest tobacco producers in the world, is aggressively challenging domestic tobacco laws around the world using the same investor-state dispute settlement that is going to be included in this agreement.

In Australia, as an example, after the highest court ruled against Philip Morris and upheld an Australian law requiring warning labels to cover a large majority of cigarette packaging, Philip Morris did not give up. Instead, Philip Morris sued Australia in an international tribunal under investor-state dispute settlement provisions in the Australia-Hong Kong Bilateral Investment Treaty. If Philip Morris wins, Australia could be forced to pay Philip Morris for expected future losses because of a warning label on tobacco products. It could be billions of dollars.

Proponents of this settlement dispute that is baked into this agreement we are going to be asked to vote on rightly claim these procedures can't require countries to change their laws. In other words, Philip Morris can sue Australia and say: Your new law is going to cost us money. Keep it if you wish, but we lost profits because of this new law, and you have to pay us for our lost profits.

They can force countries like Australia to choose between changing the law or using their own taxpayer dollars to pay billions of dollars to a company like Philip Morris for their expected future losses. Think about that for a second. Philip Morris is selling a product that kills if it is used as intended. Some 6.3 million people each year across the world die because of tobacco-related disease. Australia's health care system loses millions of dollars in tobacco-related illnesses for people in their own country, as well as lost productivity at their workplaces. Yet, when Australia enacts a public health law requiring labels on tobacco products, Philip Morris can sue Australia? Yes, that is right. Tobacco products produced by Philip Morris are literally killing Australian citizens, and Philip Morris is suing Australia because the warning labels may cost them future profits.

The same thing is happening in Uruguay. Philip Morris again lost its case against Uruguay challenging its tobacco control laws which helped reduce tobacco use in that country by 4.3 percent. Now Philip Morris says: If we can't win in the courts, we are going to win through the trade agreement. We are going to win through the trade treaty, the dispute settlement in the trade treaty.

Sometimes even just the threat of a trade dispute challenging a law is enough to block, delay, or prevent enactment of a public health law because a country doesn't have the resources to engage in an expensive and lengthy lawsuit. This was the case in New Zealand and Nambia.

Corporations are using investor-state dispute settlements to undermine legitimate public laws, from financial protection, to public health, to environment and food safety. What are we thinking? If we would allow corporations under a new trade agreement to come in and attack public health laws in America, to come in and attack environmental protection in America—because they can argue: If I can't pollute in that river, it is going to cost my company a lot of money; therefore, you have to pay us if you want to keep that pollution law on the books.

That is why I am supporting Senator ELIZABETH WARREN's amendment that removes fast-track authority for any trade agreement that includes these investor-state dispute settlements. State-to-state dispute settlements would still be available if the corporation's rights have been violated or if a country passes a law that violates a trade agreement. But there is no need to go the extra step and give priority to the rights of corporations over the rights of people when it comes to laws that protect health, food, clean water, and clean air.

As the Senate continues to debate on giving fast-track authority to these trade agreements currently being negotiated, we still don't know what is in the agreements—not entirely. Providing fast-track authority for these agreements would prevent this Senate from offering amendments that would provide only one up-or-down vote after the agreement is finalized.

I support fair trade. I support trade. I hope the final agreements will meet the standards we have spoken of. But I cannot support granting fast-track authority to agreements where we don't know their contents and we could give away the most basic responsibility we have as Senators in the United States—to protect the people of America.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the vitally important Export-Import Bank expires at the end of June. It will be gone. If this program expires—it is not like anything else—we will have to start all over again. We will have to have hearings. We will have to have markups in both Houses. If we can extend the authorization of this, it will solve so many problems for us.

The Export-Import Bank creates jobs in our country—in the United States—by providing loans and loan guarantees so customers in foreign countries can buy our exports. An example is airplanes. I have spoken to Mr. McNerney, the head of Boeing, and one of the vital parts of their business is being able to have other countries have businesses within those countries come and want to buy their airplanes or countries that want to buy their airplanes. They have difficulty doing that without the ability of the Export-Import Bank to help raise the financing.

I greatly appreciate Senator CANTWELL now bringing the attention of this body to this important program that is going to expire soon. I appreciate Senator HEITKAMP for working on legislation dealing with this important issue.

The Export-Import Bank just this year sustained 165,000 jobs. It will be a lot more if there is a long-term extension of this bill. So one might think, of course, that a program such as this which supports 165,000 jobs in just 1 year would cost taxpayers an arm and a leg, a fortune, but in this case, they would be wrong. It is just the opposite. We make money on the Export-Import Bank. Over the last 10 years, the Bank has returned more than $7 billion to the U.S. Treasury. That is $7 billion the U.S. taxpayer does not have to pay because the program is so important and so successful.

A program as effective as the Export-Import Bank should have no problem getting reauthorized, but it has had a lot of trouble. As recently as 2006, the Bank's charter was extended by unanimous consent. It didn't even have a vote. But today the Export-Import Bank is in serious danger of being terminated, ended. The Senate banking committee has made no effort to bring up the Bank's reauthorization, and the majority leader doesn't have a path forward. The best, he said, is we will give you a vote on it. Giving a vote on it is meaningless.

So what has changed since just a few years ago when we extended this by unanimous consent? Why has this immensely successful program over the last few years been on the chopping block? I will tell my colleagues why. It is because the Koch brothers have decided that it needs to go. They want to get rid of it. It is part of their attack on government programs, and this is a government program. They don't care if a bank creates jobs or makes money; they simply want to get rid of it.

That is not the worst of it. Every other developed country supports their exports. China and Europe support their exports, and so do Brazil and India. They all do. But the Koch brothers don't care. They want the United States to be unilaterally disarmed. They are telling their Republican friends in Congress that the United States should just get rid of this program. They don't care that this will put U.S. companies at a competitive disadvantage, and that is an understatement. They don't care that this will cost U.S. jobs, and that is an understatement. They don't even care that this will put a larger burden on taxpayers to have to make up the lost revenue. All the Koch brothers care about is maintaining their warped, illogical view of taking down a government program and making more money for their massive business interests.

I encourage my colleagues to reject this misguided view. Let's stop shooting ourselves in the foot. Let's pass a long-term extension of the Export-Import Bank. On this bill, the trade bill—if it became part of the trade bill, it would be signed into law. The President loves the Export-Import Bank. He said so publicly. We have been trying to get this done, but now the Republicans have said no thanks because their guiding light, the Koch brothers, don't like it because it is a government program.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1327

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as we continue to debate the future of America's trade policy, we have seen an onslaught of misleading claims and shocking tales of horror that have little or no connection to reality. Many of these ghost stories we have heard evolve around relatively obscure legal provisions relating to investor-state dispute settlement, or ISDS. Senator WARREN has called up an amendment that would give voice to those stories by stripping TPA protections from any trade agreement that includes ISDS provisions.

I call ISDS provisions obscure not because no one knows about them or they are unimportant but because in the real world where people actually live, they are not part of our day-to-day lives. It is only in the overly hyperbolic and borderline fictional world of political debate that ISDS provisions impact the lives of everyday people.

Simply defined, ISDS permits companies to challenge unfair or discriminatory treatment by foreign governments in binding arbitration rather than in ordinary courts. The purpose is to encourage the free flow of capital by protecting investors from uncompensated expropriation and other abuses that may not be adequately rectified in regular domestic courts that in many cases tend to disfavor foreign companies. That is it. That is all it is. This has nothing to do with secret tribunals that undermine U.S. sovereignty or provisions giving corporations the power to rewrite U.S. laws and regulations.

We are hearing a lot of these stories about ISDS these days because the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, which is currently under negotiation, includes such a provision. Of course, it would be a shock if it didn't. ISDS is a standard element of all U.S. trade agreements and international agreements in general. All told, there are 3,000 trade and investment agreements that include ISDS around the world. The United States has these types of agreements with 50 countries. They have been around for more than three decades.

Contrary to some of the claims made by opponents of free-trade agreements, ISDS is not a weapon foreign entities use against the United States. In fact, the United States demands the inclusion of these types of provisions in our trade agreements in order to protect American businesses from discrimination from foreign governments. You see, here in the United States, foreign companies and investors are assured fair and equal treatment under our laws and in our court system. While the same is true with regard to many of our trading partners, it is by no means guaranteed. ISDS is one mechanism we have to ensure a fair process for our job creators who do business overseas. It is not widely used, but it provides an important backstop.

Of course, those who use ISDS as a bludgeon against free-trade agreements tend to use arguments that are short on actual, verifiable facts. For example, we hear claims that ISDS allows corporations to overturn laws and regulations both here in the United States and abroad. The truth is that ISDS arbitrators have no power to overturn laws and regulations. The only recourse for a party that wins an ISDS arbitration happens to be financial compensation.

Others have claimed that ISDS can be used to undermine our health care or welfare system or to undo our environmental protections. Once again, the facts tell a far different story. Most ISDS cases involve very narrow issues affecting individual investors, such as contract disputes, licensing, and permitting. There has never been a successful claim in ISDS that a nondiscriminatory public health, welfare, or environmental rule or legislation violated fairness or antidiscrimination requirements.

We have also heard people say that ISDS provisions put U.S. taxpayers on the line for losses. In truth, the U.S. Government has never lost an ISDS case. In fact, only 17 cases have been brought against the United States in the entire history of ISDS. By contrast, 15,000 cases get filed against the U.S. Government in claims court every year. In short, ISDS poses no threats to the American taxpayer.

In the end, virtually all of the tall tales we hear about ISDS come in the form of ridiculous hypotheticals that have very little basis in reality. But the facts are what they are. While it is only used sparingly, ISDS remains an important tool to protect U.S. investors and businesses. It is a fixture in international agreements, and if our negotiators did not demand its inclusion in our trade agreements, they would be doing our country a disservice.

In March, the Washington Post editorial board—not really known for having an unabashedly probusiness bias—published an editorial outlining the shortcomings of the anti-ISDS crusade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in

the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Once again, I am all for a fair and open debate on trade policy. I am glad we are on the floor having this discussion. I hope we can stick to the facts and not spend our time debating unsubstantiated scare tactics.

I urge my colleagues to let common sense prevail and to vote against the Warren ISDS amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

[From the Washington Post, March 11, 2015]

DON'T BUY THE TRADE DEAL ALARMISM

(By Editorial Board)

President Obama's proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement is in trouble on Capitol Hill. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch (R–Utah) says a bill to enable expedited consideration of the pact will be delayed until April because of opposition from liberal Democrats and a few tea party Republicans. The latest rallying cry for TPP foes is that it would allegedly threaten environmental and labor regulations, as well as U.S. sovereignty, for the benefit, as Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D–Mass.) noted recently, of ''the biggest multinational corporations in the world.''

The supposed menace is the TPP's Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism, similar to language in more than 3,000 agreements among 180 countries, including 50 agreements to which the United States is a party. It would permit companies to challenge unfair or discriminatory treatment by TPP governments in binding arbitration rather than an ordinary court. The useful purpose of the settlement provision is to encourage the free flow of capital by protecting foreign investors from uncompensated expropriation and other abuses in countries where they are, as outsiders, disfavored in court—or in countries that may lack well-developed court systems at all.

Contrary to predictions that these processes are stacked in favor of multinationals, the United Nations reports that governments won 37 percent of cases and business only 25 percent; 28 percent were settled before the arbitrators ruled. In the history of ISDS, 356 cases have been litigated all the way to conclusion. Only 17 complaints were lodged against the United States. The number of such cases has increased in recent years but mainly because foreign investment itself has increased.

Critics trumpet ISDS horror stories, but upon closer inspection they generally turn out not to be so horrible. Take the oft-made accusation, repeated by Ms. Warren and others, that a French firm used the provision to sue Egypt ''because Egypt raised its minimum wage.'' Actually, Veolia of France, a waste management company, invoked ISDS to enforce a contract with the government of Alexandria, Egypt, that it says required compensation if costs increased; the company maintains that the wage increases triggered this provision. Incidentally, Veolia was working with Alexandria on a World Bank-supported project to reduce greenhouse gases, not some corporate plot to exploit the people. The case—which would result, at most, in a monetary award to Veolia, not the overthrow of the minimum wage—remains in litigation.

Obama administration negotiators have sought to minimize the misuse of this settlement provision under the TPP by recognizing each country's ''inherent right'' to regulate for health, safety and quality-of-life objectives. The vast majority of TPP countries are legally well-developed (Canada, Australia, New Zealand) or already free-trade partners with the United States (Mexico, Peru, Chile). So the TPP changes the status quo hardly at all.

It seems that the opponents' real beef is with the administration's view that the United States and its trading partners should encourage private investment in one another's economies. On balance, though, free-flowing capital creates more jobs and wealth than it destroys. The TPP would not only increase economic activity but also enhance geopolitical ties between the United States and its East Asian allies, especially Japan. No amount of alarmism should distract Congress from these benefits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of the thousands of men, women, and children around the world who are the victims of human trafficking. I rise in their defense, on their behalf, and in the interests of responsible trade policy that recognizes that there can be no reward to nations that ignore the problem and do nothing to end the scourge of what amounts to modern-day slavery—one of the greatest moral challenges of our time.

After negotiations with the White House, the USTR, and my colleagues on the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN and I at the appropriate time will be offering an amendment to the trade bill to make sure that any tier 3-rated nation—those are the nations that have the worst record in our ''Trafficking in Persons Report''—that any tier 3-rated nation hoping to benefit from the Trans-Pacific Partnership will have to address the problem of human trafficking in their country. They will have to make concrete efforts to meet the standards stipulated in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act or they will not have the benefit of privileged fast-track access to our markets, period.

This modification to my original amendment allows for a narrow exception, not just a waiver, as we do with most of the restrictions on the executive branch. This exception may apply only to a country that has been certified by the State Department as having taken ''concrete actions . . . to implement the principal recommendations'' of the ''Trafficking in Persons Report.'' It will have to be made public so that all will be able to judge that the implementation of those concrete actions toward those recommendations has taken place. That has real meaning. Those recommendations are the roadmap we lay out for countries to move from tier 3.

This is a historic change in the nature of trade agreements now and in the future. For the first time, we will have on the Senate floor trade promotion authority that says we cannot provide fast-track for a trade deal with countries that have done nothing to stem the tide of human trafficking. For the first time, we have an amendment in a major bill that would impose real consequences and real repercussions for turning a blind eye to recruiting, harboring, transporting, providing, or obtaining a person for compelled labor or commercial sexual acts with the use of force, fraud, or coercion. For the first time, we have given teeth to the State Department's TIP report and will hold nations accountable for their inaction. While the report has provided us with important information, it has relied on moral authority but has had no real-world impact on real-world suffering.

Should this bill pass and be signed into law, at least we will not reward nations with the worst record on reining in human traffickers with the benefits of a fast-track to American markets.

My mother was a seamstress in northern New Jersey. No one worked harder. She came home tired, but she came home to her family and was proud of her work. She wasn't held hostage by her employers, forced to hand over her salary, her passport, or worse.

Thanks to the hard work of the community of advocates against trafficking and the commitment of my colleagues on the committee, the ''no fast-track for human traffickers'' amendment is in the legislation we are debating presently on the floor. I understand there are those who would prefer to see this amendment just disappear, but, just like those it protects who are suffering around the world, it will be alive in every trade agreement now and into the future. This amendment says that we will not be silenced. We will not be bowed because some want free trade at any cost—at any human cost—even if it means letting in those nations that our own State Department has determined to be negligent at best in dealing with the scourge of human trafficking in their countries.

This amendment speaks volumes about how we approach trade, how we approach the concept of fast-track policy. We, Congress, set the terms that shape fast-track negotiations, not the other way around. Before any country gains access to U.S. markets, they must show they have taken concrete steps to eliminate human trafficking or there will be no fast-track—not for tier 3 nations at the bottom of the State Department's list.

Benjamin Franklin said, ''Justice will not be served until those who are unaffected are as outraged as those who are.'' Well, let's be outraged and make sure this amendment remains a key element of American trade policy.

I thank Senator WYDEN, the ranking member, for helping to develop compromise language that has preserved the full intent of the amendment, and

I thank all the human rights and trafficking groups that have come forward, worked hard, and helped draw attention to this problem and provided a new public mechanism to hold this administration or any other administration accountable for their efforts to end human trafficking around the world and not reward the very worst human traffickers with access to our markets.

This is a victory for those fighting the scourge of human trafficking. Fast-track is no longer a given, no matter how bad a nation's record is on how it deals with those who would traffic in human beings for profit. This amendment is for all those who have been subjected to sexual exploitation, forced labor, forced marriage, debt bondage, and the sale and exploitation of children around the world.

It is for the world's 50 million refugees and displaced people, the largest number since World War II, many of whom are targets of traffickers. It is for the 36 million women and 5 million children around the world subjected to involuntary labor and sexual exploitation. For the victims of these crimes, the term ''modern slavery'' more starkly describes what is happening around the world and, sadly, what is happening in our own backyard—too often in the nail salons in our Nation.

I will continue to fight against human trafficking in all of its forms. All of us remain vigilant, constantly aware that the cost of human trafficking is not just far away across the ocean in a distant country. It is a moral crisis of international proportions that has reached our own shores, right here in our own backyard.

So again let me thank Senator WYDEN for his efforts and the 16 colleagues of the Senate Finance Committee—Democrats and Republicans alike—who voted for my amendment in the committee. Most importantly, let me thank all of the human rights groups who have worked closely with me to ensure that we do not reward nations with the worst record on addressing human trafficking with fast-track access to our markets.

Let all of those who are suffering around the world at the hands of human traffickers be the face of any future trade agreements. I have a list of groups that have worked every day to eradicate human slavery and that have supported my work on this important effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

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

Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking (CAST), Coalition of Immokalee Workers CIW), ECPAT–USA, Free the Slaves, Futures Without Violence (FUTURES), International Justice Mission, National Domestic Workers Alliance (NDWA), National Network for Youth (NN4Y), Polaris, Safe Horizon, Solidarity Center, Verité, Vital Voices Global Partnership, World Vision.

American Jewish World Service, Bakhita Initiative, Bernardine Franciscan Sisters, Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good, Church of the Brethren, Office of Public Witness, Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach, Daughters of Charity, USA, Franciscan Action Network, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns, Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Leadership Conference of Women Religious, NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Religious Sisters of Charity, Scalabrini International Migration Network, School Sisters of Notre Dame, U.S. Shalom Offices, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth Western Province Leadership, Sisters of Mercy of the Americas—Institute Leadership Team, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Trinity Health, Tri-State Coalition for Responsible Investment, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I appreciate greatly the kind remarks of my colleague from New Jersey about my role in all of this. I do not want to make this a bouquet-tossing contest, but I do want the Senate to know and I want the country to know how important it has been that Senator MENENDEZ has led this charge.

As my colleague noted, human rights advocates, those who have been in the trenches in the fight against trafficking, have come together to work with us. Senator MENENDEZ, since our debate in the committee, has led this fight. At that time, colleagues, the committee approved an important amendment to ensure that trade agreements with countries that drop the ball on trafficking get no special privileges here in the Congress.

The reason that my colleague has put all of this time and energy and passion into it is that he understands—everyone here, Democrats and Republicans—that human trafficking is a plague that must be fought at every opportunity. So what Senator MENENDEZ and I have done over the last few weeks is to work together to try to find a practical way to further improve the language in this original amendment.

What these alterations—really improvements—are going to do is to create a new process by which the President will report to the Congress on the concrete, specific steps other countries are taking to crack down on trafficking. I think—and we just got their statement—the Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking, one of the leading groups that has been fighting this scourge the hardest, has just summed up—I just got this a few minutes ago—what the Menendez effort is all about. A test, the organization has called it, and I quote here, and describes it as a ''positive step forward'' in the fight to combat human trafficking.

When we take their statement with the fact that Senator MENENDEZ has brought the State Department on board, I think with what we are showing—and this has been a major theme, frankly, of what I have sought to do over these many months, negotiating with Chairman HATCH and colleagues, is to try to make sure that we come up with policies that demonstrate that there is a new era of trade policy afoot, a new era when trade is done right.

Because of the good work of my colleague from New Jersey, the amendment that we will be offering here, under my colleague's leadership, is a demonstration that we can do trade right, that we can do everything possible to eradicate this plague that so many around the world have mobilized to address. I congratulate my colleague for his efforts. Colleagues should note that this would not have happened had it not been for Senator MENENDEZ.

This was a matter that certainly colleagues felt very strongly about. People said: Oh, the whole debate is over. It cannot be resolved. Senator MENENDEZ said: There is a way to bring people together. I congratulate my colleague for putting this together. I look forward to voting on it later tonight, I hope.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak a little bit today about the trade legislation that is before this body this afternoon. As we have talked about over the last week, as I have come to the floor, I do think we ought to be expanding exports in this country because it is good for jobs.

I think trade-opening agreements can be very good for the workers and farmers, people that provide services who I represent in the State of Ohio. We need those jobs. 60 percent of our soybean crop is exported in Ohio, our biggest agricultural product. One of every three acres is planted for export now. For our farmers, those overseas markets are really important. Of course we want to expand them.

For our industrial workers, about 25 percent of our factory jobs in Ohio are now trade jobs, export jobs. We want to expand them. For 7 years we have not had the ability to open up new markets, by knocking down barriers overseas. So that is a good thing. We should all be for that. Everyone should be for that. But the question is, as we knock down barriers overseas, are the other countries playing by the rules? If not,

then it is not fair to our workers, our farmers, our service providers.

In Ohio, a lot of companies have become more productive. They have worked on productivity, and they have worked on efficiency. Workers have given concessions, including some of our major labor unions: the UAW, steel workers, and others, in an effort to join the global economy in a competitive way. What they are saying to me is this: You know, ROB, I would like to be able to be in this global marketplace and compete. But I want to be sure it is fair. If it is, I can do fine. I am confident. I am confident of them. So part of the discussion on the floor today is not just about expanding exports, as important as that is. But it is this: How do you have a more level playing field so that our workers are getting a fair shake, so that our farmers know, when they are competing in global markets around the world, that there is this more level playing field, so we have the ability to tell them—to look them straight in the eye and say: You know what; this is going to be good for you.

I will mention a couple of issues. Today, I saw Senator BROWN on the floor. This has to do with an amendment that we would like to offer in the trade promotion authority bill, which actually was part of the Customs bill which was voted on in committee and voted on here on the floor.

The idea is that instead of having it in the Customs bill, where it may or may not be successful, to have it in the trade promotion authority bill, where it is much more likely to go to the President, to his desk for signature. I will say that this amendment is language that Senator ORRIN HATCH, who is here on the floor with us today, the administration and others, supported putting into the Customs bill because they thought it was good policy.

Senator HATCH is very discriminating. He knows what is good trade policy in terms of being sure that we have this more level playing field for our workers in this area of subsidized imports and dumped imports into this country. So what we did was that we got this language into the Customs bill, and now we want to be sure it is part of the trade promotion authority bill.

Why is this so important?

Well, part of this level playing field is to ensure that when products are being sold into the United States of America, they aren't being sold at below their cost. If they are sold at below their cost, it is called dumping. It is an international standard. We have laws against it, but so do the other countries.

The World Trade Organization has enforcement measures against that. You are not supposed to dump product into another country in order to gain market share. It is kind of like a loss leader. What happens is, of course, our domestic companies can't compete with that because other countries are allowing their companies to sell at below cost. So when there is dumping, we want to be able to have a remedy for our workers and our companies.

The second one is called countervailing duties for subsidized product. That is when another country actually subsidizes their exports in order to get market share. That is not fair either.

Let's take the example of somebody who works in the steel industry in Ohio. They are trying to compete to sell steel to, say, the auto plant. Another country comes into the United States and sells their product that is subsidized that is well below the cost of our manufacturer. That is unfair. So you are able to put in place countervailing duties against that product.

All we are saying is that we would like to clarify the law so it is easier for a company, easier for those U.S. workers, to be able to show they are injured when you have dumping, when you have subsidized products coming into this country. Again, this is broadly supported. It is bipartisan. It is one that, again, was part of another bill called the Customs bill. It should be part of our legislation, in our view, and we hope it will be offered as an amendment. If it is able to be offered, I think it will pass because, again, I think this is an issue where there is a lot of consensus.

One of the problems right now is sometimes companies have such a hard time proving material injury that by the time they prove it, it is too late. In other words, they have lost market share, they have lost the ability to be competitive in the United States, and they end up having to lay people off—and sometimes, in some cases, in some companies in Ohio, including the steel business, they have gone out of business.

So this is, I think, a commonsense, logical approach that again has a lot of support. I hope that amendment will be able to be offered and that we will include that on the trade promotion authority.

The second amendment has to do with a third area of unfair trade. We talked about dumping. We talked about subsidizing. Another one is when a country says: You know what. I am actually going to intervene in currency markets globally in order to drive down the value of my currency explicitly to get an export advantage over other countries.

It is called currency manipulation. It is a standard that has been developed over the years by the International Monetary Fund. It is very specific, and it says that when you do that—because it does distort markets, it does affect trade—it is considered to be an unfair trade practice. The problem is there hasn't been enforcement of that.

What happens is, when countries do it, the value of their currency goes down. Therefore, their exports they sell, say, to the United States of America are relatively less expensive, and our exports to them are relatively more expensive.

Paul Volcker, who is the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve, made an interesting comment. He said, ''In five minutes, exchange rates can wipe out what it took trade negotiators ten years to accomplish.'' I think there is some truth to that. It can happen relatively quickly.

I have walked on a shop floor in my home State of Ohio, the company that makes steel pins—and these are very important steel pins because they hold up speakers at big concert halls. They have to be strong, and they have to be precisely drilled and made. They brought some that work back from China. God bless them.

I am walking the shop floor, and I am talking about how they have these new machines, they have taken their workers through new training, they have done everything to be more efficient and more productive, but they tell me: ROB, you know, unfortunately, we are going to lose some of this business now because of currency manipulation. We just can't compete.

So despite everything they were doing right and the concessions some of their workers were making in order to be more competitive, they couldn't if there was currency manipulation.

Everybody believes currency manipulation is a bad thing—the WTO does, the World Trade Organization. They have standards, and they deferred to the International Monetary Fund because it is a currency issue. The International Monetary Fund has standards. Those standards are such that if you look at our legislation, we pick up the standards from the International Monetary Fund.

So we say, ''With respect to unfair currency exchange practices [which] target protracted large-scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets by a party to a trade agreement to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties.''

So it is very specific. It is consistent with the IMF and WTO standards, but the amendment goes even further to ensure that is what we are talking about by saying that whatever we do has to be ''consistent with existing principles and agreements of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.'' So it is a targeted approach to currency manipulation.

By the way, someone said: Well, what about QE 1, 2, 3? What about monetary policy?

That is not governed, because the way we define this is, again, the IMF definition of ''protracted large-scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets by a party to a trade

agreement to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade.''

That is not why we did QE 2. We did it to stimulate our economy. We can argue about the merits or demerits of that monetary policy, but it does not fit into that definition because concerns were raised about, well, maybe it could be.

As we filed this amendment this week, we added something else to the amendment. It is a very short amendment. I encourage you to read it, Senate amendment No. 1299. It says: ''Nothing in the previous sentence shall be construed to restrict the exercise of domestic monetary policy.''

So you may hear this debate on the floor: Well, gosh. I am worried this is going to come back against us.

It can't.

All this says is our negotiators, in doing a trade agreement, have to make currency manipulation one of the negotiating objectives. We already have labor issues, environmental issues, and other issues that are negotiating objectives. We have passed one here earlier this week with regard to human rights. Certainly, currency manipulation ought to be one of them. It does affect trade.

Now, I know the Secretary of the Treasury issued a veto threat today and said he would recommend the President veto. This has been in discussion for a number of weeks now, and up until now there has not been a veto threat. So that is new today. I find that surprising; first, because we have had a lot of discussion about this, and this is the first time there has been a recommended veto threat. It is not a recommendation that Presidents always agree with when a Cabinet member says that, but it has to be taken seriously.

I would be very surprised if the President of the United States were to say: You know what. I like this trade promotion authority. This is good. It expands exports—which is a good thing in my view, as I have said earlier—but somehow I am going to veto it because, boy, we just can't take on currency manipulation.

This is at a time when everybody—everybody—the administration, Members of the House and Senate, Democratic and Republican, all agree currency manipulation ought to be prohibited.

In fact, the side-by-side amendment that is being offered by my good friend and colleague Senator HATCH and my good friend Senator WYDEN also said we should not have currency manipulation. In fact, they pick up our exact language on how to define currency manipulation, but they don't have any enforcement. There are no teeth to it. It says you could do this or that, you could have reporting, you could have rules or you could have monitoring or you could do nothing.

What ours says is very simple: Let's just make currency manipulation the same as everything else that is a negotiating objective that is enforceable. Let's subject it to dispute resolution.

So you have opportunity; one, first, you have to start with consultation with the other party; and, second, if there are consultations that break down, if you can't resolve it, then it goes to a dispute resolution process.

Someone said: Well, the United States would be the judge and the jury.

Not at all. As a former U.S. Trade Representative, who has been involved in these negotiations, who has taken into account negotiating objectives, I can tell you these three-judge panels are objective. That is the whole idea, and they determine whether there has been manipulation under the agreement that the parties have reached. So what this says is: Let's raise this issue. Let's have a discussion about it. It is a negotiating objective, and let's see what we can agree with, with the parties, and let's make it subject to the same dispute resolution you would have with other issues, such as the environment, such as labor, so this is actually enforceable.

So the question on the floor is going to be: Do you support getting rid of currency manipulation because you know it affects people you present negatively? And the answer is going to be a resounding yes.

By the way, 60 Senators wrote a letter in the last Congress—60 of them—saying that in trade agreements there ought to be an enforceable currency manipulation provision. This amendment would require 51 because it is germane. So it is just interesting. If it doesn't succeed—because I know my leadership is against this, I know the White House has now said they are against it. We will see how people vote on this because everybody agrees we ought to deal with this. The question is whether we ought to have teeth in it, whether it ought to be enforceable or not.

By the way, what is trade promotion authority? Why are we doing all of this? We are doing it because this is the way Congress can express to an administration what our prerogatives are. Again, 60 Senators have signed that letter. It seems like everybody agrees currency manipulation is a bad thing.

The side-by-side—meaning the alternative—in an effort to defeat our amendment, the alternative acknowledges currency manipulation is a bad thing and sets up the exact definition that we use. Ours is a little better because it also exempts monetary policy explicitly, and theirs does not, by the way. But then at the end it says: And what are you going to do about it?

Well, you decide. You can do this or this or this or nothing.

Ours says: No, you have to subject it to the same enforcement you have with other provisions in a trade agreement.

So I am hopeful we can get this passed. People have said: Well, this is about the auto companies. You know, I am not ashamed to represent the auto companies. I am co-chair of the Auto Caucus. The automobile industry in this country is incredibly important. We are proud in Ohio to be the No. 2 auto State in the Nation. By the way, the UAW and the management have made a lot of concessions. They have made a lot of changes to the way they produce automobiles to be more efficient, to have the safest, best automobiles in the world produced in the United States of America. I think they do deserve a fair shot. Again, the agreement can reduce all sorts of tariff barriers and so on to give them a shot at going into some of these markets. But if at the end of the day there is currency manipulation, as Chairman Volcker said—former Fed Chair Paul Volcker—''In five minutes, exchange rates can wipe out what it took trade negotiators ten years to accomplish.'' So I am very proud to be on the floor saying: Yes, it is important to the autoworkers.

But it is much broader than that. The fact that the steel companies around the country have also supported this, the fact that other industries have supported this, it affects everybody. It affects farmers. If we are selling 60 percent of our soybean crops overseas, and they have currency manipulation making our product more expensive, that is bad for our farmers.

If you are selling these steel pins I talked about earlier overseas—I had the fastener industry come see me this week. They are from Ohio. These are the people who make screws, nuts, and bolts. They are concerned about it. So it is not one narrow group. It is anybody who is involved in international trade and understands the need for us not to allow this to happen. Others have said. Well, this is a poison pill.

I view it more as a vitamin than a poison pill because I think it strengthens the underlying law. I think it makes it more likely we can get a consensus for trade going forward, including in the House of Representatives, where people want to vote for trade promotion authority, they want to expand exports, but they want to be sure it is fair. They want to be sure their workers and their farmers get a fair shake.

So I know the President has said he doesn't like it much, but the President, in the past, has spoken articulately and vociferously against currency manipulation. His statements have been very clear. He not only thinks it is wrong, he thinks it must be enforced. So I would find it surprising that he would be willing to move forward.

Is it poison pill because of the House? Again, I think it actually adds votes.

Why wouldn't it? Is it a poison pill in terms of the administration? I hope not, and I can't believe it would be. This is a priority for the President to get trade promotion authority done, and I agree with him.

I think it is important for us to give our workers and our farmers the chance to export more of their products to the 95 percent of consumers who live outside of our borders, who are not Americans but who want to buy the best products in the world that are stamped ''Made in America.'' We want to do more than that.

Then, finally, is it a poison pill for the countries that are negotiating what is called the Trans-Pacific Partnership—called the TPP. Well, I have heard Japan doesn't like this amendment much. It concerns me if our friends in Japan—and they are allies and friends, and I have worked closely with them.

When I was the Trade Ambassador, we worked more closely with Japan than anybody had previously, I would say. I brought them into the close circle of countries that were trying to move forward, in this case, on international standards through the Doha agreement. I have great respect for them.

By the way, they are not manipulating their currency now and haven't been, in my view, since probably 2012, maybe the end of 2011, by the very definition in here. So why would they be worried? I don't know.

But it worries me that they wouldn't be willing to sign off on a provision like this, very sensible, saying: Let's all agree not to manipulate our currency so we can have a more level playing field between all of our countries.

They have manipulated their currency in the past. The IMF would say, I think, about 300 times before 2012. So I don't know if they really wouldn't negotiate with us. In fact, this is a very important agreement to them. It is a very important agreement to them because they, like us, want to expand our trade ties together in the fastest growing part of the world—in the Pacific region. And that is good.

So look, I appreciate the fact we are going to have a difference of opinion on this. I just hope people will actually look at the facts. Look at the language. Look at the fact that this is an issue we all agree on in terms of currency manipulation. The alternative amendments will have that. The only question is, Should it be enforceable? Should it have teeth? Should we be able to go home and look our workers in the eye and say: You know what? We have taken care of you on this one. You are not going to find yourself playing by the rules, making concessions, going through retraining, making these big investments in these companies with the most up-to-date equipment to be competitive and then find, oh my gosh, the rug is pulled out from under us by manipulation.

So here we have President Barack Obama. I mentioned his statement earlier. This is in June of 2007: ''I will work with my colleagues in the Senate to ensure that any trade agreement brought before the Congress is measured not against administration commitments but instead against the rights of Americans to protection from unfair trade practices, including currency manipulation.''

I know where the President stands on this. He, like me, like other Senators in this Chamber, wants to be sure we do deal with currency manipulation. In this case he is saying with regard specifically to trade agreements brought before this Congress. That is what TPA is all about—establishing our congressional prerogatives as to trade.

So I hope we will be able to move forward with expanding opportunities for everybody we represent, because that is what trade is about. It is about creating more and better jobs. If you are against exports, you are against creating better jobs. Trade jobs pay, they say, on average 13 to 18 percent more. Why? Because they tend to be jobs in the manufacturing sector, in the technology sector. They tend to be good jobs.

We want more of them in my State of Ohio. Our farmers want more exports. It is good for their prices. And they all deserve to have these markets overseas because they are working hard to create the best products in the world. All they want is a level playing field to ensure they have the opportunity to send those products overseas to the 95 percent of consumers outside our borders.

If we do that—if we do that and at the same time ensure it is fair—we will be able to look them in the eye and say that this is going to be good for you and your families.

Here is what Secretary Lew said earlier today: ''Holding our trading partners accountable for their currency practices has always been important to this administration.''

Let us hold them accountable. We can't hold them accountable if there is no enforcement. We can't hold them accountable if there are no teeth. That is all we are asking for today.

I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to look at this language and look at this issue. Earlier, one of my colleagues came to speak and he had a sign like this, and it talked about free trade and fair trade. That is what we are talking about. Let us be sure we have free trade and fair trade. If we do that, we can begin to rebuild a consensus around trade that used to be a bipartisan consensus, and we can begin to create a better future for our kids and grandkids—more engaged in global markets, getting better-paying jobs and more jobs, and ensuring America's promise is met.

At a time when we have a historically weak recovery, what better thing to do than to give this economy a shot in the arm by expanding exports and by doing so in the context of creating a more level playing field for the people we represent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, this is an exceptional thing we are debating right now. We are talking about limiting our own constitutional power. We are talking about a trade promotion authority act that would restrict our ability to offer and debate amendments on free-trade agreements.

We have been told this is the only way we can move forward on things such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the soon-to-be-completed European free-trade agreement. There are great disagreements about whether that is necessary.

It is hard to understand why we hold trade to a fundamentally different standard than so many other things that are vitally necessary for our economy to move forward. Why not have a different process to pass immigration reform or energy reform or tax reform? Those are just as, if not more, necessary to economic growth than trade.

But in that we are talking about limiting our ability to offer amendments to a trade agreement, it would be the height of irony if we were to conduct that debate in a way that limited our ability to also offer amendments on the very act that takes away our power to amend the trade agreements.

So here is just a point on process. I am fairly new to this body. This is the first time I have been in the Senate debating a trade agreement. Certainly, it is the first time I have been in the Congress to debate a fast-track bill, a trade promotion authority. I think we can take our time to allow this body to work its will, to make sure we vote on more than a handful of amendments to a piece of legislation that takes away our power to offer amendments on the final trade bills.

We took 3 weeks to debate the last fast-track bill. Now, I don't think anybody is asking for 3 weeks, but we are asking for more than a few days, given that many of us think we have amendments, such as the one Senator PORTMAN is offering, that can make this bill a lot better. So I am coming to the floor today to ask for that time to get to a better place on this bill and, specifically, to ask for this body to take up a series of amendments surrounding one vital issue, and that is the issue of protecting the American supply chain on products bought by the U.S. Government. It is commonly referred to as the ''Buy American'' law. It has been on the books for decades.

It is a pretty simple premise. When we are buying things for the U.S. Government, we should buy them from

American companies, by and large. It is a pretty meager requirement. At the start, it just says that when you buy stuff for the American Government, primarily for the Defense Department, you should buy 50 percent of it from U.S. companies.

That makes a lot of sense to people in the United States. In my State of Connecticut, we believe that is just good economics, but it is also good national security policy, because if you are not making things for the Department of Defense here, you are making them abroad, and you become reliant on a supply chain that is increasingly internationalized and puts you at risk when one of those companies that is supplying parts for a jet engine, for a tank, for a weapon all of a sudden isn't your ally any longer.

The ''Buy American'' law has been riddled with loophole after loophole, exception after exception, such that the exception is now the rule. I won't go through the litany of ways you can get around the ''Buy American'' law, so that sometimes today items being bought by the Department of Defense are majority made outside the United States and frankly, often by countries that we may not be in total alignment with when it comes to our security policy.

I want to talk about one waiver, one way around the ''Buy American'' law, and that is a really big one. There is a waiver to the ''Buy American'' law for any country that we have entered into a free-trade agreement with. So if you have signed a free-trade agreement with the United States, you can supply content to goods made for the U.S. military and have it count as made in America.

Now, that is a pretty limited exception when you have only a small number of countries you have signed free-trade agreements with. But the two regions we are talking about adding to the ranks of those that have trade agreements with the United States would represent the bulk of the global economy. We are talking about a swath of countries in Asia with very low wages and then, ultimately, with the European trade agreement, the whole of Europe.

All of a sudden, we don't have a small exception to the ''Buy American'' rule, we have a truck-sized exception to the ''Buy American'' rule, rendering it almost obsolete and unenforceable at that point, because then almost any country that is producing a good can apply for the trade-agreement waiver.

So we have a series of amendments that would try to tighten up this particular waiver, this particular option built into trade agreements. The amendment I hope to offer simply says that if you want this waiver around the ''Buy American'' law, then you have to show that, No. 1, the result of moving the work overseas won't cause a U.S. company to go under—and I can give examples of when that has happened—and, No. 2, you have to prove it you can't find it in the United States—that your only option is to go overseas because you can't find it in the United States. If there is an American company making it for a reasonable price, then that company should be able to get that waiver.

Now, it doesn't take away all the other waivers. There is a waiver, for instance, that says if you can get it much cheaper overseas, then you can go overseas. We don't eliminate that waiver. We just say you have to prove you can't get it in the United States and you can't get it for a reasonable price in the United States, and then this waiver would apply.

I think all of our constituents would support trade agreements that make sure our taxpayer dollars being used to buy goods for the United States get used, preferentially, on American companies. And simply by tightening up this loophole in the ''Buy American'' law, we will protect a lot of jobs.

How do we know that? Because in 2013, the last year for which we have records, there were 1,200 of these waivers approved—1,200 waivers for existing countries with free-trade agreements—worth $500 million worth of goods. That is $500 million worth of work that would have gone to U.S. companies that went to foreign companies because of this waiver that said that any country that has a free-trade agreement just doesn't have to worry about the ''Buy American'' clause. That is 1,200 today. Imagine how many that will be in a year if we were to add all of the countries in TPP and all of the countries in TTIP. We are talking about factors of two and three and four added to that number.

So all I am asking for at this point is a debate. Let us just make sure on this seminal issue, the preference that we give American companies for work paid for by Federal taxpayers, that we have a discussion about that on the floor of the Senate at some point over the course of this week. Members can choose to vote up or down. They can choose to support American companies. They can choose to support the outsourcing of American taxpayer work. But let us have a discussion on it. We don't need 3 weeks, like we did last time, but be probably need a couple more days.

This is as big as you get for the Senate. We are debating giving away our power to amend a major trade obligation of the U.S. Government. Let us have a debate about the consequences of that with respect to American companies.

It would make a difference to one set of people in my district, and I will end on this—the former workers of Ansonia Copper & Brass. This is a company that made copper-nickel tubing for our submarines. They were the only American company that made this copper-nickel tubing, and they had a competitor in Europe that was trying to take their business away. Because of a waiver to the ''Buy American'' law, the contract was awarded by the Department of Defense to the European firm and taken away from Ansonia Copper & Brass. Because of that waiver to the ''Buy American'' law, Ansonia Copper & Brass went out of business. We now have no ability in the United States to produce copper-nickel tubing. Some of the most important components to the American sub fleet in the United States—gone. Our capacity has ended. And you can't just rebuild this, because this is a really specialized kind of material, a really specialized kind of product. Once that equipment, once that expertise is gone, you can't just start it back overnight. That has real security consequences for the United States.

I would argue that, even more importantly, it has serious economic consequences for the men and women who were laid off about a year ago from Ansonia Copper & Brass, because of an ill-thought-out waiver to the ''Buy American'' clause that compromises our economic security and our national security. Let us just pledge to have a debate about that on the floor of the Senate before we come to a final vote on trade promotion authority.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I want to take a moment to add to what my partner on the Portman-Stabenow amendment has said on the floor. I appreciate working with Senator PORTMAN on this important issue. I find it very interesting, as we are debating—as other colleagues have said—a policy that allows the administration to go ahead and negotiate a trade agreement where we voluntarily give up our right to change, to amend, and that we voluntarily, as a Congress, say we are not going to allow anyone to object to make it a 60-vote threshold. So we are giving them the fast-track authority. The tradeoff, the way we are supposed to be doing that is by setting up a set of negotiating objectives and expectations for what will be negotiated in the agreements. That is the deal here—fast-track authority, setting up the expectations. What we believe on behalf of our constituents, the people we represent, are the most important things that we want to make sure are covered: enforcement, strong labor and environmental standards, and the

No. 1 trade distorting policy in the world today, which is currency manipulation.

We want to be able to say, if you are going to get this special ability to take away our right to change something, then we expect certain things. We expect that we are going to be negotiating from a position of strength so that we are racing up in the world economy, bringing other countries up in terms of wages, what is happening in terms of protecting our environment, protecting our intellectual property rights, stopping other countries from cheating on currency or other trade violations. We want to create a race up, not a race to the bottom, not a race to the bottom where the comments are this: Well, if you would only work for less, we can be competitive. If we only take away your pension, if we only take away your health care, if we only make sure that we do not enforce our trade laws, we can be competitive. Obviously, that makes no sense.

In the area of currency, what Senator PORTMAN and I are doing is putting forth the very straightforward case that there should be a negotiating objective that is enforceable, that is tied to IMF definitions. It makes it clear that we are not talking about our domestic policies. We are not talking about Fed policies. We are not talking about quantitative easing. We are talking about the foreign currency policies that under the International Monetary Fund, 188 countries, including the Asian countries we are negotiating with, have all signed up to agree to. All signed on the dotted line—the United States, Japan, all the countries that we are talking about—that they will not manipulate their currency.

The problem is they still do. The problem is that Japan, after signing on the dotted line under the International Monetary Fund, has over the last 25 years manipulated the currency 376 times. We are saying that if we are going to let you go into a negotiation and come out with a trade agreement of 40 percent of the global economy in Asia and where we are seeing the bulk of the currency manipulation, then we believe there ought to be an enforceable standard, that we ought to have an expectation of a currency manipulation provision that would be enforceable at least as a negotiating objective. That is what we are talking about.

You would think—it is unbelievable the reaction. I understand after working with many, many Secretaries of the Treasury—and I have incredible respect and admiration for our current Secretary—but every Secretary under every President I have had the opportunity to work with—Democrat or Republican—all believe the same: Do not get into this area of policy. I understand that. I do. I respect it. I disagree in this case, but I understand that reaction. But when we are talking about a 21st-century framework on trade and what we need to do in enforcement—and we passed a customs bill that has incredibly important enforcement provisions in it. I am pleased that a number of those are ones that I have been working on—that Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I have been working on for years—provisions that are in that bill.

I am very pleased to see that the broader currency issue is addressed in there that Senator SCHUMER, Senator GRAHAM, Senator BROWN, and I and others have been working on for years, trying to not be in the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations, as we know. All of these things are good to be able to do. But if we are going to do that, we need to address—as has been quoted by one of our auto manufacturers—the mother of all trade barriers, which is currency manipulation. We know it is going on.

On the one hand, we hear from those on the other side that it is a poison pill to put this in the fast-track authority. The question is, Why? Why is it a poison pill? Why is it a poison pill?

Well, because Japan will not like it. Japan will walk away from TPP. Well, on the other side we hear that the Bank of Japan does not do currency manipulation anymore. They do not do it anymore. Why do we have to worry about it if they do not do it anymore?

If they do not do it anymore, then why in the world would they walk away from a negotiation if we have a negotiating objective on currency? It makes you wonder. Do they want to go from 376 times to 377 times? That is what I would assume, if that is that important that it would kill an entire agreement with 12 different countries to have a negotiating principle in there on currency. It is not just Japan, although, that is the major concern. We have seen this happen in Singapore, Malaysia, and other countries. If they do not intend to use that as a way to get an edge, to beat us on an unlevel playing field, then why in the world would they care? That is the question.

They cannot have it both ways. They cannot say they are not doing it anymore. But if we put this in there, somehow we are not going to be able to get this agreement. Our job in a global economy is to make sure the rules are fair for our businesses and our workers.

So far, it is estimated that we have lost some 5 million jobs and counting because of just one thing—currency manipulation. What is that? That means that Japan builds an automobile, and they sell it someplace else. When they are using the Bank of Japan to manipulate their currency, they are able to get a discount on the price artificially. We are told, on average anywhere from $6,000 to $11,000 on the price of an automobile. That is a lot when you are competing.

It is not a differential because they are more efficient at manufacturing or even paying their people less. It is because they cheat. It is because they cheat. It is not about selling into Japan, which is very difficult right now. But we also know that even if we took away the nontariff trade barriers, they have a culture of wanting to buy their own automobiles, which I wish we shared. It would be less of an issue if we in America were buying American. But the concern is that in a global economy, American companies are competing with Japanese companies to go into India—over a billion people—or Brazil or the Middle East or everyplace between America and Japan.

If we are creating this huge trade agreement and we do not address the fact that they can compete with us for those customers in other countries in an unfair way and we do not deal with that, we are forcing our manufacturers to try to compete with their hands tied behind their back. Why would we do that?

It is our job to make sure they have every opportunity to succeed—every opportunity—and that their playing field is level. How many times do we all say those words: ''level playing field,'' ''level playing field.''

We are hearing from manufacturers who want to trade. These are global companies that always support trade agreements. They are saying to us: Pay attention here. This is an issue that has gotten out of hand, that we need in the framework when we are negotiating a trade agreement with 40 percent of the global economy. For the places that manipulate the currency, we need to make sure they are not doing that.

That is what the Portman-Stabenow amendment takes a step to do. I would like to go even further and say that you do not get fast-track authority unless you have strong currency enforcement in the agreement. This is not that far. This is, in fact, the reasonable middle. It says we are going to have a strong negotiating objective that is tied to enforceable standards under the International Monetary Fund, the WTO, that it is a negotiating principle and we expect that to be in there. We expect it to be in there. But it does not have the hammer of saying you would not get fast-track authority because we want this to be something that has strong bipartisan support, that comes to the middle here in terms of what is viewed as reasonable and supporting the ability to have flexibility in negotiations and so on.

For the life of me, I do not understand the reaction on the other side in terms of the statements that this is a poison pill or that this is some outrageous thing to say that along with protecting intellectual property rights and focusing on labor standards and environmental protection, that we would have a negotiating objective on currency.

We do not dictate the outcome of it, which I would love to do. We do not do that. We say, you have to put forward your best efforts here, and you have to put folks on notice that we are serious because this is one of our negotiating objectives. When it is time for the vote, I hope that it will be in this next group of amendments.

We appreciate very much that the amendment is pending, and we look forward to a vote. We would like very much to see that happen this evening. There is no reason not to have it. We are ready to have that vote. I think we have about 25 percent of the whole Senate now as cosponsors, and we would love to have more. This is a bipartisan amendment. It is reasonable, and it tackles the No. 1 trade distorting barrier right now in the global economy, which is currency manipulation. It does it in a responsible way.

I will close by saying this. Again, we hear that this is a poison pill because the main folks who have been currency manipulating, who would be part of the TPP, do not want this, do not want anything saying the word ''currency'' that would be possibly enforceable.

We are hearing that the Bank of Japan is not doing it anymore, so you do not need the language. But, by the way, they will walk away from the agreement if you have it in the language in there. You cannot have it both ways. Either they intend to do it again, and that is why they are objecting to an agreement with any kind of currency manipulation enforcement, or they are not going to do it again and it should not matter. They can't have it both ways on this debate. The fact that folks are trying to have it both ways makes me very concerned about what is really going on in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator PORTMAN in passing this very reasonable amendment to make currency manipulation a priority in our negotiations.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I second the words of the senior Senator from Michigan. She is exactly right about the importance of currency. As she said, it is a negotiating objective. Frankly, I wish we could write even stronger language because we know that the U.S. Trade Representative—whether it is a Trade Representative serving a Democrat or a Republican—doesn't pay quite as much attention to the negotiating objectives as we want. But there is no reason we shouldn't write strong negotiating objectives. Senator STABENOW's amendment with my colleague from Ohio is exactly the right major step forward.

I wish to make one other comment. I believe Senator FRANKEN, Senator BOXER, and Senator WHITEHOUSE are coming to the floor, along with Senator MURPHY, Senator CASEY, Senator WARREN, and Senator STABENOW, to speak about amendments that really matter to TPA. There are literally almost two dozen Democratic Senators and I believe at least 8 or 10 Republican Senators—I am not sure of that number—who have good, solid, substantive amendments. That is why I want to see us do what Senator MCCONNELL has talked about, and that is have a full hearing and airing of amendments that are substantive. There are dozens of substantive amendments offered by at least a couple dozen Senators.

I wish to refer to one thing my colleague from Ohio said earlier, before Senator STABENOW's speech, and that is about the amendment that refers to leveling the playing field, which we have been working on and which is all about trade enforcement. I jotted down one thing he said, which I want to emphasize. He said that by the time our government is able to prove injury and prove an unfair trade practice, the injury is already so great to our workers and our companies. He expanded on that, and I wish to expand on that for a moment.

I have spent hours and hours over the years visiting plants in Ohio and seeing what happened to a number of our companies and the workers who work at those companies when countries such as South Korea engage in unfair trade practices, whether it is steel, coated paper, tires, or dumping oil country tubular steel—dumping means they may subsidize capital. In addition to lower wages, it may be water, energy, or land. Having lower wages is not an unfair trade practice, but the other examples are. We know what that means. It means that our workers can't compete when they don't play fair.

Whether it is Colorado, Ohio, or Michigan, we follow the rule of law, so it takes a period of time to prove these companies are engaging in unfair trade practices. We see a number of these countries and companies—it may be Korea, China, or somewhere else—not just gaming the currency system, but we see them so often not being forthcoming even though international laws require that they be forthcoming with information so we can process whether they, in fact, are subsidizing their production and dumping their product. They may give us inadequate or faulty information or they may give us purposely erroneous information. By the time we put together the trade case, small businesses, particularly in the supply chain, have gone out of business or have been damaged beyond their ability to survive long term, and so often, workers have been laid off.

I saw what happened in Lorain, OH, and I saw what has happened in Cleveland and Gallipolis and Chillicothe. I saw what happened in Trumbull County, OH, and Youngstown, OH, when China and Korea cheated on the oil country tubular steel issue.

Leveling the playing field will help us fight back. That is why so many corporations and labor unions support this legislation.

It matters to our communities because when a plant closes and workers are laid off, it is not just those workers and those families who are affected, it devastates the community. Firefighters, teachers, and police end up getting laid off, and the community is less safe. All of those things happen because we don't stand up and enforce trade law, we don't stand up for our international interests, and we don't stand up for our economic security and our community interests. That is why the Stabenow amendment on currency is so important, and that is why the Brown-Portman amendment is important—so we can level the playing field.

We have at least half a dozen Republican sponsors, and we have a number of Democratic sponsors as well. That language was so uncontroversial that it was adopted in the Finance Committee in the managers' package in the underlying bill that Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN negotiated at the beginning, about a month or so ago.

I applaud Senator STABENOW for her work on currency.

I urge my colleagues, first of all, to make the amendment on leveling the playing field pending, and second, to move on this legislation.

I also appreciate the leadership Senator WHITEHOUSE, who just joined us on the floor, has shown on these trade agreements.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I know Senator WHITEHOUSE is here and I have already spoken, but I wish to echo Senator BROWN's strong appeal that we vote on the leveling the playing field amendment. It is critical.

We have seen communities across Michigan as well as throughout the country that have been devastated. We not only lose good-paying jobs when a plant closes, but we lose small businesses from across the street, and it affects the whole community.

This is an incredibly important amendment. I hope we will get a vote on it. I believe the votes are here to support that amendment on a bipartisan basis, and I think it is critical that we vote and adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I wish to discuss.

About a year ago, we as a Senate, unanimously by a voice vote, ratified four treaties that helped protect American fisheries from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing around the world. It is called pirate fishing. This

was an effort by the Oceans Caucus. It was led by me and then-Senator Begich on our side and Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator WICKER on the other side of the aisle. It was hotlined on both sides and cleared.

It is a useful treaty to be in. It is important for our American fishing industry to make sure that they are not being punished or harmed by foreign competitors who are not fishing sustainably, fishing illegally, or violating the laws of the jurisdiction in which they are fishing. Because of their misbehavior, they are able to bring catch to market less expensively than fishermen who play by the rules.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I may call up my amendment No. 1387.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I understand there are issues on the floor that need to be resolved and there are objections pending, but I did wish to speak to this amendment. It is an amendment I hope can either get a vote or, because of its noncontroversial, bipartisan status, perhaps can be added at a time when there is a managers' amendment or some means of dealing with noncontroversial additions to this legislation.

So the objection having been made to my request, I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly on the trade legislation before us and on the importance of considering and voting on amendments that would improve it. I have submitted amendments of my own. I am co-leading a pair of amendments with Senator BALDWIN, and there are a number of very important amendments that I support.

We are talking about how we will consider trade agreements that would cover a major portion of the entire global economy. That is a very important subject, and I believe we need to fully debate this bill. I also believe we need to have votes on a number of amendments to make this bill better than it currently is.

I believe that when trade is done right, it can benefit our workers, our communities, and our businesses. But I am concerned that the fast-track procedures set up by the trade promotion authority bill we are considering will not do enough to make sure we do trade right. So, at a minimum, I believe we should debate and have votes on a number of amendments that would considerably strengthen this bill.

I have submitted two amendments of my own. One of my amendments would strengthen the negotiating objective on labor and environmental standards in the trade promotion authority bill. Right now, the bill effectively says that partner countries violate those standards only when they fail to enforce labor or environmental laws on a sustained and recurring basis. The notion that violations of standards need to be sustained and recurring to really count as violations is not found elsewhere in the bill and doesn't hold with respect to, for example, intellectual property, digital trade, or regulatory practices. My very simple amendment would take out ''sustained and recurring'' so that a labor violation is a labor violation.

My other amendment is my Community College to Career Fund Act, which is designed to address the skills gap where there are jobs open in our country because there are not workers with the right skills to fill them. Just like Senator STABENOW's amendment on renewing the community college portion of trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, of which I am a cosponsor, my amendment will bolster workforce development and training.

The community college portion of TAA has been successful in helping to retrain workers and communities that have been harmed by trade, and that is a good thing. My amendment builds on this by helping community colleges partner with business sectors in order to improve our ability to get people into jobs in manufacturing that are high-skilled jobs or in IT or in health care by providing them the skills they need. This will make all of our communities more resilient and economically successful.

I am also proud to co-lead two amendments with Senator BALDWIN of Wisconsin on our trade remedy laws. One would prevent trade negotiations from weakening those laws, and the other would strengthen the language in the TPA bill on trade remedy laws—the laws that enforce our trade policies and protect our domestic industries from dumped and subsidized imports from other countries.

In Minnesota, I have seen firsthand the damage that happens when we don't have and, just as importantly, can't enforce strong trade protections. In the last few months alone, we have seen what happens when other countries unfairly dump their goods here. In this case, it was steel products. Nearly 1,000 Minnesotans are losing their jobs after a flood of dumped steel imports. Our provisions stand up for American manufacturers by putting in place and enforcing fair trade practices.

In addition to these amendments, there are many other important amendments my colleagues have offered on currency manipulation, investor-state dispute settlement, ''Buy American,'' and a number of other issues.

I believe that these issues are worth debating and that we should be voting on amendments on the important subjects which I have mentioned as well as on other important subjects.

In my view, this bill is in need of substantial improvement, and we should not cut off the process of trying to make those improvements. We need to be voting on amendments, and we need to be working to improve this bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have been listening to colleagues speak about the importance of having a very open process here where we can offer our amendments and make this fast-track a better deal for the middle class and for jobs in our Nation. It is rather shocking to recognize that this huge agreement, which is going to cover 40 percent of trade in this world, is being jammed down our throats in a couple of days. It is ridiculous. When we look at other agreements, they have had far more time. We have well over 100 amendments filed and we have been offered 6 amendments.

I know the Senator from Washington has laid down the gauntlet on the Ex-Im Bank. I support her. We have differing views on the underlying bill, but I think she is right because it is really hard to imagine passing this huge bill and then ignoring the fact that Ex-Im Bank is going to go away.

To me, as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, recognizing that the entire highway bill is ending—the entire highway program is ending on May 31—to take up this bill without taking care of that is absurd. To take up this bill before raising the minimum wage is ridiculous. To take up this bill before we make sure we have comprehensive immigration reform so workers can come out of the shadows is just the height of insanity. To take up this bill before we have taken up the Ex-Im Bank, as I know my friend from Washington has explained, is absurd. We have deals that are pending with our small businesses through the Ex-Im Bank. They are going to be entirely upended.

So I took the majority leader at his word. I thought we were going to have votes to put the enforcement inside this bill, and now that doesn't appear to be happening.

Let me just tell my colleagues about the amendment I wish to offer. I think it would pass here overwhelmingly. I have no illusions that we will be allowed to vote on it, but it simply says: If a country doesn't have a minimum wage of at least 2 bucks an hour, we

can't fast-track a trade agreement with that country. Let me reiterate. The amendment simply says: You can't be fast-tracked if you don't pay at least $2 an hour.

Let's talk about it. Why is this important? I voted for fast-track for NAFTA. What a mistake that was. President Clinton promised us the world. Republicans and Democrats who were protrade promised us the world. Do we know what happened? We lost 700,000 jobs, mostly in manufacturing. What makes my colleagues think we are not going to see these 12 million manufacturing jobs leave when Chile pays $1.91 an hour—$1.91 an hour. Malaysia pays $1.21 an hour. Peru pays $1.15 an hour. Mexico pays 80 cents an hour. Vietnam pays 58 cents an hour. Brunei and Singapore, well, they have no minimum wage at all.

So we have a very simple amendment here which I don't believe I will ever get a chance to offer, but it is simple.

I know if I went outside and asked the average American how they felt and said: Do you think it is right for us to do a trade deal with countries that pay poverty wages, slave wages to their people—how are we going to compete with that? And people say: Oh, well, our workers are smarter.

That is right. But those workers, let me tell my colleagues, are very smart in Chile and Malaysia and Peru and Mexico and Vietnam and Brunei and Singapore. They are very good. It is tragic that they are in countries that pay them slave wages. That is this great deal we are going to make.

It is true that Australia has a very high minimum wage of $13.47; New Zealand, $10.87; Canada, $8.69. And I am embarrassed to say ours is still $7.25. Our States and cities are making up for it by raising their minimum wages. It is a tragedy. This is a race to the bottom. Japan has $6.51; and then we get to Chile at $1.91; Malaysia, $1.21; Peru at $1.15; Mexico at 80 cents; Vietnam at 58 cents; and Brunei and Singapore have no minimum wages whatsoever.

So I have this very good amendment, and I hope it makes it onto the list, I say to the majority leader. Then I have a series of amendments that deal with the environment.

If we are worried about an extrajudicial system to overturn our laws, all we have to do is look at what the World Trade Organization did yesterday when they said we cannot have country-of-origin labeling without getting tariffs put on our products. It had to do with beef. I am sure the Presiding Officer cares a lot about that. The fact is that country-of-origin labeling is critical. I want to know where the beef comes from because there have been all kinds of tragedies with diseases with beef, and I want to buy American. But the World Trade Organization said no. They said that is a trade barrier. Guess what it means? It means that if we don't cancel out that law, they are going to put tariffs not just on beef, they are going to put tariffs on wine, on our strawberries, our fruits, our vegetables, everything. They are going to put tariffs on it.

So here we are about to go into this massive trade deal with countries that pay slave wages, that have terrible environmental laws, with an extrajudicial process where companies can sue our States, sue our Nation if they say that the laws we have are barriers, and we are going to do all this on a Thursday so people can go on their trips. Uh-uh. No. I say no. That is wrong. We need to have votes on all of these things.

I will tell my colleagues, we could see polluters bringing cases in front of this new extrajudicial body and saying: Sorry, but the Clean Power Plan is making us spend too much money. Toxic laws here in America are making us spend too much money. Your laws against lead poisoning are making us spend too much money. Your laws controlling formaldehyde, California, are costing us too much money.

Then we are going to see lawsuits—and we have seen them in the past—and all we have to do is look at what happened with the WTO, the World Trade Organization, and we are in big trouble.

So on the one hand we are making a deal with seven nations that have slave wages or no minimum wage, so bye-bye, manufacturing; and secondly, we have this extrajudicial body that Senator ELIZABETH WARREN has been so eloquent about that can actually overrule America's laws and California's laws and Colorado's laws and Washington State's laws. And I have a number of amendments here that state that if we have laws that deal with toxic substances in toys—that is Boxer 1356—you can't mess with that. I have another one that says if we have laws that reduce exposure to known cancer-causing substances, you can't overrule those laws, but I can't get that on the list. My amendment is not on the list.

I have one that says that if we have laws that make sure pesticides are safe, sorry, we are not going to stand by and allow this extrajudicial process to work. That should be exempted, and toxic gas pollutants should be exempted, such as mercury and asbestos exposure. So all of my amendments make sure we do not enter into new trade agreements that have the effect of changing our longstanding environmental principle of ''polluters pay'' into ''polluters get paid.'' That is what this is about. A polluter can sue in this trade agreement.

I went downstairs. I had to give up all my electronics. I couldn't take notes with me, but I know enough to see what this is about. A polluter can go and make the case that Colorado or California has protective laws, and, by God, it made them pay more money to produce their products, and they ask for millions of dollars.

This is not a fiction. This has happened in past trade agreements. Believe me. Countries have paid through the nose and have had to repeal their laws. So we are rushing into a fast-track vote on something that is very dangerous. It is dangerous to the middle class. It is dangerous for jobs. And we are pushing it ahead of things that we ought to be doing, such as raising the minimum wage, passing the Ex-Im Bank, passing immigration laws, putting together the funding for a highway bill. We haven't raised the gas tax in 20 years. If we raise it a penny every quarter till we raise about 6 cents or 8 cents, it would cost the average driver 30 bucks. We can fix the 69 bridges that are collapsing. We can fix the 50 percent of roads that are out of compliance and not safe. And we can create 3 million jobs. But, oh, no, we are not doing that agenda for the middle class. We are doing things that threaten the middle class and that further threaten the health and safety of our people.

So I hope working with Senator MCCONNELL and Senator BROWN and Senator WYDEN, we can get a path forward here to hear our amendments.

We have a promise from the majority leader: This is a new day.

The press asked me: Is this a new day in the Senate with Senator MCCONNELL? I said no—not.

I can't get my amendments in. I have 10 amendments up. I can't get them on any list. Maybe it is because they don't want to vote on this—the protrade people. They don't want to vote to say that any deal with a country that doesn't pay at least two bucks an hour can't be fast-tracked. It is a hard vote. It is a hard vote, and I want that vote. So I am going to do everything in my power to solve this. I am going to use every tool at my disposal. I know the Senator from Washington is already doing it for me, in a way, but I stand as a backup here, because I don't like this being jammed down the throats of the people. This is wrong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, these trade agreements are big deals. Trade promotion authority used to mean setting tariffs. Now they can affect everything from the safety of our food to the working conditions of people around the world and environmental standards. Very frankly and simply, that means that Americans should know what the agreements say and what our government is saying about them, and they should be given that information while there is a meaningful chance to influence them.

I hope to influence them through this deliberative process. It is supposed to be open and transparent. I have two

amendments—one that would promote greater transparency in trade agreements and the second to help ensure that foreign countries cannot use trade agreements to undermine the safety and security of America's food supply.

First, on the subject of transparency, nothing is more fundamental than for the American people to know what is in these trade agreements. Despite their significance, despite the far-reaching ramifications and implications they have for our American economy and, indeed, our way of life, they are being negotiated in secret. In fact, Members of Congress can view them only if they go to secure locations, and staff of Members of Congress can see them only if they are accompanied by the Members themselves. The real problem is not Members of Congress or their staff but the American public who are kept in the dark. They are the supposed beneficiaries of these deals, and yet they are kept from knowing what is in them. The TPA would allow the text of an agreement to be made public only after it is already finalized—a point that is way too late for the people most directly and urgently affected by the deals to do anything but try to get Congress to vote down the whole thing in its entirety at once. That is not productive. That is not fair.

More transparency would allow issues over a particular provision to be resolved individually on their own. This kind of practice is not in accordance with our democratic condition, an open and transparent process to set policy—whether it is trade policy or any other issue of economic and political consequence.

So making the TPA more transparent is a relatively easy fix. My amendment would do it. This amendment would require the publication of ''formal proposals advanced by the United States in negotiations for a trade agreement.''

''Formal proposals advanced by the United States in negotiations for a trade agreement''—that means that the United States, when it takes an official position and offers it to another country, ought to tell the American people, its own people—not just the people who are rulers of another country but our own people. They have a right to know when this administration or any other offers something to people of another country, and my amendment would require that basic protection and transparency.

Very importantly, this amendment would not prohibit confidential negotiations or closed-door deliberations. Some off-the-record discussion, no question, is necessary for effective consideration of any multilateral agreement. And this amendment would not affect negotiations specifically relating to tariffs and similar market-access provisions that are the traditional subjects of trade negotiations.

Some negotiations have to be done in confidence—in private—but basic positions, official proposals, are outside of this realm—proposals that look more like traditional legislative policymaking, because they can involve give or take, sacrifices from the American people, and give and take by other countries. They can align standards for regulations across a number of areas, from drug development to finance.

Other countries can be encouraged. They can be empowered to adopt stronger protections for workers, for clean air and water and more. But harm can be done if trade agreements undermine American laws and American protections for health, safety, and security of our citizens.

There are a number of amendments that I have supported that will directly address labor issues, environmental issues, and security issues. This amendment would simply ensure that all of these issues are considered in an open, fair, and transparent way, so the American people—not just we in this Chamber, not just our negotiators, not just the President and his advisers—know what is happening.

Publication of formal proposals, which is a term of art in trade agreements, would bring American transparency practice in line with the general practices of our European allies. The European Union countries engaged in the TTIP negotiations announcing that they will post on the Internet all textual proposals that will be offered to the United States, as well as position papers, establishing their approach and analysis. And America should simply do the same. We are a nation that prides itself on leading the world in transparency, openness, and democracy. We should not be behind our European allies on that score.

I am very grateful for the support of Senator BROWN, a tremendous leader in this effort to ensure that American trade agreements work for the American people, as well as Senator BALDWIN and Senator UDALL. And I urge other colleagues to support this amendment and the other amendments that I am offering on food safety.

And I am grateful, again, to have the support of Senator BROWN on this one. It would establish as a principal negotiating objective of the United States the protection and promotion of strong food safety laws as well as regulations and inspections. Enforcement is key. Standards are vital. Ensuring that trade agreements do not weaken or diminish our food safety standards ought to be a given.

We take for granted all too often that our food is safe until we discover that it isn't, until we find there are food poisonings and tragedies that result from unsafe food. We saw it at the beginning of the last century. Unscrupulous corporations can cut corners by skimping on food safety or worse, by introducing dangerous additives or adulterations to foods, making them or processing them under unsafe or unacceptable conditions. They may save money, but they sacrifice lives and safety. The consequences in real lives and real time can be disastrous—not only in lives but in dollars.

The majority of food manufacturers and producers take their safety responsibilities seriously. The majority in this country certainly do. But what about abroad? What about in another country? What about in countries where the standards are nonexistent or not enforced? A campaign of dedicated advocacy and scientific research led to a system of food inspection in this country, which is far from perfect but way ahead of other countries, and it gives Americans the confidence they need and deserve to walk into any supermarket or restaurant in this country and feel trust—deserved because it is earned and because the laws are enforced.

Not all countries, unfortunately, follow these practices. Few countries have the standards that ours does. Food production is still under-inspected, spoiled or adulterated in those countries, and that is the product that we want excluded from this country if they fail to meet those standards. I am concerned that this trade agreement will affect our own food safety regulations by introducing those deficient products—unsafe food—into this country.

My amendment directs negotiators to ensure that imports of that food do not undermine the trust and confidence of our people in our own food supply as well as products from abroad. Countries with less stringent standards in protecting their citizens should not be permitted to use trade agreements to force this country to imitate them.

Trade is a crucial part of the American economy. It is an essential part of our Connecticut economy. Trade, when it is done right, is a great boon to many people and our entire economy. Defense and aerospace, small manufacturers, furniture and food companies in Connecticut all thrive because of trade. I want the world to see what Connecticut businesses have to offer, what our exports can do for them.

I know we can compete with anyone. I know how important exports are to my State, but I also know trade deals can have negative, unintended consequences, which is what we want to prevent; consequences in abuses by foreign governments seeking to subvert or circumvent American regulations or by giant multinational companies looking to move jobs and capital to where labor is cheapest and can be exploited easiest or where health or environmental protections are weakest.

My amendments would help ensure that the American people know what are in these trade agreements before

they are approved, while they are negotiated, and when our food can be protected and transparency assured.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, during this trade debate, we have often heard a lot about the words ''enforcement'' or ''enforceable,'' particularly the phrase ''enforceable labor and environmental standards.'' But the fact is there are no enforceable labor and environmental standards. There is no new generation of treaty in the TPP that is going to create something we have not had before.

What we have had before has simply failed us. Why is that? Well, we had side agreements on labor and the environment in NAFTA. Much is made of the fact that, well, we are not going to have side agreements anymore; we are actually going to put these standards right in the treaty itself. So somehow folks are arguing in support of this treaty that moving the print from over here to here somehow makes is it more effective.

That is not the case. We had the same labor and environmental standards in the agreements we passed a few years ago, agreements I voted against—the agreement with Colombia, the agreement with Korea.

But what have we seen over time? Have we ever seen any of these labor objectives and these environmental standards enforced? Let me give you a sense of what we are talking about. Under the International Labor Organization, ILO, they have a set of standards. They have lots of details. But there are things like freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining and elimination of forced labor or compulsory labor, as it is referred to, the abolition of child labor, the elimination of discrimination in the workplace.

Certainly, at the heart of this—back to the right of collective bargaining—is the right of unions to organize, the right of workers to talk to each other and to bargain for a fair return for their efforts. But have we ever enforced a single ILO provision? No, we have not. In fact, we have only challenged the terrible labor practices in another nation once; that is, Guatemala. That went through years before we officially challenged it, and now it is still not resolved some 8 years after it was first challenged.

Is there anything new that changes the process in the anticipated Trans-Pacific Partnership? No, it is the same process: put in the ILO standards and hope people will aspire to honor them—hope, the same hope that has failed us time and time again in treaty after treaty. So the next time someone comes to this floor and says there is an enforceable labor standard, no one should believe it because it is not there.

We have not enforced one labor standard, not one. Guatemala is the only one we have challenged, and that one, after 8 years, we still have not resolved it. How about environmental standards? Have we filed challenges on environmental standards? What are these environmental standards? Well, basically it is a requirement to honor international treaties.

No, these things are violated all over the place, but we have not challenged them a single time. Now, why is it that the United States does not challenge these violations? Well, first, it has to be a government-to-government action, when an issue is raised and folks are told: Hey, government, U.S. Government, you really should do something about trade unionists being murdered in Colombia.

Well, no, if we object, it will create ripples in the relationship. So the U.S. Government does not want to take action. It does not want to create ripples in the relationship. But if pressed, folks come and say: You know, it really matters that you said you would enforce this, U.S. Government, but you are not. You should really do something.

Well, you know, if we object to the way they are conducting themselves in regard to labor and environmental standards, there will be retaliatory actions against the United States. Then it will just be: We will challenge them, they will challenge us, and it will go on for years and years. It will disrupt the whole relationship. Why would we do that?

If that is not enough, then if the government, our government, is really serious about enforcing something, then the companies that have invested in that nation, then they come forward and say: Wait. The whole goal of this trade agreement was to create a stable environment for investing. If you challenge and try to have them honor the labor and environmental provisions, ultimately, not only will it produce retaliatory actions that will be potentially harmful, but if you should win somewhere down the line, that means there may be tariffs on the products that we produce in that country and they will not be able to enter the United States. Please do not mess up our investment in that nation.

So for these reasons, there has been no enforcement—none. Again, there was one effort in Guatemala never resolved. There is nothing new in this anticipated Trans-Pacific Partnership that would operate any differently.

How about if we had snapback provisions? We have been talking quite a lot on the situation with Iran, that if we reach an agreement with them in June, Congress is going to want to make sure that if there are violations of the agreement, that the controls on Iranian trade that have been effective in bringing them to the negotiating table will snap back into place to make sure folks really respond in Iran to honoring the agreement.

Is there any snapback provision anticipated, new strategy, this new tool to make sure the agreements are actually honored? No, there are not. So the old system has not worked. There is no new system. There has been no enforcement. Anyone who tells you there are enforceable labor and environmental standards is not telling you the truth because there are not. That is why we need to change the negotiations.

Now, the goal of fast-track was to lay out a series of objectives for the U.S. Government to pursue in writing an agreement on trade with other nations.

This is a little bit complicated now, because when you raise up an idea and say this should be addressed, the administration says, well, yes, but we have already negotiated this treaty. We cannot go back to the negotiating table and change it. We are 95 to 98 percent complete.

So, for example, we have been raising the issue of currency manipulation. This is a fundamental—fundamental—provision of what should be in a trade agreement, because when you get rid of a tariff, you can create an effective tariff on your trading partner's products and a subsidy on your own through intervention in the currency markets. It is known as currency manipulation. It should be covered, but it is not.

When you talk to the administration, the administration says we just cannot go back and talk about things that we have not already put on the table. So that would be unacceptable for us to take on this important provision now because we have already negotiated the agreement.

Well, then, what is really the point of fast-track, if it is not to lay out the standards that are expected for an agreement? In that case, it is nothing but a rubberstamp for an already negotiated treaty that does not meet the things that folks in this room are saying are important to have. In that case, it just simply becomes a greased track for approving the treaty or the agreement, as it is referred to. It is not referred to as a treaty. Why not? When it creates an international body that can assess fines on the United States, does that not qualify as a treaty? No. Because the folks who are negotiating this do not want it to be subject to the supermajority that the Constitution requires for a treaty. So they say we will call it an agreement. That will fix that. Now it is only a simple majority vote, and we will get this fast-track under the argument that Congress is getting a chance to say what needs to be in the treaty—but not really because we refuse to take any item we haven't already put in the agreement.

So that is really the state of affairs. That is why, instead of simply having negotiating objectives, we need to have

negotiating standards that have to be met before an agreement is brought back to this body under the fast-track rule. Objectives are just wishful thinking, wishful thinking that you have some type of ''enforceable labor provisions,'' wishful thinking that there are some forms of enforceable environmental standards.

Is that really enough? Is that all we are asking for is a little bit of wishful thinking, when we already know it is not going to be honored? So let's put in mandatory negotiating objectives in these two categories. That is why I have submitted amendment No. 1369. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that my amendment be brought up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am saddened to hear that there is an objection in a context in which the majority leader has argued that he is going to have a robust and open amendment process. So why is there an objection to bringing an amendment forward to debate a core issue, which speech after speech after speech in support of this agreement—this fast-track to accelerate consideration of TPP—has referred to enforceable labor standards? Why not debate an amendment that would actually require enforceable labor standards? Why not?

Well, because apparently that is not a serious goal. Let's turn to another piece of this. There is a part of this system referred to as ''dispute settlement,'' an international system of dispute settlement, ISDS. What this does is it sets up a tribunal not subject to American law. It is an international tribunal, has one person chosen by America and one chosen by a foreign investor and one chosen by the combination.

This group, this ISDS, is empowered to apply a series of standards and say that an action by our country has damaged the interest of a foreign investor, and the foreign investor must be compensated or, if they are not compensated, that the law has to be changed. Well, really this whole concept was generated to protect American investments in countries that had weak judicial systems because that way, if you had an investment and the foreign country tried to expropriate it, change the law so you could not sell what you were making or something of that nature, there was a way to address that.

One can understand why American businesses would want that sort of stability. You can also understand why countries with poor judicial systems would want to sign on to such a system in order to encourage investment in their country. They want the jobs. They want that foreign investment.

But in the United States, we have a good judicial system. Why would we allow it to be displaced by an international tribunal—a tribunal that has not even been approved through the treaty process, mandated in the Constitution? Why would we give the power to three corporate lawyers who have conflicts of interest—there is no prohibition on conflicts of interest for the members who serve as judges—and allow them to rule on our consumer laws, allow them to rule on our public health laws, allow them to rule on our environmental laws? Quite frankly, that is giving away a significant piece of our sovereignty, carving a big hole out of our judicial system and handing it over to an international tribunal. If that doesn't constitute something that should qualify for treaty status—giving away a chunk of sovereignty out of our judicial system—I don't know what would qualify for a treaty. But this little slick game is underway of calling it an agreement in order to bypass our constitutional standard. And what does that mean? That means if a State says ''We no longer want to allow chemicals to be put into our carpets because those flame retardants are causing cancer in our children,'' a foreign investor who has set up a factory to make flame retardants can file suit against the United States and say they have been damaged as a foreign investor. The foreign investor gets rights that do not belong to in-country investors. Why should we give special rights to foreign investors that American investors do not have?

Why should we proceed and have a labeling law on e-cigarettes—a new challenge, if you will? Let's say, for example, that we require mandatory caps, childproof caps on the bottles. Let's say we banned the flavorings on e-cigarettes. Those flavorings are things such as double chocolate delight or any other number of candy flavors, bubble gum—you name it. If it sounds like candy, there is a container of liquid nicotine with that name on it. So you take away the flavorings, you greatly diminish the sales targeted at our youth.

Why would we control the flavorings? Well, we passed a law in 2009 that gave that power to the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration. The Food and Drug Administration has done an initial draft deeming regulation. Under this draft deeming regulation, they attempt to control or perhaps may control the flavorings. They would do so because cigarette companies—that is, tobacco companies—are targeting our children because they know that addiction occurs before the age of 21. You want to get our middle school and high school children puffing on e-cigarettes so that they will be addicted before they reach 21 because by then the brain has developed to the degree that people rarely get addicted.

So we, in protection of the health of our children, have seriously considered—created a framework for regulating this candy-flavored attack on the health of our youth. That is why we do it, for the protection of our youth. But along comes a foreign investor who set up a factory to create liquid nicotine and says: I can't sell my product now because I invested in all this equipment to do all these candy flavors and you are banning it. You either have to change your law or I get to be compensated.

So we should carve out of this ISDS settlement, if we have it at all—and I think it should be opt-in. A country that wants foreign investment because they know they have a shaky judicial system should opt into it. We would not opt in because we have a fair judicial system. But if it is going to exist, it should definitely carve out our public health, our consumer laws, and our environmental laws. And that is exactly why I have amendment No. 1401.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and amendment No. 1401 be called up.

Ms. CANTWELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. I will keep pushing for consideration of my amendments, which are being banned from consideration on this floor, because if we are going to have a ''robust and open amendment process,'' we should, in fact, have a robust and open amendment process and consider these serious issues before us.

So let's turn to a third area, which is the fact that the Trans-Pacific Partnership—you hear robust labor protections that level the playing field. Well, a level playing field would involve roughly similar standards between countries. So is there anything that levels in any way the vast difference between the minimum wage in some of the prospective TPP countries and other countries? The answer is no, not a thing. The single most important labor differential between the nations is not addressed in any shape or form.

So if we were to look at the minimum wages, we would find, as the Senator from California noted earlier, that Brunei and Singapore have no minimum wage at all. Mexico and Vietnam are under $1 in minimum wage. Malaysia, Peru, and Chile are under $2.50. So basically we have 7 countries out of this group of 12 that have a minimum wage that either doesn't exist or is under roughly $2.50. That is very different from the other five countries in this agreement. These are countries such as the United States, with a minimum wage at $7.25—it should be higher, but it is $7.25; Japan's is $8.17; Canada has a minimum wage of $9.75; New

Zealand, $11.18; and Australia's is $16.87—more than double the United States, which was surprising to me.

Well, if you have this vast difference and you have manufacturers in the United States, Japan, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, these manufacturers would like to play off China against Malaysia and Malaysia against Vietnam and Vietnam against Mexico because that way they can drive the lowest possible wages between these countries.

Let me be quick to say that there are American companies—highly responsible American companies—that depend on overseas manufacturing that are very careful in monitoring their subcontractors and the conditions in which their subcontractors operate. These are often the brands that we know well, that are pillars in our community. But for every one of those, there are dozens of contractors and subcontractors that are seeking the lowest possible cost to make something, and that is why they want to play off these countries against each other. Oh, Malaysia, you are raising your minimum wage. Oh, you are enforcing your environmental standard. We are going to increase production in our Vietnamese factory. Oh, Vietnam, you now are saying you want to honor the ILO labor standard? Well, that is a problem. We are going to produce more in our Mexico factory. So this is opening a race to the bottom.

If we are going to come to the floor—as many have—to say that there are fundamentally even labor standards between the countries in this agreement, shouldn't we have even standards? Shouldn't we have an even minimum wage standard or at a minimum at least require there to be a base minimum wage and then have that raised over time for participants so as to reduce the differential between the highest paid and the lowest paid? Because not only does this system set up an ability and an effort to play off Malaysia against Mexico, against Vietnam, but it also sets up a situation where the conversation is like this: Oh, so here in America we are going to raise our minimum wage. Well, that means we are going to have to shift another 1,000 jobs somewhere else—maybe to Malaysia, maybe to Vietnam. Maybe we will use the WTO and go to China.

It has a big impact on suppressing living wages in our country, and we have seen this impact. Since 1974, we have seen productivity soar in our country, but the actual return to workers, inflation adjusted, has been flat and then declining for the last 10 years. Families are having a terribly difficult time getting by.

So not only do we have a stake in fairness not to create a race to the bottom between Malaysia, Vietnam, Mexico, and Peru, but we also have an incentive not to create a situation where U.S. living wages are constantly eviscerated under the threat of shipping those jobs overseas. Well, maybe we will assemble it here, but we will do more of our subcomponents in those countries. And once you set up an effective, efficient factory overseas, it makes it easier and easier to ship those.

That is why I have an amendment that says: At a minimum, let's fill this gaping gap. Let's proceed to require there to be, as part of the negotiations, the negotiation of a minimum wage for entry and for that minimum wage to be gradually increased in order to diminish the disparities between the high-wage countries, of which there are five in this agreement, and the low-wage countries, of which there are seven. This would be good to end the play off of one low-wage country against another, and it would be good to diminish the comparative advantage of low-wage countries in terms of taking manufacturing out of the United States. That is why I drafted amendment No. 1409.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and for my amendment No. 1409 to be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

Ms. CANTWELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. I am zero for three now in terms of being able to get substantive amendments, serious amendments on this floor for debate, but I will try to on one more, and this one is anchored in recent news that we have seen the country-of-origin labeling—or COOL, as it is called—country-of-origin labeling standard knocked down just yesterday. What does this mean? This means it is going to be considered a trade violation for us to inform Americans on where their meat comes from. Isn't it a fundamental right in our country to know where our food comes from? Shouldn't we always have the right to know that? But we have engaged in a trade agreement—a previous trade agreement—and now the adjudicating body of that agreement says: No, no, no. That is unfair, to tell people where the meat comes from. Well, I think that is wrong, absolutely 100 percent wrong. Every American consumer should have the right to know where their meat comes from, and if I want to buy American-grown beef, I should have the right to do that, and I can't exercise that right unless I know—on the package—where it was grown.

If there are human rights violations or labor violations in Colombia and I don't want to buy Colombia meat until they fix their labor negotiations, I should have the right to use my dollar to buy my meat from the United States of America and not meat grown in Colombia. But that has been struck down because we gave away previously a chunk of our sovereignty. That is the danger of giving away the sovereignty of the United States of America to an international group that strikes down fundamental rights that every one of us should have. So let's fix that.

That is why I drafted amendment No. 1404 which would declare that the right to establish information for consumers about where their food comes from will not be violated by the agreement that is brought back to the Senate.

I hope everyone will join me in unanimous consent in saying that absolutely we are going to defend the rights of Americans to know where their food comes from.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that amendment No. 1404 be brought up in order that we should all be able to exercise our rights to not buy products from countries that we find in violation of fundamental human rights or other labor abuses or environmental errors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. I see my colleagues on the floor who have their own amendments to address. I will conclude by saying that if I can't get up one of my four amendments to be debated—all substantive and all addressing key components of this agreement—then this is not a robust process, this is not an open process, and I ask the majority leader to keep his vision that he laid out on this floor that this would be an open process and a robust process.

Thank you.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the pending business, which is the trade promotion authority, also known as TPA, adding to the many initials we are throwing around these days.

I thought the Senate came to an agreement to move forward on this legislation, and as promised by the majority leader allowing amendments, but we are not getting to vote. I hope we can note that the objections are not coming from the Republican side of the aisle.

I believe the United States must engage in a global marketplace if they are going to survive economically. I also understand there are concerns about TPA. In particular, there is confusion about what exactly happens when Congress passes a TPA bill. History provides us an insight into why Congress created this particular authority.

Article I of the U.S. Constitution states, ''Congress shall have the Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign nations.'' For over 150 years, Congress established tariff rates directly.

However, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement of 1934, RTAA—more initials—Congress delegated this authority to the President, who could reduce tariffs within preapproved levels in reciprocal trade agreements.

In response to Presidential overreach under the act, Congress enacted the first trade promotion authority bill in 1974. Since that time, Congress has regularly enacted TPA legislation which defines U.S. negotiating objectives and priorities for trade agreements.

As an added measure, Congress includes time limits on the use of TPA and retains the option to disapprove of an extension when the President requests one. Finally, each Chamber has the right to exercise its constitutional authority to change TPA in an implementing bill.

The underlying TPA bill builds on the tradition of Congress setting the terms for trade by expanding the transparency and consultation requirements for the administration. The procedure allows any Member of the House or Senate to unilaterally push to remove TPA authority if he or she believes the White House has not consulted fully with Congress. This is an important check to ensure that Congress is not turning over the fast-track keys to an administration that will disrespect the negotiating objectives Congress sets in its TPA bill.

I am confident in supporting TPA because it advances the ball on the Trans-Pacific Partnership—TPP. The TPP agreement is not just a trade agreement, it is an economic and strategic agreement. The TPA parties already include a number of nations the United States already has bilateral free-trade agreements with, including Australia, Chile, Singapore, and Peru. This starting point ensures that TPP includes the highest standards of trade favorable to an economically free and fair market.

Additionally, we know the United States needs to continue setting the tone in the Pacific region both economically and politically. The TPP achieves the goal by taking the first step in creating the leading trade agreement of the 21st century.

Let me give some examples of how TPP will benefit Wyoming. Despite having no direct access to the Pacific Ocean, in 2014, businesses from Wyoming exported $1 billion in goods to TPP partners, which would grow under the new agreement. For Wyoming, most of its trade is in the natural chemical industry. A key industrial and chemical product I have spoken about on the Senate floor is soda ash. Wyoming also exports machinery and energy products to these Pacific markets.

I must also add that over two-thirds of the firms exporting goods from Wyoming are small- or medium-sized businesses. Exports are increasingly playing a role in job growth in my State. In 1992, just 12 percent of the jobs in the State of Wyoming were tied to international trade. As of 2013, one in six jobs in Wyoming is dependent on international trade. The TPP agreement is an opportunity for Wyoming's businesses, especially in mining, manufacturing, and agriculture, to expand their markets and grow. This is why on April 22 I voted to support TPA in the Senate Committee on Finance.

Trade promotion authority also plays a key role in advancing the interests of our Nation's most competitive businesses, including technology and medical innovation. I have long spoken about the importance of protecting American innovations overseas. The United States remains a leader in innovation and technology because of our strong protections for intellectual property. The TPP would include the highest standard to date for new innovations.

I look forward to advancing TPA and want to give credit to Chairman HATCH and Leader MCCONNELL for the open amendment process they are trying to get on this bill.

I will also mention, briefly, that I oppose expanding TAA—another good acronym—without a closer look at how it mimics and duplicates Federal workforce training programs. As the former chairman and ranking member of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, I am extremely familiar with the existing Federal programs that Congress funds to improve workforce training. TAA is redundant, and now is not the time to increase spending. As chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget, I cannot ignore programs that add new spending. That is why I intend to vote against expanding it and adding it to the underlying bill.

I hope we will take a look at the TPA within the amendment process, and I hope people will pay attention to an article that appeared in the Casper Star Tribune, which is our State newspaper. I assume it appeared in many other newspapers. The title of this article is ''The left is so wrong on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.'' The article goes into some of the reasons Democrats might be trying to deny this from happening. If you look at the strategy, I think that probably is where a lot of the amendments are headed—to actually defeating it, not to help it along, not to improve it, and that is wrong.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article I just mentioned.

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

[From the Casper Star Tribune, May 17, 2015]

THE LEFT IS SO WRONG ON THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

(By Froma Harrop)

The left's success in denying President Obama fast-track authority to negotiate the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is ugly to behold. The case put forth by a showboating U.S. Sen. Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass.,—that Obama cannot be trusted to make a deal in the interests of American workers—is almost worse than wrong. It is irrelevant.

The Senate Democrats who turned on Obama are playing a 78 rpm record in the age of digital downloads.

Did you hear their ally, AFL–CIO head Richard Trumka, the day after the Senate vote? He denounced TPP for being ''patterned after CAFTA and NAFTA.'' That's not so, but never mind.

There's this skip on the vinyl record that the North American Free Trade Agreement destroyed American manufacturing. To see how wrong that is, simply walk through any Wal-Mart or Target and look for all those ''made in Mexico'' labels. You won't find many. But you'll see ''made in China'' everywhere.

Many of the jobs that did go to Mexico would have otherwise left for low-wage Asian countries. Even Mexico lost manufacturing work to China.

And what can you say about the close-to-insane obsession with CAFTA? The partners in the 2005 Central American Free Trade Agreement—five mostly impoverished Central American countries plus the Dominican Republic—had a combined economy equal to that of New Haven, Conn.

(By the way, less than 10 percent of the AFL–CIO's membership is now in manufacturing.)

It's undeniable that American manufacturing workers have suffered terrible job losses. We could never compete with pennies-an-hour wages. Those low-skilled jobs are not coming back. But we have other things to sell in the global marketplace.

In Washington state, for example, exports of everything from apples to airplanes have soared 40 percent over four years to total nearly $91 billion in 2014, according to The Seattle Times. About two in five jobs there are now tied to trade.

Small wonder that U.S. Sen. Ron Wyden, a liberal Democrat from neighboring Oregon, has strongly supported fast-track authority.

Some liberals oddly complain that American efforts to strengthen intellectual property laws in trade deals protect the profits of U.S. entertainment and tech companies. What's wrong with that? Should the fruits of America's creativity (that's labor, too) be open to plundering and piracy?

One of TPP's main goals is to help the higher-wage partners compete with China. (The 12 countries taking part include the likes of Japan, Australia, Canada, Chile, Mexico and New Zealand.) In any case, Congress would get to vote the finished product up or down, so it isn't as if the public wouldn't get a say.

But then we have Warren stating with a straight face that handing negotiating authority to Obama would ''give Republicans the very tool they need to dismantle Dodd-Frank.''

Huh? Obama swatted down the remark as wild, hypothetical speculation, noting he engaged in a ''massive'' fight with Wall Street to get the reforms passed. ''And then I sign a provision that would unravel it?'' he told political writer Matt Bai.

''This is not a partisan issue,'' Warren insisted. Yes, in a twisted way, the hard left's fixation over big corporations has joined the right's determination to undermine Obama at every pass.

Trade agreements have a thousand moving parts. The United States can't negotiate

with the other countries if various domestic interests are pouncing on the details. That's why every president has been given fast-track authority over the past 80 years or so.

Except Obama.

It sure is hard to be an intelligent leader in this country.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 8 p.m. today be equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments listed: No. 1312, Inhofe-Coons, as further modified; No. 1227, Shaheen; No. 1327, Warren; No. 1251, Brown; I further ask that no second-degree amendments be in order to these amendments and that the Inhofe amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption. I further ask that it be in order to offer the following first-degree amendments during today's session of the Senate: No. 1252, Brown-Portman, the level playing field amendment; No. 1385, Hatch-Wyden, the currency amendment; No. 1384, Cruz-Grassley, the immigration amendment; No. 1410, Menendez, the child labor amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to speak first on the request. I thank Chairman HATCH for his work on this, especially on the level the playing field. He knows this amendment is a top priority for me. It is also a top priority for steelworkers and steel facilities throughout the country.

I would like to ask Chairman HATCH if he would take the same collaborative spirit he has shown toward me and ask him to modify his request, if I could. This is my request, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent that the following first-degree amendments be in order to be offered during today's session: Brown-Portman No. 1252; Hatch-Wyden No. 1385; Cruz-Grassley No. 1384; Menendez-Wyden No. 1410; Cantwell No. 1248; Casey No. 1334; Baldwin No. 1317; Murphy No. 1333; Cardin No. 1230; Blumenthal No. 1297; Sanders No. 1343; Markey No. 1308; Peters No. 1353; Whitehouse No. 1387; Boxer No. 1361; Franken No. 1390; Durbin No. 1244; Merkley No. 1401; that the time until 8 p.m. today be equally divided in the usual form and that at 8 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Inhofe-Coons No. 1312, as modified with the changes that are at the desk; Shaheen No. 1227; Warren No. 1327; McCain-Shaheen No. 1226; Brown No. 1251; Hatch-Wyden No. 1385; Portman-Stabenow No. 1299; Brown-Portman No. 1252; and Cantwell No. 1248. Further, I ask that no second-degree amendments be in order to these amendments prior to the votes and that the following amendments be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption: Inhofe-Coons No. 1312; Brown-Portman No. 1252; McCain-Shaheen No. 1226; and Cantwell No. 1248; finally, I ask unanimous consent that it not be in order for cloture to be filed on the Hatch substitute or the underlying bill during today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah so modify his request?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, of course I haven't seen all that, so I will have to enter an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Ms. CANTWELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Before Senator PETERS speaks, I again would like to thank Senator HATCH for the work he has done on this. I appreciate how he wants to move forward. There are many things here we agree with to move forward on.

The reason for the unanimous consent request I made was that we saw today a whole host of Senators come to the floor. We saw Senator BALDWIN come down, Senator MERKLEY has come down, Senator PETERS is here, Senator BLUMENTHAL came earlier, Senator WARREN, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator CASEY—and I am leaving some out—Senators BOXER and FRANKEN all came to the floor with amendments because they want, as Senator MCCONNELL promised, a full and open process. So my unanimous consent request was to take the generous offer of Senator HATCH and make it broader and wider so those Senators who have shown the interest to come to the floor today would be able to offer those amendments.

The reason I asked that cloture not be filed today is that it just simply doesn't seem right to me—and I know to a number of Members of my caucus—that literally 24 hours after we start this process we already are talking about cloture.

Thirteen years ago, the last time we did fast-track here, this debate went for 3 weeks. I am not asking for 3 weeks. I think that would be a bridge too far for most of us. But I am saying that 13 years ago there were 50 amendments that were considered. Today, we have considered 6 and there have been 149 filed. That is 4 percent of the amendments that were filed. Again, Senator HATCH's generous offer gets us not even to 10 percent of those offered amendments.

So invoking cloture this quickly really does stifle the process, and I think this is too big a deal for that. This fast-track debate encompasses the largest trade debate, the largest trade agreement in the history of the country—I guess in the history of the world, for that matter. It involves 40 percent of the world's GDP, these 12 TPP countries. Adding in the European countries in the next round, also under TPA, is another 20 percent of the world's GDP. So that would be 60 percent of the world's GDP. You don't file cloture within 24 hours and begin to shut down debate.

That was the reason for my unanimous consent request. Again, I thank Senator HATCH for his patience in working together on the level the playing field amendment, one of the major enforcement issues, but I have at least 15 Members of my caucus, as many as 20, who want to offer amendments. There have been 149 amendments filed on both sides, and to cut off debate with fewer than 10 percent of them in order or even a few more than that is simply not the way this Senate should operate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague, and I am trying to accommodate him. I always try to accommodate my colleagues. On the other hand, his side has stonewalled this since last Wednesday. Thursday was a full day we lost. We are going to be here Friday. We did not do very much yesterday; today, nothing. I am very concerned that we are not moving ahead. We are not doing what we should do. This is an important matter. It is an important bill.

I chatted with the President earlier today. He indicated how important it is to him personally, what this bill means to our country, how important it is to get it passed and to pass it in a form the House will accept, which is what I am trying to do.

I do not think it has been this side that has slowed this down, although I do not want to pick on either side. The Senators are certainly within their rights to slow-walk this all they want to. On the other hand, it is very difficult for me to sit here, having sat here all day and yesterday and would have been Thursday and Friday as well and Saturday if necessary. It strikes me as interesting that now they want all these amendments when they have had all this time to bring up their amendments and nobody was going to stop them.

All I can say is that I hope we come here tomorrow prepared to do amendments or do them tonight. I am prepared to stay if we have to. But the fact is that we are not going anywhere on this right now. This is an extremely important bill not only for the Congress but for the President of the United States and for the world at large when you stop and think about it, certainly the world over in Asia.

We are talking about having an agreement with Japan. It is the first time we have been able to do that. We have a new Prime Minister who is willing to work with us, and we are willing to work with him. That is a major achievement by this administration—not only that but 10 other countries. There is a high percentage of trade in this area, and what are we going to do—just leave it all to China to take over or are we going to take this more seriously and get this job done?

We have a number of poison pills that people have wanted to bring up that naturally would mean the end of this particular bill. I would like to prevent that if we can because we are talking about a bipartisan bill that has plenty of bipartisan support that really is crucial to this country at this time and crucial to that region. That could be a very difficult region for us if we do not do this.

If we do not do this and do it right, as we are trying to do and as the President is trying to do, then we will be just turning that whole area over to China. They are going to step right in and make the difference. Right now, these people want to deal with us, and there is a good reason they want to deal with us. But if we cannot even get our act in order to deal with them, then I can understand why they might go another route. They might be forced to go another route.

We all saw the new bank that has been established over there. At first, there were very few countries that went with it. The last time I heard—I may be wrong on this—there were up to 60 countries, including some of the European countries, some of the greatest countries in the world now.

What are we going to do—just cede the whole area to China or are we going to compete? This bill is for competitive purposes.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the distinguished chairman yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WYDEN. I appreciate that, and I appreciate the chairman's work. I want to ask a question about where, in effect, we are. The two of us worked together on the list——

Mr. HATCH. That is right. Forgive me, I did not mean to indicate I was the only one doing this. I had an excellent partner.

Mr. WYDEN. Not at all. The question is, Mr. Chairman, we worked together to put together this list, and it was based on the proposition that we were going to be fair to both sides.

Mr. HATCH. Right.

Mr. WYDEN. On my side of the aisle, my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle felt strongly about the currency issue. Senator STABENOW, for example, and many others felt very strongly about the amendment Senator WARREN sought to offer. We were able, working together, to in effect get an equal number for each side.

My understanding is that we continue to be interested—and you just, I think, made another gracious offer. We are going to stay here tonight. You are still interested in putting together a list that gives all sides a fair chance at their major amendments. Is that a fair recitation of where we are now, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I think both of us literally have tried to be fair to both sides. There are some amendments that I wish we did not have to put up with, to be perfectly frank with you, but that is always the case. Why should we not be fair to both sides?

There comes a limit to what you can do in these matters. As I said, this is probably the most important bill in many respects, outside of ObamaCare, in this President's 8 years. It is an extremely important bill for our country. It is an extremely important bill for our economy. It is an extremely important bill for our allies over in those areas. It is an extremely important bill that helps to set the stage for TTIP, the 28 countries in Europe.

All this bill does basically is provide a procedural mechanism whereby Congress has some control, if not total control, over what agreements are negotiated. This is not the TPP. It is not TTIP. It is not the final decisions on that. That will be made pursuant to this bill, which will be a very important bill for the purpose of saying that the White House and the administration follow certain protocols and recognize that the Congress of the United States is important in these trade matters, too.

I want to thank my colleague from Oregon for the hard work he has done on this bill. He has been a wonderful partner to work with today, and I really appreciate him. I hope we can resolve these problems, but as of right now, I had to object to the unanimous consent request by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, for whom I have a lot of respect. I do not agree with him, but I know he is sincere, and I know he is working very hard for what he believes is proper.

With that, I do not know what else to do other than just say I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I, too, like the chairman of the Finance Committee, have been here all day, and I empathize with the dilemma that he faces, along with the ranking member, on how to move forward with this legislation.

This is a discussion which has been going on for months and months, if not years, which is, what are we going to do, as we deal with trade issues, about the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, which expires at the end of June?

While I appreciate my colleagues on the Finance Committee and the movement of trade legislation, I have had many discussions with them over the last several months about this very issue and the fact that this issue has to get resolved. I know no Member gets to have their way about what legislation gets an amendment. The list that was just given does nothing to guarantee that we would ever see a vote on the authorization of the Ex-Im Bank.

While the other side wants to protect what they think are the opportunities to pass this legislation in the House, which I respect, I do not think the House has to dictate to the U.S. Senate how we are going to proceed when the majority of people in both the House and Senate support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Right now, it has deals of $18 billion and more pending before it. If the Bank expires June 30, all of those trade deals, which are jobs for U.S. companies, disappear and go away. So, yes, in my opinion, there is no more important amendment than one that saves $18 billion of U.S. company sales to overseas markets.

So I and my colleagues who support the Ex-Im Bank reauthorization, which is the majority in both the House and Senate, have lost our patience with the ability to get this Bank before the Senate and before the House before that June 30 deadline. So I have no compulsion at this moment to say that I do not support moving forward on the cloture motion until we get an understanding of how this Bank is going to be reauthorized.

I know people are proud of the work that has been done on TPA, but it is silly to say to the American people that we are moving forward on opening up trade opportunities but we are going to let expire the tool that small businesses and individuals use to export their products—as a credit agency. It makes no sense to open up Cambodia if then you cannot get a bank in Cambodia to have the sales of a product from my colleague from South Carolina to that country. If somebody wants to tell me that one of these New York Wall Street banks will give us that kind of financing, then maybe we will come up with a different solution, but one does not exist.

Until our colleagues give us an answer about something we have been clear about for more than a year, we are going to continue to object because we are not going to let this Bank expire—the credit agency—without a fight.

I know my colleague from South Carolina is here on the floor. I appreciate his support of the Ex-Im Bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to echo what my colleague from Washington said. To those who negotiated this trade package, well done. I am going to vote for the Portman amendment because I think currency manipulation should be addressed more forcefully.

If trade deals in the future are going to be like trade deals in the past, we need to look at what we are doing because some of the trade deals in the past have not worked out so well.

On this currency issue, I want to vote. On the bank, I am telling my leadership the following: I have talked with you and talked with you. I have forgone taking votes on the Ex-Im Bank because I did not want to rock the boat on the budget and other things. I am tired of talking. You are not going to get my vote for cloture or anything else this year until I get a vote—we get a vote—on the Ex-Im Bank. There are over 60 votes in this body.

To the chairman, whom I admire greatly, you mentioned China. Let me mention China. China makes wide-body jets. They are getting into the wide-body jets business big time. China makes about everything we make. Boeing makes 787s in South Carolina and Washington. GE makes gas turbines in Greenville, SC, mostly sold through Ex-Im financing to the developing world.

If you are worried about China stepping in if we do not have this great trade deal, here is what I am worried about: If our Bank expires, then the market share we have today because we have competitive financing goes away, and the biggest beneficiary of closing down the Bank will be China.

I am not going to subject American manufacturers to trying to sell their products overseas without ex-im financing while all their competitors have an ex-im bank. As a matter of fact, China's bank is bigger than the banks of the United States, France, England, and Germany combined.

Airbus is a great airplane. France and Germany have an ex-im bank. An American manufacturer, when it comes to a wide-body aircraft or any other product trying to be sold overseas in the developing world—this Bank makes money for the taxpayers and makes them competitive.

To all of those who really do believe in trade, the fact that you would let the Bank expire because of some ideological jihad on our side makes absolutely no sense to me. I will not be a part of that anymore.

To the people who are trying to make this the scalp for conservatism, I think you lost your way. This Bank makes money for the taxpayers. This Bank doesn't lose money. This Bank allows American manufacturers who are doing business in the developing world to have a competitive foothold against their competitors in China and throughout Europe and have access to Ex-Im financing. All we are talking about is an American-made product sold in the developing world where they cannot get traditional financing.

The Ex-Im Bank has been around for decades. Ronald Reagan was for the Ex-Im Bank. The Ex-Im Bank is directly responsible for helping to sell Boeing aircraft made in South Carolina. Seventy percent of the production in South Carolina is eligible for Ex-Im financing. There are thousands of small businesses which benefit from manufactured products sold in the developing world through Ex-Im financing.

Would I like to live in a world where there were no ex-im banks? Sure, but the world I am not going to live in is where we shut our Ex-Im Bank down and China keeps theirs open. I am not doing that. That is not trade. That is just idiotic. That is unilateral surrender.

Come to South Carolina and tell the people at Boeing and all of their suppliers—and go to the Greenville GE plant that hires thousands of South Carolinians and all of their small business suppliers—why it is a good idea for America to shut down a bank that makes money for the taxpayers that allows us to be competitive. Tell them how you think that is a good way to grow our economy. Tell those people who have good jobs in South Carolina—and who will surely lose market share because we closed our Bank down—how proud they should be of your ideological purity.

I welcome this debate in South Carolina down the road. But I promised my leadership and friends on the other side that I am a reasonable guy. I vote for issues give-and-take, but the one thing I will not do is allow the Bank to expire without a vote. If my colleagues can beat me on the floor, that is fine. I am not asking anyone to vote for the Bank. I am asking them to allow me to vote for the Bank because it is critical to the economy in my State and I think the Nation as a whole.

The only reason we are having this debate is because some outside groups have made this the conservative cause celebre—in my view, without any rational reason.

I have no problem helping the chairman and ranking member move this bill because they talk about how it will make it harder on China to take market share in Asia. The only thing I ask of this body is to allow me and my colleagues who care about the Ex-Im Bank—it is a small piece of the puzzle that has a gigantic impact. It made over $3 billion for the American taxpayers.

This Bank is essential for American manufacturers to be competitive in the developing world, and I will not let this Bank expire without a vote. I will not give market share to China or the Europeans. I will not do that.

I am willing to work with my colleagues, but they have to be willing to work with me. And if they are not willing to honor their word that they have been giving me for the last 6 months, then they have nobody to blame but themselves.

To the Senator from Washington, all we are asking for is a vote on the Ex-Im Bank—that has been around for decades, that Ronald Reagan said was a good idea and that has overwhelming bipartisan support—before June 30 on a vehicle that must become law if we can pass that amendment. I ask the Senator from Washington, is that correct?

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina is correct. That is all we have been asking for, and we have talked to our colleagues about various vehicles and various opportunities for those votes. And, yes, that is exactly what has been promised.

We are here today because, as the Senator from South Carolina has described, the failure of us to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank will mean huge opportunities for foreign competitors at the very time when we are trying to open up markets for our U.S. companies. All we are asking is for the opportunity to have this vote. As the majority leader said, let the will of the Senate be done.

The Senator from South Carolina is right. People who have extreme views on this have decided that this is something they can hold up. Well, I don't think we are here today to try to ultimately say how individual people should vote. They should vote their conscience.

The fact that this Bank is about to expire and the fact that these jobs would be lost because we didn't do our job by reauthorizing the Bank is a failure. It is an imminent threat of $18 billion. These are proposed deals for export that will not get approved and will not get done because we won't have a bank. I think the Senate can do better than that.

I thank my colleague for being here tonight and going into detail about the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, reclaiming my time, and I will wrap it up.

To my colleagues who have been raising money off of this, you can raise all the money you want to, but you will have to debate your ideas against my ideas. You will not be able to shut this Bank down without a vote. If you feel that good about your position, let's have a vote on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House.

The one thing we will not do is let the Bank die without a debate and a

vote, and that debate and vote must come before June 30 because the damage will have been done.

I will not sit on the sidelines and watch jobs in my State be lost because of some ideological crusade, the biggest beneficiaries of which would be China and our European competitors. If you really do care about China's effect in the world marketplace, shutting the Ex-Im Bank down in America and allowing China to keep theirs open is a deathblow to American manufacturers that sell in the developing world.

With that, I yield the floor and look forward to a positive outcome so my colleagues can have their bill passed and have votes on amendments they care about and get the bill up and passed if the votes are there, as long as I get a chance, along with the Senator from Washington, to vote on what I care about and what I think is essential to the economy—and not just to South Carolina but to the manufacturing community that sells in the developing world.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I think we are all aware that Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN have been working in good faith over the last several days to set up both debates and votes on amendments from both sides of the aisle. The bill managers have had some success in working together on the votes that we have had, and so far we have worked to get an additional seven amendments pending.

Sadly, there is an objection from the other side of the aisle on getting additional amendments pending regardless of which party offers the amendment.

Senator HATCH and his colleague have been down here for days trying to get amendments up, and obviously it is possible in the Senate to prevent others from getting amendments. Now we have the whole process stymied because we cannot seem to get agreements for any additional amendments.

I think we all know this is a body that requires at least some level of cooperation, and that just has not been happening here on this bipartisan bill.

I will point out that while I will file cloture on the bill this evening, that is not the end of the story. I will repeat that: That is not the end of the story. The bill managers will continue to work together to get more amendments available for votes before the cloture vote. And with a little cooperation from our friends on the other side of the aisle, I still think we can get that done.

It is my hope that we will be able to process a number of amendments, particularly those which are critical to Members on both sides, and then move forward, and we will have a couple of days to accomplish that.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a cloture motion to the Hatch amendment No. 1221 to H.R. 1314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Hatch amendment No. 1221 to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Daniel Coats, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, Jeff Flake, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Dan Sullivan.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a cloture motion to H.R. 1314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Daniel Coats, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, Jeff Flake, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Dan Sullivan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I call for regular order with respect to Portman amendment No. 1299.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1411

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to the text proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] proposes an amendment numbered 1411 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1299.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the text proposed to be stricken, insert the following:

(11) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent, with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, first off, I agree with Senator BROWN and Senator HATCH on how important this debate before us is. In fact, because it is so important, I certainly hope we have an opportunity to debate fully its ramifications, especially with issues such as the Ex-Im Bank, which I heard two of my colleagues discuss with some vigor just a few moments ago.

AMENDMENT NO. 1251

At this time I wish to talk about an amendment that I am offering with Senator BROWN to require approval of Congress before any additional countries may join the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The 12 countries currently participating in TPP negotiations encompass about 40 percent of the global gross domestic Product. This would be the largest free-trade agreement since NAFTA, and Members should know that this agreement has the potential to expand to a number of additional countries without congressional approval.

The administration has said that they would welcome interest from other nations, including China, in joining TPP. Given the impact that trade deals, such as NAFTA, have had on American businesses and workers, I would argue that it is important that Congress not only be notified of new negotiations but also have the opportunity to vote on whether to move forward with bringing on additional countries into multinational trade negotiations.

If Congress were to approve the Trans-Pacific Partnership, it should not and must not be a blank check to bring in additional nations without congressional approval.

I am particularly concerned about countries that manipulate the value of their currency and gain an unfair advantage over U.S. workers, steal intellectual property from American innovators, engage in unfair labor practices, damage the environment, and do not abide by existing trade deals.

Just yesterday, a Federal grand jury indicted six Chinese citizens for stealing trade secrets. Last year, five Chinese military officers were caught stealing intellectual property from U.S. companies. The United States has brought 16 claims against China at the World Trade Organization, and the Chinese Government has consistently manipulated their currency against our dollar.

Despite these serious problems, the administration has said that they would welcome interest from China in joining TPP. If providing fast-track authority makes it easier for countries such as China to join the TPP, robust congressional oversight is critical.

Senator BROWN and I have offered an amendment to explicitly ensure that this oversight is available and that Congress has the opportunity to vote on the addition of any new countries to TPP negotiations. Our amendment will require the President to notify Congress before entering negotiations with another country seeking to join the TPP. It provides 90 days for Congress to conduct hearings and investigations and ultimately hold any potential new entrant accountable for unfair trade practices.

The House and Senate will need to affirmatively pass a resolution of approval for any new country to join TPP negotiations.

Nations such as China will not be able to join through unilateral action by a future White House. I urge my colleagues to support the Brown-Peters amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

I would also like to urge my colleagues to support the Portman-Stabenow amendment on currency manipulation. A study by the Center for Automotive Research found that the TPP, as currently negotiated, will allow Japan to manipulate its currency, and this practice will likely lead to the elimination of over 25,000 American auto industry jobs.

Our workers and manufacturers can compete with anyone in the world, but they deserve a level playing field. Currency manipulation is the most significant trade barrier of our time, and it must be stopped. That is why I am supporting the Portman-Stabenow currency amendment, and I hope my colleagues will join me in standing up for American workers and fighting back against unfair currency manipulation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, trade is a major issue for a manufacturing State such as Wisconsin. I am very proud of the fact that the State I represent has had a rich history of making things. In fact, I don't think we can have an economy that is built to last that doesn't make things as a key part, a key sector of the overall economy. So this debate on trade promotion authority and the trade bills that may follow to the floor of the Senate and the House take on a particular disproportionate impact in a State such as Wisconsin that makes things.

We have lost a lot of those manufacturing jobs in recent years. We can't lay the entire blame on trade policies, but certainly some of our past trade deals have had a significant impact. It is hard to find folks in the State of Wisconsin who don't recall that in a negative way, who haven't suffered the results of mistakes we have made in the past.

That brings me to this debate we are having this evening and I hope tomorrow and beyond on trade promotion authority. What trade promotion authority asks us to do as Senators in the United States and Representatives over in the House is to cede some of our usual powers—our usual powers to amend bills to make them stronger, to make them more informed, to improve them, to perfect them—fast-track trade promotion authority asks us to relinquish those powers and to take a simple up-or-down, yes-or-no vote on a future trade deal that comes before us under this fast-track authority.

Now, that may bring up the question of why would one ever support ceding those powers and relinquishing those powers, and I think that, ultimately, one hypothetically can do that because what we can do is take the time in the fast-track debate to set the conditions, to set the negotiating principles that have to be met in order to be able to relinquish that power later.

That is where we get into this issue of process right now. It is so critical that we take the time to debate the conditions that we need to see present as representatives of people from States across this country, that we take the time to debate thoroughly these amendments so that we know the trade deals that will come before us later will be fair—not just free but fair. So I hope we take the time to debate all of these provisions because they matter in people's lives. They matter to middle-class, working Wisconsinites, some who have lost jobs in recent years and decades because of mistakes we have made in prior trade deals.

I come to the floor this evening to share with my colleagues that I have filed nine separate amendments to this trade promotion authority. I know we won't have the chance to fully debate and vote on all of them, but I think it is important that we try to have a thorough and comprehensive consideration. So far, we have only voted on two amendments, and there are only a handful that are pending for consideration. So on that point, I wish to take a few moments to address just four of the amendments that I think are crucial to my State of Wisconsin and the middle-class workers whom I have the honor of representing.

My first amendment is No. 1317. It is cosponsored by my colleagues Senator FRANKEN and Senator BLUMENTHAL. It strengthens the principle negotiating objective with respect to trade-remedy laws. This is talking about enforcement and having teeth in that enforcement. These trade remedies ensure that American manufacturers and their workers would compete on a level playing field globally.

American manufacturers fight an uphill battle to keep their prices low while foreign companies sell goods in the United States often at subsidized prices. U.S. manufacturing has already suffered financial losses—and thousands of jobs, I might add—as a result of unfair trade practices. My amendment would strengthen our ability to fight on behalf of our American manufacturing workers.

A second amendment I have offered is No. 1365, and I am proud to have joined forces with Senator BLUMENTHAL. It would restrict trade promotion authority for any trade agreement that includes a country that criminalizes individuals based on sexual orientation or otherwise persecutes or punishes individuals based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. These countries are identified for us in the State Department's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

At least 75 countries across the globe continue to criminalize homosexuality, subjecting lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people to imprisonment, various forms of corporal punishment and, in some countries, the death penalty. For example, in Brunei, a newly adopted law provides for execution by stoning for homosexuality. As we all know, Brunei is part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership free-trade agreement that is now under negotiation.

Senators voting here on this legislation should know and understand this. If we do not adopt my amendment, we will be granting our highest trading status to a country that executes people based on whom they love. This is not hyperbole. This is a fact. The United States should not reward countries that deny the fundamental humanity of LGBT people by subjecting them to harsh penalties and even death simply because of who they are or whom they love.

My third amendment, No. 1320, would add a principal negotiating objective to ensure that any trade agreement actually increases manufacturing jobs and wages in the United States. Many Wisconsin communities, as I mentioned

earlier, bear the scars of NAFTA and other flawed so-called free-trade agreements. From closed factories to foreclosed homes to devastated communities, Wisconsinites know all too well what happens when politicians in Washington tell them that they know what is best for them in Wisconsin.

Let me give a few numbers on trade from Wisconsin's perspective.

On jobs, according to the Economic Policy Institute, NAFTA has led to the loss of more than 680,000 jobs, most—60 percent of them—manufacturing jobs in the United States as a whole.

Since China joined the WTO in the year 2000, there has been a net loss of over 2.7 million U.S. jobs. Of that amount, Wisconsin has lost around 68,000 jobs between the years 2001 and 2013 because of our trade deficit with China and their currency manipulation.

Now, in 2011 we passed the South Korea Free Trade Agreement. In the years since, the growth of the U.S. trade deficit with South Korea has cost us more than 75,000 U.S. jobs.

On wages, competing with workers in China and other low-wage countries, it has reduced wages of 100 million U.S. workers without a college degree, a total loss of about $180 billion each year.

Since China joined the WTO, U.S. workers who lost their jobs because of trade with China have lost more than $37 billion in wages as a result of accepting lower-waged jobs.

The final amendment I wish to describe is amendment No. 1319, cosponsored by my colleague Senator MERKLEY, who was speaking with all of us earlier this evening. This amendment would require the administration to notify the public when it waives ''Buy American'' requirements. Wisconsin workers make things, and we have been one of the top manufacturing States in the Nation for generations. Now, if we hope to continue making things, we think we should continue to have our own government as a customer. Or, put another way, U.S. taxpayer dollars should support U.S. jobs. That is why I am a strong supporter of ''Buy American'' provisions that require Federal agencies to purchase American-made products. Free-trade agreements have historically allowed foreign nations way too much leeway when bidding for our government projects and contracts while not affording American companies the same access.

Now, I believe the issues I have brought up this evening and these four amendments are really important issues—important to our country, important to our standing in the world, and important to my State of Wisconsin. These are issues that the Senate should debate. I urge the majority leader to allow an open and robust amendment process so that we can vote on these critical provisions.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1411, AS MODIFIED

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have a modification to my amendment No. 1411 at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

In the language proposed to be stricken on page 27, lines 6 & 7 strike ''appropriate.'' and insert:

appropriate.

(12) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, due to inclement weather causing a flight delay, I was unavoidably detained during consideration of Brown amendment No. 1242 and missed the rollcall vote that occurred on Monday, May 18. As a cosponsor of S. 568, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 2015, and supporter of trade adjustment assistance for workers here at home, had I been present I would have voted yea.

BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT LAND PARCEL

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in the closing days of last Congress, I was proud to see this body include a provision in the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act, P.L. 113–291, to transfer a parcel of land at the former Badger Army Ammunition Plant near Baraboo, WI, from the Department of Defense to the Department of the Interior. I worked throughout the drafting of this legislation to include this provision, which is of great importance to Wisconsin.

During discussions on the specific legislative text to be included in the bill, a question was raised as to how the language might apply to Department of Defense contractors, particularly any Badger Army Ammunition Plant operators. I understand the legislative language that refers to ''activities of the Department of Defense'' to include activities undertaken by the officers and agents employed or contracted by the Department of Defense, meaning that under the terms of this provision, the Army retains responsibility for remediation of environmental contamination resulting from activities undertaken by the Department of Defense and its contractors. This clarification is critical because Badger Army Ammunition Plant was operated by the Department of Defense contractors, and contamination at the site was caused as a direct result of their activities.

I wrote to the Department of Defense to request their clarification on this matter, and I ask unanimous consent that my letter and their response be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, January 12, 2015.

Mr. JOHN CONGER,
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Installations & Environment, Department of Defense, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CONGER: The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (PL 113–291) includes a provision (Section 3078) transferring administrative jurisdiction, from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior, of property located on the site of the former Badger Army Ammunition Plant (BAAP) near Baraboo, Wisconsin. I worked throughout the drafting of this legislation to include this provision, and would like to thank you for the assistance provided by your staff in drafting the legislative language that became part of the final bill.

During discussions on the specific legislative text to be included in the bill, a question was raised as to how the language might apply to Department of Defense contractors, particularly any BAAP operators. I understand the legislative language that refers to ''activities of the Department of Defense'' to include activities undertaken by the officers and agents employed or contracted by the Department of Defense, meaning that under the terms of this provision, the Army retains

responsibility for remediation of environmental contamination resulting from activities undertaken by DOD and its contractors. This clarification is critical because BAAP was operated by DOD contractors, and contamination at the site was caused as a direct result of their activities. I would appreciate your views on this matter.

I have worked on this project for 16 years, and I am extremely grateful for the assistance provided by DOD and the Army to help craft a legislative solution. Thank you for your consideration of this request and for all that you do in support of the men and women of our Armed Forces.

Sincerely,

TAMMY BALDWIN,
United States Senator.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. TAMMY BALDWIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BALDWIN: Thank you for your January 12, 2015, letter requesting clarification of section 3078 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Pub. L. 113–291), transfer of administrative jurisdiction, from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior, of the property at the former Badger Army Ammunition Plant (BAAP) near Baraboo, Wisconsin. You asked how the act applies to the former Department of Defense operating contractors at BAAP.

The operating contractor for BAAP would have been responsible for operating the plant in accordance with the terms of the contract. Such an operating status would not change the underlying responsibility of the United States Army for the activities at the plant simply because they were performed by its contractor. This is not to say that the contractor would be absolved of responsibility for its activities while performing under the contract, but that responsibility would be governed by the terms of the contract as between the contractor and the United States Army.

To the extent that the contractor's activities were performed pursuant to and in accordance with the contract, the United States Army would retain responsibility for the activities that occurred in the operation of the plant. During those periods you appear to be most interested in, the Army was the owner of the plant for purposes of the environmental laws. We cannot prejudge any actual issue relating to who would be responsible for actions that occurred at the plant. Such responsibility would be determined after a careful review of the law and its application to the specific facts.

I hope you find this information helpful, please let me know if I can be of any further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONGER,
Performing the Duties of the
Assistant Secretary of Defense.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL R. MARTIN UMBARGER

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today I recognize and honor the extraordinary service of MG R. Martin Umbarger, the Adjutant General of Indiana, and to wish him well upon his retirement. A dedicated and loyal public servant, Major General Umbarger has served the people of Indiana and the United States in the Indiana Army National Guard for more than 45 years.

A native of Bargersville, IN, Major General Umbarger enlisted in the Indiana Army National Guard in 1969 after graduating from the University of Evansville. Shortly thereafter, in June 1971, he was commissioned as a second lieutenant, Infantry Branch, following his graduation from the Indiana Military Academy as a Distinguished Military Graduate. Since then, he has dedicated more than four decades to serving his State and his country. Some of his notable assignments include serving as Commanding General of the 76th Infantry Brigade; the Assistant Division Commander for Training, 38th Infantry Division; and the Deputy Commanding General, Reserve Component, U.S. Forces Command. On March 11, 2004, Gov. Joseph Kernan appointed Major General Umbarger to lead the Nation's fourth-largest National Guard contingent as the Adjutant General of Indiana, a position he was reappointed to by Gov. Mitch Daniels on December 1, 2004, and further reappointed by Gov. Mike Pence on December 13, 2012.

During the past 11 years as the Adjutant General, Major General Umbarger has led the Indiana Army and Air National Guard, as well as the more than 15,800 Indiana Guard, Reserve, and State employees, challenging them to embody the National Guard's motto, ''Always Ready, Always There.'' He has directed the training and deployment of nearly every unit of the Indiana Army and Air National Guard in support of the global war on terror and helped establish and oversee the well-respected J9 Resilience Program to support Guard members and their families during predeployment, deployment, and postdeployment. He also served as a member of the Secretary of the Army's Reserve Forces Policy Committee and the Secretary of Defense's Reserve Forces Policy Board.

Major General Umbarger has earned numerous awards and decorations, including: the Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Meritorious Service Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster; Army Commendation Medal Army; Achievement Medal; Armed Forces Reserve Medal, with two gold hourglass devices; Indiana Long Service Medal, and Indiana Distinguished Service Medal, Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster.

In addition to his service in the Indiana National Guard, Major General Umbarger has given his time and efforts to serving his community through many local and national organizations, including the Indiana Feed and Grain Association, the board of trustees of Johnson Memorial Hospital, the board of trustees of Franklin College, the Johnson County Animal Shelter, the Bargersville Masonic Lodge, the National Guard Association of the United States, the National Guard Association of Indiana, and the Association of the United States Army.

We thank Major General Umbarger for his service, dedication, and commitment to protecting Hoosiers and our Nation. Indiana has a long and proud tradition of serving our country, and Major General Umbarger's leadership has played a critical role in ensuring that our brave men and women have the training and support they need. General Umbarger has made the Indiana National Guard a national model and has left a strong Indiana National Guard. On behalf of Hoosiers, we wish Major General Umbarger and his wife Rowana the best in the years ahead.●

REMEMBERING A. ALFRED TAUBMAN

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the remarkable legacy of A. Alfred Taubman, an innovator whose work shaped the modern retail process for Americans and whose philanthropic endeavors have made an immeasurable impact across metro Detroit.

Mr. Taubman's story is an embodiment of the American dream. A first generation American, and the son of immigrants who fled Europe in the Great Depression looking for a chance to build a better life, Mr. Taubman came from humble beginnings. From this foundation, Mr. Taubman sought to follow his father into a career as a builder and quickly became a visionary by setting new trends in the retail shopping industry, which made him one of the most successful businessmen in the State of Michigan.

Despite entering the building trade without much formal higher education, he quickly honed his skills and by the age of 25 started his own business. In the wake of World War II, as the construction industry focused on suburban homes and industrial facilities, Mr. Taubman saw another dimension to America's burgeoning middle class, the opportunity for a new type of retail hub for suburban America: the shopping mall.

Mr. Taubman was a student of life, and took to heart the adage that learning is a lifelong experience; a principle which was integrated into his work. When he saw the opportunity to change and improve the retail shopping experience, he delved into understanding every facet and physiological component. This was a body of knowledge that he built into a formidable retail acumen. With this knowledge, he became a trendsetter, identifying untapped potential in developing communities and he led many successful endeavors.

While renowned for his groundbreaking work in the retail shopping industry, Mr. Taubman was an equally avid and passionate philanthropist, with a deep appreciation for the State of Michigan and the arts. His own work as a watercolorist inspired him to make gifts and donations to the Detroit Institute of Arts worth hundreds of millions of dollars. His charitable giving also extended to the University of Michigan's School of Medicine, where his donations have been used to fund stem cell research, holding the promise to cure degenerative diseases including ALS, as well as the College for Creative Studies and Lawrence Technological University, which are shaping the next generation of artists and innovators. Having suffered from the effects of dyslexia, he also generously supported programs to promote adult literacy, which led to him being recognized as an honorary chair for Reading Works.

A. Alfred Taubman's reach was both deep and broad in every endeavor he pursued. From his work in the commercial retail industry to his philanthropic endeavors, Mr. Taubman has left a legacy that will last for generations. His passion, knowledge, and leadership will be greatly missed, but I know they will inspire future entrepreneurs, creative thinkers, and community activists to succeed and make a difference in their communities.●

TRIBUTE TO DURWARD ''BUTCH'' WADDILL

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Durward C. ''Butch'' Waddill, a veteran of the Vietnam war. On behalf of all Montanans and all Americans, I say ''thank you'' to Butch for his service to our Nation.

It is my honor to share the story of Butch's service in Vietnam, because no story of bravery should ever be forgotten. Butch was born on November 20, 1946 in Battle Creek, MI. Butch's parents were both in the Army: his mother was an Army nurse and his father was in the Medical Service Corps. Butch spent most of his childhood traveling among Army bases before settling in California.

In 1964, Butch enlisted in the Marine Corps during his senior year of high school. Butch joined the infantry and attended training at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego and Camp Pendleton. Butch was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment and was deployed to Okinawa for a 13-month assignment. After 1 month of training, Butch was sent as one of the first units to Vietnam in July 1965. His unit made a tactical landing on the beach in Da Nang.

Butch spent the next 13 months in Vietnam before he was reassigned to Camp Lejeune in North Carolina. Butch joined the 2nd Reconnaissance Battalion for a Caribbean cruise until he volunteered to return to Vietnam for a second tour. Back in Vietnam, Butch served with Company D, 3rd Reconnaissance Battalion, 3rd Marine Division.

On November 9, 1967, Butch was monitoring his battalion's radio net from a base at Phu Bai when he heard his reconnaissance team had been ambushed and was having trouble evacuating casualties. Butch hadn't been assigned to patrol because he was preparing to attend Navy diving school in the Philippines. Butch rushed to board a helicopter that was going to attempt to extract the team and insisted on joining the rescue effort. At the team's location, the thick jungle extended for miles and there were no available clearings that were suitable for the helicopter to land. Butch requested to be lowered by cable through the jungle canopy. Without regard for his own safety, Butch immediately organized the evacuation of the two most seriously wounded. Then continuing his brave mission he helped rescue the remaining team members. He administered first aid while directing fire to protect the team's escape.

Butch was left on the ground because there was no additional room for him on the chopper. Alone in the jungle, Butch gathered the team's rifles and radios. Butch didn't know if they would be able to return for him because it was getting dark and he might have to stay the night and risk getting shot or taken prisoner. When a helicopter returned to hoist him out, Butch was dragged through heavy underbrush for hundreds of yards which caused multiple injuries. Once inside the helicopter, Butch had blood on his face, hat, and all the way to his boots. Butch had 3 rifles slung over each shoulder and a giant load of radio and other gear. Maj. Bobby Thatcher says he will never forget the look on Butch's bloody face—a huge smile and big white teeth.

Butch's unmatched bravery resulted in the rescue of all the members of the reconnaissance team while under extreme combat conditions. Maj. Bobby Thatcher says Butch's actions were the single bravest thing he has ever seen, before or since. Butch's bold initiative, undaunted courage, and complete dedication to duty display the true meaning of selfless service.

Butch finished his second tour of Vietnam in August 1968 and returned to the U.S. where he was promoted to second lieutenant while stationed in Hawaii. After 9 months in Hawaii, Butch volunteered, yet again, to return to Vietnam. Butch began his third tour of Vietnam in August 1969 and was assigned to the 1st Reconnaissance Battalion. Butch was eventually reassigned to the 3rd battalion, 5th Marine Regiment as platoon commander and promoted to company commander. After his third tour, Butch continued his service until August 1988. His distinguished 24 years of military service included serving as an instructor at Quantico, to the staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon.

Butch retired to Nice, France for 7 years where he served as a body guard for a Saudi Arabian Princess and as security officer for the American International School. In 1995, Butch returned to the United States and lived in Colorado for a year. After visiting a friend in Montana, Butch decided to move there in 1996. Butch served in the Montana Legislature in the early 2000s. Butch and his life partner Marilyn Wolff are members of the Montana Wilderness Association where they work to protect our state's public lands.

It is my privilege to honor Butch Waddill's true heroism, sacrifice, and dedication to service by presenting him with the Silver Star Medal. Thank you, Butch.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13303 OF MAY 22, 2003, WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ—PM 18

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to

the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2015.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 2015*.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 91. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans.

H.R. 474. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs.

H.R. 1038. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee.

H.R. 1313. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of the Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences.

H.R. 1382. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans.

H.R. 1816. An act to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance.

H.R. 1987. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Mr. ADERHOLT of Alabama, Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, Mr. HULTGREN of Illinois, and Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTENGER of North Carolina, and Mr. HULTGREN of Illinois.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2252. An act to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 91. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 474. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1038. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1313. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1382. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1816. An act to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1987. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–1606. A communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; ordered to lie on the table.

EC–1607. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Logistics and Materiel Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the percentage of funds that was expended during the preceding fiscal year and is projected to be expended during the current and ensuing fiscal year for the Department's depot maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1608. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary (Terrorism and Financial Intelligence), Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1609. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Turkey; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1610. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the foreign aviation authorities to which the Administration provided services during fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1611. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the foreign aviation authorities to which the Administration provided services during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1612. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Member, IRS Oversight Board, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1613. A communication from the Lead Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Cancer (Malignant Neoplastic Diseases)'' (RIN0960–AH43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1614. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–020); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1615. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–007); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1616. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–003); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1617. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–145); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1618. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–144); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1619. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates'' (Notice 2015–39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1620. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Triple Drop and Check'' (Rev. Rul. 2015–10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1621. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Eligibility for Minimum Essential Coverage for Purposes of the Premium Tax Credit'' (Notice 2015–37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1622. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Rev. Rul. 78–130'' (Rev. Rul. 2015–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1623. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Annual Price Inflation Adjustments for Contribution Limitations Made to a Health Savings Account Pursuant to Section 223 of the Internal Revenue Code'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1624. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notional Principal Contracts; Swaps with Nonperiodic Payments'' ((RIN1545–BM62) (TD 9719)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1625. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly exception Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) as of December 31, 2014 (DCN OSS 2015–0656); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1626. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Admiral Samuel J. Locklear III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1627. A joint communication from the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2016 report on the plan for the nuclear weapons stockpile, complex, delivery systems, and command and control systems; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1628. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Intelligence), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's plans to adopt continuous evaluation (CE) and Insider Threat capabilities within the Department of Defense (DoD); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1629. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trinexapac-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9926–62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1630. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trichoderma asperelloides strain JM41R; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9926–87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1631. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fragrance Components; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9927–38) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1632. A communication from the Under Secretary for Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Strategic Economic and Community Development'' (RIN0570–AA94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1633. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2015–0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1634. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA–2014–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1635. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1636. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1637. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1638. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Integration of National Bank and Federal Savings Association Regulations: Licensing Rules; Final Rule'' (RIN1557–AD80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1639. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's annual report concerning military assistance and military exports; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1640. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a Determination and Certification under Section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act relative to countries not cooperating fully with United States antiterrorism efforts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1641. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a section of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT 15–004); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1642. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–036); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1643. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of a determination to waive certain restrictions on maintaining a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office in Washington and on the receipt and expenditure of PLO funds for a period of six months; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1644. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of a determination to waive certain restrictions on maintaining a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office in Washington and on the receipt and expenditure of PLO funds for a period of six months; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1645. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operation in the 3550–3650 MHz Band, Report

and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking'' ((GN Docket No. 12–354) (FCC 15–47)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1646. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; NAAQS Update'' (FRL No. 9927–48–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1647. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Storage Tanks and Transport Vessels'' (FRL No. 9927–59–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1648. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Utah County—Trading of Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets for PM10 Transportation Conformity'' (FRL No. 9927–68–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1649. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia; 2011 Base Year Emissions Inventories for the Washington DC–MD–VA Nonattainment Area for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard'' (FRL No. 9927–70–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1650. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Justice, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1651. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances; Extension of Temporary Placement of UR–144, XLR11, and AKB48 in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act'' (Docket No. DEA–414) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 18, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1652. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the Rules of Practice for Trials Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board'' (RIN0651–AD00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 18, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1653. A communication from the Project Manager, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Employment Authorization for Certain H–4 Dependent Spouses; Final Rule'' (RIN1615–AB92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 12, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1654. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third quarter of fiscal year 2014 quarterly report of the Department of Justice's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1655. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1656. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1657. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''What is Due Process in Federal Civil Service Employment?''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1658. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transportation's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1659. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act Inventory for fiscal years 2012 and 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1660. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Leasing of Osage Reservation Lands for Oil and Gas Mining'' (RIN1076–AF17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1376. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–49).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Jessie Hill Roberson, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2018.

*Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management).

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) John D. Alexander and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Ricky L. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 10, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Eugene H. Black III and ending with Capt. William W. Wheeler III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Jeffrey G. Lofgren, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Michael G. Dana, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Matthew P. Beevers, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. John N. Christenson, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Shoshana S. Chatfield, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. James W. Crawford III, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators .

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

Air Force nomination of Rhys William Hunt, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with James D. Brantingham and ending with George T. Youstra, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Randall E. Ackerman and ending with Clinton R. Zumbrunnen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Joshua D. Burgess and ending with James R. Cantu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Air Force nomination of Michael I. Etan, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Erik D. Masick, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Muhammad R. Khawaja and ending with Nikalesh Reddy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Marine Corps nomination of Henry C. Bodden, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of William E. Lanham, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Rebecca L. Wilkinson, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Matthew F. Amidon and ending with John A.

Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2015.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Michael J. Corrado and ending with Craig C. Ullman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 29, 2015.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Rory L. Aldridge and ending with Mark D. Zimmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 29, 2015.

Navy nomination of Miriam Behpour, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Thomas P. Murphy, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Todd S. Levant, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Jennifer L. Borstelmann, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Robert S. Thompson, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Melissa C. Austin, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Anthony S. Ardito and ending with Roderick D. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nomination of Garrett T. Pankow, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of William M. Walker, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Christopher C. Meyer, to be Lieutenant Commander .

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey G. Bentson and ending with Paul N. Porensky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nomination of Kevin D. Clarida, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Brianna E. Jackson, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Jared M. Spilka, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Francine Segovia, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Todd W. Mallory, to be Lieutenant Commander.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1368. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Inspector General for Monitoring the Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1369. A bill to allow funds under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to be used to provide training to school personnel regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1370. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to adequately fund bridges in the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1371. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1372. A bill to repeal the crude oil export ban, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1373. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act to improve higher education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1374. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fair and consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1375. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1376. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1377. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1378. A bill to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1379. A bill to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to require the development of a plan for each sub-Saharan African country for negotiating and entering into free trade agreements and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KAINE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1380. A bill to support early learning; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1381. A bill to require the President to make the text of trade agreements available to the public in order for those agreements to receive expedited consideration from Congress; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1382. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PERDUE:

S. 1383. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1384. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide for the discharge of student loan obligations upon the death of the student borrower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1385. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring race or ethnicity to be disclosed in connection with the transfer of a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1386. A bill to provide multiyear procurement authority for the procurement of up to six polar icebreakers to be owned and operated by the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1387. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1388. A bill to require the President to submit a plan for resolving all outstanding claims relating to property confiscated by the Government of Cuba before taking action to ease restrictions on travel to or trade with Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1389. A bill to authorize exportation of consumer communications devices to Cuba and the provision of telecommunications services to Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. Res. 180. A resolution urging additional sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. Res. 181. A resolution designating May 19, 2015, as ''National Schizencephaly Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 182. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Defense laboratories have been, and continue to be, on the cutting edge of scientific and technological advancement and supporting the designation of May 14, 2015, as the ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 141

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 141, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 405

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 405, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 739

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 739, a bill to modify the treatment of agreements entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish nursing home care, adult day health care, or other extended care services, and for other purposes.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 804

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

S. 806

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 806, a bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for preemployment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers and for other purposes.

S. 807

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 807, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and reset the excise tax on beer, and for other purposes.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 836, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 925

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 925, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding the likeness of a woman on the twenty dollar bill, and for other purposes.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 1049

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to allow the financing by United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1088

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for voter registration through the Internet, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1123, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1169, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1300, a bill to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa fees in certain situations.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to amend the limitation on liability for passenger rail accidents or incidents under section 28103 of title 49, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

AMENDMENT NO. 1226

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1226 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1227

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1227 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1251

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1251 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1252

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1252 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1273

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1273 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1297

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1297 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1299 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1299 proposed to H.R. 1314, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 1317

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1317 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an

administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1319

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1319 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1334

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1334 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1335

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1335 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1336

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1336 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1337

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1337 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1365

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1365 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1369. A bill to allow funds under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to be used to provide training to school personnel regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senator BLUNT, to introduce bipartisan legislation that would expand approved uses for the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts professional development funding to include training for teachers and school personnel on how to recognize signs of sexual abuse in students.

According to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System, 865,643 children were victims of maltreatment in 2013. Approximately 7 percent, or 60,956 children, were victims of sexual abuse.

The vast majority of States require that teachers report suspicions of child abuse, but most teachers do not receive any training on how to see the signs.

According to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System, 61 percent of all reports of child abuse and neglect are made by professionals, yet only 17.5 percent of abuse and neglect is reported by education personnel.

Given the amount of time teachers and school personnel spend with children, it is critical that the warning signs of child sexual abuse are identified and reported and that action is taken. Students must also be provided appropriate resources and support if they have been abused.

The Helping Schools Protect Our Children Act of 2015 expands the list of allowable uses for Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, Title II funding to permit States to use this funding to provide training for teachers, principals, Specialized Instructional Support Personnel and paraprofessionals on how to recognize the signs of sexual abuse and handle the situation if sexual abuse is identified. Under current law, Title II provides grants to states for a variety of purposes related to recruitment, retention, and professional development of K–12 teachers and principals. Our bill would simply allow professional development funds to be used to provide school personnel with this important training.

I am proud that Senator ROY BLUNT has joined me as original cosponsor on this bill.

It is essential that as mandated reporters, school personnel have access to the proper training to recognize abuse. When no one steps in to stop abuse, children can be scarred for their entire lives. If we learn to recognize the signs of abuse or neglect, we will be better able to foster a safe environment for young people to learn and grow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1369

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Helping Schools Protect Our Children Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. TRAINING TEACHERS TO RECOGNIZE CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE.

(a) STATE ACTIVITIES.—Section 2113(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6613(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(19) Providing training for all school personnel, including teachers, principals, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse.''.

(b) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY ACTIVITIES.—Section 2123(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6623(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(9) Providing training for all school personnel, including teachers, principals, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse.''.

(c) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES.—Section 2134(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6634(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) providing training for school personnel, including teachers, principals, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse.''.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1372. A bill to repeal the crude oil export ban, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce today, with my good friend from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, a bill that will wipe an outdated policy from our books while providing a boost to our domestic oil development and production industry. I am also pleased to have my great friends from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN, and Tennessee, Senator CORKER, join us in introducing this bill today. This bill would allow U.S. crude oil producers to compete on equal footing with most other major oil producing nations, helping to remove current barriers that prevent U.S. producers from receiving a fair price for their commodity on the world market.

Just last week, I joined Senator MURKOWSKI as she introduced her bill, The

Energy Supply and Distribution Act, that looks to address the build-out of critical energy infrastructure and opening up access to new markets for our energy commodities, while also looking to make it easier to distribute our energy to our neighbors in Mexico and Canada. A provision in that bill also looks to repeal the current crude oil export ban. I will continue to advocate for that bill as well, and look forward to Senator MURKOWSKI bringing that bill before her Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. I view this bill as not only complimentary to the bill introduced last week, but also a way to keep the conversation going as I look to bring this bill up for debate in another Committee, before a different audience. Senator MURKOWSKI and I have been working on this effort for some time and we both felt it was time to show our cards and let our colleagues and others see where we are in this process. The language may be different, but the goal is the same.

Some people may wonder how we even got here, and why would we want to remove a policy that has brought little public or Congressional scrutiny for almost forty years. Well, in 1973, President Richard Nixon placed crude oil under price controls after the price of oil continued to rise. He created a ban on oil exports as an enforcement tool for his price controls, restricting sales outside the U.S. When President Ronald Reagan lifted those price controls, the accompanying export ban was retained. So basically, the current restricted trade environment for U.S. crude oil is an unintended consequence of a 1970's price control policy.

While certain exemptions were added over the years allowing for the export of some U.S. oil from California and Alaska, repeal of the overall prohibition on U.S. crude oil exports was never really seen as a major policy priority. All of that changed with the new oil production renaissance in the U.S. brought about by technological innovations that have allowed for pin-point accurate horizontal drilling and continued advances in hydraulic fracturing. These, and other advances, have allowed for exploration and production of shale in places like North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Texas, Colorado, and New Mexico. These shale oil and natural gas plays across the country have made the U.S. the number one combined crude oil and natural gas producer in the world. The situation on the ground has certainly changed and it is time to make sure our export policies are finally updated to reflect those changes.

This issue is of particular importance to North Dakota. Due to transportation and infrastructure constraints, producers in the Bakken are already selling their crude oil at an even steeper discount than U.S. producers in other plays. Combined with the recent downturn in the price of a barrel of oil, static or declining current global demand, and stable production from OPEC nations—U.S. crude producers in North Dakota and elsewhere have begun to feel the pinch. While other nations, including Iran and Russia, are able to sell their crude oil into the world market for the best price and can continue to maintain or pick up market share during this downturn, U.S. producers are constrained from competing on equal footing.

As recently as 2007, North Dakota ranked eight among U.S. oil producing states. However, due to the shale oil boom in the Bakken, North Dakota has been the number two oil producing state in the country since 2012—behind only Texas. While North Dakota continues to remain in that spot, there has been a steep downturn since September 2014. The state has over one hundred less drilling rigs then at the same time in September 2014, the number of wells awaiting completion are at near historic highs, capital expenditures in the U.S. are way down for oil companies, and we continue to see layoffs and reduced hours in the oil and oilfield services industries. North Dakota crude oil producers need access to the world market to maintain and continue to develop the valuable natural resource in the State.

Numerous studies in the past year including one by the non-partisan U.S. Government Accountability Office have found that repealing the ban on crude oil exports will lower U.S. gasoline prices. These studies concluded that we should export crude oil in the same manner that we export millions of barrels of gasoline and diesel every day. As a matter of fact, while some people continue to say that we need to keep our crude oil locked in or retail gasoline prices will rise—they fail to mention the fact that the U.S. is the number exporter in the world of refined petroleum products, including gasoline. So the facts just do not add up for their argument. Additionally, at a time of growing threats to international security, hardworking Americans in the energy sector are helping our nation become more secure, prosperous, and resilient to crises overseas. The administration's own National Security Strategy recognizes that energy abundance at home can translate to a strengthened geopolitical position on the global stage.

Unrestricted exports of U.S. crude oil is key to the long-term stability of consumer prices, continued investment and growth in U.S. development and production, resumption of job growth in the energy sector and supporting industries, and continued reduction in the U.S. trade deficit, while also providing national energy security. I hope our colleagues will join us in supporting this important effort to remove an outdated policy and put our U.S. crude oil on equal footing with crude oil from around the world.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1374. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fair and consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1374

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Medical School Accountability Fairness Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

To establish consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside of the United States and Canada in order to increase accountability and protect American students and taxpayer dollars.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Three for-profit schools in the Caribbean receive more than two-thirds of all Federal funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) that goes to students enrolled at foreign graduate medical schools, despite those three schools being exempt from meeting the same eligibility requirements as the majority of graduate medical schools located outside of the United States and Canada.

(2) The National Committee on Foreign Medical Education and Accreditation and the Department of Education recommend that all foreign graduate medical schools should be required to meet the same eligibility requirements to participate in Federal funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) and see no rationale for excluding certain schools.

(3) The attrition rate at United States medical schools averaged 3 percent for the class beginning in 2009 while rates at for-profit Caribbean schools have reached 26 percent or higher.

(4) In 2013, residency match rates for foreign trained graduates averaged 53 percent compared to 94 percent for graduates of medical schools in the United States.

(5) On average, students at for-profit medical schools operating outside of the United States and Canada amass more student debt than those at medical schools in the United States.

SEC. 4. REPEAL GRANDFATHER PROVISIONS.

Section 102(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) in the case of a graduate medical school located outside the United States—

''(I) at least 60 percent of those enrolled in, and at least 60 percent of the graduates of, the graduate medical school outside the United States were not persons described in

section 484(a)(5) in the year preceding the year for which a student is seeking a loan under part D of title IV; and

''(II) at least 75 percent of the individuals who were students or graduates of the graduate medical school outside the United States or Canada (both nationals of the United States and others) taking the examinations administered by the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates received a passing score in the year preceding the year for which a student is seeking a loan under part D of title IV;''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by adding at the end the following:

''(V) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of a graduate medical school described in subclause (I) to qualify for participation in the loan programs under part D of title IV pursuant to this clause shall expire beginning on the first July 1 following the date of enactment of the Foreign Medical School Accountability Fairness Act of 2015.''.

SEC. 5. LOSS OF ELIGIBILITY.

If a graduate medical school loses eligibility to participate in the loan programs under part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq.) due to the enactment of the amendments made by section 4, then a student enrolled at such graduate medical school on or before the date of enactment of this Act may, notwithstanding such loss of eligibility, continue to be eligible to receive a loan under such part D while attending such graduate medical school in which the student was enrolled upon the date of enactment of this Act, subject to the student continuing to meet all applicable requirements for satisfactory academic progress, until the earliest of—

(1) withdrawal by the student from the graduate medical school;

(2) completion of the program of study by the student at the graduate medical school; or

(3) the fourth June 30 after such loss of eligibility.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1375. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1375

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''America's Red Rock Wilderness Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Utah.

TITLE I—DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 101. GREAT BASIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Great Basin region of western Utah is comprised of starkly beautiful mountain ranges that rise as islands from the desert floor;

(2) the Wah Wah Mountains in the Great Basin region are arid and austere, with massive cliff faces and leathery slopes speckled with piñon and juniper;

(3) the Pilot Range and Stansbury Mountains in the Great Basin region are high enough to draw moisture from passing clouds and support ecosystems found nowhere else on earth;

(4) from bristlecone pine, the world's oldest living organism, to newly flowered mountain meadows, mountains of the Great Basin region are islands of nature that—

(A) support remarkable biological diversity; and

(B) provide opportunities to experience the colossal silence of the Great Basin; and

(5) the Great Basin region of western Utah should be protected and managed to ensure the preservation of the natural conditions of the region.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Antelope Range (approximately 17,000 acres).

(2) Barn Hills (approximately 20,000 acres).

(3) Black Hills (approximately 9,000 acres).

(4) Bullgrass Knoll (approximately 15,000 acres).

(5) Burbank Hills/Tunnel Spring (approximately 92,000 acres).

(6) Conger Mountains (approximately 21,000 acres).

(7) Crater Bench (approximately 35,000 acres).

(8) Crater and Silver Island Mountains (approximately 121,000 acres).

(9) Cricket Mountains Cluster (approximately 62,000 acres).

(10) Deep Creek Mountains (approximately 126,000 acres).

(11) Drum Mountains (approximately 39,000 acres).

(12) Dugway Mountains (approximately 24,000 acres).

(13) Essex Canyon (approximately 1,300 acres).

(14) Fish Springs Range (approximately 64,000 acres).

(15) Granite Peak (approximately 19,000 acres).

(16) Grassy Mountains (approximately 23,000 acres).

(17) Grouse Creek Mountains (approximately 15,000 acres).

(18) House Range (approximately 201,000 acres).

(19) Keg Mountains (approximately 38,000 acres).

(20) Kern Mountains (approximately 15,000 acres).

(21) King Top (approximately 110,000 acres).

(22) Ledger Canyon (approximately 9,000 acres).

(23) Little Goose Creek (approximately 1,200 acres).

(24) Middle/Granite Mountains (approximately 80,000 acres).

(25) Mount Escalante (approximately 18,000 acres).

(26) Mountain Home Range (approximately 90,000 acres).

(27) Newfoundland Mountains (approximately 22,000 acres).

(28) Ochre Mountain (approximately 13,000 acres).

(29) Oquirrh Mountains (approximately 9,000 acres).

(30) Painted Rock Mountain (approximately 26,000 acres).

(31) Paradise/Steamboat Mountains (approximately 144,000 acres).

(32) Pilot Range (approximately 45,000 acres).

(33) Red Tops (approximately 28,000 acres).

(34) Rockwell-Little Sahara (approximately 21,000 acres).

(35) San Francisco Mountains (approximately 39,000 acres).

(36) Sand Ridge (approximately 73,000 acres).

(37) Simpson Mountains (approximately 42,000 acres).

(38) Snake Valley (approximately 100,000 acres).

(39) Spring Creek Canyon (approximately 4,000 acres).

(40) Stansbury Island (approximately 10,000 acres).

(41) Stansbury Mountains (approximately 24,000 acres).

(42) Thomas Range (approximately 36,000 acres).

(43) Tule Valley (approximately 159,000 acres).

(44) Wah Wah Mountains (approximately 167,000 acres).

(45) Wasatch/Sevier Plateaus (approximately 29,000 acres).

(46) White Rock Range (approximately 5,200 acres).

SEC. 102. GRAND STAIRCASE-ESCALANTE WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) GRAND STAIRCASE AREA.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the area known as the Grand Staircase rises more than 6,000 feet in a series of great cliffs and plateaus from the depths of the Grand Canyon to the forested rim of Bryce Canyon;

(B) the Grand Staircase—

(i) spans 6 major life zones, from the lower Sonoran Desert to the alpine forest; and

(ii) encompasses geologic formations that display 3,000,000,000 years of Earth's history;

(C) land managed by the Secretary lines the intricate canyon system of the Paria River and forms a vital natural corridor connection to the deserts and forests of those national parks;

(D) land described in paragraph (2) (other than East of Bryce, Upper Kanab Creek, Moquith Mountain, Bunting Point, and Vermillion Cliffs) is located within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; and

(E) the Grand Staircase in Utah should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(2) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Bryce View (approximately 4,500 acres).

(B) Bunting Point (approximately 11,000 acres).

(C) Canaan Mountain (approximately 16,000 acres in Kane County).

(D) Canaan Peak Slopes (approximately 2,300 acres).

(E) East of Bryce (approximately 750 acres).

(F) Glass Eye Canyon (approximately 24,000 acres).

(G) Ladder Canyon (approximately 14,000 acres).

(H) Moquith Mountain (approximately 16,000 acres).

(I) Nephi Point (approximately 14,000 acres).

(J) Orderville Canyon (approximately 9,200 acres).

(K) Paria-Hackberry (approximately 188,000 acres).

(L) Paria Wilderness Expansion (approximately 3,300 acres).

(M) Parunuweap Canyon (approximately 43,000 acres).

(N) Pine Hollow (approximately 11,000 acres).

(O) Slopes of Bryce (approximately 2,600 acres).

(P) Timber Mountain (approximately 51,000 acres).

(Q) Upper Kanab Creek (approximately 49,000 acres).

(R) Vermillion Cliffs (approximately 26,000 acres).

(S) Willis Creek (approximately 21,000 acres).

(b) KAIPAROWITS PLATEAU.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Kaiparowits Plateau east of the Paria River is one of the most rugged and isolated wilderness regions in the United States;

(B) the Kaiparowits Plateau, a windswept land of harsh beauty, contains distant vistas and a remarkable variety of plant and animal species;

(C) ancient forests, an abundance of big game animals, and 22 species of raptors thrive undisturbed on the grassland mesa tops of the Kaiparowits Plateau;

(D) each of the areas described in paragraph (2) (other than Heaps Canyon, Little Valley, and Wide Hollow) is located within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; and

(E) the Kaiparowits Plateau should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(2) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Andalex Not (approximately 18,000 acres).

(B) The Blues (approximately 21,000 acres).

(C) Box Canyon (approximately 2,800 acres).

(D) Burning Hills (approximately 80,000 acres).

(E) Carcass Canyon (approximately 83,000 acres).

(F) The Cockscomb (approximately 11,000 acres).

(G) Fiftymile Bench (approximately 12,000 acres).

(H) Fiftymile Mountain (approximately 203,000 acres).

(I) Heaps Canyon (approximately 4,000 acres).

(J) Horse Spring Canyon (approximately 31,000 acres).

(K) Kodachrome Headlands (approximately 10,000 acres).

(L) Little Valley Canyon (approximately 4,000 acres).

(M) Mud Spring Canyon (approximately 65,000 acres).

(N) Nipple Bench (approximately 32,000 acres).

(O) Paradise Canyon-Wahweap (approximately 262,000 acres).

(P) Rock Cove (approximately 16,000 acres).

(Q) Warm Creek (approximately 23,000 acres).

(R) Wide Hollow (approximately 6,800 acres).

(c) ESCALANTE CANYONS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) glens and coves carved in massive sandstone cliffs, spring-watered hanging gardens, and the silence of ancient Anasazi ruins are examples of the unique features that entice hikers, campers, and sightseers from around the world to Escalante Canyon;

(B) Escalante Canyon links the spruce fir forests of the 11,000-foot Aquarius Plateau with winding slickrock canyons that flow into Glen Canyon;

(C) Escalante Canyon, one of Utah's most popular natural areas, contains critical habitat for deer, elk, and wild bighorn sheep that also enhances the scenic integrity of the area;

(D) each of the areas described in paragraph (2) is located within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; and

(E) Escalante Canyon should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(2) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Brinkerhof Flats (approximately 3,000 acres).

(B) Colt Mesa (approximately 28,000 acres).

(C) Death Hollow (approximately 49,000 acres).

(D) Forty Mile Gulch (approximately 6,600 acres).

(E) Hurricane Wash (approximately 9,000 acres).

(F) Lampstand (approximately 7,900 acres).

(G) Muley Twist Flank (approximately 3,600 acres).

(H) North Escalante Canyons (approximately 176,000 acres).

(I) Pioneer Mesa (approximately 11,000 acres).

(J) Scorpion (approximately 53,000 acres).

(K) Sooner Bench (approximately 390 acres).

(L) Steep Creek (approximately 35,000 acres).

(M) Studhorse Peaks (approximately 24,000 acres).

SEC. 103. MOAB-LA SAL CANYONS WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the canyons surrounding the La Sal Mountains and the town of Moab offer a variety of extraordinary landscapes;

(2) outstanding examples of natural formations and landscapes in the Moab-La Sal area include the huge sandstone fins of Behind the Rocks, the mysterious Fisher Towers, and the whitewater rapids of Westwater Canyon; and

(3) the Moab-La Sal area should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Arches Adjacent (approximately 12,000 acres).

(2) Beaver Creek (approximately 41,000 acres).

(3) Behind the Rocks and Hunters Canyon (approximately 22,000 acres).

(4) Big Triangle (approximately 20,000 acres).

(5) Coyote Wash (approximately 28,000 acres).

(6) Dome Plateau-Professor Valley (approximately 35,000 acres).

(7) Fisher Towers (approximately 18,000 acres).

(8) Goldbar Canyon (approximately 9,000 acres).

(9) Granite Creek (approximately 5,000 acres).

(10) Mary Jane Canyon (approximately 25,000 acres).

(11) Mill Creek (approximately 14,000 acres).

(12) Porcupine Rim and Morning Glory (approximately 20,000 acres).

(13) Renegade Point (approximately 6,600 acres).

(14) Westwater Canyon (approximately 37,000 acres).

(15) Yellow Bird (approximately 4,200 acres).

SEC. 104. HENRY MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Henry Mountain Range, the last mountain range to be discovered and named by early explorers in the contiguous United States, still retains a wild and undiscovered quality;

(2) fluted badlands that surround the flanks of 11,000-foot Mounts Ellen and Pennell contain areas of critical habitat for mule deer and for the largest herd of free-roaming buffalo in the United States;

(3) despite their relative accessibility, the Henry Mountain Range remains one of the wildest, least-known ranges in the United States; and

(4) the Henry Mountain range should be protected and managed to ensure the preservation of the range as a wilderness area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Bull Mountain (approximately 16,000 acres).

(2) Bullfrog Creek (approximately 35,000 acres).

(3) Dogwater Creek (approximately 3,400 acres).

(4) Fremont Gorge (approximately 20,000 acres).

(5) Long Canyon (approximately 16,000 acres).

(6) Mount Ellen-Blue Hills (approximately 140,000 acres).
(7) Mount Hillers (approximately 21,000 acres).
(8) Mount Pennell (approximately 147,000 acres).
(9) Notom Bench (approximately 6,200 acres).
(10) Oak Creek (approximately 1,700 acres).
(11) Ragged Mountain (approximately 28,000 acres).

SEC. 105. GLEN CANYON WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the side canyons of Glen Canyon, including the Dirty Devil River and the Red, White and Blue Canyons, contain some of the most remote and outstanding landscapes in southern Utah;
(2) the Dirty Devil River, once the fortress hideout of outlaw Butch Cassidy's Wild Bunch, has sculpted a maze of slickrock canyons through an imposing landscape of monoliths and inaccessible mesas;
(3) the Red and Blue Canyons contain colorful Chinle/Moenkopi badlands found nowhere else in the region; and
(4) the canyons of Glen Canyon in the State should be protected and managed as wilderness areas.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:
(1) Cane Spring Desert (approximately 18,000 acres).
(2) Dark Canyon (approximately 134,000 acres).
(3) Dirty Devil (approximately 242,000 acres).
(4) Fiddler Butte (approximately 92,000 acres).
(5) Flat Tops (approximately 30,000 acres).
(6) Little Rockies (approximately 64,000 acres).
(7) The Needle (approximately 11,000 acres).
(8) Red Rock Plateau (approximately 213,000 acres).
(9) White Canyon (approximately 98,000 acres).

SEC. 106. SAN JUAN-ANASAZI WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) more than 1,000 years ago, the Anasazi Indian culture flourished in the slickrock canyons and on the piñon-covered mesas of southeastern Utah;
(2) evidence of the ancient presence of the Anasazi pervades the Cedar Mesa area of the San Juan-Anasazi area where cliff dwellings, rock art, and ceremonial kivas embellish sandstone overhangs and isolated benchlands;
(3) the Cedar Mesa area is in need of protection from the vandalism and theft of its unique cultural resources;
(4) the Cedar Mesa wilderness areas should be created to protect both the archaeological heritage and the extraordinary wilderness, scenic, and ecological values of the United States; and
(5) the San Juan-Anasazi area should be protected and managed as a wilderness area to ensure the preservation of the unique and valuable resources of that area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:
(1) Allen Canyon (approximately 5,900 acres).
(2) Arch Canyon (approximately 30,000 acres).
(3) Comb Ridge (approximately 15,000 acres).
(4) East Montezuma (approximately 45,000 acres).
(5) Fish and Owl Creek Canyons (approximately 73,000 acres).
(6) Grand Gulch (approximately 159,000 acres).
(7) Hammond Canyon (approximately 4,400 acres).
(8) Nokai Dome (approximately 93,000 acres).
(9) Road Canyon (approximately 63,000 acres).
(10) San Juan River (Sugarloaf) (approximately 15,000 acres).
(11) The Tabernacle (approximately 7,000 acres).
(12) Valley of the Gods (approximately 21,000 acres).

SEC. 107. CANYONLANDS BASIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) Canyonlands National Park safeguards only a small portion of the extraordinary red-hued, cliff-walled canyonland region of the Colorado Plateau;
(2) areas near Arches National Park and Canyonlands National Park contain canyons with rushing perennial streams, natural arches, bridges, and towers;
(3) the gorges of the Green and Colorado Rivers lie on adjacent land managed by the Secretary;
(4) popular overlooks in Canyonlands Nations Park and Dead Horse Point State Park have views directly into adjacent areas, including Lockhart Basin and Indian Creek; and
(5) designation of those areas as wilderness would ensure the protection of this erosional masterpiece of nature and of the rich pockets of wildlife found within its expanded boundaries.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:
(1) Bridger Jack Mesa (approximately 33,000 acres).
(2) Butler Wash (approximately 27,000 acres).
(3) Dead Horse Cliffs (approximately 5,300 acres).
(4) Demon's Playground (approximately 3,700 acres).
(5) Duma Point (approximately 14,000 acres).
(6) Gooseneck (approximately 9,000 acres).
(7) Hatch Point Canyons/Lockhart Basin (approximately 149,000 acres).
(8) Horsethief Point (approximately 15,000 acres).
(9) Indian Creek (approximately 28,000 acres).
(10) Labyrinth Canyon (approximately 150,000 acres).
(11) San Rafael River (approximately 101,000 acres).
(12) Shay Mountain (approximately 14,000 acres).
(13) Sweetwater Reef (approximately 69,000 acres).
(14) Upper Horseshoe Canyon (approximately 60,000 acres).

SEC. 108. SAN RAFAEL SWELL WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the San Rafael Swell towers above the desert like a castle, ringed by 1,000-foot ramparts of Navajo Sandstone;
(2) the highlands of the San Rafael Swell have been fractured by uplift and rendered hollow by erosion over countless millennia, leaving a tremendous basin punctuated by mesas, buttes, and canyons and traversed by sediment-laden desert streams;
(3) among other places, the San Rafael wilderness offers exceptional back country opportunities in the colorful Wild Horse Badlands, the monoliths of North Caineville Mesa, the rock towers of Cliff Wash, and colorful cliffs of Humbug Canyon;
(4) the mountains within these areas are among Utah's most valuable habitat for desert bighorn sheep; and
(5) the San Rafael Swell area should be protected and managed to ensure its preservation as a wilderness area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:
(1) Cedar Mountain (approximately 15,000 acres).
(2) Devils Canyon (approximately 23,000 acres).
(3) Eagle Canyon (approximately 38,000 acres).
(4) Factory Butte (approximately 22,000 acres).
(5) Hondu Country (approximately 20,000 acres).
(6) Jones Bench (approximately 2,800 acres).
(7) Limestone Cliffs (approximately 25,000 acres).
(8) Lost Spring Wash (approximately 37,000 acres).
(9) Mexican Mountain (approximately 100,000 acres).
(10) Molen Reef (approximately 33,000 acres).
(11) Muddy Creek (approximately 240,000 acres).
(12) Mussentuchit Badlands (approximately 25,000 acres).
(13) Pleasant Creek Bench (approximately 1,100 acres).
(14) Price River-Humbug (approximately 120,000 acres).
(15) Red Desert (approximately 40,000 acres).
(16) Rock Canyon (approximately 18,000 acres).
(17) San Rafael Knob (approximately 15,000 acres).
(18) San Rafael Reef (approximately 114,000 acres).
(19) Sids Mountain (approximately 107,000 acres).
(20) Upper Muddy Creek (approximately 19,000 acres).
(21) Wild Horse Mesa (approximately 92,000 acres).

SEC. 109. BOOK CLIFFS AND UINTA BASIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the Book Cliffs and Uinta Basin wilderness areas offer—
(A) unique big game hunting opportunities in verdant high-plateau forests;
(B) the opportunity for float trips of several days duration down the Green River in Desolation Canyon; and
(C) the opportunity for calm water canoe weekends on the White River;
(2) the long rampart of the Book Cliffs bounds the area on the south, while seldom-visited uplands, dissected by the rivers and streams, slope away to the north into the Uinta Basin;
(3) bears, Bighorn sheep, cougars, elk, and mule deer flourish in the back country of the Book Cliffs; and

(4) the Book Cliffs and Uinta Basin areas should be protected and managed to ensure the protection of the areas as wilderness.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(1) Bourdette Draw (approximately 15,000 acres).

(2) Bull Canyon (approximately 2,800 acres).

(3) Chipeta (approximately 95,000 acres).

(4) Dead Horse Pass (approximately 8,000 acres).

(5) Desbrough Canyon (approximately 13,000 acres).

(6) Desolation Canyon (approximately 555,000 acres).

(7) Diamond Breaks (approximately 9,000 acres).

(8) Diamond Canyon (approximately 166,000 acres).

(9) Diamond Mountain (also known as ''Wild Mountain'') (approximately 27,000 acres).

(10) Dinosaur Adjacent (approximately 10,000 acres).

(11) Goslin Mountain (approximately 4,900 acres).

(12) Hideout Canyon (approximately 12,000 acres).

(13) Lower Bitter Creek (approximately 14,000 acres).

(14) Lower Flaming Gorge (approximately 21,000 acres).

(15) Mexico Point (approximately 15,000 acres).

(16) Moonshine Draw (also known as ''Daniels Canyon'') (approximately 10,000 acres).

(17) Mountain Home (approximately 9,000 acres).

(18) O-Wi-Yu-Kuts (approximately 13,000 acres).

(19) Red Creek Badlands (approximately 3,600 acres).

(20) Seep Canyon (approximately 21,000 acres).

(21) Sunday School Canyon (approximately 18,000 acres).

(22) Survey Point (approximately 8,000 acres).

(23) Turtle Canyon (approximately 39,000 acres).

(24) White River (approximately 23,000 acres).

(25) Winter Ridge (approximately 38,000 acres).

(26) Wolf Point (approximately 15,000 acres).

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) NAMES OF WILDERNESS AREAS.—Each wilderness area named in title I shall—

(1) consist of the quantity of land referenced with respect to that named area, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Utah BLM Wilderness''; and

(2) be known by the name given to it in title I.

(b) MAP AND DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by this Act with—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—A map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be filed and made available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 202. ADMINISTRATION.

Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, each wilderness area designated under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with—

(1) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(2) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

SEC. 203. STATE SCHOOL TRUST LAND WITHIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), if State-owned land is included in an area designated by this Act as a wilderness area, the Secretary shall offer to exchange land owned by the United States in the State of approximately equal value in accordance with section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)) and section 5(a) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1134(a)).

(b) MINERAL INTERESTS.—The Secretary shall not transfer any mineral interests under subsection (a) unless the State transfers to the Secretary any mineral interests in land designated by this Act as a wilderness area.

SEC. 204. WATER.

(a) RESERVATION.—

(1) WATER FOR WILDERNESS AREAS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each wilderness area designated by this Act, Congress reserves a quantity of water determined by the Secretary to be sufficient for the wilderness area.

(B) PRIORITY DATE.—The priority date of a right reserved under subparagraph (A) shall be the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PROTECTION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary and other officers and employees of the United States shall take any steps necessary to protect the rights reserved by paragraph (1)(A), including the filing of a claim for the quantification of the rights in any present or future appropriate stream adjudication in the courts of the State—

(A) in which the United States is or may be joined; and

(B) that is conducted in accordance with section 208 of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 560, chapter 651).

(b) PRIOR RIGHTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act relinquishes or reduces any water rights reserved or appropriated by the United States in the State on or before the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) SPECIFICATION OF RIGHTS.—The Federal water rights reserved by this Act are specific to the wilderness areas designated by this Act.

(2) NO PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED.—Nothing in this Act related to reserved Federal water rights—

(A) shall establish a precedent with regard to any future designation of water rights; or

(B) shall affect the interpretation of any other Act or any designation made under any other Act.

SEC. 205. ROADS.

(a) SETBACKS.—

(1) MEASUREMENT IN GENERAL.—A setback under this section shall be measured from the center line of the road.

(2) WILDERNESS ON 1 SIDE OF ROADS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a setback for a road with wilderness on only 1 side shall be set at—

(A) 300 feet from a paved Federal or State highway;

(B) 100 feet from any other paved road or high standard dirt or gravel road; and

(C) 30 feet from any other road.

(3) WILDERNESS ON BOTH SIDES OF ROADS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a setback for a road with wilderness on both sides (including cherry-stems or roads separating 2 wilderness units) shall be set at—

(A) 200 feet from a paved Federal or State highway;

(B) 40 feet from any other paved road or high standard dirt or gravel road; and

(C) 10 feet from any other roads.

(b) SETBACK EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) WELL-DEFINED TOPOGRAPHICAL BARRIERS.—If, between the road and the boundary of a setback area described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), there is a well-defined cliff edge, stream bank, or other topographical barrier, the Secretary shall use the barrier as the wilderness boundary.

(2) FENCES.—If, between the road and the boundary of a setback area specified in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), there is a fence running parallel to a road, the Secretary shall use the fence as the wilderness boundary if, in the opinion of the Secretary, doing so would result in a more manageable boundary.

(3) DEVIATIONS FROM SETBACK AREAS.—

(A) EXCLUSION OF DISTURBANCES FROM WILDERNESS BOUNDARIES.—In cases where there is an existing livestock development, dispersed camping area, borrow pit, or similar disturbance within 100 feet of a road that forms part of a wilderness boundary, the Secretary may delineate the boundary so as to exclude the disturbance from the wilderness area.

(B) LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION OF DISTURBANCES.—The Secretary shall make a boundary adjustment under subparagraph (A) only if the Secretary determines that doing so is consistent with wilderness management goals.

(C) DEVIATIONS RESTRICTED TO MINIMUM NECESSARY.—Any deviation under this paragraph from the setbacks required under in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) shall be the minimum necessary to exclude the disturbance.

(c) DELINEATION WITHIN SETBACK AREA.—The Secretary may delineate a wilderness boundary at a location within a setback under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) if, as determined by the Secretary, the delineation would enhance wilderness management goals.

SEC. 206. LIVESTOCK.

Within the wilderness areas designated under title I, the grazing of livestock authorized on the date of enactment of this Act shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations and procedures as the Secretary considers necessary, as long as the regulations and procedures are consistent with—

(1) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(2) section 101(f) of the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–628; 104 Stat. 4469).

SEC. 207. FISH AND WILDLIFE.

Nothing in this Act affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to wildlife and fish on the public land located in the State.

SEC. 208. MANAGEMENT OF NEWLY ACQUIRED LAND.

Any land within the boundaries of a wilderness area designated under this Act that

is acquired by the Federal Government shall—

(1) become part of the wilderness area in which the land is located; and

(2) be managed in accordance with this Act and other laws applicable to wilderness areas.

SEC. 209. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid rights existing on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal land referred to in title I is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under public law;

(2) location, entry, and patent under mining law; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1377. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I reintroduce the Civilian Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act, CEJA. The U.S. has huge numbers of Government employees and contractors working overseas, but the legal framework governing them is unclear and outdated. To promote accountability, Congress must make sure that our criminal laws reach serious misconduct by U.S. Government employees and contractors wherever they act. The Civilian Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act accomplishes this important and common sense goal by allowing U.S. contractors and employees working overseas who commit specific crimes to be tried and sentenced under U.S. law.

Tragic events in Iraq and Afghanistan highlight the need to strengthen the laws providing for jurisdiction over American government employees and contractors working abroad. In September 2007, Blackwater security contractors working for the State Department shot more than 20 unarmed civilians on the streets of Baghdad, killing at least 14 of them, and causing a rift in our relations with the Iraqi government. Efforts to prosecute those responsible for these shootings were fraught with difficulties. The Blackwater trial has now concluded, eight years after this tragedy, with one former security contractor receiving a life sentence and three others receiving sentences of 30 years for their role. The trial was significantly delayed, however, as defendants argued in court that the U.S. Government did not have jurisdiction to prosecute them.

I worked with Senator SESSIONS and others in 2000 to pass the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act, MEJA, and then, again, to amend it in 2004, so that U.S. criminal laws would extend to all members of the U.S. military, to those who accompany them, and to contractors who work with the military. That law provides criminal jurisdiction over Defense Department employees and contractors, but it does not cover people working for other Federal agencies unless they are supporting a Defense Department mission. Although prosecutors were able to demonstrate that the Blackwater contractors met this criteria, had jurisdiction in that tragic incident been clear from the outset, it could have prevented some of the problems that delayed the case.

Other incidents have made it all too clear that the Blackwater case was not an isolated incident. Private security contractors have been involved in violent incidents and serious misconduct in Iraq and Afghanistan, including other shooting incidents in which civilians have been seriously injured or killed. MEJA does not cover many of the thousands of U.S. contractors and employees who are working abroad. The legislation I introduce today fills this gap.

Ensuring criminal accountability will also improve our national security and protect Americans overseas. Importantly, in those instances where the local justice system may be less than fair, this explicit jurisdiction will also protect Americans by providing the option of prosecuting them in the United States, rather than leaving them subject to potentially hostile and unpredictable local courts. Our allies, including those countries most essential to our counterterrorism and national security efforts, work best with us when we hold our own accountable.

The legislation I propose today has been carefully crafted to ensure that the intelligence community can continue its authorized activities unimpeded. This bill would also provide greater protection to American victims of crime, as it would lead to more accountability for crimes committed by U.S. Government contractors and employees against Americans working abroad.

This legislation provides another important benefit: It will lay the groundwork to expand U.S. preclearance operations in Canada—thereby enhancing national security and facilitating commerce and tourism with our largest trading partner. The U.S. currently stations U.S. Customs and Border Protection, CBP, Officers in select locations in Canada to inspect passengers and cargo bound for the United States before they leave Canada. These operations relieve congestion at U.S. airports, improve commerce, save money, and provide national security benefits. Earlier this year, Secretary Johnson was joined in Washington by Canada's Minister of Public Safety, Steven Blaney, for the signing of a new preclearance agreement that was negotiated under the Beyond the Border Action Plan. That agreement sets the stage for expansion of preclearance capacity for traffic in the marine, land, air and rail sectors between the United States and Canada. But one barrier in these discussions is that the United States lacks legal authority to prosecute U.S. officials engaged in preclearance operations if they commit crimes while stationed in Canada. CEJA would ensure that the U.S. has legal authority to hold our own officials accountable if they engage in wrongdoing, and thereby help pave the way to fully implementing the expanded Canada preclearance agreement.

In the past, legislation in this area has been bipartisan. I hope Senators of both parties will work together to pass this important reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1377

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Civilian Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act of 2015'' or the ''CEJA''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION AND EXPANSION OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL CONTRACTORS AND EMPLOYEES.

(a) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL CONTRACTORS AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by transferring the text of section 3272 to the end of section 3271, redesignating such text as subsection (c) of section 3271, and, in such text, as so redesignated, by striking ''this chapter'' and inserting ''this section'';

(B) by striking the heading of section 3272; and

(C) by adding after section 3271, as amended by this paragraph, the following new sections:

''§ 3272. Offenses committed by Federal contractors and employees outside the United States

''(a)(1) Whoever, while employed by any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense or accompanying any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense, knowingly engages in conduct (or conspires or attempts to engage in conduct) outside the United States that would constitute an offense enumerated in paragraph (3) had the conduct been engaged in within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States shall be punished as provided for that offense.

''(2) A prosecution may not be commenced against a person under this subsection if a foreign government, in accordance with jurisdiction recognized by the United States, has prosecuted or is prosecuting such person for the conduct constituting the offense, except upon the approval of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General (or a person acting in either such capacity), which function of approval may not be delegated.

''(3) The offenses covered by paragraph (1) are the following:

''(A) Any offense under chapter 5 (arson) of this title.

''(B) Any offense under section 111 (assaulting, resisting, or impeding certain officers or employees), 113 (assault within maritime and territorial jurisdiction), or 114 (maiming within maritime and territorial jurisdiction) of this title, but only if the offense is subject to a maximum sentence of imprisonment of one year or more.

''(C) Any offense under section 201 (bribery of public officials and witnesses) of this title.

''(D) Any offense under section 499 (military, naval, or official passes) of this title.

''(E) Any offense under section 701 (official badges, identifications cards, and other insignia), 702 (uniform of armed forces and Public Health Service), 703 (uniform of friendly nation), or 704 (military medals or decorations) of this title.

''(F) Any offense under chapter 41 (extortion and threats) of this title, but only if the offense is subject to a maximum sentence of imprisonment of three years or more.

''(G) Any offense under chapter 42 (extortionate credit transactions) of this title.

''(H) Any offense under section 924(c) (use of firearm in violent or drug trafficking crime) or 924(o) (conspiracy to violate section 924(c)) of this title.

''(I) Any offense under chapter 50A (genocide) of this title.

''(J) Any offense under section 1111 (murder), 1112 (manslaughter), 1113 (attempt to commit murder or manslaughter), 1114 (protection of officers and employees of the United States), 1116 (murder or manslaughter of foreign officials, official guests, or internationally protected persons), 1117 (conspiracy to commit murder), or 1119 (foreign murder of United States nationals) of this title.

''(K) Any offense under chapter 55 (kidnapping) of this title.

''(L) Any offense under section 1503 (influencing or injuring officer or juror generally), 1505 (obstruction of proceedings before departments, agencies, and committees), 1510 (obstruction of criminal investigations), 1512 (tampering with a witness, victim, or informant), or 1513 (retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant) of this title.

''(M) Any offense under section 1951 (interference with commerce by threats or violence), 1952 (interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises), 1956 (laundering of monetary instruments), 1957 (engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity), 1958 (use of interstate commerce facilities in the commission of murder for hire), or 1959 (violent crimes in aid of racketeering activity) of this title.

''(N) Any offense under section 2111 (robbery or burglary within special maritime and territorial jurisdiction) of this title.

''(O) Any offense under chapter 109A (sexual abuse) of this title.

''(P) Any offense under chapter 113B (terrorism) of this title.

''(Q) Any offense under chapter 113C (torture) of this title.

''(R) Any offense under chapter 115 (treason, sedition, and subversive activities) of this title.

''(S) Any offense under section 2442 (child soldiers) of this title.

''(T) Any offense under section 401 (manufacture, distribution, or possession with intent to distribute a controlled substance) or 408 (continuing criminal enterprise) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841, 848), or under section 1002 (importation of controlled substances), 1003 (exportation of controlled substances), or 1010 (import or export of a controlled substance) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 952, 953, 960), but only if the offense is subject to a maximum sentence of imprisonment of 20 years or more.

''(b) In addition to the jurisdiction under subsection (a), whoever, while employed by any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense and stationed or deployed in a country outside of the United States pursuant to a treaty or executive agreement in furtherance of a border security initiative with that country, engages in conduct (or conspires or attempts to engage in conduct) outside the United States that would constitute an offense for which a person may be prosecuted in a court of the United States had the conduct been engaged in within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States shall be punished as provided for that offense.

''(c) In this section:

''(1) The term 'employed by any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense' means—

''(A) being employed as a civilian employee, a contractor (including a subcontractor at any tier), an employee of a contractor (or a subcontractor at any tier), a grantee (including a contractor of a grantee or a subgrantee or subcontractor at any tier), or an employee of a grantee (or a contractor of a grantee or a subgrantee or subcontractor at any tier) of any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense;

''(B) being present or residing outside the United States in connection with such employment;

''(C) not being a national of or ordinarily resident in the host nation; and

''(D) in the case of such a contractor, contractor employee, grantee, or grantee employee, that such employment supports a program, project, or activity for a department or agency of the United States.

''(2) The term 'accompanying any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense' means—

''(A) being a dependant, family member, or member of household of—

''(i) a civilian employee of any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense; or

''(ii) a contractor (including a subcontractor at any tier), an employee of a contractor (or a subcontractor at any tier), a grantee (including a contractor of a grantee or a subgrantee or subcontractor at any tier), or an employee of a grantee (or a contractor of a grantee or a subgrantee or subcontractor at any tier) of any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense, which contractor, contractor employee, grantee, or grantee employee is supporting a program, project, or activity for a department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense;

''(B) residing with such civilian employee, contractor, contractor employee, grantee, or grantee employee outside the United States; and

''(C) not being a national of or ordinarily resident in the host nation.

''(3) The term 'grant agreement' means a legal instrument described in section 6304 or 6305 of title 31, other than an agreement between the United States and a State, local, or foreign government or an international organization.

''(4) The term 'grantee' means a party, other than the United States, to a grant agreement.

''(5) The term 'host nation' means the country outside of the United States where the employee or contractor resides, the country where the employee or contractor commits the alleged offense at issue, or both.

''§ 3273. Regulations

''The Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall prescribe regulations governing the investigation, apprehension, detention, delivery, and removal of persons described in sections 3271 and 3272 of this title.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 3267(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(A) employed as a civilian employee, a contractor (including a subcontractor at any tier), or an employee of a contractor (or a subcontractor at any tier) of the Department of Defense (including a nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the Department);''.

(b) VENUE.—Chapter 211 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 3245. Optional venue for offenses involving Federal employees and contractors overseas

''In addition to any venue otherwise provided in this chapter, the trial of any offense involving a violation of section 3261, 3271, or 3272 of this title may be brought—

''(1) in the district in which is headquartered the department or agency of the United States that employs the offender, or any 1 of 2 or more joint offenders; or

''(2) in the district in which is headquartered the department or agency of the United States that the offender is accompanying, or that any 1 of 2 or more joint offenders is accompanying.''.

(c) SUSPENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3287 the following new section:

''§ 3287A. Suspension of limitations for offenses involving Federal employees and contractors overseas

''The statute of limitations for an offense under section 3272 of this title shall be suspended for the period during which the person is outside the United States or is a fugitive from justice within the meaning of section 3290 of this title.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING AMENDMENT.—The heading of chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 212A—EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OVER OFFENSES OF CONTRACTORS AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT''.

(2) TABLES OF SECTIONS.—(A) The table of sections for chapter 211 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''3245. Optional venue for offenses involving Federal employees and contractors overseas.''.

(B) The table of sections for chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 3272 and inserting the following new items:

''3272. Offenses committed by Federal contractors and employees outside the United States.

''3273. Regulations.''.

(C) The table of sections for chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3287 the following new item:

''3287A. Suspension of limitations for offenses involving Federal employees and contractors overseas.''.

(3) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The item relating to chapter 212A in the table of chapters for part II of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''212A. Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Over Offenses of Contractors and Civilian Employees of the Federal Government ..... 3271''.

SEC. 3. INVESTIGATIVE TASK FORCES FOR CONTRACTOR AND EMPLOYEE OVERSIGHT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF INVESTIGATIVE TASK FORCES FOR CONTRACTOR AND EMPLOYEE OVERSIGHT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the head of any other department or agency of the Federal Government responsible for employing contractors or persons overseas, shall assign adequate personnel and resources, including through the creation of task forces, to investigate allegations of criminal offenses under chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), and may authorize the overseas deployment of law enforcement agents and other employees of the Federal Government for that purpose.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) INVESTIGATION.—The Attorney General shall have principal authority for the enforcement of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and shall have the authority to initiate, conduct, and supervise investigations of any alleged offense under this Act or an amendment made by this Act.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—With respect to violations of sections 3271 and 3272 of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), the Attorney General may authorize any person serving in a law enforcement position in any other department or agency of the Federal Government, including a member of the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State or a military police officer of the Armed Forces, to exercise investigative and law enforcement authority, including those powers that may be exercised under section 3052 of title 18, United States Code, subject to such guidelines or policies as the Attorney General considers appropriate for the exercise of such powers.

(3) PROSECUTION.—The Attorney General may establish such procedures the Attorney General considers appropriate to ensure that Federal law enforcement agencies refer offenses under section 3271 or 3272 of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), to the Attorney General for prosecution in a uniform and timely manner.

(4) ASSISTANCE ON REQUEST OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any statute, rule, or regulation to the contrary, the Attorney General may request assistance from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the head of any other department or agency of the Federal Government to enforce section 3271 or 3272 of title 18, United States Code (as so amended). The assistance requested may include the following:

(A) The assignment of additional employees and resources to task forces established by the Attorney General under subsection (a).

(B) An investigation into alleged misconduct or arrest of an individual suspected of alleged misconduct by agents of the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State present in the nation in which the alleged misconduct occurs.

(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 5 years, the Attorney General shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(A) The number of prosecutions under chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), including the nature of the offenses and any dispositions reached, during the previous year.

(B) The actions taken to implement subsection (a), including the organization and training of employees and the use of task forces, during the previous year.

(C) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the President considers appropriate to enforce chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), and the provisions of this section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''agency'' and ''department'' have the meanings given such terms in section 6 of title 18, United States Code.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any authority of the Attorney General or any Federal law enforcement agency to investigate violations of Federal law or deploy employees overseas.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVENESS.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Attorney General and the head of any other department or agency of the Federal Government to which this Act or an amendment made by this Act applies shall have 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act to ensure compliance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 5. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall be construed—

(1) to limit or affect the application of extraterritorial jurisdiction related to any other Federal law; or

(2) to limit or affect any authority or responsibility of a Chief of Mission as provided in section 207 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3927).

(b) INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall apply to the authorized intelligence activities of the United States Government.

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

If any amounts are appropriated to carry out this Act or an amendment made by this Act, the amounts shall be from amounts which would have otherwise been made available or appropriated to the Department of Justice.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 180—URGING ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. GARDNER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 180

Whereas the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) tested nuclear weapons on three separate occasions, in October 2006, in May 2009, and in February 2013;

Whereas nuclear experts have reported that the DPRK may currently have as many as 20 nuclear warheads and has the potential to possess as many as 100 warheads within the next 5 years;

Whereas, according to the 2014 Department of Defense (DoD) report, ''Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea'', the DPRK has proliferated nuclear technology to Libya via the proliferation network of Pakistani scientist A.Q. Khan;

Whereas, according to the 2014 DoD report, ''North Korea also provided Syria with nuclear reactor technology until 2007.'';

Whereas, on September 6, 2007, as part of ''Operation Orchard'', the Israeli Air Force destroyed the suspected nuclear facility in Syria;

Whereas, according to the 2014 DoD report, ''North Korea has exported conventional and ballistic missile-related equipment, components, materials, and technical assistance to countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.'';

Whereas, on November 29, 1987, DPRK agents planted explosive devices onboard Korean Air flight 858, which killed all 115 passengers and crew on board;

Whereas, on March 26, 2010, the DPRK fired upon and sank the South Korean warship Cheonan, killing 46 of her crew;

Whereas, on November 23, 2010, the DPRK shelled South Korea's Yeonpyeong Island, killing 4 South Korean citizens;

Whereas, on February 7, 2014, the United Nations ''Commission of Inquiry on human rights in DPRK ('Commission of Inquiry')'' released a report detailing the atrocious human rights record of the DPRK;

Whereas Dr. Michael Kirby, Chair of the Commission, stated on March 17, 2014, ''The Commission of Inquiry has found systematic, widespread, and grave human rights violations occurring in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It has also found a disturbing array of crimes against humanity. These crimes are committed against inmates of political and other prison camps; against starving populations; against religious believers; against persons who try to flee the country—including those forcibly repatriated by China.'';

Whereas Dr. Michael Kirby also stated, ''These crimes arise from policies established at the highest level of the State. They have been committed, and continue to take place in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, because the policies, institutions, and patterns of impunity that lie at their heart remain in place. The gravity, scale, duration, and nature of the unspeakable atrocities committed in the country reveal a totalitarian State that does not have any parallel in the contemporary world.'';

Whereas the Commission of Inquiry also notes, ''Since 1950, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has engaged in the systematic abduction, denial of repatriation, and subsequent enforced disappearance of persons from other countries on a large scale and as a matter of State policy. Well over 200,000 persons, including children, who were brought from other countries to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea may have become victims of enforced disappearance,'' and states that the DPRK has failed to account or address this injustice in any way;

Whereas, according to reports and analysis from organizations such as the International Network for the Human Rights of North Korean Overseas Labor, the Korea Policy Research Center, NK Watch, the Asan Institute for Policy Studies, the Center for International and Strategic Studies (CSIS), and the George W. Bush Institute, there may currently be as many as 100,000 North Korean overseas laborers in various nations around the world;

Whereas these forced North Korean laborers are often subjected to harsh working conditions under the direct supervision of DPRK officials, and their salaries contribute to anywhere from $150,000,000 to $230,000,000 a year to the DPRK state coffers;

Whereas, according to the Director of National Intelligence's (DNI) 2015 Worldwide Threat Assessment, ''North Korea's nuclear weapons and missile programs pose a serious threat to the United States and to the security environment in East Asia.'';

Whereas the 2015 DNI report states, ''North Korea has also expanded the size and sophistication of its ballistic missile forces, ranging from close-range ballistic missiles to ICBMs, while continuing to conduct test launches. In 2014, North Korea launched an unprecedented number of ballistic missiles.'';

Whereas, on December 19, 2015, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) declared that the DPRK was responsible for a cyberattack on Sony Pictures conducted on November 24, 2014;

Whereas, from 1998 to 2008, the DPRK was designated by the United States Government as a state sponsor of terrorism;

Whereas the DPRK is currently in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), and 2094 (2013);

Whereas the DPRK repeatedly violated agreements with the United States and the other so-called Six-Party Talks partners (the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Russian Federation, and the People's Republic of China) designed to halt its nuclear weapons program, while receiving significant concessions, including fuel, oil, and food aid;

Whereas the Six Party talks have not been held since December 2008; and

Whereas, on May 9, 2015, the DPRK claimed that it has test-fired a ballistic missile from a submarine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) finds that the DPRK represents a serious threat to the national security of the United States and United States allies in East Asia and to international peace and stability, and grossly violates the human rights of its own people;

(2) urges the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to impose additional sanctions against the DPRK, including targeting its financial assets around the world, specific designations relating to human rights abuses, and a redesignation of the DPRK as a state sponsor of terror; and

(3) warns the President against resuming the negotiations with the DPRK, either bilaterally or as part of the Six Party talks, without strict pre-conditions, including that the DPRK—

(A) adhere to its denuclearization commitments outlined in the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party talks;

(B) commit to halting its ballistic missile programs and its proliferation activities;

(C) cease military provocations; and

(D) measurably and significantly improve its human rights record.

SENATE RESOLUTION 181—DESIGNATING MAY 19, 2015, AS ''NATIONAL SCHIZENCEPHALY AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 181

Whereas schizencephaly is an extremely rare developmental birth defect characterized by abnormal slits, or clefts, in the brain;

Whereas individuals with bilateral schizencephaly, the more severe case, commonly have developmental delays, delays in speech and language skills, problems with brain-spinal cord communication, limited mobility, and shorter lifespans;

Whereas schizencephaly is the second rarest brain malformation, and only approximately 7,000 cases have ever been reported;

Whereas promoting education and increasing awareness among health professionals and families will lead to early intervention and treatment options for individuals with schizencephaly; and

Whereas continued Federal support for medical research will help identify causes, improve diagnostics, and develop promising treatments for schizencephaly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates May 19, 2015, as ''National Schizencephaly Awareness Day''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 182—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT DEFENSE LABORATORIES HAVE BEEN, AND CONTINUE TO BE, ON THE CUTTING EDGE OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT AND SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 14, 2015, AS THE ''DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORY DAY''

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 182

Whereas a Defense laboratory is defined as any laboratory, Department of Defense-funded research and development center, or engineering center that is owned by a military service and funded by the Federal Government;

Whereas Defense laboratories should be commended for the unique role the laboratories have played in numerous innovations and advances in the areas of defense and national security;

Whereas technological progress is responsible for up to half the growth of the United States economy and is the principal driving force behind long-term economic growth and increases in the standard of living in the United States;

Whereas defense-supported research and development has led to new products and processes for state-of-the-art military weapons and technology, as well as for the public good;

Whereas Defense laboratories frequently partner with State and local governments and regional organizations to transfer technology to the private sector;

Whereas Defense laboratories are at the forefront of cutting-edge science and technology, earning prestigious national and international awards for research and technology transfer efforts;

Whereas the innovations produced at the Defense laboratories of the United States fuel economic growth by creating new industries, companies, and jobs;

Whereas the work of the Defense laboratories is essential to the continued prosperity of the United States; and

Whereas May 14, 2015, would be an appropriate day to designate as the ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 14, 2015, as the ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day'' in recognition of the work and accomplishments of the national network of Defense laboratories;

(2) recognizes that supporting research and development, including federally sponsored work performed at the Defense laboratories, is key to maintaining United States innovation and competitiveness in a global economy;

(3) acknowledges that the knowledge base, technologies, and techniques generated in the Defense laboratory system serve as a foundation for the defense industrial base;

(4) reaffirms the importance of robust investment in Defense laboratories to preserving the technological superiority of the Armed Forces in the 21st century; and

(5) encourages the Defense laboratories, the executive branch agencies, and Congress to hold an outreach event on May 14, 2015, ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day'', to raise public awareness of the work of the Defense laboratories.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1366. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1367. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1368. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1369. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1370. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1371. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1372. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1373. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1374. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1375. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1376. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1377. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1378. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1379. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1380. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1381. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1382. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1383. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1384. Mr. HATCH (for Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. INHOFE)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1385. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1386. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1387. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1388. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1389. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1390. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1391. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1392. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1393. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1394. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1395. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1396. Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1397. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1398. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1399. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1400. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1401. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1402. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1403. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1404. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1405. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1406. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1407. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1408. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1409. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1410. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1411. Mr. HATCH proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1366. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 103(b), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—A trade agreement may not be entered into under this subsection if such agreement could subject policies of the United States Government or any State or local government in the United States to claims by foreign investors that would be decided outside the United States legal system.

SA 1367. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 103(b), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—A trade agreement may not be entered into under this subsection if such agreement could subject policies of State or local governments in the United States to claims by foreign investors that would be decided outside the United States legal system.

SA 1368. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 103(b), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, AND CONSUMERS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement exempts policies for protecting the environment, public health, and consumers from any investor-state dispute settlement provisions included in the agreement.

SA 1369. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, line 6, strike ''makes progress in meeting'' and insert ''achieves''.

On page 88, line 10, strike ''makes progress in achieving'' and insert ''achieves''.

On page 88, lines 15 through 17, strike ''and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving'' and insert ''the agreement achieves''.

On page 92, line 24, strike ''make progress in achieving'' and insert ''achieve''.

SA 1370. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 44, strike line 4, and all that follows through page 93, line 2, and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement achieves the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(3) BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this title referred to as ''trade authorities procedures'') apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this title be referred to as an ''implementing bill''.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(c) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL PROCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 106(b)—

(A) the trade authorities procedures apply to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) before July 1, 2018; and

(B) the trade authorities procedures shall be extended to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) after June 30, 2018, and before July 1, 2021, if (and only if)—

(i) the President requests such extension under paragraph (2); and

(ii) neither House of Congress adopts an extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (5) before July 1, 2018.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.—If the President is of the opinion that the trade authorities procedures should be extended to implementing bills described in paragraph (1)(B), the President shall submit to Congress, not later than April 1, 2018, a written report that contains a request for such extension, together with—

(A) a description of all trade agreements that have been negotiated under subsection (b) and the anticipated schedule for submitting such agreements to Congress for approval;

(B) a description of the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title, and a statement that such progress justifies the continuation of negotiations; and

(C) a statement of the reasons why the extension is needed to complete the negotiations.

(3) OTHER REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The President shall promptly inform the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The Advisory Committee shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains—

(i) its views regarding the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension requested under paragraph (2) should be approved or disapproved.

(B) REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The President shall promptly inform the United States International Trade Commission of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The International Trade Commission shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains a review and analysis of the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements implemented between the date of the enactment of this Act and the date on which the President decides to seek an extension requested under paragraph (2).

(4) STATUS OF REPORTS.—The reports submitted to Congress under paragraphs (2) and (3), or any portion of such reports, may be classified to the extent the President determines appropriate.

(5) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTIONS.—(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ''extension disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 103(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.'', with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(B) Extension disapproval resolutions—

(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House; and

(ii) shall be referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules.

(C) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to extension disapproval resolutions.

(D) It is not in order for—

(i) the House of Representatives to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules;

(ii) the Senate to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance; or

(iii) either House of Congress to consider an extension disapproval resolution after June 30, 2018.

(d) COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—In order to contribute to the continued economic expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting

any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102.

SEC. 104. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) CONSULTATIONS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—

(1) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement;

(B) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(E) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(2) CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO FORCE.—Prior to exchanging notes providing for the entry into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(3) ENHANCED COORDINATION WITH CONGRESS.—

(A) WRITTEN GUIDELINES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with Congress, including coordination with designated congressional advisers under subsection (b), regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall enhance coordination with Congress through procedures to ensure—

(i) timely briefings upon request of any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress conducted under this title, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement; and

(ii) the sharing of detailed and timely information with Members of Congress, and their staff with proper security clearances as appropriate, regarding those negotiations and pertinent documents related to those negotiations (including classified information), and with committee staff with proper security clearances as would be appropriate in the light of the responsibilities of that committee over the trade agreements programs affected by those negotiations.

(C) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(b) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—

(A) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In each Congress, any Member of the House of Representatives may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consulting with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(B) SENATE.—In each Congress, any Member of the Senate may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(2) CONSULTATIONS WITH DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations designated under paragraph (1).

(3) ACCREDITATION.—Each Member of Congress designated as a congressional adviser under paragraph (1) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiating sessions relating to trade agreements.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY GROUPS ON NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—By not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 30 days after the convening of each Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall convene the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall convene the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations (in this subsection referred to collectively as the ''congressional advisory groups'').

(2) MEMBERS AND FUNCTIONS.—

(A) MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the House of Representatives:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the House of Representatives that would have, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(B) MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the Senate:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the Senate that would have, under the Rules of the Senate, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(C) ACCREDITATION.—Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in negotiations for any trade agreement to which this title applies. Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in the negotiations by reason of which the member is in one of the congressional advisory groups.

(D) CONSULTATION AND ADVICE.—The congressional advisory groups shall consult with and provide advice to the Trade Representative regarding the formulation of specific objectives, negotiating strategies and positions, the development of the applicable trade agreement, and compliance and enforcement of the negotiated commitments under the trade agreement.

(E) CHAIR.—The House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(F) COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES.—Members of any committee represented on one of the congressional advisory groups may submit comments to the member of the appropriate congressional advisory group from that committee regarding any matter related to a negotiation for any trade agreement to which this title applies.

(3) GUIDELINES.—

(A) PURPOSE AND REVISION.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall provide for, among other things—

(i) detailed briefings on a fixed timetable to be specified in the guidelines of the congressional advisory groups regarding negotiating objectives and positions and the status of the applicable negotiations, beginning as soon as practicable after the congressional advisory groups are convened, with more frequent briefings as trade negotiations enter the final stage;

(ii) access by members of the congressional advisory groups, and staff with proper security clearances, to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(iii) the closest practicable coordination between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups at all critical periods during the negotiations, including at negotiation sites;

(iv) after the applicable trade agreement is concluded, consultation regarding ongoing compliance and enforcement of negotiated commitments under the trade agreement; and

(v) the timeframe for submitting the report required under section 105(d)(3).

(4) REQUEST FOR MEETING.—Upon the request of a majority of either of the congressional advisory groups, the President shall meet with that congressional advisory group before initiating negotiations with respect to a trade agreement, or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

(d) CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) PURPOSES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) facilitate transparency;

(B) encourage public participation; and

(C) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include procedures that—

(A) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(B) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(4) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(e) CONSULTATIONS WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with advisory committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall enhance coordination with advisory committees described in that paragraph through procedures to ensure—

(A) timely briefings of advisory committees and regular opportunities for advisory committees to provide input throughout the negotiation process on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by those committees; and

(B) the sharing of detailed and timely information with each member of an advisory committee regarding negotiations and pertinent documents related to the negotiation (including classified information) on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas the member represents, and with a designee with proper security clearances of each such member as appropriate.

(3) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF TRANSPARENCY OFFICER IN THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) There shall be in the Office one Chief Transparency Officer. The Chief Transparency Officer shall consult with Congress on transparency policy, coordinate transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.''.

SEC. 105. NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS BEFORE NEGOTIATION.—

(1) NOTICE.—The President, with respect to any agreement that is subject to the provisions of section 103(b), shall—

(A) provide, at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, written notice to Congress of the President's intention to enter into the negotiations with that country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President intends to initiate those negotiations, the specific United States objectives for the negotiations with that country, and whether the President intends to seek an agreement, or changes to an existing agreement;

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consult regarding the negotiations with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, such other committees of the House and Senate as the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c);

(C) upon the request of a majority of the members of either the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c), meet with the requesting congressional advisory group before initiating the negotiations or at any other time concerning the negotiations; and

(D) after consulting with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance, and at least 30 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and regularly update thereafter, a detailed and comprehensive summary of the specific objectives with respect to the negotiations, and a description of how the agreement, if successfully concluded, will further those objectives and benefit the United States.

(2) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURE.—

(A) ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to the subject matter under section 102(b)(3)(B) with any country, the President shall—

(i) assess whether United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country;

(ii) consider whether the tariff levels bound and applied throughout the world with respect to imports from the United States are higher than United States tariffs and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(iii) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(B) SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS ON IMPORT SENSITIVE PRODUCTS.—(i) Before initiating negotiations with regard to agriculture and, with respect to agreements described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 107(a), as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(I) identify those agricultural products subject to tariff rate quotas on the date of enactment of this Act, and agricultural products subject to tariff reductions by the United States as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, for which the rate of duty was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate which was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994;

(II) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning—

(aa) whether any further tariff reductions on the products identified under subclause (I) should be appropriate, taking into account

the impact of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned;

(bb) whether the products so identified face unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including those not based on scientific principles in contravention of the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(cc) whether the countries participating in the negotiations maintain export subsidies or other programs, policies, or practices that distort world trade in such products and the impact of such programs, policies, and practices on United States producers of the products;

(III) request that the International Trade Commission prepare an assessment of the probable economic effects of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned and on the United States economy as a whole; and

(IV) upon complying with subclauses (I), (II), and (III), notify the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of those products identified under subclause (I) for which the Trade Representative intends to seek tariff liberalization in the negotiations and the reasons for seeking such tariff liberalization.

(ii) If, after negotiations described in clause (i) are commenced—

(I) the United States Trade Representative identifies any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) for tariff reductions which were not the subject of a notification under clause (i)(IV), or

(II) any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) is the subject of a request for tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations,

the Trade Representative shall, as soon as practicable, notify the committees referred to in clause (i)(IV) of those products and the reasons for seeking such tariff reductions.

(3) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE FISHING INDUSTRY.—Before initiating, or continuing, negotiations that directly relate to fish or shellfish trade with any country, the President shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and shall keep the Committees apprised of the negotiations on an ongoing and timely basis.

(4) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING TEXTILES.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to textiles and apparel products with any country, the President shall—

(A) assess whether United States tariffs on textile and apparel products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(B) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(5) ADHERENCE TO EXISTING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT AGREEMENT OBLIGATIONS.—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the President shall take into account the extent to which that country has implemented, or has accelerated the implementation of, its international trade and investment commitments to the United States, including pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE ENTRY INTO AGREEMENT.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Before entering into any trade agreement under section 103(b), the President shall consult with—

(A) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(B) each other committee of the House and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters which would be affected by the trade agreement; and

(C) the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

(2) SCOPE.—The consultation described in paragraph (1) shall include consultation with respect to—

(A) the nature of the agreement;

(B) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(C) the implementation of the agreement under section 106, including the general effect of the agreement on existing laws.

(3) REPORT REGARDING UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—

(A) CHANGES IN CERTAIN TRADE LAWS.—The President, not less than 180 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

(i) the range of proposals advanced in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could require amendments to title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(ii) how these proposals relate to the objectives described in section 102(b)(16).

(B) RESOLUTIONS.—(i) At any time after the transmission of the report under subparagraph (A), if a resolution is introduced with respect to that report in either House of Congress, the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) shall apply to that resolution if—

(I) no other resolution with respect to that report has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to those procedures; and

(II) no procedural disapproval resolution under section 106(b) introduced with respect to a trade agreement entered into pursuant to the negotiations to which the report under subparagraph (A) relates has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be.

(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ''resolution'' means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ finds that the proposed changes to United States trade remedy laws contained in the report of the President transmitted to Congress on _____ under section 105(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 with respect to _____, are inconsistent with the negotiating objectives described in section 102(b)(16) of that Act.'', with the first blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress, the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date of the report, and the third blank space being filled with the name of the country or countries involved.

(iii) Resolutions in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee.

(iv) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(v) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(vi) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(vii) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) shall apply to resolutions.

(4) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS.—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(e)(1)) regarding any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 shall be provided to the President, Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 103(a)(2) or 106(a)(1)(A) of the intention of the President to enter into the agreement.

(c) INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION ASSESSMENT.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO COMMISSION.—The President, not later than 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall provide the International Trade Commission (referred to in this subsection as the ''Commission'') with the details of the agreement as it exists at that time and request the Commission to prepare and submit an assessment of the agreement as described in paragraph (2). Between the time the President makes the request under this paragraph and the time the Commission submits the assessment, the President shall keep the Commission current with respect to the details of the agreement.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 105 calendar days after the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report assessing the likely impact of the agreement on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors, including the impact the agreement will have on the gross domestic product, exports and imports, aggregate employment and employment opportunities, the production, employment, and competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the agreement, and the interests of United States consumers.

(3) REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE.—In preparing the assessment under paragraph (2), the Commission shall review available economic assessments regarding the agreement, including literature regarding any

substantially equivalent proposed agreement, and shall provide in its assessment a description of the analyses used and conclusions drawn in such literature, and a discussion of areas of consensus and divergence between the various analyses and conclusions, including those of the Commission regarding the agreement.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make each assessment under paragraph (2) available to the public.

(d) REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES WITH AGREEMENT.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) conduct environmental reviews of future trade and investment agreements, consistent with Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169), dated November 16, 1999, and its relevant guidelines; and

(B) submit a report on those reviews and on the content and operation of consultative mechanisms established pursuant to section 102(c) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(2) EMPLOYMENT IMPACT REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169) to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria; and

(B) submit a report on such reviews to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(3) REPORT ON LABOR RIGHTS.—The President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on a timeframe determined in accordance with section 104(c)(3)(B)(v)—

(A) a meaningful labor rights report of the country, or countries, with respect to which the President is negotiating; and

(B) a description of any provisions that would require changes to the labor laws and labor practices of the United States.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make all reports required under this subsection available to the public.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E), the President shall also submit to Congress a plan for implementing and enforcing the agreement.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The implementation and enforcement plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) BORDER PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required at border entry points, including a list of additional customs and agricultural inspectors.

(B) AGENCY STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required by Federal agencies responsible for monitoring and implementing the trade agreement, including personnel required by the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture (including additional personnel required to implement sanitary and phytosanitary measures in order to obtain market access for United States exports), the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Treasury, and such other agencies as may be necessary.

(C) CUSTOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS.—A description of the additional equipment and facilities needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(D) IMPACT ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—A description of the impact the trade agreement will have on State and local governments as a result of increases in trade.

(E) COST ANALYSIS.—An analysis of the costs associated with each of the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) BUDGET SUBMISSION.—The President shall include a request for the resources necessary to support the plan required by paragraph (1) in the first budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, after the date of the submission of the plan.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the plan required under this subsection available to the public.

(f) OTHER REPORTS.—

(1) REPORT ON PENALTIES.—Not later than one year after the imposition by the United States of a penalty or remedy permitted by a trade agreement to which this title applies, the President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the penalty or remedy applied under United States law in enforcing United States rights under the trade agreement, which shall address whether the penalty or remedy was effective in changing the behavior of the targeted party and whether the penalty or remedy had any adverse impact on parties or interests not party to the dispute.

(2) REPORT ON IMPACT OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 5 years thereafter, the United States International Trade Commission shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements with respect to which Congress has enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures since January 1, 1984.

(3) ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS AND REPORTS.—(A) The United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate after acceptance of a petition for review or taking an enforcement action in regard to an obligation under a trade agreement, including a labor or environmental obligation. During such consultations, the United States Trade Representative shall describe the matter, including the basis for such action and the application of any relevant legal obligations.

(B) As part of the report required pursuant to section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213), the President shall report annually to Congress on enforcement actions taken pursuant to a trade agreement to which the United States is a party, as well as on any public reports issued by Federal agencies on enforcement matters relating to a trade agreement.

(g) ADDITIONAL COORDINATION WITH MEMBERS.—Any Member of the House of Representatives may submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and any Member of the Senate may submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate the views of that Member on any matter relevant to a proposed trade agreement, and the relevant Committee shall receive those views for consideration.

SEC. 106. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.—Any agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(A) the President, at least 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into the trade agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(B) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the agreement, publishes the text of the agreement on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(C) within 60 days after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement;

(D) the President, at least 30 days before submitting to Congress the materials under subparagraph (E), submits to Congress—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement;

(E) after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft of an implementing bill described in section 103(b)(3);

(ii) a statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the trade agreement; and

(iii) the supporting information described in paragraph (2)(A);

(F) the implementing bill is enacted into law; and

(G) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the agreement enters into force with respect to a party to the agreement, submits written notice to Congress that the President has determined that the party has taken measures necessary to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date on which the agreement enters into force.

(2) SUPPORTING INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The supporting information required under paragraph (1)(E)(iii) consists of—

(i) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement—

(I) asserting that the agreement achieves the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(II) setting forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(aa) how the agreement achieves the applicable purposes, policies, and objectives referred to in subclause (I);

(bb) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(cc) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(dd) how the implementing bill meets the standards set forth in section 103(b)(3).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the supporting information described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(3) RECIPROCAL BENEFITS.—In order to ensure that a foreign country that is not a party to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) does not receive benefits under the agreement unless the country is also subject to the obligations under the agreement, the implementing bill submitted with respect to the agreement shall provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement apply only to the parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement. The implementing bill may also provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement do not apply uniformly to all parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(4) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or other understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacts an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress,

shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) FOR LACK OF NOTICE OR CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if during the 60-day period beginning on the date that one House of Congress agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution for lack of notice or consultations with respect to such trade agreement or agreements, the other House separately agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.

(B) PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.—(i) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''procedural disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.'', with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements with respect to which the President is considered to have failed or refused to notify or consult.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i) and paragraphs (3)(C) and (4)(C), the President has ''failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015'' on negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements if—

(I) the President has failed or refused to consult (as the case may be) in accordance with sections 104 and 105 and this section with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(II) guidelines under section 104 have not been developed or met with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(III) the President has not met with the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations pursuant to a request made under section 104(c)(4) with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements; or

(IV) the agreement or agreements fail to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title.

SA 1371. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country that has a minimum wage that is less than $2.00 an hour, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

SA 1372. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country that has a minimum wage that is less than $3.00 an hour, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

SA 1373. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country that has a minimum wage that is less than $4.00 an hour, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

SA 1374. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—TRADE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. MODIFICATION OF FACTORS CONSIDERED IN FINAL DETERMINATION IN ANTIDUMPING OR COUNTERVAILING DUTY INVESTIGATION IN CASE OF AN ALLEGATION OF CRITICAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

(a) COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.—Clause (ii) of section 705(b)(4)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(ii) LIKELY TO SERIOUSLY UNDERMINE THE REMEDIAL EFFECT OF A COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDER.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall find under clause (i) that imports of subject merchandise subject to the affirmative determination under subsection (a)(2) are likely to undermine seriously the remedial effect of the countervailing duty order to be issued under section 706 if the Commission determines that imports of such merchandise after the filing of the petition under this subtitle substantially weaken the remedial effect of any subsequent countervailing duty order.

''(II) FACTORS IN DETERMINATION.—In making a determination under subclause (I) with respect to imports of subject merchandise described in that subclause, the Commission shall consider, based on the facts available, the following:

''(aa) An increase in the market share in the United States of imports of such merchandise after the filing of the petition.

''(bb) An increase in underselling of the domestic like product by imports of such merchandise, in terms of frequency or magnitude, after the filing of the petition.

''(cc) A significant buildup of inventories of imports of such merchandise in the United States, whether held by United States importers, purchasers, or end users, after the filing of the petition.

''(dd) A weakening of the industry of the domestic like product after the filing of the petition.

''(ee) Any other circumstances indicating that, after the filing of the petition, imports of such merchandise substantially weaken the remedial effect of the countervailing duty order.

''(III) ASSESSMENT OF COMPETITION.—The Commission shall consider items (aa) through (ee) of subclause (II) based on the particular conditions of competition in the relevant industry.

''(IV) TIME PERIOD.—The period of time evaluated in making a determination under subclause (I) shall not include any period after the issuance of the preliminary determination by the administering authority under section 703(b) with respect to the subject merchandise.''.

(b) ANTIDUMPING DUTIES.—Clause (ii) of section 735(b)(4)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(ii) LIKELY TO SERIOUSLY UNDERMINE THE REMEDIAL EFFECT OF AN ANTIDUMPING DUTY ORDER.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall find under clause (i) that imports of subject

merchandise subject to the affirmative determination under subsection (a)(3) are likely to undermine seriously the remedial effect of the antidumping duty order to be issued under section 736 if the Commission determines that imports of such merchandise after the filing of the petition under this subtitle substantially weaken the remedial effect of any subsequent antidumping duty order.

''(II) FACTORS IN DETERMINATION.—In making a determination under subclause (I) with respect to imports of subject merchandise described in that subclause, the Commission shall consider, based on the facts available, the following:

''(aa) An increase in the market share in the United States of imports of such merchandise after the filing of the petition.

''(bb) An increase in underselling of the domestic like product by imports of such merchandise, in terms of frequency or magnitude, after the filing of the petition.

''(cc) A significant buildup of inventories of imports of such merchandise in the United States, whether held by United States importers, purchasers, or end users, after the filing of the petition.

''(dd) A weakening of the industry of the domestic like product after the filing of the petition.

''(ee) Any other circumstances indicating that, after the filing of the petition, imports of such merchandise substantially weaken the remedial effect of the antidumping duty order.

''(III) ASSESSMENT OF COMPETITION.—The Commission shall consider items (aa) through (ee) of subclause (II) based on the particular conditions of competition in the relevant industry.

''(IV) TIME PERIOD.—The period of time evaluated in making a determination under subclause (I) shall not include any period after the issuance of the preliminary determination by the administering authority under section 733(b) with respect to the subject merchandise.''.

SEC. 302. MODIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF THREAT OF MATERIAL INJURY BASED ON IMMINENT FUTURE IMPORTS IN ANTIDUMPING OR COUNTERVAILING DUTY INVESTIGATION.

Section 771(7)(F) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(F)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) EFFECT OF IMMINENT FUTURE IMPORTS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclauses (II) and (III), the Commission may determine under this subparagraph that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury by reason of imports (or sales for importation) of the subject merchandise notwithstanding the results of an evaluation under subparagraph (C)(iii) with respect to the effect of imports of the subject merchandise on that industry if the Commission determines that imminent future imports of the subject merchandise will likely lead to a change of circumstances concerning the state of that industry.

''(II) FUTURE PERFORMANCE ESTIMATE.—The Commission shall determine under this subparagraph that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury if the performance of that industry is likely to be materially worse than it would have been in the absence of the likely volume of imports of subject merchandise in the imminent future.

''(III) FOREIGN PROJECTIONS.—With respect to considering economic factors described in clause (i)(II), in a case in which production capacity in or exports to the United States from the exporting country are projected by foreign producers to decline in the imminent future and such projection is contrary to information examined by the Commission in the investigation, such projection shall require verification or independent corroboration before being considered under this subparagraph.''.

SEC. 303. PREVENTION OF DUTY EVASION THROUGH IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS AND COUNTRIES RESPONSIBLE FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CUSTOMS LAWS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO VIOLATE THE CUSTOMS LAWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may publish semi-annually in the Federal Register a list of any producer, manufacturer, supplier, seller, exporter, or other person located outside the customs territory of the United States to which the Commissioner has issued a penalty claim under section 592(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592(b)(2)) citing any of the violations of the customs laws described in paragraph (3).

(2) EFFECT OF PETITION FOR REMISSION OR MITIGATION.—If a person to which a penalty claim described in paragraph (1) is issued files a petition for remission or mitigation under section 618 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1618) with respect to the penalty claim, the Secretary may not include the person on a list published under paragraph (1) until a final determination is made under such section 618.

(3) VIOLATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The violations of the customs laws described in this paragraph are the following:

(i) Using documentation, or providing documentation subsequently used by the importer of record, that indicates a false or fraudulent country of origin or source of goods described in subparagraph (B) being entered into the customs territory of the United States.

(ii) Using counterfeit visas, licenses, permits, bills of lading, commercial invoices, packing lists, certificates of origin, or similar documentation, or providing counterfeit visas, licenses, permits, bills of lading, commercial invoices, packing lists, certificates of origin, or similar documentation subsequently used by the importer of record, with respect to the entry into the customs territory of the United States of goods described in subparagraph (B).

(iii) Manufacturing, producing, supplying, or selling goods described in subparagraph (B) that are falsely or fraudulently labeled as to country of origin or source.

(iv) Engaging in practices that aid or abet the transshipment, through a country other than the country of origin, of goods described in subparagraph (B), in a manner that conceals the true origin of the goods or permits the evasion of quotas or duties on, or voluntary restraint agreements with respect to, imports of the goods.

(B) GOODS DESCRIBED.—Goods described in this subparagraph are—

(i) textile or apparel goods; or

(ii) goods subject to antidumping or countervailing duty orders under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.).

(4) REMOVAL FROM LIST.—Any person included on a list published under paragraph (1) may petition the Secretary to be removed from the list. If the Secretary finds that the person has not committed any violations of the customs laws described in paragraph (3) for a period of not less than 3 years after the date on which the person was included on the list, the Secretary shall remove the person from the list as of the next publication of the list under paragraph (1).

(5) REASONABLE CARE REQUIRED FOR SUBSEQUENT IMPORTS.—

(A) RESPONSIBILITY OF IMPORTERS AND OTHERS.—After a person has been included on a list published under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall require any importer of record entering, introducing, or attempting to introduce into the commerce of the United States any goods described in paragraph (3)(B) that were either directly or indirectly produced, manufactured, supplied, sold, exported, or transported by the person on the list to show, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that such importer has exercised reasonable care to ensure that those goods are accompanied by documentation, packaging, and labeling that are accurate as to the origin of those goods. Such reasonable care shall not include reliance solely on information provided by the person on the list.

(B) FAILURE TO EXERCISE REASONABLE CARE.—If the Commissioner determines that an imported good is not from the country claimed on the documentation accompanying the good, the failure to exercise reasonable care described in subparagraph (A) shall be considered when the Commissioner determines whether the importer of record is in violation of section 484(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1484(a)) or regulations issued under that section.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF HIGH-RISK COUNTRIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may publish annually in the Federal Register a list of countries—

(A) in which illegal activities have occurred involving transshipped goods or activities designed to evade quotas or duties of the United States on goods; and

(B) the governments of which fail to demonstrate a good faith effort to cooperate with United States authorities in ceasing such activities.

(2) REMOVAL FROM LIST.—Any country that is on the list published under paragraph (1) that subsequently demonstrates a good faith effort to cooperate with United States authorities in ceasing activities described in that paragraph shall be removed from the list, and such removal shall be published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable.

(3) REASONABLE CARE REQUIRED FOR SUBSEQUENT IMPORTS.—

(A) RESPONSIBILITY OF IMPORTERS OF RECORD.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require any importer of record entering, introducing, or attempting to introduce into the commerce of the United States goods indicated, on the documentation, packaging, or labeling accompanying such goods, to be from any country on the list published under paragraph (1) to show, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that the importer, consignee, or purchaser has exercised reasonable care to identify the true country of origin of the good.

(B) FAILURE TO EXERCISE REASONABLE CARE.—If the Commissioner determines that a good described in subparagraph (A) is not from the country claimed on the documentation accompanying the good, the failure to exercise reasonable care under that subparagraph shall be considered when the Commissioner determines whether the importer of record is in violation of section 484(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1484(a)) or regulations issued under that section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSIONER.—The term ''Commissioner'' means the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(2) COUNTRY.—The term ''country'' means a foreign country or territory, including any overseas dependent territory or possession of a foreign country.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SA 1375. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(b), add at the end the following:

(21) FOOD SAFETY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to food safety are—

(A) to ensure that a trade agreement does not weaken or diminish food safety standards that protect public health;

(B) to promote strong food safety laws and regulations in the United States; and

(C) to maintain and strengthen food safety inspection systems, including the continuous inspection of meat, poultry, seafood, and egg products exported to the United States.

SA 1376. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015''.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103–428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015''.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SA 1377. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103–428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SA 1378. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 111(7), insert after subparagraph (C) the following:

(D) the provision of equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value, as set forth in ILO Convention No. 100 Concerning Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value;

SA 1379. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 119, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(e) REAUTHORIZATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND CAREER TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 272(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2372(a)) is amended by striking ''for each of the fiscal years 2009 and 2010'' and all that follows through ''December 31, 2010,'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021''.

SA 1380. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. REPORT ON AUTOMOTIVE IMPORTS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to Congress a report on imports into the United States of automobiles and auto parts, including an analysis of, for the year preceding the submission of the report—

(1) any changes to the supply chain in the United States with respect to automobiles and auto parts;

(2) any changes to employment in the United States with respect to automobiles and auto parts; and

(3) the impact of imports into the United States of automobiles and auto parts on the changes described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

SA 1381. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES THAT MANIPULATE THEIR CURRENCIES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement under section 103(b) with a country that engages in protracted large-scale intervention in one direction in the currency exchange markets to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to the trade agreement.

SA 1382. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 2, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 4, line 6, and insert the following:

(1) to achieve an overall balance of payments over a reasonable period of time, eliminate persistent trade deficits, and reverse the accumulation of foreign debt;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and investment and that increase the United States trade deficit;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement;

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, enhance the competitiveness of the United States, promote full employment in the United States, and substantially reduce global current account imbalances;

(5) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and enhance the international means of doing so, while optimizing the use of the world's resources;

(6) to promote respect for worker rights and the rights of children consistent with core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7)) and an understanding of the relationship between trade and worker rights;

(7) to seek provisions in trade agreements under which parties to those agreements ensure that they do not weaken or reduce the

protections afforded in domestic environmental and labor laws as an encouragement for trade;

(8) to ensure that trade agreements afford small businesses equal access to international markets and increased net export results and provide for the reduction or elimination of trade and investment barriers that disproportionately impact small businesses;

SA 1383. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. BONUSES FOR COST-CUTTERS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2015''.

(b) COST SAVINGS ENHANCEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or identification of surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority'' after ''mismanagement'';

(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(iii) in the matter following paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) The Inspector General of an agency or other agency employee designated under subsection (b) shall refer to the Chief Financial Officer of the agency any potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee, along with any recommendations of the Inspector General or other agency employee.

''(d)(1) If the Chief Financial Officer of an agency determines that rescission of potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee would not hinder the effectiveness of the agency, except as provided in subsection (e), the head of the agency shall transfer the amount of the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority from the applicable appropriations account to the general fund of the Treasury.

''(2) Title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.) shall not apply to transfers under paragraph (1).

''(3) Any amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction, except that in the case of a fiscal year for which there is no Federal budget deficit, such amounts shall be used to reduce the Federal debt (in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

''(e)(1) The head of an agency may retain not more than 10 percent of amounts to be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury under subsection (d).

''(2) Amounts retained by the head of an agency under paragraph (1) may be—

''(A) used for the purpose of paying a cash award under subsection (a) to 1 or more employees who identified the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority; and

''(B) to the extent amounts remain after paying cash awards under subsection (a), transferred or reprogrammed for use by the agency, in accordance with any limitation on such a transfer or reprogramming under any other provision of law.

''(f)(1) The head of each agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management an annual report regarding—

''(A) each disclosure of possible fraud, waste, or mismanagement or identification of potentially surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority by an employee of the agency determined by the agency to have merit;

''(B) the total savings achieved through disclosures and identifications described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) the number and amount of cash awards by the agency under subsection (a).

''(2)(A) The head of each agency shall include the information described in paragraph (1) in each budget request of the agency submitted to the Office of Management and Budget as part of the preparation of the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

''(B) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Government Accountability Office an annual report on Federal cost saving and awards based on the reports submitted under subparagraph (A).

''(g) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

''(1) ensure that the cash award program of each agency complies with this section; and

''(2) submit to Congress an annual certification indicating whether the cash award program of each agency complies with this section.

''(h) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2015, and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the operation of the cost savings and awards program under this section, including any recommendations for legislative changes.''.

(2) OFFICERS ELIGIBLE FOR CASH AWARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 4509 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term 'agency'—

''(1) has the meaning given that term under section 551(1); and

''(2) includes an entity described in section 4501(1).

''(b) PROHIBITION.—An officer may not receive a cash award under this subchapter if the officer—

''(1) serves in a position at level I of the Executive Schedule;

''(2) is the head of an agency; or

''(3) is a commissioner, board member, or other voting member of an independent establishment.''.

(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4509 and inserting the following:

''4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers.''.

SA 1384. Mr. HATCH (for Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. INHOFE)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(a), add the following:

(14) to ensure that trade agreements do not require changes to the immigration laws of the United States.

SA 1385. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 102(b)(11) and insert the following:

(11) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

SA 1386. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. COMMUNITY COLLEGE TO CAREER FUND.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Community College to Career Fund Act''.

(b) COMMUNITY COLLEGE TO CAREER FUND.—Title I of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subtitle F—Community College to Career Fund

''SEC. 199. COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds appropriated under section 199D(a)(1), the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education, in accordance with the interagency

agreement described in section 199E, shall award competitive grants to eligible entities described in subsection (b) for the purpose of developing, offering, improving, or providing educational or career training programs for workers.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

''(1) PARTNERSHIPS WITH EMPLOYERS OR AN EMPLOYER OR INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP.—

''(A) GENERAL DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, an 'eligible entity' means any of the entities described in subparagraph (B) (or a consortium of any of such entities) in partnership with employers or an employer or industry partnership representing multiple employers.

''(B) DESCRIPTION OF ENTITIES.—The entities described in this subparagraph are—

''(i) a community college;

''(ii) a 4-year public institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) that offers 2-year degrees, and that will use funds provided under this section for activities at the certificate and associate degree levels;

''(iii) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))); or

''(iv) a private or nonprofit, 2-year institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)) in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, or the Republic of Palau.

''(2) ADDITIONAL PARTNERS.—

''(A) AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PARTNERS.—In addition to partnering with employers or an employer or industry partnership representing multiple employers as described in paragraph (1)(A), an entity described in paragraph (1) may include in the partnership described in paragraph (1) 1 or more of the organizations described in subparagraph (B). An eligible entity that includes 1 or more such organizations shall collaborate with the State or local board in the area served by the eligible entity.

''(B) ORGANIZATIONS.—The organizations described in this subparagraph are as follows:

''(i) An adult education provider or institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)).

''(ii) A community-based organization.

''(iii) A joint labor-management partnership.

''(iv) A State or local board.

''(v) Any other organization that the Secretaries consider appropriate.

''(c) EDUCATIONAL OR CAREER TRAINING PROGRAM.—For purposes of this section, the Governor of the State in which at least 1 of the entities described in subsection (b)(1)(B) of an eligible entity is located shall establish criteria for an educational or career training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential for which an eligible entity submits a grant proposal under subsection (d).

''(d) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application containing a grant proposal to the Secretaries at such time and containing such information as the Secretaries determine is required, including a detailed description of—

''(1) the specific educational or career training program for which the grant proposal is submitted and how the program meets the criteria established under subsection (e), including the manner in which the grant will be used to develop, offer, improve, or provide the educational or career training program;

''(2) the extent to which the program will meet the educational or career training needs of workers in the area served by the eligible entity;

''(3) the extent to which the program will meet the needs of employers in the area for skilled workers in in-demand industry sectors and occupations;

''(4) the extent to which the program described fits within any overall strategic plan developed by the eligible entity;

''(5) any previous experience of the eligible entity in providing educational or career training programs, the absence of which shall not automatically disqualify an eligible institution from receiving a grant under this section; and

''(6) in the case of a project that involves an educational or career training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential described in subsection (f), how the program leading to the credential meets the criteria described in subsection (c).

''(e) CRITERIA FOR AWARD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants under this section shall be awarded based on criteria established by the Secretaries, that include the following:

''(A) A determination of the merits of the grant proposal submitted by the eligible entity involved to develop, offer, improve, or provide an educational or career training program to be made available to workers.

''(B) An assessment of the likely employment opportunities available in the area to individuals who complete an educational or career training program that the eligible entity proposes to develop, offer, improve, or provide.

''(C) An assessment of prior demand for training programs by individuals eligible for training and served by the eligible entity, as well as availability and capacity of existing (as of the date of the assessment) training programs to meet future demand for training programs.

''(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretaries shall give priority to eligible entities that—

''(A) include a partnership, with employers or an employer or industry partnership, that—

''(i) pays a portion of the costs of educational or career training programs; or

''(ii) agrees to hire individuals who have attained a recognized postsecondary credential resulting from the educational or career training program of the eligible entity;

''(B) enter into a partnership with a labor organization or labor-management training program to provide, through the program, technical expertise for occupationally specific education necessary for a recognized postsecondary credential leading to a skilled occupation in an in-demand industry sector;

''(C) are focused on serving individuals with barriers to employment, low-income, non-traditional students, students who are dislocated workers, students who are veterans, or students who are long-term unemployed;

''(D) include community colleges serving areas with high unemployment rates, including rural areas;

''(E) are eligible entities that include an institution of higher education eligible for assistance under title III or V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.; 20 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

''(F) include a partnership, with employers or an employer or industry partnership, that increases domestic production of goods, such as advanced manufacturing or production of clean energy technology.

''(f) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds awarded under this section shall be used for one or more of the following:

''(1) The development, offering, improvement, or provision of educational or career training programs, that provide relevant job training for skilled occupations that will meet the needs of employers in in-demand industry sectors, and which may include registered apprenticeship programs, on-the-job training programs, and programs that support employers in upgrading the skills of their workforce.

''(2) The development and implementation of policies and programs to expand opportunities for students to earn a recognized postsecondary credential, including a degree, in in-demand industry sectors and occupations, including by—

''(A) facilitating the transfer of academic credits between institutions of higher education, including the transfer of academic credits for courses in the same field of study;

''(B) expanding articulation agreements and policies that guarantee transfers between such institutions, including through common course numbering and use of a general core curriculum; and

''(C) developing or enhancing student support services programs.

''(3) The creation of workforce programs that provide a sequence of education and occupational training that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential, including a degree, including programs that—

''(A) blend basic skills and occupational training;

''(B) facilitate means of transitioning participants from non-credit occupational, basic skills, or developmental coursework to for-credit coursework within and across institutions;

''(C) build or enhance linkages, including the development of dual enrollment programs and early college high schools, between secondary education or adult education programs (including programs established under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) and title II of this Act);

''(D) are innovative programs designed to increase the provision of training for students, including students who are members of the National Guard or Reserves, to enter skilled occupations in in-demand industry sectors; and

''(E) support paid internships that will allow students to simultaneously earn credit for work-based learning and gain relevant employment experience in an in-demand industry sector or occupation, which shall include opportunities that transition individuals into employment.

''(4) The support of regional or national in-demand industry sectors to develop skills consortia that will identify pressing workforce needs and develop solutions such as—

''(A) standardizing industry certifications;

''(B) developing new training technologies; and

''(C) collaborating with industry employers to define and describe how specific skills lead to particular jobs and career opportunities.

''SEC. 199A. PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE AND PAY-FOR-SUCCESS JOB TRAINING PROJECTS.

''(a) AWARD GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds appropriated under section 199D(a)(2),

the Secretaries, in accordance with the interagency agreement described in section 199E, shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities described in subsection (b) who achieve specific performance outcomes and criteria agreed to by the Secretaries under subsection (c) to carry out job training projects. Projects funded by grants under this section shall be referred to as either Pay-for-Performance or Pay-for-Success projects, as set forth in subsection (b).

''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be a State or local organization (which may be a local workforce organization) in partnership with an entity such as a community college or other training provider, who—

''(1) in the case of an entity seeking to carry out a Pay-for-Performance project, agrees to be reimbursed under the grant primarily on the basis of achievement of specified performance outcomes and criteria agreed to by the Secretaries under subsection (c); or

''(2) in the case of an entity seeking to carry out a Pay-for-Success project—

''(A) enters into a partnership with an investor, such as a philanthropic organization that provides funding for a specific project to address a clear and measurable job training need in the area to be served under the grant; and

''(B) agrees to be reimbursed under the grant only if the project achieves specified performance outcomes and criteria agreed to by the Secretaries under subsection (c).

''(c) PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES AND CRITERIA.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subtitle, the Secretaries shall establish and publish specific performance measures, which include performance outcomes and criteria, for the initial qualification and reimbursement of eligible entities to receive a grant under this section. At a minimum, to receive such a grant, an eligible entity shall—

''(1) identify a particular program area and client population that is not achieving optimal outcomes;

''(2) provide evidence that the proposed strategy for the job training project would achieve better outcomes;

''(3) clearly articulate and quantify the improved outcomes of such new approach;

''(4) for a Pay-for-Success project, specify a monetary value that would need to be paid to obtain such outcomes and explain the basis for such value;

''(5) identify data that would be required to evaluate whether outcomes are being achieved for a target population and a comparison group;

''(6) identify estimated savings that would result from the improved outcomes, including to other programs or units of government;

''(7) demonstrate the capacity to collect required data, track outcomes, and validate those outcomes; and

''(8) specify how the entity will meet any other criteria the Secretaries may require.

''(d) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY FOR PAY-FOR-SUCCESS PROJECTS.—Funds appropriated to carry out Pay-for-Success projects pursuant to section 199D(a)(2) shall, upon obligation, remain available for disbursement until expended, notwithstanding section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and, if later deobligated, in whole or in part, be available until expended under additional Pay-for-Success grants under this section.

''SEC. 199B. BRING JOBS BACK TO AMERICA GRANTS.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds appropriated under section 199D(a)(3), the Secretaries, in accordance with the interagency agreement described in section 199E, shall award grants to State or local governments for job training and recruiting activities that can quickly provide businesses with skilled workers in order to encourage businesses to relocate to or remain in areas served by such governments. The Secretaries shall coordinate activities with the Secretary of Commerce in carrying out this section.

''(b) PURPOSE AND USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds awarded under this section may be used by a State or local government to issue subgrants, using procedures established by the Secretaries, to eligible entities, including those described in section 199(b), to assist such eligible entities in providing job training necessary to provide skilled workers for businesses that have relocated or are considering relocating operations outside the United States, and may instead relocate to or remain in the areas served by such governments, and in conducting recruiting activities.

''(c) APPLICATION.—A State or local government seeking a grant under the program established under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretaries in such manner and containing such information as the Secretaries may require. At a minimum, each application shall include—

''(1) a description of the eligible entity the State or local government proposes to assist in providing job training or recruiting activities;

''(2) a description of the proposed or existing business facility involved, including the number of jobs relating to such facility and the average wage or salary of those jobs; and

''(3) a description of any other resources that the State has committed to assisting such business in locating such facility, including tax incentives provided, bonding authority exercised, and land granted.

''(d) CRITERIA.—The Secretaries shall award grants under this section to the State and local governments that—

''(1) the Secretaries determine are most likely to succeed, with such a grant, in assisting an eligible entity in providing the job training and recruiting necessary to cause a business to relocate to or remain in an area served by such government;

''(2) will fund job training and recruiting programs that will result in the greatest number and quality of jobs;

''(3) have committed State or other resources, to the extent of their ability as determined by the Secretaries, to assist a business to relocate to or remain in an area served by such government; and

''(4) have met such other criteria as the Secretaries consider appropriate, including criteria relating to marketing plans, and benefits for ongoing area or State strategies for economic development and job growth.

''SEC. 199C. GRANTS FOR ENTREPRENEUR AND SMALL BUSINESS STARTUP TRAINING.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds appropriated under section 199D(a)(4), the Secretaries, in accordance with the interagency agreement described in section 199E, shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities described in subsection (b) to provide training in starting a small business and entrepreneurship. The Secretaries shall coordinate activities with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration in carrying out this section, including coordinating the development of criteria and selection of proposals.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible entity' means an entity described in section 199(b)(1)(B) (or a consortium of any of such entities) in partnership with at least 1 local or regional economic development entity described in paragraph (2).

''(2) ADDITIONAL PARTNERS.—Local or regional economic development entities described in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) Small business development centers.

''(B) Women's business centers.

''(C) Regional innovation clusters.

''(D) Local accelerators or incubators.

''(E) State or local economic development agencies.

''(c) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application containing a grant proposal in such manner and containing such information as the Secretaries and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall require. Such information shall include a description of the manner in which small business and entrepreneurship training (including education) will be provided, the role of partners in the arrangement involved, and the manner in which the proposal will integrate local economic development resources and partner with local economic development entities.

''(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds awarded under this section shall be used to provide training in starting a small business and entrepreneurship, including through online courses, intensive seminars, and comprehensive courses.

''SEC. 199D. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program established by section 199;

''(2) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program established by section 199A;

''(3) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program established by section 199B; and

''(4) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program established by section 199C.

''(b) RECIPIENT.—For each amount appropriated under paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a), 50 percent shall be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor and 50 percent shall be appropriated to the Secretary of Education.

''(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COST.—Not more than 5 percent of the amounts made available under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a) may be used by the Secretaries to administer the program described in that paragraph, including providing technical assistance and carrying out evaluations for the program described in that paragraph.

''(d) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Except as provided in section 199A(d), the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year shall be available for Federal obligation for that fiscal year and the succeeding 2 fiscal years.

''SEC. 199E. INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall jointly develop policies for the administration of this subtitle in accordance with such terms as the Secretaries shall set forth in an interagency agreement. Such interagency agreement, at a minimum, shall include a description of the respective roles and responsibilities of the Secretaries in carrying out this

subtitle (both jointly and separately), including—

''(1) how the funds available under this subtitle will be obligated and disbursed and compliance with applicable laws (including regulations) will be ensured, as well as how the grantees will be selected and monitored;

''(2) how evaluations and research will be conducted on the effectiveness of grants awarded under this subtitle in addressing the education and employment needs of workers, and employers;

''(3) how technical assistance will be provided to applicants and grant recipients;

''(4) how information will be disseminated, including through electronic means, on best practices and effective strategies and service delivery models for activities carried out under this subtitle; and

''(5) how policies and processes critical to the successful achievement of the education, training, and employment goals of this subtitle will be established.

''(b) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall have the authority to transfer funds between the Department of Labor and the Department of Education to carry out this subtitle in accordance with the agreement described in subsection (a). The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall have the ability to transfer funds to the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out sections 199B and 199C, respectively.

''(c) REPORTS.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall jointly develop and submit a biennial report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, describing the activities carried out under this subtitle and the outcomes of such activities.

''SEC. 199F. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this subtitle:

''(1) COMMUNITY COLLEGE.—The term 'community college' has the meaning given the term 'junior or community college' in section 312(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(f)).

''(2) NONTRADITIONAL STUDENT.—The term 'nontraditional student' has the meaning given the term in section 803(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1161c(j)).

''(3) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.—The term 'recognized postsecondary credential' means a credential consisting of—

''(A) an industry-recognized certificate;

''(B) a certificate of completion of an apprenticeship registered under the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the 'National Apprenticeship Act'; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.); or

''(C) an associate or baccalaureate degree.

''(4) SECRETARIES.—The term 'Secretaries' means the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is amended by inserting after the items relating to subtitle E of title I the following:

''Subtitle F—Community College to Career Fund

''Sec. 199. Community college and industry partnerships program.
''Sec. 199A. Pay-for-Performance and Pay-for-Success job training projects.
''Sec. 199B. Bring jobs back to America grants.
''Sec. 199C. Grants for entrepreneur and small business startup training.
''Sec. 199D. Authorization of appropriations.
''Sec. 199E. Interagency agreement.
''Sec. 199F. Definitions.''.

SA 1387. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 111(6)(B), add the following:

(viii) The Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

SA 1388. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT DO NOT COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) with a country that—

(A) does not have in effect laws prohibiting, in a manner similar to the prohibition under section 1597 of title 18, United States Code, an employer from knowingly destroying, concealing, removing, confiscating, or possessing an actual or purported passport or other travel documentation of an employee; or

(B) the Secretary of State recommends in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons submitted under section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)) should improve the enforcement of such laws.

SA 1389. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. DRUG IMPORTATION.

(a) PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) until the Secretary of Health and Human Services promulgates regulations under section 804(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384(b)).

(b) AMENDMENTS TO FFDCA.—Section 804(a)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384(a)(1)) is amended, by striking ''pharmacist or wholesaler'' and inserting ''pharmacist, wholesaler, or the head of a relevant agency of the Federal Government''.

(c) PRESCRIPTION DRUG IMPORTATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding the importation of prescription drugs is to permit the importation of such drugs from any country that is a party to a trade agreement with the United States, pursuant to section 804 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384).

SA 1390. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, line 10, strike ''sustained or recurring''.

SA 1391. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(a), add at the end the following:

(13) to advance the goal of improving the social and economic status of women and achieving gender equality by promoting the adoption of international standards to reduce gender-based violence in the workplace.

SA 1392. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON RATIFICATION OF THE ILO CONVENTION NO. 111 ON DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) trading partners of the United States should pursue policies designed to promote equality of opportunity and treatment with a view toward eliminating discrimination in employment and occupation;

(2) it should be the policy of the United States to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to eliminating any distinction, exclusion, or preference that has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in employment or occupation, including on the basis of race, sex, or religion; and

(3) the Senate should move promptly to approve a resolution of ratification of ILO Convention No. 111 on Discrimination in Employment and Occupation, one of the 8 core conventions of the ILO, which has been ratified by 172 of the 185 member countries of the ILO.

SA 1393. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RECRUITING MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM THE ARMED FORCES TO SERVE AS U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers carry out critical law enforcement duties at ports of entry associated with screening—

(A) foreign visitors to the United States;

(B) citizens of the United States who are returning to the United States; and

(C) cargo imported into the United States.

(2) It is in the national interest of the United States for ports of entry to be adequately staffed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers.

(3) The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76) provided funding to hire and complete the training of 2,000 new U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers by the end of fiscal year 2015.

(4) The hiring and training of officers described in paragraph (3) has been moving forward more slowly than anticipated.

(5) It is estimated that approximately 250,000 to 300,000 individuals undergo discharge or release from the Armed Forces each year, some of whom will have skills transferable to the law enforcement duties required at ports of entry and be qualified to serve as U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that additional recruiting efforts should be undertaken to ensure that individuals undergoing discharge or release from the Armed Forces are aware of opportunities for employment as U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers.

SA 1394. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike sections 208 through 212 and insert the following:

SEC. 208. DISQUALIFICATION ON RECEIPT OF DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS IN A MONTH FOR WHICH UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IS RECEIVED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 223(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 423(d)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C)(i) If for any week in whole or in part within a month an individual is paid or determined to be eligible for unemployment compensation, such individual shall be deemed to have engaged in substantial gainful activity for such month.

''(ii) For purposes of clause (i), the term 'unemployment compensation' means—

''(I) 'regular compensation', 'extended compensation', and 'additional compensation' (as such terms are defined by section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act (26 U.S.C. 3304 note)); and

''(II) trade adjustment assistance under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).''.

(b) TRIAL WORK PERIOD.—Section 222(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 422(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6)(A) For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall be deemed to have rendered services in a month if the individual is entitled to unemployment compensation for such month.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'unemployment compensation' means—

''(i) 'regular compensation', 'extended compensation', and 'additional compensation' (as such terms are defined by section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act (26 U.S.C. 3304 note)); and

''(ii) trade adjustment assistance under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).''.

(c) DATA MATCHING.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall implement the amendments made by this section using appropriate electronic data.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to individuals who initially apply for disability insurance benefits on or after January 1, 2016.

SA 1395. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. PROTECTION OF INDIAN EXPORTS AND TREATY RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any trade agreement for which negotiations are conducted under this title shall ensure that—

(1) goods of or for the benefit of Indian tribes may be exported through ports in the United States;

(2) Indian treaty rights are protected; and

(3) goods of or for the benefit of Indian tribes have the opportunity to compete in the world market.

(b) CONFLICTING INTERESTS.—If different Indian tribes have conflicting interests under subsection (a), the head of an appropriate Federal agency, as designated by the President, shall act to resolve that conflict.

(c) INDIAN TRIBE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given that term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

SA 1396. Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE III—MANUFACTURING SKILLS ACT OF 2015

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Manufacturing Skills Act of 2015''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means a State or a metropolitan area.

(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' means each of the following:

(A) An institution of higher education, as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(B) A postsecondary vocational institution, as defined in section 102(c) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1002(c)).

(3) MANUFACTURING SECTOR.—The term ''manufacturing sector'' means a manufacturing sector classified in code 31, 32, or 33 of the most recent version of the North American Industry Classification System developed under the direction of the Office of Management and Budget.

(4) METROPOLITAN AREA.—The term ''metropolitan area'' means a standard metropolitan statistical area, as designated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) PARTNERSHIP.—The term ''Partnership'' means the Manufacturing Skills Partnership established in section 311(a).

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Subtitle A—Manufacturing Skills Program

SEC. 311. MANUFACTURING SKILLS PROGRAM.

(a) MANUFACTURING SKILLS PARTNERSHIP.—The Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Education, Secretary of the Department of Defense, and Director of the National Science Foundation shall jointly establish a Manufacturing Skills Partnership consisting of the Secretaries and the Director, or their representatives. The Partnership shall—

(1) administer and carry out the program established under this subtitle;

(2) establish and publish guidelines for the review of applications, and the criteria for selection, for grants under this subtitle; and

(3) submit an annual report to Congress on—

(A) the eligible entities that receive grants under this subtitle; and

(B) the progress such eligible entities have made in achieving the milestones identified in accordance with section 312(b)(2)(H).

(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts appropriated to carry out this subtitle, the Partnership shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to enable the eligible entities to carry out their proposals submitted in the application under section 312(b)(2), in order to promote reforms in workforce education and skill training for manufacturing in the eligible entities.

(2) GRANT DURATION.—A grant awarded under paragraph (1) shall be for a 3-year period, with grant funds under such grant distributed annually in accordance with subsection (c)(2).

(3) SECOND GRANTS.—If amounts are made available to award grants under this subtitle for subsequent grant periods, the Partnership may award a grant to an eligible entity that previously received a grant under this subtitle after such first grant period expires. The Partnership shall evaluate the performance of the eligible entity under the first grant in determining whether to award the eligible entity a second grant under this subtitle.

SEC. 312. APPLICATION AND AWARD PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that desires to receive a grant under this subtitle shall—

(1) establish a task force, consisting of leaders from the public, nonprofit, and manufacturing sectors, representatives of labor organizations, representatives of elementary schools and secondary schools, and representatives of institutions of higher education, to apply for and carry out a grant under this subtitle; and

(2) submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Partnership may require.

(b) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—The application described in subsection (a)(2) shall include—

(1) a description of the task force that the eligible entity has assembled to design the proposal described in paragraph (2);

(2) a proposal that—

(A) identifies, as of the date of the application—

(i) the current strengths of the State or metropolitan area represented by the eligible entity in manufacturing; and

(ii) areas for new growth opportunities in manufacturing;

(B) identifies, as of the date of the application, manufacturing workforce and skills challenges preventing the eligible entity from expanding in the areas identified under subparagraph (A)(ii), such as—

(i) a lack of availability of—

(I) strong career and technical education;

(II) educational programs in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics; or

(III) a skills training system; or

(ii) an absence of customized training for existing industrial businesses and sectors;

(C) identifies challenges faced within the manufacturing sector by underrepresented and disadvantaged workers, including veterans, in the State or metropolitan area represented by the eligible entity;

(D) provides strategies, designed by the eligible entity, to address challenges identified in subparagraphs (B) and (C) through tangible projects and investments, with the deep and sustainable involvement of manufacturing businesses;

(E) identifies and leverages innovative and effective career and technical education or skills training programs in the field of manufacturing that are available in the eligible entity;

(F) leverages other Federal funds in support of such strategies;

(G) reforms State or local policies and governance, as applicable, in support of such strategies; and

(H) holds the eligible entity accountable, on a regular basis, through a set of transparent performance measures, including a timeline for the grant period describing when specific milestones and reforms will be achieved; and

(3) a description of the source of the matching funds required under subsection (d) that the eligible entity will use if selected for a grant under this subtitle.

(c) AWARD BASIS.—

(1) SELECTION BASIS AND MAXIMUM NUMBER OF GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Partnership shall award grants under this subtitle, by not earlier than January 1, 2015, and not later than March 31, 2015, to the eligible entities that submit the strongest and most comprehensive proposals under subsection (b)(2).

(B) MAXIMUM NUMBER OF GRANTS.—For any grant period, the Partnership shall award not more than 5 grants under this subtitle to eligible entities representing States and not more than 5 grants to eligible entities representing metropolitan areas.

(2) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Partnership shall award grants under this subtitle in an amount that averages, for all grants issued for a 3-year grant period, $10,000,000 for each year, subject to subparagraph (C) and paragraph (3).

(B) AMOUNT.—In determining the amount of each grant for an eligible entity, the Partnership shall take into consideration the size of the industrial base of the eligible entity.

(C) INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATIONS.—For any grant period for which the amounts available to carry out this subtitle are insufficient to award grants in the amount described in subparagraph (A), the Partnership shall award grants in amounts determined appropriate by the Partnership.

(3) FUNDING CONTINGENT ON PERFORMANCE.—In order for an eligible entity to receive funds under a grant under this subtitle for the second or third year of the grant period, the eligible entity shall demonstrate to the Partnership that the eligible entity has achieved the specific reforms and milestones required under the timeline included in the eligible entity's proposal under subsection (b)(2)(H).

(4) CONSULTATION WITH POLICY EXPERTS.—The Partnership shall assemble a panel of manufacturing policy experts and manufacturing leaders from the private sector to serve in an advisory capacity in helping to oversee the competition and review the competition's effectiveness.

(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this subtitle shall provide matching funds toward the grant in an amount of not less than 50 percent of the costs of the activities carried out under the grant. Matching funds under this subsection shall be from non-Federal sources and shall be in cash or in-kind.

SEC. 313. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2016.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

Subtitle B—Audit of Federal Education and Skills Training

SEC. 321. AUDIT OF FEDERAL EDUCATION AND SKILLS TRAINING.

(a) AUDIT.—By not later than March 31, 2016, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, acting through the Advanced Manufacturing National Program Office, shall conduct an audit of all Federal education and skills training programs related to manufacturing to ensure that States and metropolitan areas are able to align Federal resources to the greatest extent possible with the labor demands of their primary manufacturing industries. In carrying out the audit, the Director shall work with States and metropolitan areas to determine how Federal funds can be more tailored to meet their different needs.

(b) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—By not later than March 31, 2016, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall prepare and submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) a summary of the findings from the audit conducted under subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations for such legislative and administrative actions to reform the existing funding for Federal education and skills training programs related to manufacturing as the Director determines appropriate.

Subtitle C—Offset

SEC. 331. RESCISSION OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FUNDS.

(a) RESCISSION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an amount equal to the amount of funds made available to carry out subtitle A for a fiscal year shall be rescinded, in accordance with subsection (b), from the unobligated discretionary funds available to the Secretary from prior fiscal years.

(b) RETURN OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, by not later than 15 days after funds are appropriated or made available to carry out subtitle A, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) identify from which appropriations accounts available to the Secretary of Labor the rescission described in subsection (a) shall apply; and

(2) determine the amount of the rescission that shall apply to each account.

SA 1397. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) that includes provisions that could subject policies of State or local governments in the United States to claims by foreign investors that would be decided outside the United States legal system.

SA 1398. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE THE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT FOOD.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) that includes provisions that could limit the right of the United States to provide information to the public on food for sale in United States markets, including through the use of nondiscriminatory labeling requirements.

SA 1399. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, strike lines 4 through 9, and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if the agreement fully protects the right of the United States to require, in a nondiscriminatory manner, disclosure of the country of origin of food sold in the United States.

SA 1400. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, strike lines 4 through 9, and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if the agreement fully protects the right of the United States to provide information to the public on food for sale in United States markets, including through the use of nondiscriminatory labeling requirements.

SA 1401. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, AND CONSUMERS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) unless the agreement exempts policies for protecting the environment, public health, and consumers from any investor-state dispute settlement provisions included in the agreement.

SA 1402. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) that includes provisions that could subject policies of the United States Government or any State or local government in the United States to claims by foreign investors that would be decided outside the United States legal system.

SA 1403. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 23, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(ii) adopts and maintains measures ensuring a minimum wage that is appropriately comparable to the Federal minimum wage in the United States, taking into account the local cost of living and other factors,

---

SA 1404. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE THE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT FOOD.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) that includes provisions that could limit the right of the United States to require, in a nondiscriminatory manner, disclosure of the country of origin of food sold in the United States.

SA 1405. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(a)(2)(A)(ii)(II), add the following:

(ee) whether and how the agreement will increase production and employment in the United States and whether and how the agreement will increase the wages of workers in the United States.

SA 1406. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 119, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 204. CONSIDERATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT LEAD TO RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIALS.

Section 236(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) In approving training for adversely affected workers and adversely affected incumbent workers under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give consideration to training programs that lead to recognized postsecondary credentials and are aligned with in-demand occupations.''.

SA 1407. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. REPORT ON IMPORTS OF STEEL.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter while this title is in effect, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to Congress a report on imports into the United States of steel, including an analysis of, for the year preceding the submission of the report—

(1) any changes to the supply chain in the United States with respect to steel;

(2) any changes to employment in the United States with respect to steel; and

(3) the impact of imports into the United States of steel on the changes described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

SA 1408. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—FEDERAL RESERVE TRANSPARENCY

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Federal Reserve Transparency Act of 2015''.

SEC. 302. AUDIT REFORM AND TRANSPARENCY FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 714 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks under subsection (b) of such section 714 shall be completed within 12 months of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A report on the audit required under subsection (a) shall be submitted by the Comptroller General to the Congress before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which such audit is completed and made available to the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee and each subcommittee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and any other Member of Congress who requests it.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a detailed description of the findings and conclusion of the Comptroller General with respect to the audit that is the subject of the report, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General may determine to be appropriate.

(c) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking all after ''in writing.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 303. AUDIT OF LOAN FILE REVIEWS REQUIRED BY ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of the review of loan files of homeowners in foreclosure in 2009 or 2010, required as part of the enforcement actions taken by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System against supervised financial institutions.

(b) CONTENT OF AUDIT.—The audit carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the guidance given by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to independent consultants retained by the supervised financial institutions regarding the procedures to be followed in conducting the file reviews;

(2) the factors considered by independent consultants when evaluating loan files;

(3) the results obtained by the independent consultants pursuant to those reviews;

(4) the determinations made by the independent consultants regarding the nature and extent of financial injury sustained by each homeowner as well as the level and type of remediation offered to each homeowner; and

(5) the specific measures taken by the independent consultants to verify, confirm, or rebut the assertions and representations made by supervised financial institutions regarding the contents of loan files and the extent of financial injury to homeowners.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the audit required under subsection (a).

SA 1409. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT SUBJECT UNITED STATES WORKERS TO UNFAIR COMPETITION ON THE BASIS OF WAGES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) unless the agreement—

(A) establishes a minimum wage that each party to the agreement is required to establish and maintain before the trade agreement is implemented; and

(B) stipulates that the minimum wage required for each party to the agreement increase over time, to continuously reduce the disparity between the lowest and highest minimum wages paid by parties to the agreement.

SA 1410. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(B) EXCEPTION.—

(i) INVOKING EXCEPTION.—If the Secretary of State submits to the appropriate congressional committees a letter stating that a country subject to subparagraph (A) has taken concrete actions to implement the principal recommendations in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons, this paragraph shall not apply with respect to agreements with that country.

(ii) CONTENT OF LETTER; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—A letter submitted under clause (i) with respect to a country shall—

(I) include a description of the concrete actions that the country has taken to implement the principal recommendations described in clause (i); and

(II) be made available to the public.

(iii) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(I) the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(II) the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SA 1411. Mr. HATCH proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

In lieu of the text proposed to be stricken, insert the following:

(11) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''FAA Reauthorization: Air Traffic Control Modernization and Reform.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''No Place to Grow Up: How to Safely Reduce Reliance on Foster Care Group Homes.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 2:45 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor,

and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Examining EEOC's Enforcement and Litigation Programs.''

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 2 p.m., in SR–428A Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''An Examination of Proposed Environment Regulation's Impacts on America's Small Businesses.''

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Body Cameras: Can Technology Increase Protection for Law Enforcement Officers and the Public?''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WATER, AND WILDLIFE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''S. 1140, The Federal Water Quality Protection Act.''

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

NATIONAL SCHIZENCEPHALY AWARENESS DAY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 181, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows.

A resolution (S. Res. 181) designating May 19, 2015, as ''National Schizencephaly Awareness Day.''

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 181) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 14, 2015, AS THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORY DAY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 182.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 182) expressing the sense of the Senate that Defense laboratories have been, and continue to be, on the cutting edge of scientific and technological advancement and supporting the designation of May 14, 2015, as the ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day.''

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 182) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2015

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 20; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1314.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, Senators should be aware that the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to both the underlying bill and the substitute amendment is at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:15 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 20, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL K. HANIFAN
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL M. KRUMREI

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL HUGH T. CORBETT
COLONEL ANDREW LAWLOR
COLONEL RODERICK R. LEON GUERRERO
COLONEL GERVASIO ORTIZ LOPEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. WILLIAM C. MAYVILLE, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOSEPH E. TOFALO

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL MICHAEL S. CEDERHOLM
COLONEL DENNIS A. CRALL
COLONEL BRADFORD J. GERING
COLONEL JAMES F. GLYNN
COLONEL GREGORY L. MASIELLO
COLONEL DAVID W. MAXWELL
COLONEL STEPHEN M. NEARY
COLONEL STEPHEN D. SKLENKA
COLONEL ROGER B. TURNER, JR.
COLONEL RICK A. URIBE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, May 19, 2015*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 19, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week, The Washington Post ran a story titled, ''Defense Firm that Employed Drunk, High Contractors in Afghanistan May Have Wasted $135 Million in Taxpayer Dollars,'' by Colby Itkowitz. Colby writes:

''The defense contractor investigated in 2012 after cellphone videos surfaced of its employees drunk and high on drugs in Afghanistan may have misused almost $135 million of U.S. taxpayer money, an audit finds.''

The Hill further reported that:

''The company also did not comply with Federal procurement law, the audit found.''

Mr. Speaker, I have been coming down to this floor for weeks to highlight the waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan, which John Sopko, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, has reported is worse now than ever.

The National Defense Authorization Act, which the House passed last week, authorized $42 billion for Afghanistan, which is one of the reasons I did not vote for the bill.

Why do we continue to spend billions of American taxpayer dollars in Afghanistan when infrastructure all over the United States is rapidly deteriorating? This past weekend, CBS' ''60 Minutes'' ran a segment on America's failing infrastructure and reported that 70,000 bridges in the United States have been deemed structurally deficient, according to the Federal Government. That is one bridge out of every nine. My constituents in eastern North Carolina continually experience frustration and concern over the Bonner Bridge, which is falling apart. This further highlights the waste and the failed policy in Afghanistan.

I know some Members of Congress will be upset that I am calling attention to the reckless spending in Afghanistan the NDAA authorized, but then why doesn't Congress stop sending billions of dollars to a failed state where young American men and women are being wounded and killed? Mr. Speaker, this includes the father of these two little girls who are on a poster beside me. Their names are Eden and Stephanie Balduf. Their daddy, Sergeant Kevin Balduf, was shot and killed in Afghanistan 2 years ago by the Afghan he was training.

Mr. Speaker, it just gets worse and worse. Those wasted billions of dollars should be allocated to fix American bridges and roads from falling apart and endangering American citizens. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the American people that, last year, the Obama administration signed a 10-year bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan strapping us with 10 more years of waste, fraud, and abuse; 10 more years of billions of dollars being wasted; 10 more years of young Americans being killed and wounded while the infrastructure in America is collapsing; 10 more years of veterans worrying about their benefits. There are so many needs here in America, so many needs that are not being met because we are wasting money overseas in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should debate and vote to stop the madness in Afghanistan on behalf of our soldiers and our men and women in uniform, their families, and the taxpayers of America.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times that Afghanistan is a graveyard of empires. I hope there is a headstone for America because that is where we are heading, to the graveyard in Afghanistan.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, after a rocky start this Congress, we have seen some signs of progress.

Earlier this session, the House leadership allowed the process to work when all Democrats joined many Republicans to rescue Homeland Security from the potential disastrous shutdown by cutting off funds.

Later, a decade-long struggle on the Medicare sustainable growth rate, the so-called doc fix, moved forward. An impasse that had lasted for years was broken, and the solution was overwhelmingly approved by Members of both parties.

Well, now, we are facing yet another impasse, one that has haunted us far longer than a decade, transportation funding. The authority to spend for surface transportation programs expires May 31.

Just as I predicted last summer, the stopgap approach that we approved then would put us right back in the same spot this spring, cutting badly needed transportation projects this summer and the jobs that go with them.

America is falling apart and falling behind in part because you cannot pay for 2015 transportation needs with 1993 dollars, which was the last time we raised the gas tax. Thirty-two short-term funding extensions are evidence of a bipartisan failure for these 22 years to deal with the gas tax, and there is no meaningful alternative for transportation resources on the horizon.

Ironically, the solution is clear, thoroughly studied and broadly supported: raise the gas tax for the first time since 1993. The House Republican leadership doesn't have to do anything extraordinary, just allow the Ways and Means Committee to follow regular order. Let's listen to the experts; invite the stakeholders that build, maintain, and use our transportation system.

Listen to the heads of the AFL–CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, leaders in transit, truckers, AAA, bicyclists, all of whom agree with President Eisenhower, who used the gas tax to start the highway trust fund and the interstate freeway system, and President

Ronald Reagan, who increased gas tax a nickel, more than doubling it in 1992.

In fact, we can invite legislators from today. Six red Republican States have raised the gas tax already this year: Nebraska, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Utah, and South Dakota. State Senator Michael Vehle comes to mind.

The key is to have real hearings, like Congress used to conduct. Have a full week devoted to solving the transportation funding crisis. Bring in the witnesses, grill them, test their thoughts and theories, discuss real solutions, not gimmicks or ideologically driven fantasies.

Let's have serious work sessions and a markup. President Obama could help by establishing a marker that he will approve no further extensions past September 31.

It will not be less complex, expensive, or easier politically in 2016, 2017, or 2018. If this slides until 2016, which is the approach evidently favored by the Republican leadership, we will be struggling with this in the next Congress and the next administration.

This does not have to be an exercise in futility. We are seeing the leadership exhibited all across the country with 20 States that have stepped up, and as I mentioned, six red States already this year.

Now is the time for Congress to do its job. In fact, if we do our job, taking the solution that has been thoroughly vetted, studied, and widely supported by interest groups across the political spectrum, we are going to be able to solve this funding conundrum.

We will be able to rebuild and renew America, putting hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs, while Congress helps make our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

I strongly urge that the House reject the approach that would simply dodge this problem for 2 more months, then slide to the end of the year and beyond. We should call the question now, establish the parameters.

This is something that is long overdue, that all of us can embrace, and America will be the better for it.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the challenges we face today are different from the challenges we faced when Mental Health Awareness Month began decades ago, but now, it is more important than ever that we take time out of our busy schedules to speak about the prevalence of mental illness and understand the importance, as friends, as family members, and as a community, of discussing the common signs of mental illness.

Mr. Speaker, you may be surprised to learn, as I was, that 1 in 5 adults experience mental health problems each year; and, while each illness is unique, there are some common signs that you or a loved one could be suffering from mental illness, like difficulty concentrating or experiencing a change in sleeping habits.

As parents, we must make an effort to talk to our children about their emotions and their mental health, just as we care for our children's physical health, by encouraging them to eat well, get enough sleep, and exercise frequently.

Without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, America is one of the most blessed countries in the world. We are all offered the opportunities for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Raising healthy families, both physically and mentally, is one of the responsibilities that comes with those freedoms.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the more voices we have speaking up about mental health, the better we can eliminate stigma surrounding mental health conditions. The National Alliance on Mental Illness of North Carolina is asking individuals in my home State, North Carolina, to see the person and not the illness and pledge to be stigma-free.

It is time to end the silence and stigma often linked with mental health conditions, and I join them happily in this effort.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF B.B. KING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, B.B. King, a musical genius, has passed away.

When B.B. King was just a little boy down in Indianola, Mississippi, he stood up in the middle of a cotton field, and he said:

> One day, somebody is going to stand up and sing about me and play the guitar about me.

Then he said:

> You know, I reckon it will be myself. Yeah, I reckon it will be me.

B.B. King went on to become a worldwide icon of music; and people all over the world, regardless of race, creed, or color, appreciated and loved B.B. King. B.B. King influenced all the great ones, from Frank Sinatra to Elvis Presley; and Elvis Presley loved B.B. King.

Aretha Franklin, Sam Cook, Eric Clapton, Mick Jagger, even the Beatles and Muddy Waters, Bo Diddley, all of these musical legends were influenced by B.B. King.

□ 1015

B.B. King sung about the deep things of life. He sung about love—love lost and love gained. B.B. King sang, and he played the blues. A unique American cultural, musical genre, B.B. King.

Ladies and gentlemen, you know, B.B. King would say:

> Trouble in mind, I'm blue
> But I won't be blue always
> 'Cause I know the sun's gonna shine in my back door someday
> I am all alone at midnight, and the lights are burning low
> But the sun's gonna shine in my back door someday.

Mr. Speaker, the great classic of so many classics that he wrote and he sang was ''The Thrill is Gone.'' As he would say, ''The thrill is gone away.'' But, Mr. Speaker, the thrill of B.B. King and his life and his music and his great contributions as a genuine American hero will live on and on for generations to come. B.B. King's music will live on, and Lucille, his guitar, will live on.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, we thank God, Jehovah God Almighty, for sending B.B. King our way.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, a large and respected Iranian expatriate community has settled in California, and it has been my privilege to get to know some of them in recent years. They are part of an international diaspora of 5 million people who fled Iran after it fell to Islamic fascism 36 years ago. The stories they tell are bloodcurdling.

One woman told of her cousin who had been rounded up in an antigovernment demonstration and taken to prison. After several years, the families were informed that their loved ones were to be released in the town square. When the excited families arrived for their long-awaited reunion, their sons were hanged before their eyes.

A doctor told me of his college days in Paris. He called home to tell his brother in Tehran of an anti-Khomeini demonstration. His brother was promptly arrested, tortured, and imprisoned for simply listening.

Now, a few months ago, after many years of silence, the brother in America received a call from his brother in Iran who wanted to tell him of the simmering unrest going on throughout that country. The American brother told him to shut up, to remember what happened the last time they had spoken so candidly. His brother in Tehran said: ''I don't care anymore. They can't arrest all of us.''

All of the Iranian expatriates I spoke with tell me the same thing: the economic sanctions and international isolation of the regime were bringing Iran to the brink of revolution.

And this brings us to the President's negotiation with Iran's fascist Islamic regime. Any agreement between Iran's leaders and the United States is meaningless because Iran's leaders' word is meaningless. Iran's government is a notoriously untrustworthy rogue state that has made it unmistakably clear that it intends to acquire nuclear weapons and, once acquired, to use them. The only way to avert this nightmare, short of war, is for the regime to collapse from within.

Over the last several years, the Iranian opposition has grown dramatically for two reasons: there is a strong and growing perception among the Iranian people that the Iranian dictatorship is a pariah in the international community, and the resulting international economic sanctions have created conditions that make the regime's overthrow imperative.

At precisely this moment in history, Barack Obama did incalculable damage by initiating these negotiations. By engaging this rogue state, President Obama has given it international recognition and legitimacy at just that moment when it had lost legitimacy in the eyes of its own people. Worse, by promising relief from economic sanctions, he has removed the most compelling reason the organized Iranian resistance had to justify the regime's overthrow.

It is not the outcome of the negotiations that matters because any agreement with Iran's conniving leaders is meaningless. It is the negotiations, themselves, that have greatly strengthened the regime, just when it was most vulnerable from growing opposition among its own people.

Now, the House just passed H.R. 1191 that purports to restore congressional oversight to these talks. I believe it completely missed the point.

First, our Constitution requires that any treaty be approved by two-thirds of the Senate. Well, that wasn't going to happen, so Mr. Obama simply redefined the prospective treaty as an agreement between leaders, an agreement with no force of law and no legal standing.

I fear the Congress has just changed this equation by establishing a wholly extra-constitutional process that lends the imprimatur of Congress to these negotiations with no practical way to stop the lifting of sanctions. Instead of two-thirds of the Senate having to approve a treaty, as the Constitution requires, this agreement takes effect automatically unless two-thirds of both Houses reject it—a complete sham.

But worse, I fear this bill gives tacit approval to extremely harmful negotiations that Congress, instead, ought to vigorously condemn and unambiguously repudiate.

We can only hope that in the days ahead what Churchill called ''the parliamentary democracies'' will regain the national leadership required to prevent these negotiations from producing what amounts to the Munich accords for the Middle East. That will require treating the Iranian dictatorship as the international pariah that it is, and it will require providing every ounce of moral and material support to the Iranian opposition that they need to rid their Nation of this fascist Islamic dictatorship, to restore their proud heritage, and to retake their place among the civilized nations of the world.

POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once said that ''action speaks louder than words but not nearly as often.''

Since last week's tragic Amtrak accident, we have heard plenty of words about the need for stronger rail safety measures and investments in our infrastructure, but it is time for Congress to back up these words with action. It is time for Congress to put its money where its mouth is.

We know how to prevent tragic accidents like the one that happened on Amtrak last week. We even mandated new technology called positive train control that would have prevented it. But what Congress has refused to do is to pay to actually get it done.

Positive train control is a game-changer for rail safety. The technology would have likely prevented 140 train accidents that have caused more than 280 deaths and $300 million in property damage since 1969. But this safety technology is also incredibly complex and expensive to implement. We have mandated technology that is expected to cost billions, and we are forcing the Nation's railroads to foot the entire bill.

Much of this last week's focus has been on Amtrak, but despite last week's accident, Amtrak is actually on target to implement positive train control by the end of the year.

For the already cash-strapped commuter railroads around the country, it is a completely different story. For them, Congress' refusal to fund positive train control has pretty much stopped implementation in its tracks. Expected to cost commuter railroads nearly $3.5 billion, it is no wonder that over 70 percent of commuter railroads won't achieve positive train control implementation before this year's deadline.

Our commuter railroads are integral to the daily commute of millions of Americans. In fact, Amtrak's annual ridership pales in comparison to our Nation's commuter railroads. While Amtrak carries 30 million riders a year, commuter railroads carry close to 500 million.

In the Chicago area alone, Metra's ridership last year was over 80 million. With numbers like that, how can Congress justify mandating a policy that they know commuter railroads simply cannot afford while providing very little funding to help them do it?

This unfunded mandate is forcing commuter rails to sacrifice other investments that are crucial to railroad safety and efficiency. Fifty percent of commuter railroads are currently deferring other capital investments to implement positive train control.

And what happens when the commuters aren't able to implement this technology before the end of this year? They get penalized—fined. Instead of giving money to the commuters to pay for PTC, the Federal Government is actually going to end up collecting money from them for not being able to afford to do so.

For good reason, Congress mandated incredibly important and incredibly expensive new technology. But it has amounted to a lot of words and very little action.

The same 2008 law that mandated PTC also authorized $50 million a year in rail safety technology grants to help Amtrak and commuter railroads pay for this implementation, but in the 7 years since the law was passed, Congress has only appropriated funding once.

Mr. Speaker, $50 million a year wasn't enough then, and it is sure not enough now. That is why I introduced a bill with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) in March to reauthorize PTC funding at $200 million a year.

It is time for Congress to finish what it started. It is time for Congress to get serious about investing in our Nation's transportation infrastructure. And it is time for Congress to help our commuter railroads implement positive train control and prevent the kind of tragedies that we saw on Amtrak last week.

RECOGNIZING MAX DEMBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Max Demby. Mr. Demby is a former congressional intern from my office, a University of Colorado senior, and an outstanding young man of character who was recently recognized by his community and local police for an act of heroism when he stopped a sexual assault in progress on his school campus.

Mr. Demby, who is from Cortez, Colorado, is a dedicated student, pursuing a degree in accounting at CU. He fills his time outside of the classroom with extracurricular activities such as internships and also works as a Ralphie handler at CU, which involves helping to manage the school mascot.

Late one evening, Mr. Demby was walking on campus when he happened to come across what looked to be an attempted sexual assault. Acting with bravery and determination, Mr. Demby took action and ran off the attacker.

Referencing the confrontation with the attacker, Mr. Demby humbly stated: ''I was able to be in the right place at the right time and do the right thing.'' By intervening, Max put himself in harm's way to help the victim, and his act of selflessness drastically reduced the irreparable damage that the criminal was intent on causing.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Demby's selfless act should not go unnoticed. He serves as an admirable example of what young men of character should be. By putting others before himself and by intervening to stop a crime without hesitation, he made his community and campus a safer place.

On behalf of the Third Congressional District and the State of Colorado, I would like to thank Mr. Demby for his selfless act of bravery.

HUNGER AMONG SENIORS GROWING IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of March, I had the privilege of spending some time with the Highland Valley Elder Services' Meals on Wheels program in Northampton, Massachusetts, as part of their ''March for Meals Month'' to raise awareness about senior hunger.

I began my visit in the kitchen at the Walter Salvo Elder House, where an average of 550 healthy meals are prepared from scratch every weekday for delivery to homebound seniors and disabled residents of Hampshire County.

I had the opportunity to chat with Highland Valley director Allan Ouimet and nutrition program director Nancy Mathers. Then I helped volunteer driver Arthur Mongeon pack up the day's meals in insulated coolers to keep the food hot. This day's meal was homemade chicken covered in gravy, mashed potatoes, green beans, cranberry sauce, applesauce, and milk. The food looked and smelled delicious and reminded me of what my grandmother used to make.

I joined Arthur on his normal N1 route, making stops at 15 homes in Northampton. At each stop, I had the opportunity to deliver the meal and chat with the residents. It was an eye-opening experience, and I thoroughly enjoyed hearing people's stories.

Each meal delivered contains one-third of the daily nutritional recommendations. For many individuals, the meal they receive from Meals on Wheels is the only well-balanced meal they eat all day.

□ 1030

The individuals who receive these meals are low-income and often have significant health challenges that make it simply too difficult to prepare a full meal, never mind going out to the grocery store to shop.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting things I learned from my visit is that Meals on Wheels is so much more than just a meals program. People who are homebound—many, who live alone—look forward to the brief, daily visits from the volunteers. These visits lift their spirits and allow them to socialize, and volunteers can check in and see how they are doing. Because of programs like Meals on Wheels, seniors can stay in their own homes where they are most comfortable and live independently longer.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about food insecurity in this country, nearly everybody talks about children, and we are right to want to do everything we can to end childhood hunger. But lost in that narrative is the reality that, among the food insecure, the rising population is seniors. One in twelve seniors in our country is faced with the reality of hunger. That is 5.3 million seniors who don't have enough to eat. Many are living on fixed incomes that often force them to choose between prescriptions and food—or paying their medical bills or heating their homes.

Seniors and the disabled represent about 20 percent of those who receive Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, benefits. The average SNAP benefit for households with seniors is a meager $134 per month. Unfortunately, we also know that eligible elderly households are much less likely to participate in SNAP than other eligible households. Many seniors may not realize that they qualify for assistance, or they may simply be reluctant to ask for help.

Seniors have unique nutritional needs. Hunger is especially dangerous for seniors and can exacerbate underlying medical conditions. Food-insecure seniors are at increased risk for conditions like depression, heart attack, diabetes, and high blood pressure.

Mr. Speaker, May is Older Americans Month, and national organizations like Feeding America, the nationwide network of food banks, are focused on raising awareness about senior hunger through their #solveseniorhunger social media campaign.

In July, we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Older Americans Act, which provides a range of critical services, including Meals on Wheels, that enable about 11 million older adults to stay independent as long as possible. To honor that significant anniversary, I hope that Congress will pass a strong reauthorization of OAA programs, which have been flat-funded over the past decade and without a long-term authorization since 2011. Demand for OAA programs and services continues to rapidly increase as our population ages, and to think that more and more seniors will experience hunger is heartbreaking. It is unacceptable in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the wonderful people and the work that they do at Highland Valley Elder Services throughout western Massachusetts. Every day they are making the lives of seniors a little better and a little brighter. We in Congress should do our part to ensure that our Nation's seniors don't go hungry. We should pass a strong reauthorization of the Older Americans Act and adequately fund programs like Meals on Wheels, and we should reject harmful cuts to SNAP that will disproportionately harm the most vulnerable among us: children, seniors, and the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, we should urge the White House to hold a White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Hunger to come up with a comprehensive plan to end hunger once and for all in this country. We can and we should end hunger now.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an issue that is coming upon us very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, many people across the Nation have talked about Social Security and Medicare and the trust funds going bankrupt for the retirement fund and Medicare sometime in 2033, 2034, but, Mr. Speaker, there is a more impending crisis coming down upon us. The Social Security disability trust fund is scheduled to go insolvent in 2016. That means, if we do nothing, what is going to happen in 2016 is millions of Americans across this Nation who receive those lifesaving disability benefits monthly will see a reduction in their benefits to the tune of 20 to 21 percent. That is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Two years ago, as I serve on the Ways and Means Committee, I had an opportunity to question our Treasury Secretary, Jack Lew. I asked him the question 2 years ago: You know this crisis is on the horizon. I have read your testimony to this committee of Ways and Means, and I read the entire President's budget.

I said: Nowhere in there is a solution or a reference to this impending crisis. What is the solution the White House is offering?

Simply, what they propose is they are going to take the portion of our payroll taxes that goes to Social Security retirement that is paid by future

retirees and use the $270 billion necessary to bail out the disability trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I had a private business. If you talk to any small-business owner across America, what they will tell you that is, it is robbing Peter to pay Paul because the Social Security retirement trust fund is on that same path to insolvency in 2033. So why would you take from one and use it to bail out another when both programs are in dire straits? So, Mr. Speaker, I said to Jack Lew this year, when I had an opportunity to question him, that is unacceptable. We need to do better not only in order to protect the Social Security retirees, who are near and dear to me, but also to those in the disability community that rely on these benefits.

The disability trust fund hasn't been reformed for decades. I care about those individuals deeply. And when I see disabled folks coming in to my office, as I have reached out to stakeholder groups and had conversations, what they tell me is they have a disability trust fund program that essentially penalizes them for trying to go back to work. That doesn't make sense.

We should be standing with the disability community if they have a capacity, a willingness, and a desire to go back to work. Our policies here in Washington, D.C., should say we are going to stand with you, we are going to encourage you, and we are going to applaud you, not penalize you, for doing that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that this crisis needs to be dealt with. It is time to lead. What we are looking for is input from across the country on ideas on how we can reform the disability trust fund, protect our Social Security retirees to the extent that we possibly can, and make sure that we have a disability trust fund that is designed and performing in the 21st century, a trust fund that says to the disabled community, we are with you, we are going to stand next to you, and we are going to give you the resources you need in order to live a great and fruitful life. At the same time we are going to look at our Social Security retirees and say to them, ''We are going to protect you.''

If we can't fix this crisis coming upon us in 2016, Mr. Speaker, then how in God's name can we fix the crises of Medicare and Social Security that are coming upon us in 2033 and thereabouts? There are millions of Americans that deserve a better answer than kicking the can down the road. Mr. Speaker, it is time to lead, and I rise today to ask all my colleagues to join me in that leadership role.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Gregory Goethals, S.J., Loyola High School, Los Angeles, California, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come today to this holy Chamber of democracy conscious of our great gifts and conscious of the great people for whom we use these gifts in service.

Come to us. Remain with us. Enlighten our hearts. Give us courage and strength to know Your will, to make it our own, and to live it in our own lives.

Enable us to uphold the rights of others, and never let us be misled by ignorance or corrupted by fear and favor. Unite us in the bond of Your unconditional love, and keep us faithful to all that is true.

May we always temper justice with Your love so that our decisions are pleasing to You and earn for us the reward promised to all of Your good and faithful servants.

And we ask this in the name of your Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND GREGORY GOETHALS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Father Gregory Goethals, a member of the Society of Jesus and the president of Loyola High School in Los Angeles, to the United States House of Representatives. We thank him for delivering today's opening prayer.

Father Goethals is one of Los Angeles' finest public servants. He has dedicated his life to educating our country's next generation of leaders. Loyola High School, an all-boys school in the Pico Union area of Los Angeles, ranks as one of the finest institutions of secondary education in America.

At Loyola, under Father Goethals, young men are motivated to become ''educated'' in the full sense of the word. Not only do students at Loyola go on to complete college at the finest universities in America, but they graduate Loyola having donated more than 1.5 million hours of community service to inner city schools and neighborhoods over the past 25 years.

This year, Loyola High School will celebrate its 150th anniversary, making it the oldest continually operated educational institution in southern California. Under the visionary stewardship of Father Goethals, Loyola is poised to graduate yet another era of American heroes and leaders.

For that, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me to applaud Father Gregory Goethals for his dedication to his faith and to our leaders of tomorrow. We will remember his words of prayer this morning.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Foreign Affairs:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: With my appointment to the House Financial Services Committee, I hereby resign from the House Agriculture Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee. It has been an honor to serve on both.

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

TOM EMMER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the Committee on Homeland Security.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MEEHAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 272

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Emmer of Minnesota.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Donovan.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Donovan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DISTINGUISHED EAGLE SCOUT AWARD

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this evening I will have the honor and the privilege of presenting the national Eagle Scout Association's Distinguished Eagle Scout Award to Mr. John Graham, president and CEO of the American Society of Association Executives.

The Distinguished Eagle Scout Award was established in 1969 to acknowledge Eagle Scouts who have received extraordinary national-level recognition or eminence within their field and have a strong record of voluntary service to the community.

Mr. Speaker, of the over 100 million Scouting alumni over the last century, less than 4 percent attain the rank of Eagle, and of these Eagles, only 1 in 1,000 will be awarded the Distinguished Eagle Scout honor. Renowned Distinguished Eagle Scouts include the president of the Boy Scouts of America, Secretary Bob Gates, Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer, President Gerald Ford, astronaut Neil Armstrong, and director Steven Spielberg.

As a fellow Distinguished Eagle Scout, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. John Graham on receiving this prestigious award.

SUPPORTING A LONG-TERM SOLUTION TO OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE CRISIS

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, for months we have been calling for a long-term surface transportation bill to replace the one that expires at the end of this month.

In recent weeks, I have joined many of my colleagues as we counted down the days left for Congress to act. Without a funding solution, the jobs of over 600,000 American workers are at risk. The gas tax, by the way, hasn't been raised in 20 years and is no longer sufficient to pay for repairs to dangerous roads, highways, bridges, and rail lines needed to protect Americans.

We are being asked to vote this week on a bandaid approach that only runs to July instead of a real solution to this infrastructure crisis. This is often what happens here, but it is not the best way to govern. States and local transit agencies need this certainty that long-term funding will be available as they make important decisions about construction projects to meet our needs well into the future.

Let's pass a long-term transportation bill now.

CONGRATULATING TOYOTA MOTOR MANUFACTURING IN PRINCETON, INDIANA

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a manufacturer in Indiana on a tremendous milestone for not just the company, but our communities in southern Indiana. Just this month, Toyota Manufacturing in Princeton, Indiana, impressively surpassed 5,000 employees, and the plant plans to add an additional 300 positions by the end of next year.

Mr. Speaker, these are good-paying jobs that support our families and our local economy. In addition to the workforce growth, the plant recently celebrated the production of its 4 millionth vehicle, which is a testament to the best workforce in America.

These dedicated hard-working men and women are making topnotch products in Indiana that are being shipped across the country and around the world.

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure investment can be an economic game changer. In western New York, the Federal highway bill funded the reconstruction of Fuhrman Boulevard, which reconnected our community with its waterfront, resulting in new private sector investment.

From Filmore Avenue and Ohio Street in Buffalo to Main Street in Williamsville, the Robert Moses Parkway in Niagara Falls, and Kenmore Avenue in Tonawanda, tens of millions of Federal dollars are contributing to transformative projects in our community. The construction of these projects has economic benefits as well. 660,000 jobs depend on Federal road and transit investment. Yet today, the House will extend, for just 2 months, the Federal transportation program that is weak and inadequate. We can do much better.

America needs a long-term bill that provides funding. We need to create jobs and bring our infrastructure to a state of good repair.

Last week, I introduced the Nation Building Here at Home Act to do just that. Congress should be humbled that it has allowed our infrastructure to fall into such disrepair, and we should use these 2 months to pass a long-term bill that America needs.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to observe Mental Health Awareness Month.

Approximately one in five Americans have a mental illness. That is roughly 43 million Americans. These invisible wounds are just as serious as physical ones, and it is vital we understand the health care needs of individuals living with mental illnesses.

Race, sex, age, gender—mental illnesses do not discriminate.

Many of the Americans who suffer from PTS and TBI are our veterans, our true heroes. As vice chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am familiar with their struggle. This is why I introduced the COVER Act,

which recently passed in the Veterans' Affairs Health Subcommittee and which gives veterans choices to seek alternative therapies and treatments for PTS and TBI.

As we observe Mental Health Awareness Month, let us all remember: these invisible wounds deserve our attention as much as the physical ones.

SAM HOUSTON HIGH SCHOOL SOCCER TEAM

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Sam Houston Texans on their soccer team and their hard-fought journey to the 6A University Interscholastic League semifinals. These 25 young men not only demonstrated their athletic talent but exemplified the teamwork and perseverance needed to complete a successful season.

I also want to congratulate Samuel Huerta, Rene Benitez, and Eddy Rodriguez of the Sam Houston High soccer team for being named to the first team 6A all-State team.

The young men of Sam Houston High School's soccer team continue a tradition of success through hard work, determination, and pride. I am proud to represent Arlington Independent School District and Sam Houston High.

To all the coaches, parents, teachers, and students of Sam Houston High School, congratulations on this incredible athletic accomplishment. You have made north Texas proud.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

(Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great support of S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

Today marks a significant milestone in the fight against human trafficking, and I am honored to see my amendment adopted into this legislation.

Having served as a nurse, I recognize that members of the medical community are the only outside aid to have direct contact with trafficking victims. Mr. Speaker, my amendment will educate and train health care professionals on proper techniques in order to better administer care. But, more importantly, it empowers members of the medical community so they can intervene on behalf of those being trafficked.

It has been an honor to work with my colleagues on this pivotal piece of legislation, and I am thrilled to see this legislation and my amendment move to the President's desk to be signed into law.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there are only 2 legislative days left until the highway trust fund expires on May 31, and we do not have time to waste. Across the country, 6,000 critical construction jobs are in jeopardy, and 660,000 good-paying construction jobs are hanging in the balance.

In Michigan, we know how desperately this funding is needed. Seventeen percent of our roads are rated in good shape—only 17 percent; 38 percent of our roads are in poor, some dangerous—not fair, but poor, condition. It is unacceptable.

We must work together to find a long-term solution to repair our roads, bridges, and transit. Today our Republican colleagues have introduced a plan that just kicks it down the road again. This must be the last time. Funding the highway trust fund is about this Nation's future. It is about our competitiveness. It is about providing businesses and local and State governments the certainty that they need, and it is about good-paying jobs for working families.

It is time to end this culture of crisis and bring to the floor a long-term, sustainable solution to authorize the highway trust fund.

□ 1215

HOPEFULLY THE PRESIDENT CHANGES COURSE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the President's decision to target Abu Sayyaf where Special Operations Forces heroically carried out a successful mission. I hope this is a change of course where the President takes action to stop further attacks on American families for a strategy of victory.

Sadly, the same day, ISIL murderers seized the Anbar capital of Ramadi, holding one-third of Iraq, revealing the President's failure to negotiate a Status of Forces Agreement. This follows the mass murder of Muslim pilgrims in Karachi, Pakistan, and Egyptian Christians in Libya. Radical Islamic attacks are increasing worldwide with the murder of Jews in Paris, the killing of troops at Fort Hood, and the stabbing in London.

Incredibly, the President continues negotiations with the murderous ideology of Tehran while they continue development of intercontinental ballistic missiles to fulfill their goal of death to America, death to Israel. Hopefully, the President will divert policies to establish a legacy of peace through strength. The President can avoid a legacy of continued attacks by terrorists who have declared war on the American people.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

COMMEMORATING THE HONORABLE SERVICE OF WARREN JACKSON AND ROY DUMONT

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the honorable service of Mr. Warren Jackson and Mr. Roy Dumont, both who bravely fought in the United States Army in World War II. Both gentlemen, who are from my hometown of Flint, Michigan, are in Washington today to visit the World War II Memorial and to pay their respects to their fellow men and women in uniform who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Jackson served honorably in the 3758th Quartermaster Truck Company throughout World War II and retired from the 41st Artillery in 1966. Mr. Dumont served honorably in the 87th Infantry Division, the Golden Acorns, from 1942 through 1945. These men risked their lives to defend freedoms that we cherish and often take for granted as Americans, and our country is and should be forever grateful to them for their service.

Mr. Jackson and Mr. Dumont, on behalf of the people of the Fifth Congressional District and on behalf of the entire 114th Congress, I thank you for wearing the uniform of the United States and defending this great Nation. You will forever have our lasting gratitude.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND OPEN MARKETS: KEYS TO A HEALTHY AND GROWING ECONOMY

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, policies that support free enterprise and open markets are the key to building a strong economy. Texas is a prime example.

For the 11th year in a row, Texas has been ranked by Chief Executive magazine as the number one State to relocate your business to; and for more than 20 years straight, Texas job creation has outpaced the rest of the country by a factor of 2 to 1.

Behind this lasting success are policies that have enhanced economic agreement and allowed Texas-made goods to be sold at markets across the world. It is no surprise Texas has also led the Nation in exports for the last 13 years running.

Allowing free enterprise and open markets to thrive has fueled decades of Texas growth. It has also created millions of good-paying jobs for Texas families. Let's build on these successful free market policies and bring lasting strength to our American economy.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, from city halls to the Halls of Congress, there is universal agreement that our national infrastructure, once the envy of the world, is eroding around us. It is eroding from simple political inattention and inaction.

We must stop short-term fixes for our long-term infrastructure. We must develop a sustainable funding solution to repair, to restore, and to upgrade our infrastructure.

The remaining question is: How do we solve it here and now? Are we going to do a responsible, long-term funding solution or are we just going to kick the can down the road? Are we going to wait for more bridges to collapse, for trains to derail, and more roads to fall into gridlock?

Mr. Speaker, we must come together to solve this problem. The safety of every American, the efficiency of every business, and the momentum of our national economy depend on us and are at risk.

HONORING FIRE CHIEF BILL MUND OF THE CITY OF ST. CLOUD, MINNESOTA

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Chief Bill Mund, who retires this week after more than a decade as fire chief of the City of St. Cloud, Minnesota.

Chief Mund is a St. Cloud boy through and through. He not only grew up in the Granite City, but after graduating from Apollo High School in 1977 and serving in the United States Navy, he returned to his hometown. He has dedicated his career to his hometown community, joining the St. Cloud Fire Department 32 years ago.

Before becoming St. Cloud's fire chief, he was the assistant chief to his predecessor, Mike Holman. Now as chief, he has overseen five fire stations and 63 firefighters that respond to approximately 4,000 incidents each year.

Thank you for all you have done for the St. Cloud community, Chief Mund. Enjoy your retirement. You deserve it.

HONORING AND REMEMBERING SIX HEROIC UNITED STATES MARINES

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember six heroic United States marines who died last week serving our country during a humanitarian lifesaving mission halfway around the world. They were killed in a tragic helicopter crash in Nepal as they delivered badly needed supplies to that nation's suffering earthquake victims.

Among the six are two men with close ties to Nebraska. One of the helicopter's decorated pilots, 29-year-old Captain Dustin Lukasiewicz, grew up in Wilcox, Nebraska. Prior to serving in Nepal, he was deployed in Afghanistan. Captain Lukasiewicz leaves behind his wife, Ashley, and one daughter. Ashley is also pregnant and due to deliver next month.

Twenty-two-year-old Lance Corporal Jacob Hug, a decorated combat videographer from Arizona, leaves behind several family members and close friends who live in Omaha and neighboring Council Bluffs, Iowa. Corporal Hug was capturing images of the Marine Corps' relief efforts in Nepal. Prior to deploying to Nepal, Corporal Hug filmed and photographed marines from South Korea, Thailand, Australia, Japan, Guam, and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in keeping these brave, selfless individuals and their families in your thoughts and prayers.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL R. MARTIN UMBARGER OF THE INDIANA NATIONAL GUARD

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Hoosier, a true patriot, and my friend, Major General R. Martin Umbarger of the Indiana National Guard. He is retiring at the end of this month.

General Umbarger started his career in public service as an enlisted soldier in the Indiana Army National Guard in 1969. Over the next three decades, Marty rose through the ranks and stood out as a remarkable leader. In 2004, then-Governor Mitch Daniels appointed him Adjutant General of the State of Indiana, where he served as the highest ranking military officer in our great State's National Guard for more than 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, General Umbarger is a true Hoosier hero. His shoes will be big ones to fill.

Best of luck in your retirement, sir, and thank you for your incredible service to our State and our Nation.

DEFERRED ACTION FOR PARENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY APPLICATIONS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, today the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement was supposed to begin accepting Deferred Action for Parental Accountability, or DAPA, applications. It was to be a day of hope, not disappointment, for millions of families across the country. But because of a politically motivated decision by a Texas judge, implementation has been halted. Now 17,000 hard-working men and women in Clark County, Nevada, must wait for relief in fear of being torn from their families.

Mr. Speaker, Nevada is the State with the largest share of undocumented immigrants in its total population—210,000 people, or 7.6 percent, and that is equal to 10.2 percent of our workforce. They are our colleagues, our neighbors, our classmates, and our friends, and they play a vital role in the success of our community.

Congress needs to pass comprehensive immigration reform so families across the country and in Nevada can come out of the shadows, legally work, go to school, and contribute to the only community they call home.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I realize, like my friends across the aisle, that we find ourselves in a crisis situation of our own making. The Federal highway trust fund is set to run out of money, and with our current infrastructure needs, the fund's moneys are simply not enough. But instead of addressing the issue during the last several Congresses, short-term fixes have been passed, and Congress has kicked the can down the road. We need more than rhetoric on the importance of infrastructure. We need solutions.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I will introduce the Prioritizing American Roads and Jobs Act. This bill will roll back 100 percent Medicaid expansion reimbursement rates to be equal to traditional Medicaid rates, with the savings transferring to the highway trust fund. This bill will add $15 billion a year to the trust fund and put it back on the path to financial stability for the long term, while freeing up $150 billion for deficit reduction over the next 10 years.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of continuing investments in early childhood education.

Yesterday marked the 50th anniversary launch of Head Start. Head Start programs give students an opportunity to start out strong and help to close the achievement gap that plagues many low-income communities.

As a mother, grandmother, and retired educator, I recognize that early education provides students with the resources they need in the most critical learning years. More than 27 percent of the people in my district live below the poverty line. Students in low-income families have obvious disadvantages that are exacerbated when they arrive in kindergarten less prepared than their peers.

More than 3,000 children in my district benefit from Head Start programs. These programs give many children the jump-start and the confidence they need. Research shows that children enrolled in high-quality education programs are more likely to graduate from high school, go to college, and secure high-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, an investment in early education is an investment in our future. I will continue fighting for early learning initiatives and commonsense education reform that prepare all of our students to succeed, and I call on my colleagues to do the same.

COMMENDING CADET JONATHAN CHASE STRICKLAND

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend Cadet Jonathan Chase Strickland of the University of North Georgia Corps of Cadets for being selected as the top ROTC cadet in the Nation. Cadet Strickland was also selected as the United States Army Cadet Command's Cadet of the Year for 2015.

Mr. Speaker, Chase was selected out of 5,617 Army ROTC cadets across the Nation based on outstanding performance in physical fitness, campus leadership, and academic record. A factor in his selection was his successful completion of the Army's Leadership Development and Assessment Course.

Chase is a native of Gainesville, Georgia, attended North Hall High School, and will graduate this spring from my alma mater, the University of North Georgia, with a degree in international affairs. He will be commissioned into the Army as a 2nd lieutenant in military intelligence. He plans on attending the Infantry Officer Leadership School at Fort Benning and the Ranger School.

After watching Chase grow up, knowing his father and his grandfather and his fine family, it is not surprising that he rose to the top. Please join me in congratulating Cadet Strickland on this truly great accomplishment, and wish him the very best and a successful career of service to our country.

□ 1230

CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today should have been a great day of celebration of hope and relief for the millions of hard-working immigrant families across the country who would be able to register for the expanded DACA and DAPA programs.

DACA's expansion and the new DAPA program would provide welcome relief to thousands of hard-working immigrant families, allowing them to pay a fine, register, get right with the law, and work legally. Unfortunately, they sit in limbo while they wait for a judge to decide the fate of the DACA and DAPA programs.

It should be incumbent on any politician who seeks to thwart or undermine these programs to propose a legislative solution through Congress. That is everybody's first choice. Only Congress can provide a pathway to citizenship. Only Congress can permanently replace our broken immigration system with one that works, one that restores the rule of law, one that secures our border, and one that provides a pathway to citizenship.

I hope the fifth circuit will rule on the side of justice and the rule of law by lifting the injunction; but no matter what happens, this judicial mess is just further proof of Congress' failure to act.

I call upon Congress to address our broken immigration system and move forward with restoring the rule of law.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 19, 2015 at 9:30 am.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 43.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 19, 2015 at 11:27 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2252.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1806, AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2250, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2353, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 271

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1806) to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-15. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report,

may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, H. Res. 271, providing for consideration of three important bills.

This rule provides for consideration of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 and the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2016 under structured rules, and the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015 under a closed rule. It is important to note that this combined rule allows for separate consideration of each bill. This House will separately debate and consider these important issues.

The Legislative Branch Appropriations bill is traditionally considered under a structured amendment process, and that practice is continued today.

The America COMPETES Act makes a dozen amendments in order, with more than half—eight amendments—coming from Democratic sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1806 is a fiscally responsible proscience bill that reauthorizes civilian research programs at the Department of Energy, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The bill keeps our Nation competitive on the global stage and works to refocus the Federal Government's primary scientific role to fund basic research. This reprioritization of basic research will help ensure future U.S. economic competitiveness and security and will spur additional private sector technological innovation, which is crucial to the United States remaining a world leader in scientific and technological advances.

This bill keeps overall funding for these programs equal to the fiscal year 2015 appropriated levels and is consistent with the caps set by the Budget Control Act, prioritizing taxpayer investment in basic research without increasing overall Federal spending.

The emphasis this legislation places on Federal investment and research in the physical sciences and engineering helps to develop and advance knowledge and technologies used in fields by scientists who are dedicated to improving the lives of all Americans.

I have seen firsthand the importance of these investments while visiting the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, one of our 17 national labs, which I am proud to represent in my district, Washington's Fourth District.

The work being done at PNNL and at the national labs and research universities all across the country is critical to our country's future, and the prioritizations and reforms on this bill will enhance the work being done to the benefit of all Americans.

Additionally, H.R. 1806 reduces by $1 billion the administration's large and unjustified program, such as late stage commercialization, which picks winners and losers that compete with the private sector.

We must be responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars, and this legislation will prevent duplicative and wasteful research activities by requiring the Department of Energy to certify that the work being done is original and has not already been conducted by another Federal agency.

Overall, the America COMPETES Act will reestablish the priority of basic research in the core physical sciences and biology in the Nation's civilian science agencies. This bill sets the right priorities for our Nation's civilian research and will promote U.S. innovation, ingenuity, and competitiveness, all without increasing our national debt or deficit.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2250, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2016. This legislation provides funding for all operations of the United States House of Representatives, the U.S. Capitol complex, the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, and the many other agencies that are so important to the day-to-day functions of Congress.

H.R. 2250 provides the legislative branch with $3.3 billion in fiscal year 2016—the same amount as fiscal year 2014, as well as fiscal year 2015—continuing this Chamber's commitment to leading by example during these times of huge deficits and out-of-control debt.

The activities this bill funds are critical to the operations of the Capitol complex, which must be protected, cared for, and maintained. Visitors from my district in central Washington, as well as visitors from across the country and throughout the world, travel countless miles to visit this remarkable institution, which is a symbol of democracy and freedom for so many.

For these and many other reasons, we must ensure that the Capitol remains in this pristine condition and is able to withstand the test of time so that many future generations are able to visit this truly unique and historic place.

□ 1245

Finally, this rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015.

H.R. 2353 will extend the highway trust fund's expenditure authority for 2 months—from May 31 to July 31. It will also provide an extension for many important Federal highway and public transportation programs, such as the motor carrier and highway safety programs as well as the hazardous materials transportation program, through July 31.

Last August, Congress passed and the President signed the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, which was intended to provide enough funding for the highway trust fund to remain solvent through May 31 of this year. However, the funding is now lasting longer than was originally predicted, and this bill will extend the trust fund's expenditure authority so that transportation spending is able to continue through July while Congress works to find a solution that will ensure the trust fund remains solvent for years to come. A constructive dialogue in Congress is needed on this issue, one that will give States the certainty they need to build the roads, the bridges, and other infrastructure that our communities and our economy need to thrive in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule. I support its adoption, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills.

We should be celebrating today the start of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals expansion and the Deferred Action for Parents of American Citizens program that President Obama launched in light of the continued failure of this Congress to finally fix our broken immigration system. This Congress hasn't brought forth a single immigration bill, not secured our border, not ensured that employers follow our law and only employ legal American workers; but, rather, at every opportunity, it has sought to thwart the executive branch, doing what they can with the powers they have under our U.S. Constitution to restore the rule of law without the help of this body.

These three bills before us today are yet another way of kicking the ball down the road and refusing to address our broken immigration system, a problem that will continue to get worse until Congress steps up and solves it.

I hope that the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program's expansion, known as DACA—already a great success with additional success along the way with the new expansion—and the Deferred Action for Parents of American Citizens program, or DAPA, are soon unclogged by the courts to at least reduce the size of this sometimes insurmountable problem that Congress continues to refuse to tackle. That is the alternative.

If Congress continues to bring up three bills every week and if none of them are about border security and none of them are about immigration, do you know what? Instead of there being 10 million people here illegally, there are going to be 15 or 20 million here in 10 years. That is exactly where this Republican Congress is leading us—towards an America where, someday, there might be more people here illegally than there are here legally. Think about that, Mr. Speaker.

This first bill that we are considering before us today is not immigration reform. It is, instead, a 2-month extension of the current surface transportation authorization. Our transportation system is the lifeblood of our country. It dictates our ability to move and manage not only people but information, ideas, products, industries, commerce, jobs. By failing to pass a long-term transportation reauthorization, which will ensure the security of our highways and transit systems for more than 60 days, we are putting our Nation's economic lifeblood in jeopardy.

The second bill we will see before us today is not immigration reform. The second bill, instead, is a partisan attempt to inject the ideological priorities of my Republican colleagues into education and research, priorities that are opposed by the very titans of research for whom this bill is ostensibly designed. I will talk more about that in a moment.

Of the third bill before us today, I am hopeful. Is it immigration reform? I ask the gentleman from Washington: Is the third bill before us today immigration reform? I am happy to yield to the gentleman for an answer.

In reclaiming my time, he is speechless. He is speechless because he knows the truth: the third bill is not immigration reform. The third bill is actually the funding bill for the legislative branch of government. Maybe if the legislative branch of government were actually doing its job we would have an immigration reform bill before us; but, no, my colleague from Washington is speechless because he knows as well as I do that this is not immigration reform, that it is, instead, a funding bill for Members of Congress' salaries and the salaries of our staffs. I guess that is more important than securing our border. I guess that is more important to the Republicans than restoring the rule of law.

Let me get into these three bills.

The Surface Transportation Act would extend the authority of the government to fund our highways for 2 months—only for 2 months. What that means is we risk wasting $51 billion and, in jeopardizing that funding, risk over 660,000 jobs by failing to do a long-term authorization of the highway trust fund.

We all have an interest in this. Any one of us can talk about the importance of transportation in our districts. If you have ever been to Colorado, you will know that there is one major artery to get to our world-class ski facilities and unparalleled 14,000 peaks from the metro area—Highway 70. If you have ever taken it, particularly on a Friday, or have come back on a Sunday, you might very well have sat in your car at a dead stop. If you have been to Fort Collins, which is the largest city in my district and is home to one of our great universities, Colorado State University, you might have found similar circumstances around the long rush hour on Highway 25 north. Waiting 45 minutes in traffic to go 5 or 10 miles is something my constituents do every day—doubling, tripling, quadrupling their commuting time.

These stories aren't unique to Colorado. They aren't unique to my district. I will bet every Member of Congress can share the importance of transportation in their districts. That is why, ostensibly, every Member of Congress says, ''We want transportation. We support roads.''

There are no Republican roads and Democratic roads. There are roads. Yet, by continuing to fail to provide a long-term funding structure for them, we are playing games with the livelihoods of the American people, hurting our own economic lifeblood, wasting people's time as they are sitting in traffic, throwing into jeopardy the status of the jobs of contractors and subcontractors, and risking lives by continuing to repair our necessary bridges and infrastructure that have accumulated safety deficits. I urge my colleagues to consider the irresponsibility inherent in this punt.

I would also like to talk about the America COMPETES Act. Now, the original genesis of this bill, which was passed in 2007, was to help America compete in an increasingly global environment across the sciences and to ensure our innovative spirit.

My district is a hub for scientific research, and we are excited to have the University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado State University, NOAA, NREL, and NCAR. Research that is done in Colorado has ramifications and positive effects across the country, like our space weather lab in Boulder, which helps make sure that air traffic controllers and pilots have access to up-to-the-minute information about solar flares that could alter their trajectories in realtime.

This bill, instead of continuing the bipartisan legacy that the original COMPETES Act sets out or instead of replacing our broken immigration system with one that works for our country, seems to cherry-pick winners based on ideology and overturns the historic priorities of the bill. Why else would the dean of Research at CU-Boulder oppose this bill? Why else would our widely respected Secretary of Energy oppose this bill? Dozens of the largest scientific organizations and coalitions—this is supposed to be a science bill—are saying, ''Don't give us this bill. It will hurt science in our country.'' How does that even make any sense?

The efforts of the Republicans to hijack this legislation for ideological interests are utterly transparent. Scientists are saying, ''Go home Federal Government. Don't help us with this bill.'' Again, in yet another instance of Federal overreach, the Republicans are imposing their versions of science on those in the field who are doing work.

Finally, this rule brings forth H.R. 2250, also a bill that is not immigration reform. It does nothing to secure our border, but it does make sure that Members of Congress get paid. I am sure Republicans can go home happy about that. It makes sure our hard-working staff gets paid, the committees get paid, and the buildings get repaired.

No, I am not against those things. Those are fine things. If we had an all-volunteer legislature, we probably wouldn't have the fine caliber of statesmen we have tackling our national problems here today. But it is not immigration reform, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't secure our border, and it will only continue to increase the number of people who are here illegally in our country while Congress continues to punt and to undermine the efforts of the President to do what he can with the powers he has through DACA and DAPA, which were scheduled to start today.

I do want to point out that the underlying draft of this Legislative Branch Appropriations Act is another example of the failure to address many of the needs of our country. There was an effort by my colleague DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ to put forward an amendment to ensure that House cafeteria workers receive a living wage. You would think we would want to be an example of a model employer. I would hope that we, as custodians of the U.S. Capitol, would take some pride in that we are a model employer; we are a little microcosm of what employers should do, best practices. But there is a Senate employee who is homeless because, on the salary he gets, he can't even afford to rent here in Washington. People who work every day here in the Nation's Capital are living in poverty.

I think that we can do better as a model employer. If this were my company, I would take no pride in that. I would like to think that this is our company. It is the United States of America, and we are the board. Let's have employment policies that we as employers can be proud of.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and to, instead, bring to the floor immigration reform or better versions of these bills: a science bill that, maybe, scientists support, maybe; or a transportation bill that maybe funds our highways for more than 2 months so that people can plan. It is time we begin working for the American people, not against them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I share the gentleman from Colorado's opinion that the issue of immigration reform is huge, that it is one of the biggest issues facing this country today. I agree that we need to give it adequate debate and time and consideration; although, today is not the day.

Mr. Speaker, we recently heard from colleagues on the other side of the aisle that combining multiple bills in a single rule can lead to fragmented and confusing debate.

In an effort to refocus our debate today, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me time, and who is a former member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee himself.

H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, is a pro-science, fiscally responsible bill that sets America on a path to remain the world's leader in innovation. This bill reauthorizes civilian research programs at the National Science Foundation, at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, at the Department of Energy, and at the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Since January, the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee has held numerous hearings that have provided input into this bill. This includes budget hearings with the NSF Director, the Acting NIST Director, the Secretary of Energy, and the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. But our consideration of the provisions in this bill began long before last year.

In the last Congress, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee held numerous hearings on the topics addressed by this bill as well, and many of the provisions in the bill were debated during the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's consideration of the first act last Congress, which the Science, Space, and Technology Committee passed in May.

Title I of the bill reauthorizes the National Science Foundation for 2 years and provides a 4.3 percent increase for research and related activities. The bill prioritizes funding for the directors of biology, computer science, engineering, and mathematics and physical sciences, and it recognizes the need to make strategic investments in basic R&D for the U.S. to remain the global leader in science and innovation.

The bill reprioritizes research spending at the National Science Foundation by reducing funding for the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Directorate and Geosciences. The bill, instead, focuses funds on the physical sciences from which there are almost all of the scientific breakthroughs that drive new technology, new businesses, industries, and job creation and that spurs innovation.

Tight Federal budget constraints require all taxpayers' dollars to be spent on high-value science in the national interest. Unfortunately, the National Science Foundation has funded a number of projects that do not meet the highest standards of scientific merit—from climate change musicals, to evaluating animal photographs in National Geographic, to studying human-set fires in New Zealand in the 1800s—and there are dozens of other examples.

□ 1300

The bill ensures accountability by restoring the original intent of the 1950 NSF Act and requiring that all grants serve the national interest.

Title II represents the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's commitment to enhancing STEM education programs. A healthy and viable STEM workforce is critical to American industries and ensures our future economic prosperity. The definition of STEM is expanded to include computer science, which connects all STEM subjects.

Title III includes three bipartisan bills the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology approved in March. Those bills—H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act; H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015; and H.R. 1162, the Science Prize Competitions Act—passed the committee by voice vote. Two of these bills were sponsored by Democrats.

Title IV supports the important measurement standards and technology work taking place at the National Institute for Standards and Technology laboratories, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, and the recently authorized Network for Manufacturing Innovation.

Title V reauthorizes the Department of Energy Office of Science for 2 years at a 5.4 percent increase over fiscal year 2015. It prioritizes basic research that enables researchers in all 50

States to have access to world-class user facilities, including supercomputers and high-intensity light sources. This bill also prevents duplication and requires DOE to certify that its climate science work is unique and not being undertaken by other Federal agencies.

Title VI reauthorizes the DOE applied research and development programs and activities for fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017.

H.R. 1806 refocuses some spending on late-stage commercialization efforts within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to research and development efforts.

Title VII proposes to cut red tape and bureaucracy in the DOE technology transfer process. Currently, the private sector has little incentive to build reactor prototypes due to regulatory uncertainty from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

H.R. 1806 sets the right priorities for Federal civilian research, which enhances innovation and U.S. competitiveness without adding to the Federal deficit and debt. I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was told the gentleman from Washington shares a desire to address the broken immigration system. I know the chair of the Committee on Rules, Mr. SESSIONS, has indicated similarly. Just as I have posed to Mr. SESSIONS in the past, I would like to pose to the gentleman from Washington if he has a timeframe for when we can expect immigration legislation here on the floor of the House.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington to answer that.

Well, sometimes silence speaks louder than words.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to just one aspect on the floor of this rule. My colleague from Washington made a statement that we are dealing with a 2-month extension because we found some extra money to let it last longer.

No, the reason that we are having a 2-month extension is because we have not been able to resolve this problem. I made the remarks on the floor of the House last summer that extending it to May is not going to get us anyplace, and we would be right back in the same spot. I could dust off the same speech.

What is happening is that you have a little tiny bit of give, but it doesn't mean that we have enough money and that there aren't consequences. There are States across the country, because of the uncertainty of the Republican funding approach, that are already cutting back on construction projects this summer.

This will be the 33rd short-term funding extension. It is a symbol of the failure of my Republican colleagues to do anything in the 55 months that they have been in charge to deal with transportation funding. They have never even had a hearing on transportation finance.

Now, I will say that over the last 22 years there have been some bipartisan failures to step up to it. Ironically, the solution is clear, thoroughly studied, and broadly supported: raise the gas tax for the first time since 1993.

The Republican leadership doesn't have to do anything extraordinary, just allow the Committee on Ways and Means to follow regular order. Have some serious committee hearings. Listen to the experts. Invite in the stakeholders that build, that maintain, and use our transportation system. Let's have at the witness dais heads of the AFL–CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—who agree we should raise the gas tax—the head of transit, the American Trucking Association, AAA, bicyclists.

They could refer back to great Republican leaders of the past. Dwight Eisenhower established the gas tax to fund the Interstate Highway System. Ronald Reagan, the conservative icon, called Congress back in November of 1982 to more than double the gas tax, which Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did.

In fact, my Republican friends could involve Republican leaders today. Six Republican States have raised the gas tax already this year: Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, Utah, South Dakota, Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Not exactly liberal bastions.

This is something that we can and should do. Let's step up, solve this problem, avoid this continual uncertainty for people around the country. They deserve better.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, just a note to my colleague from Colorado, I agree that this is an important issue that he keeps bringing up of immigration, and I will certainly ask my chairman for any timeframe, and I will look forward to working with him and all my colleagues on solving this important issue.

But today we are talking about highways. We are talking about science. We are talking about keeping this place running smoothly.

To get us back on subject, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me the time. I am glad to hear I am getting us back on subject.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule on H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015. This is fiscally responsible legislation that cuts wasteful government spending and prioritizes innovative scientific research and development.

A key reform included in the America COMPETES Act is reining in spending at the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, or EERE. EERE's budget has grown by almost 60 percent in the last decade. President Obama's fiscal year 2016 budget request for EERE is over $2.7 billion, with a B, which is a requested increase of another $800 million over last fiscal year.

The Department of Energy's approach to energy research and development has also become more and more unbalanced with the EERE's continued growth. In fact, the President's proposed budget for EERE R&D is more than double the budgets for nuclear, fossil, and electricity R&D combined. In addition, the work prioritized by EERE is far too focused on increasing the use of today's existing technology. Many EERE programs are focused on reducing market barriers for existing technology or funding R&D activities already prioritized by the private sector, not conducting the fundamental research to build towards future breakthroughs.

With our national debt at $18 trillion and rising, and spending caps guiding budgets on everything from energy to national defense, Congress cannot rubberstamp this kind of out-of-control spending. It is time to adjust the Department of Energy's budget to reality.

The America COMPETES Act refocuses Federal investment on energy research and development, not deployment of today's technology. By funding the basic research and development prioritized in the America COMPETES Act, the Department of Energy can build a foundation for the private sector to bring innovative energy technology to the market and thereby grow the American economy.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this rule and ''yes'' on H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS), the ranking member on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Space.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today both as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I can't think of a worse rule, frankly, that we could bring to the floor. We could have had bipartisan cooperation on America COMPETES so that we can invest in our science and our research and our technology, and yet that is not what is happening here today.

As to the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, it doesn't allow for any amendments to the legislation that would fix and fund our Nation's crumbling infrastructure with predictability, stability, and for the long term. The highway trust fund and the current surface transportation authorization, as we know, are set to expire on May 31, leaving just 3 legislative days to extend it or 4,000 transportation workers will be laid off and work would stop on Federal highway programs all across the country right in the middle of prime construction and building season.

Now, the responsible among us know that we can't walk away from the highway trust fund. Millions of jobs and thousands of businesses hang in the balance. But we also know that what is before us today is the least most responsible way to fund our infrastructure—2 months at a time. Can you believe it? Two months at a time, Mr. Speaker; no long-term projects, no opportunity for planning, no relief for workers, and at another pivotal moment in the construction season.

As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, today I am joining Ranking Member DEFAZIO and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON in introducing the GROW AMERICA Act on behalf of the administration. This bill would serve us well to provide $478 billion over 6 years for our highways, bridges, transit, rail, and highway safety programs. This long-term and robust funding bill is a 45 percent increase over our current spending on our tatterdemalion and crumbling infrastructure. It is the type of plan that we have to ensure that our major-league economy does not have the infrastructure that wouldn't even fit children playing T-ball.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle twiddle their thumbs 2 months at a time, America is falling apart. Once one of the leaders in the world in quality infrastructure, we are now number 16, according to the World Economic Forum. According to the American Society of Engineers, the overall assessment of our Nation's infrastructure ranks with a whopping D-plus.

Now look at my home State of Maryland: 5,305 bridges are deficient; they are falling apart. That is 27 percent of the bridges in our State. Just a few months ago, one of my constituents was driving along Suitland Parkway, minding her own business, when a chunk of cement fell and hit her car hood because the bridge was in disrepair.

Though it is not my preference, we have to extend the highway trust fund today, and I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to use this time to go through a bipartisan negotiation on how to pay for our long-term and fully funded investments to construct and rebuild our roads, bridges, transit, and rail infrastructure.

Thirty-four extensions of the highway trust fund, 52 votes against ACA. Come on, let's get serious. Move away from the kids' table; get to the grown-up table and fund our highway transportation and infrastructure.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the reason you hear so many people talking about different topics is there are three completely unrelated topics in this single rule. There is the funding for all of the legislative salaries and the people who work in this building, that is one bill; another one funds roads, but only for 2 months, across the whole country; and the other one is the one that they say is for science but all the scientists oppose. So that is why it is so confusing. There are three completely unrelated bills in here, none of which do a thing about illegal immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

□ 1315

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we need a surface transportation bill, but the last thing in the world we need is this bill, a 2-month extension.

If this short-term plan was a necessary step to get us to a long-term bill, that would make some sense; but, as speakers have noted, this is the 33rd time in the past 5 years where Congress has failed to provide long-term and sustainable funding for our surface transportation needs. This is a habit; it is not a plan.

Mr. Speaker, this bill follows on the heels of the bill we passed 9 months ago, and that was a 9-month extension of surface transportation paid for by ''pension smoothing.'' You can't make that up.

We lowered the obligation corporations pay to pensions in order to put money in the highway transportation fund. We created a pothole in pensions to fix potholes in the highways; it makes no sense, but now, we are here on a 2-month plan—a good job, Congress.

We were given some assurances that we would have a long-term bill. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there are good long-term plans out there. Congressman RENACCI has a plan, the President has a plan, as do Congressman DELANEY and Congressman BLUMENAUER. There are policies out there. We don't need a policy debate. We need a decision.

The reality is we have got to make Congress work, do its job, and pass a long-term funding bill that is going to allow this country to modernize its airports, fix its bridges, make its railroads safer, and dredge our ports deeper.

We have to bring our 20th century infrastructure into the 21st century, and the only way we are going to get that done is by stepping up to the responsibility that we have to pass a long-term funding plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the Speaker himself that it is a tough job putting a bill on the floor. It always is tough when Congress has to pull the trigger on what that revenue source is going to be.

I will support any plan that is reasonable and sustainable. The only plan I won't support is no revenue plan at all.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I worked at the Economic Development Board for Tacoma, and in my office, I had a sign that said: ''We are competing with everyone, everywhere, every day, forever.''

That sentiment was echoed in a report by the National Academies last decade called, ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' which was the main influence behind the bipartisan America COMPETES Act. The report provided us with a pathway on how to increase American competitiveness so that we don't fall behind our global competitors.

Its finding were stark. The report told us that, if we are going to compete as a nation, if we want innovation to happen here in America, if we want jobs to be created here in America, we need to make significant investments in basic research and double the funding dedicated toward research and development. That is from that report.

That is not what we are doing here today. In fact, funding for basic research in the bill that we are currently debating fails to keep up with the rate of inflation. It fails to live up to the standards set forth in that bipartisan report.

When this bill was first considered in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee last Congress, a group of my fellow members of the New Democratic Coalition developed a set of principles we thought should guide a reauthorization of America COMPETES legislation.

These principles included increasing funding for basic research, stabilizing funding for research and development, and supporting policies that spark innovation.

We were disappointed when the FIRST Act strayed away from these

policies and are disappointed this America COMPETES legislation fails to make investments needed for America to remain competitive in the 21st century.

The amendment I introduced, along with my colleagues, does not call for doubling the funding for research and development in the underlying bill or put funding on pace with what was outlined in ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.'' The amendment we put forward was a compromise. Unfortunately, this amendment was made out of order and not brought to the floor for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to make critical investments in research and innovation, America will fall behind. Let's take up a bill that lives up to the spirit of bipartisanship and the goals laid out in ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.'' Let's compete everywhere, every day, forever.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), who represents one of the strongest science clusters in the United States in San Diego.

Mr. PETERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our country, as Mr. KILMER pointed out, is facing an ever-increasing global competition for scientific research. We can't afford to cede the leading edge we have built up in innovation to other countries, but the current level of funding in the underlying COMPETES bill does not provide adequate and constant funding for our basic scientific endeavors.

It cuts energy efficiency and renewable energy by 37 percent, cuts electric grid reliability research by 30 percent, and cuts the Advanced Research Projects Agency for Energy, or ARPA-E, by 50 percent.

These levels will not maintain strong foundations for basic scientific research and will make it even harder for us to retain young scientists in the United States. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography, a world leader in ocean research, has noted the harmful cuts to the geoscientist program, which is used to improve prediction for events, including earthquakes, tornados, hurricanes, tsunamis, drought, and solar storms. At a time of increasingly extreme weather, we should be investing in research, not cutting it.

Unfortunately, the amendment offered by Mr. KILMER, Ms. ESTY, and me to increase funding by a small but significant 3.5 percent was not even given a chance to have a vote here on the House floor.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this rule and to stand up for America's scientists and our competitiveness.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to thank the gentleman from the great State of Colorado for yielding and for his leadership on the Rules Committee and on so many other important issues before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the highway trust fund, which finances highway and transportation projects all across this country, is set to expire at the end of this month. It is coming right up. Passing a short-term fix is necessary because the Republicans have ignored our Nation's transportation needs for the past 10 months, since the last short-term extension was passed.

We don't need a short-term extension. We need long-term planning and investment in our infrastructure. The sad reality is that the United States is not investing nearly enough in its infrastructure. As a share of gross domestic product, we invest about one-half of what Europe does. We invest only one-quarter of what China does.

As you look at this chart, it shows the amount of road traffic volume is up 297 percent; yet the public spending on road maintenance is so much lower, 125 percent. It is nearly 2.5 times faster that we are spending—and having volume go up—but we are not investing in our infrastructure to keep up with this volume.

One out of every four bridges is structurally deficient or functionally obsolete in the United States. We have had two bridges with cars on them that literally collapsed in recent history.

The question of whether to fix our infrastructure is not about the money. We are already spending the money, fixing our cars when they hit yet another pothole or wasting our time sitting in traffic. Why don't we have high-speed rail like the rest of the world?

Let's save ourselves some time and money by investing wisely to support our transportation infrastructure through the highway trust fund.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this rule under this debate covers three significant but entirely unrelated bills. That is why you are hearing people discuss highway funding; you are hearing people discuss the legislative branch, and you are hearing people discuss science.

On the day that DACA expansion and DAPA were scheduled to go into effect to make sure people here illegally can pay a fine, get right with the law, and be employed legally, rather than illegally, we are doing nothing relating to restoring the rule of law and securing our borders or anything to address our broken immigration system.

We are making sure that Members of Congress and our staffs get paid. That is not the wrong thing. Our hard-working men and women who work here should get paid. It is a question of priorities. I would like to see us do something about the 10 or 12 million people here illegally before we start paying ourselves and our staff.

What about the highway trust fund? Again, this is an example of Congress kicking the ball down the road 2 months here, 2 months there, a month here, a month there. All the contractors and subcontractors don't even know how to present bids when they don't know whether a yearlong or 2-year project will be funded for more than 2 months. Taxpayers wind up paying more for the same amount of work because we lack the certainty.

Then there is the COMPETES Act—the science bill—which targets certain kinds of science which apparently Republicans don't like—for instance, the physical sciences and the geological sciences.

Handicapping the physical sciences hurts our ability to recognize the causes of things like wildfires and floods that affect my district in Colorado, foresee patterns leading to events like the great Western drought in California. It seems like, if anything, there should be a focus on a very relevant form of science that impacts quality of life every day.

They also apparently don't like, for political reasons, the social sciences. Again, going after the social sciences would harm our ability to adapt for historic storms like Hurricane Sandy or the flood in New Orleans with Katrina and mitigate against floods like those in Colorado.

There is an interface between the physical sciences and people, and that is the work of the social science programs: how public health looks, how flood evacuations look, how disease control looks.

These are important considerations and should not be politicized by this body, which is why not only I oppose this bill, but dozens of the largest scientific associations and coalitions oppose this bill that ostensibly is for the cause of science.

Having all these bills under this rule is what we call a grab-bag approach, just jamming unrelated legislation into ineffective packages that seem to confuse and muddle the meaningful debate that needs to occur.

Since 2011, when Republicans won the majority of the House, this practice of jamming several unrelated bills together into one rule has increased by 400 percent. This rule is an example of that, and it is why the American people suffer from the somewhat disjointed debate around it—one person talks about highways; another counters a point about science; another talks about the legislative branch. It is because they are all in here. This is a Christmas tree bill.

Now, if it had immigration reform in it, I would support this Christmas tree. I could swallow the others if that was in here. I offered that to the gentleman from Washington, but unfortunately, it is not, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, the very people that should be benefiting from the bills we are reviewing today, like scientists, are actually opposing the bills. That should be a signal that this body is not understanding or heeding the needs of the American people.

We can reject this rule. We can tell Congress to get back on course. We can tell Congress to do a long-term reauthorization of transportation funding. We can tell Congress to pass a COMPETES Act that actually fosters innovation and makes America more competitive and a legislative branch appropriations bill that furthers the ability of this body to deliberate and be a model employer for those who work here.

How do we do that, Mr. Speaker? We do that by rejecting this rule.

If we can bring down this grab-bag, Christmas tree rule, we can set this Congress right.

I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Americans have sent us here to get things done. They are tired of gridlock. And we, in the 114th Congress, are on track to be one of the most productive Congresses in modern history.

House Republicans have an aggressive and forward-looking agenda which will help our economy recover and help create high-paying American jobs.

The use of the compound rule, which provides for separate consideration of each underlying measure under a single rule, helps expedite legislative business.

The consideration of one rule allows the House more time to debate the underlying measures, or to consider additional legislative business. We have a lot to do, and this is an efficient way to get our work done.

I appreciate the discussion that we have had over the last hour. And although we may have our differences of opinion, I believe that this rule and the underlying bills are strong measures that are important to the future of our country.

This rule provides for ample debate on the floor: the opportunity to debate and vote on three bills and numerous amendments sponsored by both Democrat and Republican Members of this Chamber. This rule will provide for a smooth and deliberative process for sending these bills to the Senate for their consideration.

These bills are solid and substantial measures that will address several critical issues facing our country.

H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, is a proscience bill that will keep America competitive in the 21st century global economy by prioritizing taxpayer investments in basic research without increasing overall Federal spending.

H.R. 2250, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2016, keeps funding for the legislative branch level with fiscal years 2014 and 2015 and will be used efficiently and effectively for the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, will allow transportation spending to continue through July while we in Congress work diligently toward a next step to close the shortfall in the highway trust fund.

Currently, highway and transit spending authority expires at the end of this month, and officials at the Department of Transportation are concerned that Federal cash infusions to transportation projects in my State and around the country would slow or even halt as the summer construction season begins unless we extend this temporary extension.

Overall, this is a strong rule that provides for consideration of three important bills, and I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 271 and the underlying bills.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Act of 2015, a bill that was originally written to provide much needed support for our nation's res arch and development activities in science and engineering.

I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for the opportunity to speak on the Rules for H.R. 1806.

The America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 as written raises serious concerns among the representatives from the scientific, academic, and business communities.

The groups that oppose the bill include the American Physical Society, the American Geophysical Union, the American Anthropological Association the Association of American Universities, and the Consortium of Social Science Associations.

Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Ranking Member on the House Science Committee, the committee that authored the bill, will be offering a Managers Amendment to this bill.

The Administration has also signaled that it will not support the bill in its current form.

According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, the bill: reduces funding for several scientific disciplines; curtails the ability of federal agencies to pursue climate science; and adds burdensome new requirements to the way the National Science Foundation operates.

Perhaps most worrisome, the legislation would prevent the federal government from using Department of Energy-sponsored research to make policy.

My amendments offered for inclusion in the Rule to H.R. 1806 were simple and would have improved the bill by addressing the STEM education and training gap.

These Jackson Lee amendments focus on reducing the STEM gap that currently exists between people of different geographic regions and socio-economic backgrounds.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, reports that as many as 1.4 million new computer science jobs could soon be available in the United States, but only 400,000 students will be enrolled in programs at colleges and universities that would prepare them to take these jobs.

This disparity is often referred to as the STEM gap.

Only 1 out of 10 high schools in the U.S. offer computer science programs.

It is estimated that the education systems in 25 states do not count computer science classes toward high school graduation.

Both economists and business leaders have identified that the future of the American economy will 130 in STEM fields, which the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates win create more than 9 million jobs between 2012 and 2022.

The STEM gap is more pronounced when considering minority groups.

U.S. Census 2010 data from the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Census Bureau, showed that underrepresented minorities earned 18.6 percent of total undergraduate degrees from 4-year colleges, but only 16.4 percent of the degrees in science fields and less than 13 percent of degrees in physical sciences and engineering.

Many historically underrepresented groups, including low income urban, rural and Native American communities have difficulty accessing STEM education and job training opportunities.

By including all of the Jackson Lee Amendments in the Rule the committee could have made significant progress in reducing the STEM gap underserved populations with the chance to participate in the economy of the future.

Jackson Lee Amendments offered on H.R. 1806, included: Jackson Lee Amendment #3, which the Rules Committee has included in the Rule for the bill would create state and regional workshops to train K–12 teachers in project-based science and technology learning, which will allow them to provide instruction in initiating robotics and other STEM competition team development programs.

This amendment also leverages the collaboration among higher education, businesses, local private and public education agencies to support STEM efforts at schools located in areas with unemployment is 1 percent or more above the national rate.

Robotics competitions and other similar competitive opportunities have proven to be one of the most successful paths for engaging young minds in STEM education.

Competitions such as FIRST, a national robotics competition that engages 400,000 students each year and awards millions of dollars in scholarships are paving the way for future STEM success.

Jackson Lee Amendments Not included in the Rule: Jackson Lee Amendment #17 would have increased awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities by providing information on certification, undergraduate and graduate STEM programs.

One of the most enduring difficulties faced by underrepresented populations is a lack of awareness and understanding of the connection between STEM and employment opportunities.

In 2012, a survey found that despite the nation's growing demand for more workers in science, technology, engineering, and math, the skills gap among the largest ethnic and racial minorities groups remain stubbornly wide.

Blacks and Latinos account for only 7 percent, of the STEM workforce despite representing 28 percent of the U.S. population.

Jackson Lee Amendment #18 would have made sure that the issue of reducing the skills and education gap of underrepresented groups in STEM degree programs is considered as current STEM education federal programs were reviewed.

Jackson Lee Amendment #19 could have furthered the skills development and training of teachers who provide instruction in K–12 STEM courses where 40 percent of the students are on free or reduced lunch programs or in areas where unemployment is 1 percent or more above the national average.

Although most STEM specific education occurs in college and graduate school, interest in STEM fields must be fostered from a young age through successful K–12 programs.

Many schools serving low-income students lack the resources to provide continuity of STEM K–12 education, and as a result, students lose the opportunity to develop the skills that will prepare them for higher STEM education.

Jackson Lee Amendment #21 was an effort to identify no-cost or low-cost summer and after school science and technology education programs and have that information broadly disseminated to the public.

Throughout primary and secondary education, skills retention is one of the most pressing concerns facing underrepresented students.

Without access to after-school and summer programs, even those students with a passion for STEM risk falling behind their peers.

Jackson Lee Amendment #22 made grants available to local education agencies to support training in STEM education methods to teachers to improve their instruction at schools serving neglected, delinquent, and migrant students, English learners, at-risk students, and Native Americans as determined by the director.

Jackson Lee Amendment #23 establishes within the Directorate for Education and Human Resources an Office of STEM Education Gap Awareness with the duties of reducing the STEM gap in K–12 and post-secondary education among underrepresented populations.

The Jackson Lee amendments are intended to bridge the STEM gap in rural and urban areas where opportunities for training in STEM that can enhance the productivity of businesses large and small are lacking.

The Brookings' Metropolitan Policy Program's report ''The Hidden STEM Economy,'' reported that in 2011, 26 million jobs or 20 percent of all occupations required knowledge in 1 or more STEM areas.

Half of all STEM jobs are available to workers without a 4 year degree and these jobs pay on average $53,000 a year, which is 10 percent higher than jobs with similar education requirements.

There will be STEM winners and losers not because the skills needed are too difficult to obtain, but because people are not aware of the jobs that are going unfilled today nor do they know what education or training will create job security for the next 2 to 3 decades.

I am very aware of the importance of STEM job training and education.

A third of Houston jobs are in STEM-based fields.

Houston has the second largest concentrations of engineers (22.4 for every 1,000 workers according to the Greater Houston Partnership).

Houston has 59,070 engineers, the second largest population in the nation.

STEM jobs are at the core of Houston's economic success, but what we have done with STEM innovation and job creation in the city of Houston is not enough to satisfy the region's demand for STEM trained workers.

Houston anticipates that in the next 5 years the gap in the number of people with STEM skills and training will not keep up with the number of positions requiring those skills.

This is not just true for Houston, Texas—it is true for every region of the nation—whether you live in a rural community or urban center.

By 2018 the United States will need: 710,000 Computing workers; 160,000 Engineers; 70,000 Physical Scientists; 40,000 Life Science workers; 20,000 Mathematics workers.

STEM Computing Jobs are critical to America's future: Software engineers; Computer networking workers; Systems analysis; Computer researcher or support workers.

Types of STEM Engineering Jobs: Structural Engineers; Mechanical Engineers; Software Engineers; Electrical Engineers; Automotive Engineers; Aeronautical Engineers; Naval Engineers; Architects.

Types of STEM Physical Sciences Jobs: Biologists; Zoologists; Agricultural; Food Scientists; Conservation Scientists; Medical Scientists; Climatologists.

Types of STEM Life Scientists [PhDs]: Political Science; Economists; Anthropologists; Archaeology; Cultural Researchers; Language Experts (Linguistic and Language Skills).

Types of STEM Mathematics: Teachers; Physicists; Cryptographers; Statisticians; Accountants.

In order to ensure that underserved populations reach the level of STEM education and opportunity they choose to pursue, I believe it is integral to create an office that will focus on closing the STEM education gap.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 178.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

YEAS—242

Abraham	Guinta	Perry
Aderholt	Guthrie	Pittenger
Allen	Hanna	Pitts
Amash	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Amodei	Harper	Poliquin
Babin	Harris	Pompeo
Barletta	Hartzler	Posey
Barr	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Barton	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Benishek	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bilirakis	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Ribble
Black	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Rigell
Blum	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Bost	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brat	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Issa	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Buck	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Bucshon	Jolly	Rothfus
Burgess	Jones	Rouzer
Byrne	Jordan	Royce
Calvert	Joyce	Russell
Carter (GA)	Katko	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Scalise
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sessions
Comstock	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Conaway	Lamborn	Shuster
Cook	Lance	Simpson
Costello (PA)	Latta	Sinema
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Long	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Love	Smith (TX)
Curbelo (FL)	Lucas	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Denham	Lummis	Stivers
Dent	MacArthur	Stutzman
DeSantis	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	Marino	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Tiberi
Dold	McCarthy	Tipton
Duffy	McCaul	Trott
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Upton
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley	Valadao
Emmer (MN)	McMorris Rodgers	Wagner
Farenthold	McSally	Walberg
Fincher	Meadows	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Walker
Fleischmann	Messer	Walorski
Fleming	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Flores	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Foxx	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gibson	Newhouse	Wittman
Gohmert	Noem	Womack
Goodlatte	Nugent	Woodall
Gowdy	Nunes	Yoder
Granger	Olson	Yoho
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Graves (LA)	Palmer	Young (IA)
Graves (MO)	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Griffith	Pearce	Zeldin
Grothman		Zinke

NAYS—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Deutch
Donovan
Gosar
Hastings
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

□ 1359

Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, and HONDA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 3, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—420

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—3

Conyers
Massie
Scott (VA)

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Grayson
Hastings
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1407

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 2353, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 2353 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2353.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 271, I call up the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2353

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015''.

(b) RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in fiscal year 2015 by amounts apportioned or allocated pursuant to the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, including the amendments made by that Act, for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

SEC. 1001. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(a) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking ''May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 1001(b)(1) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking ''for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, a sum equal to 243/365 of the total amount'' and inserting ''for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, a sum equal to 304/365 of the total amount''.

(2) GENERAL FUND.—Section 1123(h)(1) of MAP–21 (23 U.S.C. 202 note) is amended by striking ''and $19,972,603 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $24,986,301 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(c)(1) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended—

(A) by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''; and

(B) by striking ''243/365'' and inserting ''304/365''.

(2) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 1102 of MAP–21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) $33,528,284,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.'';

(B) in subsection (b)(12) by striking '', and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, only in an amount equal to $639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by 243/365 for that period'' and inserting '', and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, only in an amount equal to $639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by 304/365 for that period'';

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2015, that is equal to 243/365 of such unobligated balance'' and inserting ''for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, that is equal to 304/365 of such unobligated balance''; and

(D) in subsection (f)(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1002. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

Section 1002 of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1842) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program $292,931,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.'' and inserting ''for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program $366,465,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b)(2) and inserting the following:

''(2) for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, subject to the limitations on administrative expenses under the heading 'Federal Highway Administration' in appropriations Acts that apply to that period.''.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.—

(1) HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(1)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $195,726,027 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(2) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 31101(a)(2)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $94,531,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(3) NATIONAL PRIORITY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(3)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $226,542,466 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(4) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 31101(a)(4)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(5) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31101(a)(5)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $24,153,425 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(B) LAW ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGNS.—Section 2009(a) of SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended—

(i) in the first sentence by striking ''May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''; and

(ii) in the second sentence by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''.

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31101(a)(6)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $21,238,356 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(b) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—Section 403(f)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $1,664,384 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the

period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $2,082,192 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.—Section 31101(c) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a)(10) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(10) $181,567,123 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1)(J) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(J) $215,715,068 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(2) BORDER ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $26,652,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(3) PERFORMANCE AND REGISTRATION INFORMATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(3) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(4) COMMERCIAL VEHICLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND NETWORKS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(4) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $20,821,918 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(5) SAFETY DATA IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(5) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $2,498,630 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and up to $9,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and up to $12,493,151 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and up to $21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and up to $26,652,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking ''and $2,663,014 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $3,331,507 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 31301 note) is amended by striking ''and $665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $832,877 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1103. DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.

Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

SEC. 1201. FORMULA GRANTS FOR RURAL AREAS.

Section 5311(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''and $16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $20,821,918 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1202. APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5336(h)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1203. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 5338(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''and $5,722,150,685 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $7,158,575,342 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and $85,749,041 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $107,274,521 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''and $6,657,534 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $8,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''and $2,968,361,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $3,713,505,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''and $171,964,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $215,132,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(E) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by striking ''and $404,644,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $506,222,466 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(ii) by striking ''and $19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''; and

(iii) by striking ''and $13,315,068 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $16,657,534 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking ''and $1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $2,498,630 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking ''and $2,563,151 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $3,206,575 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking ''and $1,441,955,342 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $1,803,927,671 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking ''and $284,809,315 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $356,304,658 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''; and

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking ''and $350,119,726 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $438,009,863 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(b) RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION AND DEPLOYMENT PROJECTS.—Section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $46,602,740 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $58,301,370 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(c) TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 5338(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $5,830,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT.—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $5,830,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(e) HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING.—Section 5338(e) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(f) CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.—Section 5338(g) of title 49, United States Code, is

amended by striking ''and $1,269,591,781 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $1,558,295,890 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(g) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 5338(h) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''and $69,238,356 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $86,619,178 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking ''and not less than $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and not less than $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking ''and not less than $665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and not less than $832,877 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1204. BUS AND BUS FACILITIES FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5339(d)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and $43,606,849 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $54,553,425 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(2) by striking ''$832,192 for such period'' and inserting ''$1,041,096 for such period''; and

(3) by striking ''$332,877 for such period'' and inserting ''$416,438 for such period''.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

SEC. 1301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5128(a)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(3) $35,615,474 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(b) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND.—Section 5128(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2) FISCAL YEAR 2015.—From the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund established under section 5116(i), the Secretary may expend for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015—

''(A) $156,581 to carry out section 5115;

''(B) $18,156,712 to carry out subsections (a) and (b) of section 5116, of which not less than $11,368,767 shall be available to carry out section 5116(b);

''(C) $124,932 to carry out section 5116(f);

''(D) $520,548 to publish and distribute the Emergency Response Guidebook under section 5116(i)(3); and

''(E) $832,877 to carry out section 5116(j).''.

(c) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRAINING GRANTS.—Section 5128(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $2,663,014 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $3,331,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''June 1, 2015'' in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting ''August 1, 2015'', and

(2) by striking ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014'' in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015''.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014'' each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015'', and

(2) by striking ''June 1, 2015'' in subsection (d)(2) and inserting ''August 1, 2015''.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Section 9508(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''June 1, 2015'' and inserting ''August 1, 2015''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015. This bill will extend the Federal surface transportation programs for 2 months, through July of 2015.

H.R. 2353 is a clean extension of the surface transportation programs, funded at the authorized amounts for fiscal year 2014. No transfer of funding to the highway trust fund is necessary because the trust fund will remain solvent during the period. However, we will more than likely have to pass another short-term patch before the August recess and take steps to ensure the trust fund remains solvent. I hope all of you will support H.R. 2353.

I have to say, a short-term extension through the end of July was not our preferred path forward. Our hope was to extend the surface programs through the end of the calendar year. That would have ensured reliable funding for the States through the construction season. A longer extension would also have allowed us to focus on finding a long-term funding solution within the context of tax reform without the distraction of needing to address a shortfall in the highway trust fund later this summer. Unfortunately, we were unable to reach an agreement on a 7-month extension, and so we are left with a 2-month patch.

Mr. Speaker, we have an immediate, critical need to extend the current surface transportation law. If Congress fails to act, over 4,000 Department of Transportation personnel will be furloughed and the States will not be able to be reimbursed. Transportation projects and jobs across the country will be at risk.

I appreciate Chairman RYAN's attention to this pressing issue, as well as his commitment to addressing the long-term solvency of the highway trust fund. A long-term reauthorization bill will continue to be a top priority for this committee. I look forward to working with Chairman RYAN, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and others to achieve a long-term bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, here we are again, yet another short-term pass. It is a heck of a way to run a great nation. Our system is falling apart: 140,000 bridges on the National Highway System need repair or replacement; 40 percent of the surface National Highway System is in such bad shape we have to dig up the roadbed and resurface; and we have an $86 billion backlog in transit just to bring the existing transit up to a state of good repair. It is so bad that we are killing people in the Nation's Capital unnecessarily because of the state of disrepair of the Metro system.

It is embarrassing. The United States of America has gone from number one in the world, unparalleled in terms of its infrastructure in the Eisenhower era and through a good deal of the latter part of the last century, to 26th and falling fast. We are investing less of a percentage of our GDP in infrastructure repairs and maintenance—let alone, building out a new system—than virtually every nation in the world.

□ 1415

We are down to around 1 percent. There are many developing nations who are investing much, much more because they know they have to move their people and their goods more efficiently in a world economy.

We cannot continue to kick this can down the road. The road is at a dead end. Today, we will reluctantly go along with a 2-month patch because, if we do not act today, at the end of this month, June 1, 4,000 people will be laid off at DOT and all Federal funding for surface transportation and transit would stop. That would be the end of it. It wouldn't be authorized.

States that had bills pending couldn't be paid, and States that want to get new commitments for new projects wouldn't be able to do it, a tragedy at the height of the construction season. Sixty days should be enough time to negotiate a long-term bill.

Today, we introduce the GROW AMERICA Act written by the administration. It has many, many good points to it, especially the spending levels. We need to enhance spending. We can't pretend, Oh, we are going to do more with less. We are past that point.

Look at what has happened to the purchasing power of the gas tax, which hasn't been changed since 1993, two and a half times faster road traffic volume is going up than we are dealing with the funding issues. We are in a huge deficit situation, and there are many, many ways—many of them proposed on a bipartisan basis—to deal with this. We should be able to work that out.

More importantly, this committee writes the policy. We introduced a bill today that sets the levels for $87 billion. It is an increase in transit to deal with the backlog, an increase in highways to deal with the insufficiencies there, a new dedicated program for freight; and it puts some more money into rail—commuter rail, in particular—to deal with positive train control and other issues.

We believe that this is the last wake-up call to give Congress time. Sixty days is more than enough time to write a long-term authorization and for the Ways and Means Committee to figure out a way to fund it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank, in addition to this patch, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman RYAN for their very hard work towards a long-term reauthorization of the Federal highway bill.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of Missouri has nearly 35,000 highway miles and over 10,000 bridges that are practically begging for our attention. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, every single day I hear about the need to improve and repair our roadways in this country.

As you can imagine, this isn't a simple task. This is a job that is going to take years to complete. It requires the hard work and cooperation of thousands of men and women and relies on partnerships between the stakeholders, local governments, and Washington.

Most importantly, though, a task of this magnitude requires that those responsible for planning each project, the State and local governments, are able to do so with confidence. They need certainty not only in this year's budget, but also the budgets for the next 5 or 6 years.

This 2-month extension does not come under ideal circumstances, but it is going to ensure that States are reimbursed for their expenses on Federal projects, and it is going to give us the time to craft a bipartisan long-term reauthorization that we so desperately need.

Long-term reauthorization is critical for everyone who plays a role in improving our Nation's highways and bridges. For too long, they have been forced to operate off of short-term extension after short-term extension, and this makes the already difficult job of maintaining our roadways nearly impossible.

This Congress, we have a huge opportunity to secure a long-term highway bill that is going to improve, rebuild, and modernize America's highway system. It is time that we come together to do just that, and I hope this extension gives us the time to come up with that agreement that we need.

Again, I want to thank both chairmen for their hard work, and I look forward to finalizing a much-needed long-term reauthorization.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

By July, when this new patch expires, Mr. Speaker, we shall have spent a full year since the last patch, not even trying to make progress toward a long-term authorization bill.

We have acquired a dangerous habit—33 since the last long-term bill—of patches that create no urgency to get a long-term bill done. The Ways and Means Committee, the funding committee for this bill, is holding its first hearing next month. The frustration in the States has accumulated as fast as the untenable backlog of projects. Another construction season has already been sacrificed.

The reason we are here is itself a comment on congressional neglect of the Nation's infrastructure. States have slowed down their request for reimbursements from the trust fund because the unreplenished fund, together with the short-term patches, make it impossible for States, themselves, to even begin projects of any size.

Mr. Speaker, the States have already scaled back their plans for 2015 that would have created jobs. This self-inflicted crisis is threatening other jobs, too—many Federal employees in my district and thousands of others throughout the country. If Congress fails to take action by May 31, many Federal employees will be furloughed; Federal reimbursements will stop, and the highway and transit programs will shut down. The hidden costs are even worse, the many economic development projects in the country that can't be started until roads, bridges, and transit to accommodate them are done.

Today, the Democrats on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee have introduced the President's GROW AMERICA Act. We are putting a good bill on the table. Change it or do your own substitute, but do not leave the Nation's infrastructure twisting in the dust of another delay.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their hard work and to the rest of the committee for the hours of work already done on a long-term transportation bill.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2353 to prevent the shutdown of funding for infrastructure improvement. I believe there is shared commitment between the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and most of the Members of the House to pass a fully funded, multiyear highway bill.

With the debt crisis we continue to battle, it is becoming more and more difficult to find the much-needed resources for our most critical needs. That leaves few options at our immediate disposal, most of which are not palatable in this economic environment.

Members of both the Transportation Committee and the Ways and Means Committee will have to take a closer look at potential funding alternatives and be creative in how to finance a reliable and modern infrastructure system, and at the same time, we need to work towards getting our country back on a path of fiscal solvency.

As we work on a long-term solution, we should examine how to reform the highway trust fund to prevent finding ourselves in this same position over and over. A consistent funding mechanism, paired with a more transparent system that demonstrates effective use of taxpayer dollars, will put us in a better position to fund critical infrastructure projects and instill more confidence on the part of our constituents.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 2353 so we can continue work on a multiyear transportation bill to ensure our Nation's growth. Failure to act threatens our general contractors and their employees, suppliers, and puts at risk the jobs that are both directly and indirectly supported by these projects.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to keep our folks in business and continue any meaningful growth in our economy, then we must find a reliable, long-term solution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to extend highway and transit programs for 2 months, but with reservations.

The last surface transportation bill, MAP–21, expired last fall. At that time, we passed an extension to the end of this month to give us time to work on a long-term bill. We have known for months that this day was coming; yet we have made no progress finding a solution to funding highways, transit, and other important surface transportation programs.

MAP–21, itself, was only a 2-year bill, breaking the tradition of Congress passing 5- or 6-year bills to provide the reliable funding necessary to promote long-term capital plans and projects that require a commitment beyond 1

fiscal year. The last long-term bill we passed was SAFETEA–LU in 2005. That was 10 years ago, and that bill was underfunded because of a resistance to raising the gasoline tax or to identifying new revenue sources.

For over a decade, we have failed to address the funding challenges necessary to break the cycle of underinvestment and put this country back on a competitive path with the rest of the work.

Today, we spend about 1.7 percent of GDP on infrastructure, while China spends 9 percent and Europe spends 4½ to 5 percent. We used to spend 4½ to 5 percent also.

According to DOT, there is an $800 billion backlog of investment needs on highways and bridges, including $479 billion in critical repair work. Public transit has an $86 billion backlog of critical maintenance and repair needs, which increases by $2.5 billion each year as bus and rail infrastructure ages.

While our infrastructure crumbles around us, House and Senate leadership refuse to come up with the additional $60 billion needed to fill the gap in the highway trust fund just to do a long-term bill at current levels; but this week, they will put on the floor a tax extender that will cost $182 billion over 10 years, completely unpaid for. The priorities of this Congress are completely out of whack.

I am concerned that we will pass this 2-month extension and be right back here in July having this same conversation. I will support this extension, but only with the understanding that we must spend the next 2 months, once and for all, making transportation funding a priority so that our citizens don't have to risk unsafe transportation so that we can invest in our infrastructure and we can be competitive in our economy going forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015.

Although we must construct a long-term highway bill, this legislation is a compromise that will provide States with certainty through the vital summer construction months.

By extending the expenditure authority of the highway trust fund through the end of July, States will not have to worry about reimbursements from the Federal Government while they are in the middle of the busiest construction season of the year.

Following the passage of this extension, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to construct a long-term highway bill with a sustainable funding mechanism.

Upon its enactment in 2012, MAP–21 made important reforms by consolidating Federal highway programs and streamlining the project approval process. The next highway bill should build on MAP–21's successes to cut red tape and ensure highway trust fund dollars are spent responsibly.

We must also be good stewards of taxpayer dollars by keeping our promise to the American people that the next surface transportation bill will provide adequate funding for highway and freight infrastructure to create jobs and keep our Nation competitive.

My constituents and the hard-working people all over this country need reliable roads and bridges to commute to work, take their children to school, and get home safely at night.

Unfortunately, the President's funding proposal is not viable and, I believe, will encourage more inversions or takeovers of American companies.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2353 and encourage them to commit to crafting a long-term fiscally responsible highway bill that will provide the much-needed certainty to States, industry, and the American people.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I appreciate his leadership on this matter. He hit it right on the nail.

We are in a situation, I am sad to say, having listened to my colleague a moment ago; the States will still have to worry. Two months doesn't give them a straight shot at a construction season, and there is still uncertainty.

I could have dusted off the speech I gave last summer where I said we would be right back here in the same spot, with uncertainty around the country; and the local governments, the State governments, the contractors don't deserve that.

But it is not the problem of the T and I Committee, as much as Ways and Means. You can't craft a bill unless you know how much money you have got to spend. I am embarrassed as a member of that committee that, in the 55 months my Republican colleagues have been in charge, we have not had a single hearing on transportation finance.

We hear certain things are off the table or not acceptable. It is interesting, we haven't raised the gas tax in 22 years, but six States—six red States—have raised the gas tax already this year. Utah, Idaho, Georgia, South Dakota—these are not flaming bastions of liberalism. These are people who looked at the problem and decided they needed to step up, and they stepped up not to take the place of the Federal responsibility, but in anticipation that at some point, the Federal Government would meet its obligation for almost half of the major construction projects.

I would respectfully request that we dive in and see what we can do over the course of the next couple of months, but that the Ways and Means Committee spend one week listening to the men and women who build, operate, and use our Nation's infrastructure, spend a week, look at the items, consider maybe what Ronald Reagan thought was a good idea in 1982: raise the gas tax.

We can pass that bill out of committee in 1 week, and you can have the next couple of months to give America the bill it needs to rebuild and renew this great country.

□ 1430

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY).

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of long-term highway funding. I will support the bill on the floor today, but let's be clear. This is a long-term problem that needs to have a long-term solution.

We gather in hearings and we gather in meetings to discuss the various options we have for revenue. We now have to gather to make a decision, the long-term decision.

We were elected to Congress to represent our constituents and to make difficult decisions that will help us guide our Nation forward. It is time for us to accelerate and produce a solution to our highway funding problems. Our highways and our bridges are falling into disrepair.

Before I became involved in public service, I was a contractor in Nevada where I worked on roads, bridges, and dams. I know the wear and tear that our infrastructure is experiencing. I know the uncertainty that States are facing when it comes to highway projects.

Our inaction has created a difficult environment for the States to make decisions. So I stand here today to support long-term funding. It is a long-term problem that requires a long-term solution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the leadership of this committee for getting to this point. I am very, very sorry that this is another kicking the can down the road, but we don't have much choice but to support the bill before us today.

We have missed a major construction season already. Bridges are falling; accidents are happening; traffic jams increase because of the crumbling infrastructure. This is all very costly, and it is more costly when we have a winter like we just had that hits already crumbling infrastructure.

We must address this costly neglect of our infrastructure around the country. It is not partisan. There are no

Democrat and Republican bridges or streets. We must address our responsibility to this Nation.

Sensible, large projects must have time to plan for those long-term projects. They cannot do that. No city or State can do that kind of planning without knowing whether we have a long-term source of funding that will keep it going.

It is unwise for us to continue just to put this off. We have got to pay for it no matter when we do it. The time is now. We have extended this time too long. The Nation has suffered too long. Traffic is jamming; accidents are happening; and it will not get better until we take on our responsibility.

I would urge all of us today to support this short-term bill for the last time. It is time for us to have a long-term infrastructure bill for this Nation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chair the balance of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 19 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, the funding and authorization for our Federal highway program expires in just 12 days. This is a deadline that Congress, the Department of Transportation, and the American people have known about for almost a year now. And the bill before us today is not the long-term solution that we were hoping for, but it is the necessary step forward at this time while we continue to work on a longer term solution for our highway funding.

I appreciate very much the attention that Chairman SHUSTER has given to this important issue. He has taken a very keen interest in what we need on a national level, and many of us from the Houston area appreciate his coming to our part of America to learn and see what our needs are in the State of Texas. I am confident that the chairman and those of us on the relevant committees in the House and the Senate will come together and deliver a long-term solution for our highway programs and will strengthen them for every Texan and every American.

While this bill before us isn't ideal, the choice is very simple. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes'' on this bill to keep our State Department of Transportation on the job through the summer building months and to keep Congress working on a long-term solution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, passing another extension and failing in our duty to provide a world-class transportation system.

Transportation programs are much too critical to our economy to be delayed any longer. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in Washington continues its long-running failure to fund surface transportation infrastructure programs. Just last week, House Republicans passed a bill, with no offsets, that cut taxes by $269 billion for the richest 1 percent of Americans, but they failed to pass a real transportation authorization bill that would put Americans to work. We know, for every billion dollars we invest in transportation, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs.

In closing, Secretary Anthony Foxx said that all of us have roles to play in shaping our Nation's infrastructure. As we saw last week during the tragic train derailment in Philadelphia, Congress urgently needs to increase funding for our Nation's passenger rail system in order to make it safer for all of the traveling public and to prevent future tragedies on our Nation's rails.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. DEFAZIO for yielding and for the work that he does on this committee.

Let me also say to the chairman of the committee, Mr. SHUSTER, how pleased I am with the kind of work that he does on the committee. Very frankly, Mr. SHUSTER is committed to getting things done and to working in a bipartisan fashion. That is good for this House, and it is good for his State, and it is good for the country. I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this 60-day extension because it is essential that we do this. The consequences of not doing it would be very, very negative. I rise to lament the fact that we have gone 10 months in our having known full well that this date was upon us and that theoretically, we thought, that funding as well as authorization would end on the 31st of this month. We have now found that funding will not end. This bill is necessary to authorize, not to fund, because funding is available for the next 60 days from the 31st.

I also rise to urge this House, under Mr. SHUSTER's and Mr. DEFAZIO's leadership, to do the work we were sent here to do—to invest in America, to invest in the growth of our economy, to invest in the creation of jobs—in fact, what the board of directors of the greatest country on the face of the Earth ought to have done many years and, certainly, months ago.

I am absolutely convinced that this House has the capacity, the intellect, and the ability within 60 days to come to this floor with a bill that will invest in our infrastructure and provide sufficient funds to make America competitive and to pay for it, not to pass the expense along to future generations—my children, my grandchildren, my great grandchildren. They are going to have to buy for themselves the infrastructure of their generations, and they ought not to have to pay the bills of our generation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. It is a moral responsibility that this generation pays for the investments that it needs to make in the infrastructure that will be used today and tomorrow.

Mr. SHUSTER, I know, wants to do that. Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO have the courage to do that. The issue is going to be whether this body, on both sides of the aisle, comes forward with a responsible, paid-for infrastructure bill, particularly for highways and roads and bridges, but for other investments as well.

I want to tell Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO that I will work closely with them and that I will urge the Members on my side of the aisle to work closely with the Members on Mr. SHUSTER's side of the aisle to effect this end. But let us not pretend on July 30 that we can extend until December 31 or until a year from then. Today, let us commit ourselves to using the next 70 days, approximately, to come up with a paid-for, 6-year reauthorization that will make America stronger, grow our economy, and be a pride of the American people, whom we serve.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished whip for his kind words, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, again, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this failure to write a long-term, paid-for surface transportation bill for this country has become a national embarrassment. Quite frankly, it is an international embarrassment. Passenger trains and oil trains are coming off the tracks, are taking lives, are causing untold amounts of damage. The simple truth is that we can't fix those lives who were lost, but we can fix our transportation system. Isn't it about time that we do that? It is not only a national embarrassment, our failure here, but it is a failure of the Congress. It is a failure of the legislative process. It is a failure of the committee process. That is what is happening here.

We held hearings in the last session. We heard from the Chamber of Commerce; we heard from the unions; we heard from the retailers; we heard from the truckers. Everybody said three things: one, our transportation system is falling apart. They had that right. Two, it is hurting our ability to grow our economy and to create jobs. They had that right. Three, they said we need to find some new revenue. None of it could be more obvious. Yet the Transportation Committee held hearings from all of those people in the last session, and we held hearings again in this session, but we never took up the markup and the writing of a transportation bill.

□ 1445

That is the simple truth, Mr. Speaker, and I am calling on the leadership here to either instruct the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or allow the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to write a transportation bill. I have absolute confidence that we can come together if we do.

It is through the committee process that we find common ground. That is where we reach our bipartisanship. That is how we fix things here in the Congress. That is how we get things done. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, allow or instruct the committee to do its job, to do its business, and we will write a transportation plan for this country that gets this country moving again, saves lives, and builds an economy.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a member of the committee.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, why are we debating an extension of the surface transportation authorization instead of doing the right thing and passing a bill that invests in our future? We should be playing the long game, not betting on the come, as they say in Nevada.

For the 2 million residents who live in the Las Vegas valley and the more than 42 million visitors who come to our city from around the world, we must commit to the passage of a long-term surface transportation bill this summer. We can't do yet another extension that creates uncertainty, stifles development, and puts us further behind.

We must pass a bill that includes investment that is real, sustainable, and goes beyond just maintaining our current infrastructure but instead sets our Nation on a road that is built to last.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), a member of the committee.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to start by thanking Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO for their bipartisan leadership. I am going to vote for this 2-month extension for the highway trust fund in order to avoid a shutdown of America's transit building and repair.

But with that said, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is like fixing our roads and bridges with Silly Putty. It is just not strong enough to hold our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. So I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to say it is time to make those long-term investments necessary for people and goods to get to their destination safely and timely.

Mr. Speaker, transportation moves our economy. It is time for Congress to get going.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a strong advocate for all things transportation, a member of the powerful Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the chairman. I am not going to vote for this piece of legislation—not even close.

Everyone talks about how we must maintain the roads. If you listened over the last 45 minutes, all of these infrastructure issues are in bad shape, terrible shape. We know the problem. So long speeches about this and the problem don't make much sense.

Here is my question to every Member of this body: What are you prepared to do? Make believe you are doing something? Hide under the desk in your office?

How much money have we used, Mr. Speaker, from the general fund to bail out transportation? The percentage of general funds increases each budget that we are using. So without a clear source of long-term funding, our States cannot plan for the future. In fact, many States are not putting money into their trust fund. My own State, the State of New Jersey, I guess the money is going to fall out of the sky. So 2 months, 4 months, 7 months, it is all a joke.

Ensuring the solvency of the trust fund is not only a key component of meeting our transportation challenges, it is our job. The Committee on Ways and Means has not even had one hearing, Mr. Ranking Member, Mr. Chairman. How many States have put themselves in the same position as the Federal Government?

I understand that some Members are already planning another short-term extension in July because you say now we are ready to have a long-term solution, but you are already planning for another short-term in July. In fact, we are moving towards the omnibus bill, where we will put everything together. It will be like a stew: trade, transportation, lollipops, put them all in there. Put it all in there, and then we will vote on it and have some of our Members vote against motherhood so that they will be on the block a year from this November.

Look, let me suggest something novel for this group. Let's spend the next 8 weeks resuscitating a system where users of the system pay to maintain and grow the system. International tax can be a part of the solution. I say to the President and the Congress, it is not nearly enough money.

A group of us presented a bipartisan plan—Republicans and Democrats—to fund the Federal highway trust fund. Through Democratic Presidents, Republican Presidents, through Democratic Houses and Republican Houses, we have always been able to come to a resolution on this until the last 3 or 4 years. Why? Why is this?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, neither party has the wherewithal to deal with the problem. I believe our model must receive serious consideration as the clock counts down on the trust fund's expiration. Our legislation has the support of both business and labor.

I am done with extensions, and I plan to vote ''no'' today. I ask my colleagues to show support for a long-term bill and cosponsor the Renacci-Pascrell plan, because if we don't change something, we will be right back here in July talking to each other.

Mr. SHUSTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First off, I want to join in what many others have said: transportation infrastructure has not been historically nor should it become a partisan issue. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work together on many aspects. We will at times disagree over elements of bills, but in general we agree that what makes this country great, what makes us competitive in the world is a world-class system of transportation infrastructure and other critical infrastructure, and today we are deficient. I talked during my introductory remarks about some of the needs. Let me just talk about the revenues.

Back in 1993, when the gas tax was raised by a bipartisan coalition in the House—actually, on the Republican side, led by the chairman's father, Bud Shuster—we paid about 14 percent.

Every time you went to the pump, with the increase in the gas tax in 1993, 14 percent of your bill went to invest in the Nation's infrastructure. Yet today, some 22 years later, 7 percent goes to the infrastructure. Population has grown, road miles have increased, and the Eisenhower infrastructure has aged.

Infrastructure doesn't just age a little bit each year. It reaches a point where it accelerates dramatically, so a bridge that you could fix for $15 million or $20 million today, 2 years from now you might have to totally replace for $100 million. So not delaying these needed investments, unless we want to see people detouring around all the rivers in America because of bridge outages, is really, really critical for a just-in-time economy, for our world competitiveness, to save on fuel efficiency.

Now, a number of States have stepped in to fill the void; 14 States have voted to raise their own gas taxes since 2013. As the gentleman from Oregon pointed out, six deep red Republican States have voted to raise their gas tax this year.

Just to assure my colleagues, for those who raised it before the last election, nobody lost their election because they raised the gas tax in those States. People recognize it as a user fee. They are tired of blowing out tires and car repairs because of potholes. They are tired of detours. The trucking industry is tired of detours, and they don't want a proliferation of tolls across America. The solution is a Federal partnership.

The chairman held a hearing recently where we had the Department of Transportation director from Wyoming, a deep red State, talking about the fact that they had increased their gas tax, but they still need the Federal partnership; it is critical. We had the Governor of North Carolina—has one of the highest gas taxes in the country, deep red State these days—saying the Federal partnership was more critical than ever. The same with the mayor of Salt Lake City, the Federal partnership is critical. No State can do it on its own.

I propose that we index the gas tax to construction costs, inflation, fleet fuel economy. That would mean next year the gas tax would go up by 1.7 cents. I would like to see the Member of Congress who thinks they are going to lose their election over a 1.7 cent investment in America's infrastructure to avoid those potholes, the congestion, the detours, the delays, or the additional tolling to maintain what we have. It won't happen. It hasn't happened recently in red States that have raised it much more than 1.7 cents.

But if we index to inflation, fleet fuel economy, and construction costs inflation, we could borrow upfront for the trust fund, let's say, $150 billion, a nice increase over the current levels of spending, and we could pay it back in about 15 years with that increment, just the indexed increment that would grow a tiny bit each year.

And again, you drive by the gas station on your way to work, and when you drive home at night, ExxonMobil has raised it a nickel because there were rumors of war in the Middle East or a refinery had an outage or something or this. Where did that nickel go? It went into the pockets of ExxonMobil or speculators on Wall Street. It didn't go into our Nation's infrastructure.

The American people would sure as heck rather pay 1.7 cents to rebuild our system and make America more competitive and put hundreds of thousands of people to work than another nickel in the coffers of OPEC or ExxonMobil or Wall Street speculators.

It is time to suck it up around here, act like men and women who were sent here to make tough decisions, to regain our legacy, to begin to bring America back toward a world-class infrastructure. It would take many years and many tens or hundreds of billions of dollars to reclaim the legacy of the Eisenhower era, but it is only a lack of will—will—that prevents us from doing that. There is no major impediment. Nobody is going to lose their election over 1.7 cents a gallon. In fact, people will thank you at home.

The trucking industry is begging—begging—for an increase in the diesel tax. The United States Chamber of Commerce, when is the last time they asked for an increase in a tax? Look, all across the spectrum, the retailers, the business community, all across this country people are saying: Help us; get us out of congestion; fix the system; bring it up to a state of good repair. There is another whole contingent of American people who are saying: We need jobs.

There is no more certain way to create jobs in this country than investing in America's infrastructure. And they are not just construction jobs. They are engineering jobs. They are manufacturing jobs. In the case of mass transit, they are high-tech jobs. They are small business jobs. They are disadvantaged business enterprise jobs. It goes through the entire economy. No American will be left behind.

We could create hundreds of thousands of jobs and make America number one again. All we lack is the will here in this House. Let's say this is the last 60-day delay. Let's work together, and let's get a real 6-year bill by the end of July.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to announce we introduced the GROW AMERICA Act comprehensive bill with which we could begin policy discussions, H.R. 2410, today, with 19 cosponsors.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate the passion of the ranking member, my friend, Mr. DEFAZIO, on these issues. I have to say that much of what has been said on this floor by both sides, I agree with. The need to invest in our infrastructure is real. It is critical. Our infrastructure is crumbling all around us.

I also agree that we need to find a long-term solution to the trust fund to make sure it is fiscally responsible, and most importantly, I agree that we need to act. This 2-month extension was not my preference. What my preference is, is to buckle down, work hard, find the dollars, and have a long-term surface transportation bill that is sustainable.

Again, I stand here today urging all my colleagues to vote for this essential 2-month extension to get us through to July. I am committed to continue to work to find the solution so we can have a long-term bill, but a vote against this bill is a vote in favor of shutting down these vital programs, stopping the work of thousands of highway projects around the country and laying off thousands of construction workers and Federal employees.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the highway trust fund has enough money to pay for projects through the end of July, but its legal authority to spend that money expires at the end of this month. I would have preferred to pass an extension that lasted through the end of the year, but we just couldn't come to a bipartisan agreement on how to pay for it. That's unfortunate because the more time we spend on these short-term patches, the less time we'll have to find a long-term solution.

And ultimately, the only real solution is a long-term solution. At the very least, this legislation will allow the trust find to continue to fund projects through July, while we continue to work on an extension for the rest of the year. But if we really want to solve this problem, both parties need to confront the serious challenges facing the trust fund. That's the only way we'll come up with a plan to give states the certainty they need to build the roads and bridges our families need to thrive.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill, H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015 but with reservations.

I support Chairman SHUSTER's efforts to ensure the Highway Bill does not expire and cost the economy jobs and cause important projects to stop progress.

I am, however, disappointed we once again face this issue.

We need to pass a long-term highway bill so that our communities and businesses have the certainty they need to invest in our future.

I understand the fiscal challenges we face but I believe that we must do more to improve our nation's transportation system.

Transportation funding, particularly for highways and transit, is particularly important for my constituents and the entirety of the Greater Houston area.

We have a congestion problem in Houston.

We have done a lot to reduce this congestion, but more must be done.

We also have the largest port for foreign tonnage and largest petrochemical complex in our country along the banks of the Port of Houston.

In the years ahead, we will face a much higher traffic volume due to population growth and the expansion of the Panama Canal, which will bring more truck traffic and economic development to the area.

In order for Houston and our Port to continue to be a hub for commerce, we must strengthen our rail and road infrastructure.

Both a successful port and a growing local economy rely on well maintained roads and bridges.

Communities around our country must improve its transportation infrastructure in order to encourage businesses and economic development.

While I understand the strain the Highway Trust Fund is experiencing, it is important that we fund important highway projects throughout the country.

We are at a critical time for our nation in terms of transportation funding.

We must fix bridges, expand highways, and increase the capacity of our infrastructure.

Highway and transit projects are important to our constituents, so they can get to work and school and they are important to our businesses so they can move commerce.

Everyone wins when we increase our investments in our transportation infrastructure.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2353 but I also urge my colleagues to fix the problem and craft a long-term highway bill for the benefit of all our citizens.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2353. This bill will mark the thirty-third time we've passed a short-term extension to the Highway bill in eight years. Enough is enough. Our roads and bridges are crumbling. We owe it to the American people to pass a robust long-term surface transportation bill and make real investments in our transportation infrastructure. These short-term extensions not only diminish our economic competitiveness as a nation but they erode the safety of all of the folks we were sent here to represent. I will not support any more short-term gimmicks and implore my colleagues to join me in rejecting this proposal and instead pass a long-term bill and once again invest in our national infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. ESTY. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2353 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle E—Passenger Rail Positive Train Control Funding

SEC. 1401. PASSENGER RAIL POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL FUNDING.

Section 20158(c) of title 49, United States Code is amended by inserting ``, and $750,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'' after ``2013''.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

My amendment provides $750 million to passenger railroads to help them implement positive train control. Tragically, last week, Amtrak 188 derailed, killing 8 people and injuring more than 200. My thoughts and prayers are with the victims and their loved ones.

Unfortunately, last week's tragic accident is just the latest in a series of incidents that are unacceptable and largely preventable.

According to National Transportation Safety Board member Robert Sumwalt, the lead investigator of last week's Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia: ''Had PTC''—positive train control—''been installed on the section of track, this accident would not have occurred.''

Now, what is positive train control? Positive train control, commonly referred to as PTC, is a communications and signaling system that uses GPS technology and sensors to communicate train location, speed, restrictions, and moving authority.

Most importantly, PTC can save lives. For instance, positive train control technology can detect if a train is going too fast for an area and use onboard equipment to automatically slow or stop the train.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last week's derailment is not the first time NTSB has recommended implementing positive train control. This recommendation has been made since 1969, following an investigation of a head-on collision of two Penn Central commuter trains near Darien, Connecticut, in my home State. That collision killed 4 people and left 43 injured.

Forty-six years after that deadly collision in Connecticut, the NTSB is still demanding and waiting for action. During this time, the NTSB has investigated 144 accidents that would have been preventable if railroads had installed PTC. Not surprisingly, positive train control has been on the NTSB's most wanted list of safety improvements since 1990.

144 accidents over 43 years—try and think about that, and try to comprehend 6,532 preventable injuries and 288 preventable deaths.

This just isn't an issue only on the Northeast corridor. In 2008, a tragic accident in California killed 25 people and injured 102. After that accident, this House enacted legislation requiring PTC on commuter and intercity passenger rails by December 31 of this year; but protecting lives requires leadership from this Congress.

The American Public Transportation Association asked Congress to provide Federal funding for 80 percent of the installation costs on passenger rails. We in Congress can help. We can and must make this investment before another terrible accident, before another life is tragically and needlessly lost. We can't afford to wait.

Less than 2 years ago, a Metro-North Railroad engineer fell asleep as the train he was operating sped up to 82 miles an hour through a tight curve. The restriction for that section was only 30 miles an hour. As a result of the derailment, 4 people died, and 61 were injured. With tragic predictability, the NTSB investigation determined that positive train control could have prevented that tragedy as well.

How many more times does the NTSB need to repeat its recommendation before PTC is implemented?

There is no reason why this Congress should continue to ignore its responsibility to help passenger railroads implement the lifesaving technology as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to provide the necessary funding to help passenger railroads implement PTC across the United States.

Let me be clear: this funding won't prevent every single accident. The fact that PTC will not prevent every accident should not—cannot—be an excuse for this Congress' failure to act.

Failure to act today on implementing positive train control is wrong. It is unworthy of a great country. A great country does not respond to crises with duct tape; a great country leads with action.

I ask all House Members to join me to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SHUSTER. I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion. We certainly know of the tragedy that happened in Philadelphia, in my home State, but this really is not the place to address this.

We need to pass a clean extension. We have got to pass it and get it to the Senate, so we make sure that these vital programs keep people working, we keep projects moving forward, and that they don't shut down.

Again, this is a clean extension. We want it to be a clean extension because we know that time is of the essence to get this over to the Senate, as I said, and pass it. You are talking about 4,000 people in the government that will be furloughed and thousands of workers across America. Projects will stop, and they won't be working.

Again, we have an immediate need to extend the highway transit and safety programs. I am confident and remain committed to working with Chairman RYAN; but this is not the time to slow this down. This the time to get it done so that we can get it to the Senate as quickly as possible.

Again, I am opposed to this motion. I urge a ''no'' vote on the motion and continue to ask my colleagues to support the underlying bill that gets the job done and gets us past this critical time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–40)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2015.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 2015.*

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on consideration of H.R. 2250, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2250.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1516

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARTER of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When I joined the Appropriations Committee a little over 4 years ago, I said that I wanted this committee to be known as a place where taxpayer money was saved and not spent. In recent years, there has been a major change in the perception of this committee.

Thanks in large part to the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and the members of the committee, the process is open, and it is transparent, and this committee has made a priority of ensuring every taxpayer dollar is spent wisely.

In keeping with that trend, the bill that we are here to debate today holds the line on spending. It is a bill that honors and respects the taxpayer while preserving the beauty of the Capitol campus, providing essential security for visitors and staff, and ensuring that we are able to provide the services that our constituents expect and deserve.

This bill is a total of $3.3 billion for the legislative branch, excluding all Senate items. The bill continues the freeze on funding for the House of Representatives, including leadership, committees, and Member office budgets. It also continues the Member pay freeze that was put in place in 2010.

In all, this represents a 14 percent reduction in funding for the House of Representatives since Republicans have gained control of Congress in January of 2011.

Now, more specifically, this bill increases funding for the Capitol Police and allows small increases for several other agencies while trimming budgets in less critical areas.

This bill recognizes the continuing challenges faced by our Architect of the Capitol. There is a balance that must be struck between preserving these historic buildings and funding other critical projects, including life-safety projects.

Overall, the Architect's budget is one that was trimmed. This bill puts a new emphasis on transparency and accountability in major construction projects under the Architect. That is why this bill transitions to direct appropriations for the Cannon restoration project, rather than continuing to use the House historic building revitalization fund. This change will significantly improve the committee's ability to provide oversight for this major project.

Additionally, this bill includes language that places a 25 percent cap on the amount available for larger projects within the legislative branch. In order to receive the remaining 75 percent of their appropriations, this new oversight feature requires a plan for any project over $5 million to be submitted to the GAO and our committee for approval.

The plan must address any projected changes to the project's schedule and cost, and it must include a description of the safeguards taken to ensure that the project remains on time and on budget.

Now, regarding the Library of Congress, this bill includes funding to meet the Library's current needs, including an increase for the U.S. Copyright Office to reduce claims processing and analyze possible process improvements.

Additionally, the committee will be working with the Library in the upcoming months to track its progress in addressing its critical IT infrastructure problems which have been identified in a recent GAO report.

In closing, I would like to thank Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Chairman ROGERS, Mrs. LOWEY, and the members of our subcommittee and full committee and staff for their hard work throughout this entire process. This is a product that we can be proud of.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Payment to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress	---	---	174	+174	+174
Salaries and Expenses					
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker	6,645	6,645	6,645	---	---
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	2,180	2,180	2,180	---	---
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	7,114	7,114	7,114	---	---
Office of the Majority Whip	1,887	1,887	1,887	---	---
Office of the Minority Whip	1,460	1,460	1,460	---	---
Republican Conference	1,505	1,505	1,505	---	---
Democratic Caucus	1,487	1,487	1,487	---	---
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	22,278	22,278	22,278	---	---
Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail					
Expenses	554,318	554,318	554,318	---	---
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select	123,903	123,903	123,903	---	---
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	23,271	23,271	23,271	---	---
Subtotal, Committee employees	147,174	147,174	147,174	---	---
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk	24,009	24,981	24,981	+972	---
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	11,927	14,827	14,827	+2,900	---
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	113,100	117,165	115,010	+1,910	-2,155
Office of the Inspector General	4,742	4,742	4,742	---	---
Office of General Counsel	1,341	1,413	1,413	+72	---
Office of the Parliamentarian	1,952	1,975	1,975	+23	---
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	4,088	3,120	3,120	-968	---
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	8,893	8,353	8,353	-540	---
Office of Interparliamentary Affairs	814	814	814	---	---
Other authorized employees	479	479	479	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries, officers and employees	171,345	177,869	175,714	+4,369	-2,155
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	4,153	3,625	3,625	-528	---
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House	190	190	190	---	---
Government contributions	256,636	252,164	254,448	-2,188	+2,284
Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery	16,217	16,289	16,217	---	-72
Transition activities	3,737	2,084	2,084	-1,653	---
Wounded Warrior program	2,500	2,500	2,500	---	---
Office of Congressional Ethics	1,467	1,524	1,467	---	-57
Miscellaneous items	720	720	720	---	---
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses	285,620	279,096	281,251	-4,369	+2,155
Total, House of Representatives (discretionary)	1,180,735	1,180,735	1,180,735	---	---
Total, House of Representatives (mandatory)	---	---	174	+174	+174

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Economic Committee	4,203	4,254	4,203	---	-51
Joint Committee on Taxation	10,095	10,300	10,095	---	-205
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	3,371	3,797	3,784	+413	-13
Office of Congressional Accessibility Services	1,387	1,416	1,387	---	-29
Total, Joint items	19,056	19,767	19,469	+413	-298
CAPITOL POLICE					
Salaries	286,500	307,428	300,000	+13,500	-7,428
General expenses	61,459	71,472	69,000	+7,541	-2,472
Total, Capitol Police	347,959	378,900	369,000	+21,041	-9,900
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE					
Salaries and expenses	3,959	4,020	3,959	---	-61
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	45,700	47,270	47,270	+1,570	---
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Capitol Construction and Operations 1/	91,455	95,396	90,946	-509	-4,450
Capitol building	54,665	58,052	46,737	-7,928	-11,315
Capitol grounds	11,973	15,273	11,880	-93	-3,393
House of Representatives buildings:					
House office buildings	89,447	90,282	149,962	+60,515	+59,680
House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund	70,000	70,000	10,000	-60,000	-60,000
Capitol Power Plant	99,652	129,803	100,550	+898	-29,253
Offsetting collections	-9,000	-9,000	-9,000	---	---
Subtotal, Capitol Power Plant	90,652	120,803	91,550	+898	-29,253
Library buildings and grounds	42,180	65,801	36,589	-5,591	-29,212
Capitol police buildings, grounds, and security	19,159	28,247	22,058	+2,899	-6,189
Botanic Garden	15,573	12,113	11,892	-3,681	-221
Capitol Visitor Center:					
CVC operations	20,844	21,043	20,557	-287	-486
Total, Architect of the Capitol	505,948	577,010	492,171	-13,777	-84,839
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses	419,357	444,370	419,357	---	-25,013
Authority to spend receipts	-6,350	-6,350	-6,350	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	413,007	438,020	413,007	---	-25,013
Copyright Office, Salaries and expenses	54,303	58,875	57,008	+2,705	-1,867
Authority to spend receipts	-33,582	-35,777	-35,777	-2,195	---
Subtotal, Copyright Office	20,721	23,098	21,231	+510	-1,867
Congressional Research Service, Salaries and expenses	106,945	111,956	106,945	---	-5,011
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, Salaries and expenses	50,248	51,428	50,248	---	-1,180
Total, Library of Congress	590,921	624,502	591,431	+510	-33,071

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE					
Congressional publishing	79,736	79,736	79,736	---	---
Public Information Programs of the Superintendent of Documents,					
Salaries and expenses	31,500	30,500	30,500	-1,000	---
Government Publishing Office Business Operations Revolving Fund	8,757	9,764	---	-8,757	-9,764
Total, Government Publishing Office	119,993	120,000	110,236	-9,757	-9,764
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	545,750	578,508	547,450	+1,700	-31,058
Offsetting collections	-23,750	-25,450	-25,450	-1,700	---
Total, Government Accountability Office	522,000	553,058	522,000	---	-31,058
OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND					
Payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund	5,700	8,000	5,700	---	-2,300
JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT					
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Scorekeeping adjustment (CBO estimate)	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
Grand total	3,341,401	3,513,692	3,341,575	+174	-172,117
Discretionary	(3,341,401)	(3,513,692)	(3,341,401)	---	(-172,291)
Mandatory	---	---	(174)	(+174)	(+174)

1/ Formerly named General Administration

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
House of Representatives (discretionary)	1,180,735	1,180,735	1,180,735	---	---
House of Representatives (mandatory)	---	---	174	+174	+174
Joint Items	19,056	19,767	19,469	+413	-298
Capitol Police	347,959	378,900	369,000	+21,041	-9,900
Office of Compliance	3,959	4,020	3,959	---	-61
Congressional Budget Office	45,700	47,270	47,270	+1,570	---
Architect of the Capitol	505,948	577,010	492,171	-13,777	-84,839
Library of Congress	590,921	624,502	591,431	+510	-33,071
Government Publishing Office	119,993	120,000	110,236	-9,757	-9,764
Government Accountability Office	522,000	553,058	522,000	---	-31,058
Open World Leadership Center	5,700	8,000	5,700	---	-2,300
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
General Provisions	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
Grand total	3,341,401	3,513,692	3,341,575	+174	-172,117
Discretionary	(3,341,401)	(3,513,692)	(3,341,401)	---	(-172,291)
Mandatory	---	---	(174)	(+174)	(+174)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by congratulating Chairman GRAVES on his maiden voyage as a chair of an appropriations subcommittee. I know that he was diligent and focused, and we found agreement where we could, and where we could not agree, I appreciate his willingness to discuss it in a congenial and thoughtful manner.

Today, we consider the smallest of the appropriations bills; and, while that is the case, it is one that does fund an entire branch of our government. The bill provides, as the chairman mentioned, $3.3 billion to the legislative branch, without Senate items, and is equal to the amount provided in fiscal year 2015.

Unfortunately, this represents the third year in a row of flat funding for the overall legislative branch. Certain agencies—the Architect of the Capitol and the Government Publishing Office—are cut below fiscal year 2015 to support increases in other agencies.

I know if there was overall relief in the budget allocation, we would see more investment in the staff and facilities in the legislative branch, but we are starting to cut into bone in some places, and it is truly unwise.

It is regrettable that this bill is, as are all of the other appropriations bills, bound by spending limits set by the Republican budget resolution that continues sequestration.

The President put forward a plan that will avoid sequestration's harmful budget cuts and reduce the deficit in a balanced way. Unfortunately, the Republican budget does not at least meet the President's plan halfway.

As we look to conference with the Senate later in the year on appropriations bills, I am hopeful that both parties and the President can come together for another reasonable bargain that gives us more room for discretionary programs.

This bill is being considered under a structured rule, as is tradition. Twenty amendments were filed, seven of which were filed by Democratic Members. Regrettably, the Rules Committee only made three Republican amendments in order, all of which would further erode the Legislative Branch bill's funding.

No Democratic amendments were made in order, even though several were aimed at improving the lives of our restaurant workers whose plight was played out in very public display in the last several weeks.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, I asked the committee to attempt to find some parity, Mr. Chairman, between the majority and minority with regard to amendments made in order; instead of parity, the minority was completely shut out of the process.

As a result of the allocation, several infrastructure projects with life and safety elements are not funded in this bill, even though we have been committed to funding those in past years.

Cutting necessary upgrades to our elevators will not get us out of debt; what it will do is get people stuck in our elevators. We should not be surprised if an accident happens because we didn't address important life-safety projects.

This bill, as I have said many times before, is not the sexiest of the 13 appropriations bills, but it is one that is incredibly important, and it is important that we keep the people who visit the Capitol and work in the Capitol safe, and this bill makes it less likely that we will be able to do that.

There are not many new initiatives in the bill, given the allocation, but I am pleased that the bill recognized the importance of the Nation's copyright laws by providing some of the requested increase.

The Copyright Office must improve the backlog of registrations, as well as their business processes. Currently, customers can only submit documents on paper, which the Copyright Office turns into a digital format, which is a glaring inefficiency. It is 2015, the 21st century. Our Copyright Office should not be conducting 21st century business in a 20th century format.

The Copyright Office said it best itself in a report released in February of this year:

> There is a widespread perception that our licensing system is broken. Songwriters and recording artists are concerned that they cannot make a living under the existing structure, which raises serious and systemic concerns for the future. Music publishers and performance rights organizations are frustrated that so much of their licensing activity is subject to government control, so they are constrained in the marketplace. Record labels and digital services complain that the licensing process is burdensome and inefficient, making it difficult to innovate.

I am glad to see that this bill is beginning to address necessary upgrades.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned with the cut to the Government Publishing Office in the underlying bill. This office was formerly known as the Government Printing Office. Congress changed the name in December to reflect what the agency actually does in this digital world. The office publishes information online and plays a vital role in Congress' transparency.

Unfortunately, GPO's request to continue to improve its online site, as it has been allowed to do each year before this one, even under full sequestration, was denied in the bill. The cut to GPO's online site continues to raise the concern from some that GPO could ultimately decide to charge the public for access to legislative documents, as was recommended to them by the National Academy of Public Administration in 2013.

I agree with Representatives CANDICE MILLER and BOB BRADY, the chair and ranking member of House Administration, who wrote to GPO, stating: ''Charging the public to access legislative data and documents would be a colossal setback to the progress Congress has made to improve transparency and access to legislative information.''

They also said charging the public ''would be a direct assault on our ability to engage Americans in a process that is of great consequence to their livelihoods.''

GPO indicated at the time of the Miller-Brady letter that it had no plans to charge users for what should be public information; but what choice are we leaving them if we don't continue investing in their online systems?

Also included in the bill is a requirement that the Architect seek approval, as the chairman described, from the House Committee on Appropriations and the Government Accountability Office for any project or phase of a project over $5 million.

I support strong oversight, as I have demonstrated many times over the last 8 years, but I do question whether or not the low threshold would unnecessarily hold up the progress of essential projects.

We should require the assistance of GAO to review projects on the scale of the Cannon building restoration. I have asked GAO to come in and get involved very specifically in a number of things where accountability was a concern, but I question the use of GAO's resources on projects as small as $5 million. That begins to micromanage beyond what is reasonable.

To end on a more positive note, I am pleased that we were able to provide $10 million to add to the House historic buildings revitalization trust fund. We have been banking funds for our large projects over the last several years, which is imperative to help ensure we avoid getting caught flatfooted if we experience unexpected costs in the future.

As I conclude, I want to, again, thank Chairman GRAVES for an open dialogue as he crafted this bill. I did have a lot of opportunity to talk with him about the details of this bill and offer suggestions, many of which he took. Again, I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman as the bill moves to the Senate and then on to conference.

I particularly want to thank our incredible staff, one of whom is sitting next to me, Shalanda Young, and the rest of our staff, Liz Dawson, Chuck Turner, on the majority side; and Jenny Panone, as well as Jason Murphy, with Chairman GRAVES' personal office; and Rosalyn Kumar, on my personal staff. Thank you so much.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to our full committee chairman, I do want to thank the ranking member for her work on

this, her input. She worked diligently through the process and was supportive in subcommittee and full committee, and I wanted to thank her for that publicly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Chairman GRAVES, thank you for yielding the time, and thank you for the great work.

This is the first bill that Chairman GRAVES has brought to the floor of the House. He is the newest cardinal that we have, one of the 12 subcommittee chairmen—they are called cardinals—and this is his first bill.

I want to congratulate him and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for putting together what I think is a pretty high standard for fiscal responsibility for the House, freezing funding at last year's level, $3.3 billion.

That is the third year in a row, Mr. Chairman, that we have frozen the budget of the House of Representatives, making good on our promise to rein in spending and do more with less.

□ 1530

This level maintains the 14 percent reduction in House funding that began when Republicans took control of the House 4 years ago.

In addition, we have continued the freeze on Member pay that has been in place since 2010. We believe that in order for us to ask others to sacrifice throughout the government, that we have to sacrifice, ourselves, first; and that is what this bill does.

The bill includes numerous provisions designed to guarantee that the House and its support agencies are spending their tax dollars appropriately and to keep them accountable to the taxpayers. This includes enhancing oversight of the Cannon building restoration project and making sure that Congress approves any large-scale construction project.

These steps will help ensure that this type of major undertaking stays on time and on budget and are especially important given the historical significance of our buildings and the importance of their use.

The $3.3 billion this bill provides for the House is directed to support the most important functions of our legislative branch: keeping our Member and committee offices open for business, protecting the safety of those who work in and visit the Capitol complex, and improving the way we support our agencies—and the importance of doing just that.

For instance, the Capitol Police budget has been increased by $21 million to ensure our men in blue have the resources needed to protect this hallowed building and its grounds. And where we have seen issues in the agencies funded by the bill—for example, IT infrastructure challenges at the Library of Congress—we have taken the steps to make sure that these will be fixed moving forward.

Again, I want to thank Chairman GRAVES, Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and this great staff that has worked hard on this bill. They have demonstrated their love of this institution and these grounds by the hard work and devotion they have put into making this bill possible. So we want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for putting together this small but mighty bill. So I thank them for all of their work.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud that the House can lead by example when it comes to restoring fiscal discipline to the operations of the Federal Government. This bill will allow the House to fulfill its core duties within a responsible, realistic budget and preserve the democracy that makes this Nation so great.

I thank the chairman for the time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee as well as the ranking member of the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GRAVES and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work on this bill.

Today, during what the majority has labeled ''Innovation Week,'' we consider the smallest of the appropriation bills, which funds the operations of our Nation's legislative branch.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely nothing innovative about this bill. Without Senate items, the bill is $3.341 billion. Despite years of ''tightening our belts,'' the majority has, yet again, kept funding flat and further damaged this institution's reputation and ability to function at the highest level.

Member representational allowances, or MRAs, would be frozen for a third consecutive year and will continue to strain the House's ability to serve the American people due to fewer staff for constituent casework, the inability to effectively communicate with our constituents, and fewer district offices.

Furthermore, we will consider amendments to the bill which would compound the problems legislative branch agencies face: our buildings are crumbling, life and safety projects are postponed, and agencies have hit the limits of what they can do with inadequate funding. Further cuts proposed today will have even greater implications for the operations of the Congress.

I am concerned that the majority continues funding for a partisan lawsuit against the President. At a time when we are putting appropriation bills under tight budgetary restrictions, this waste of taxpayer dollars only distracts us from the serious work Congress should get done.

Notwithstanding my misgivings, I want to again congratulate the chairman for putting forth his first bill and working with the ranking member, where possible. We need more cooperation between the majority and the minority.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise on this bill, as a member of the subcommittee, with very mixed emotions. There are some very good things in this bill, but there is also some bad stuff. The question is whether the bill is 51 percent good or 51 percent bad.

I came to Congress because I believe that government can play a positive role in American lives. Government is not the enemy.

But it makes me wonder then why this body refuses to invest in the tools to do the job of government and, by extension, to do the job of the American people. This bill contains the same funding levels it did last year, and that is $172 million less than the budget request.

Any good corporation plots its investments so the company can prosper. In terms of the House of Representatives, that would mean setting spending at a level that would maximize its ability to serve the people. By failing to make those investments, we disrespect the American people, and we tell them that we are not worth the investment, not worth the effort, not worth doing the job well.

This bill fails to invest in the very institution we depend upon to make government function properly. This body is being given short shrift.

I am on the Appropriations Committee. I think it is our responsibility to meet the needs of the Nation in every respect, and that includes investing in the legislative branch of government so it can do its job.

Those low polling numbers that Congress gets—everybody here talks about how low it is—I think they are the self-fulfilled policy of a Congress that refuses to provide itself the tools they need to serve the public.

Skimping isn't going to make this place work any better. Using taxpayer dollars more wisely will.

Having said that, I am also supportive of what the committee brought to the floor in a program called the Open World Leadership Center. It is operated out of funds from Congress with the Library of Congress.

What Members may not know is that this program was begun as the brainchild of the late Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska and the Librarian of Congress. It was to expose young and emerging leaders—average age about 38—in Russia and former Eastern bloc countries. Some of those countries include Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, Kazakhstan.

I think President Putin would love to see this program go away, the way USAID has left the region.

It makes a difference to those young leaders to visit congressional districts, to see how city councils work, to see how school boards work, to see the United States, the State legislators, the judges. The program belongs in the legislative branch because peer-to-peer relationships do work.

The program reaches out to all 50 States. More than 23,000 rising leaders have been hosted by the United States Government since the program's inception. Eighty percent of those have met with Members of Congress and visited their congressional districts. This is a very robust exchange program.

I had a group in my district out in the central coast of California, and one of the visitors had been a member of the Duma, their Congress. He told me that he had been invited by our country to be here at least about a dozen times. But only in visiting the communities and seeing the local government in action did he actually understand what democracy was all about, a bottom's-up process in America that is never learned just visiting Washington or getting taught in a classroom. The value of hands-on, from-the-ground-up democracy is a lesson that can't be learned from a book. Open World experiences show these participants that democracy is not just a dream. It is actually a working reality, one that they can have in their home countries if they work at it. And America shows them how.

There is an amendment coming up, the Ratcliffe amendment, and I hope that all the Members of Congress will reject that amendment to delete this program.

Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the work of the gentleman from Georgia, our new chairman. He has done a great job. I hope that we will spend, though, a little bit more money investing in this institution so that we can get the job done, not just talk about how we can cut, squeeze, and trim, sacrificing the ability of Congress to be its best.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR). He is a great member of the subcommittee and a strong advocate for a lot of elements within our budget. The truth is, we had tough choices to make. It wasn't easy. We are held within the constraints of what current law is.

The President may have submitted a budget that didn't comply with the constraints that we have to comply with, but that doesn't mean that we can adhere to his budget numbers. So we are $170-something million below what the President requested or what the budget request was, but we are within the limits that are provided by law that many of the Members within this body voted for—excluding myself—and the President signed it into law.

At some point, we have to grapple with that, as a House, and understand that is the law. And until that law is changed, tough choices we will have to make.

As the chairman of the full committee so eloquently stated earlier, it is up to us to lead by example, and that is who we have elected to be our leaders and to represent our districts by example. So these are tough choices, no doubt. I agree with the gentleman from California.

I know we had a goal, as a committee, and it was really bipartisan, our objective; and that was to honor and respect taxpayers today and preserve the institution for future generations, given the limited resources we had to work with.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, let me just point out that the chairman is right: we do have to lead by example.

Leading by example, as we have in the past, like last fiscal year—after the President submitted his budget, we certainly could have and should have, as a Congress, sat down with the President and negotiated an adjustment to the sequester, which we were able to successfully do last year, and that was to the betterment of making sure that people who are simply trying to succeed have the opportunity to do so in this country instead of living under the severe cuts and caps that sequestration forced us into. That is Congress' job, which we abdicated. That was not the choice of the minority; it was the choice of the majority.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I appreciate my colleague from Florida yielding, and I appreciate the work that she and colleagues on both sides of the aisle have done on this bill. I want to commend them for their work.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to address an amendment yet to come, one that I hope this body will reject. This is an amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE). It will be an amendment to undo the bipartisan work of our Appropriations Committee. It would terminate the Open World program at the Library of Congress, which is a major outreach effort of our legislative branch in Russia and former Soviet and Soviet bloc countries.

At a time when these countries' democracies and sovereignty are under threat, the Open World program, I believe, is more important than ever. This isn't President Putin's favorite activity, as others have stated. That puts it very mildly, believe me. But he has not been able to stop it.

It is now more important than ever, not just in Russia but in fragile democracies and would-be democracies, such as Ukraine, Moldova, Kyrgyzstan, and Georgia.

This is the best program of its kind that I have ever seen. And I have a lot of personal experience with Open World groups that have come to Washington and have come to my district.

This is a program unique in both scope and concept. Most participants aren't the people who typically participate in international exchange programs. They are teachers, judges, local officials, young activists, people who live in rural areas and small towns. This program penetrates deeply, rather than just being another run-of-the-mill exchange program.

□ 1545

I invite any colleague to talk to any of our diplomats in the participant countries. You will leave with no doubt about how unique and how valuable the network of Open World participants is in the struggle for democracy in those countries and for the way our country is regarded, and there is a long list of veterans of Open World who are now public and private sector leaders in their countries.

Mr. Chairman, some may question the placement of Open World in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill. In fact, I think that is a huge asset. Because the program is not tied to a specific administration with its goals and politics, there is no hurdle to participation. There is no possibility that it will get lost as the State Department focuses on our other regions or on other priorities.

Now, unlike the other programs in this bill, sure enough, Open World is not about us. It is not about our salaries. It is not about our staffs. It is not about our operations. It is not about us. But I assure you, it is about our country. It is about what we stand for at home and around the world. It is about projecting the value of our democratic principles to countries with histories of oppressive rule.

The Appropriations Committee included funding for Open World following a bipartisan effort led by Representatives FORTENBERRY and FARR. Hopefully, today that wise decision will be sustained.

I strongly encourage this body to stand with the pro-democracy advocates, many, many brave and courageous people in a critical part of the world. Oppose the Ratcliffe amendment.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Point of clarification because I know these proceedings are documented well, and I know the ranking member stated that sequestration was a decision of the majority and not the minority. In some aspects, she is very correct, because at the time sequestration was implemented, the majority of the Senate was held by Democrats, and the concept came from Jack Lew, which is heavily documented, from the President's administration. So just to make sure there is full clarity here of majority and minority perspectives, there was a different majority at the time when that was taking place.

If I could, just for a moment, address the Open World discussion here. This is a program that has been ongoing for several years—it has been decades, quite frankly—with great intentions in the beginning. What hasn't been stated today is that its intention was to be a one-time program to assist during a transitional phase of the Soviet bloc countries at that time, back in the Bill Clinton administration, to assist them with some dialogue with free markets and diplomacy and such as we were experiencing during that time.

As we know, with a lot of government programs that have good intentions of being one time, singular, they tend to go on into perpetuity. Yet we have heard claims today that there is not enough money, that we don't have enough to spend on things that are so vital and so critical to this body, to the institution, to meeting our constituents' needs, to the $1.5 billion in deferred maintenance of buildings, to MRAs not being enough, or whatever it might be. Yet there is still this clinging to $5 million of training Russian diplomats or Russian civic leaders is more important, more important than meeting the critical needs that we have here as a body, whether it is the Library of Congress, whether it is making sure that there is security provided through the Capitol Police, that they are fully funded where they need to be, whatever it might be.

I would claim, Mr. Chairman, that today, if we cannot cut $5 million from a program that is duplicative, that there are 95 other programs that do very similar things, a program that has not been transparent, a program that has outlived its day, that is training Russians at a time when Russia is causing aggression against our allies and it is assisting our enemies, if we can't cut $5 million today and the gentleman from Texas' amendment fails today, God help us, when can we cut something from this budget?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While I intend to claim time in opposition to the amendment that addresses Open World a little bit later, which I know will come as a surprise to the chairman, I do want to point out now that what the chairman says is not quite accurate, which is why I am going to oppose the amendment. Because were we—and there were a number of options available to the Rules Committee—taking the $5 million that is going to Open World in the Legislative Branch bill now and putting it in to some other place in the Legislative Branch bill, life safety programs, restoring the cuts to GPO, or doing something that is going to make sure that the legislative branch can be competitive and has the ability to get our work done, then that would have been fine, because I agree that Open World is actually a square peg in a round hole and shouldn't be funded out of this bill, and I have made that case for many years.

Instead, what the majority did is they took an amendment that takes that $5 million and puts it into the spending reduction account. We are already $106 million below 2010 levels in our MRA, in our office accounts. This bill is flat-funded for 3 years in a row. We are doing ourselves a disservice and making it difficult for us to do our jobs when we had a ripe opportunity to take that $5 million—which I would have been for—and put it somewhere in the Legislative Branch bill instead of sending it out of here. That is not responsible.

Additionally, I will point out that perhaps the chairman's comments about sequestration demonstrate that he thinks that Congress' hands are tied and that we don't have the ability to actually make changes. The President has proposed what he believes we should do as an alternative to the sequester. That was his proposed budget.

Like last year, we also have the ability to set aside and work with the administration—set aside at least part of the sequester—so we could provide improved allocations for each of these appropriations bills and make sure that we can make life better for more Americans. Unfortunately, the majority continues to act as if somehow we are frozen in time and that we are paralyzed by sequestration as the law. The last time I checked, the Founding Fathers in the Constitution gave Congress the ability to change the law, which we should do.

Mr. Chairman, I will look forward to discussing some of the amendments that we will be debating in a few moments.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for, really, the opportunity to spend some time focusing on the needs of the legislative branch and giving us the ability to at least move forward in some ways towards addressing our role as a coequal branch of government. I think this bill could have been far better. It has made several positive changes, but as I have outlined, we have places where we disagree, but we did it without being disagreeable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the ranking member, and I appreciate her acknowledgment of her opposition to the amendment that will arrive earlier. I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that I am not a member of the Rules Committee. I did not make that decision as to what amendment would be adopted or not. There were three amendments very similar. They were bipartisan. So there was bipartisan opposition to this program. We have the amendment before us that is before us, and, for the record, I will be supporting that amendment.

Let me say this has been a process that has been difficult. I understand that. We have had some tough choices to make, but we have made them. We made them in a bipartisan way in which we had unanimous support out of subcommittee; we had no opposition that I recall in full committee. And so I expect today that we might maintain some of that bipartisanship, some of that ability to get something done here for the American people and show them that we have priorities in place that honor and respect them and preserve this institution for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, to sum up what this bill does is we are here to hold the line on spending. We are keeping it flat-funded, as we have for the last year or two. This is a bill that is going to honor and respect our taxpayers. It is one that is preserving the beauty of this Capitol campus, providing a central security for all visitors and staff, and ensuring that we are able to provide the services that our constituents expect and deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 2250, a bill to fund the operations of the U.S. House of Representatives for 2016 and for other purposes.

In these times of needed fiscal discipline, everyone must do their part. We are bound by funding caps and, though the president has put forward a blueprint to address sequestration, the Republican leadership has chosen to disregard the plan. As a result, appropriators have produced a bill that makes deep cuts to agencies and programs that support the legislative branch when compared to the president's request.

H.R. 2250 provides a total of $3.341 billion for vital House and House affiliated functions as well as for greater Congressional operations. This is a reduction from the president's

request of $200 million. Within the total available funding, $492.2 million is provided for the Architect of the Capitol which oversees maintenance and repairs of House and Senate office buildings in addition to many other important buildings in the Congressional complex. Excluding Senate items, this is an $84 million reduction in funding for maintenance of the Capitol Visitor Center, the Capitol Grounds, the Library of Congress and the U.S. Botanical Garden. $591.4 million is provided in the bill to fund Library of Congress (LOC) operations. In addition to being the repository of the nation's print and recorded media, the LOC serves as the research arm of Congress, helping to inform the legislative debate on Capitol Hill. This bill cuts its funding by $33 million below the president's request. The bill also reduces funding for the Government Accountability Office (GAO). The GAO functions as the ''congressional watchdog'' by investigating how federal agencies spend American taxpayer dollars. This bill funds GAO at $522 million, which is $31 million less than the president's request. H.R. 2250 does increase funding for the Capitol Police when compared to enacted funding levels, but the increase is actually a $10 million cut when compared to the president's request.

I believe spending taxpayer dollars carefully should always be a priority of Congress, and seeking ways to reduce government spending should also be a priority. There are funding reductions in the bill that I support, including the pay freeze for Members of Congress. But the American people expect us to make wise cuts. They don't want us cutting for the sake of cutting—especially when vital services may be impacted. The president's budget contained a strategy to address sequestration that would have made many of these cuts unnecessary. I regret that my Republican colleagues chose to ignore it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2250

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PAYMENT TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to Tori B. Nunnelee, widow of Alan Nunnelee, late a Representative from the State of Mississippi, $174,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, $1,180,736,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, $22,278,891, including: Office of the Speaker, $6,645,417, including $25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, $2,180,048, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, $7,114,471, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, $1,886,632, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, $1,459,639, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Republican Conference, $1,505,426; Democratic Caucus, $1,487,258: *Provided*, That such amount for salaries and expenses shall remain available from January 3, 2016 until January 2, 2017.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, $554,317,732.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, $123,903,173: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, $23,271,004, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, $175,713,679, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including the positions of the Chaplain and the Historian, and including not more than $25,000, of which not more than $20,000 is for the Family Room and not more than $2,000 is for the Office of the Chaplain, for official representation and reception expenses, $24,980,898; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages and the Office of Emergency Management, and including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $14,827,120 of which $4,784,229 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $115,010,000, of which $1,350,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, $4,741,809; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, $1,413,450; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian, $2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, and not more than $1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $1,974,606; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, $3,119,766; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, $8,352,975; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, $814,069; for other authorized employees, $478,986.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, $281,251,521, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, $3,625,236; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, $190,486; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, $254,447,514, to remain available until March 31, 2017; Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery, $16,217,008 of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended; transition activities for new members and staff, $2,084,000, to remain available until expended; Wounded Warrior Program $2,500,000, to remain available until expended; Office of Congressional Ethics, $1,467,030; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, $720,247.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) REQUIRING AMOUNTS REMAINING IN MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES TO BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for ''HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES—MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES'' shall be available only for fiscal year 2016. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for fiscal year 2016 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''Member of the House of Representatives'' means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

DELIVERY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SEC. 102. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of a bill, joint resolution, or resolution to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) unless the Member requests a copy.

DELIVERY OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 103. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of any version of the Congressional Record to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

LIMITATION ON AMOUNT AVAILABLE TO LEASE VEHICLES

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives to make any payments from any Members' Representational Allowance for the leasing of a vehicle, excluding mobile district offices, in an aggregate amount that exceeds $1,000 for the vehicle in any month.

LIMITATION ON PRINTED COPIES OF U.S. CODE TO HOUSE

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide an aggregate number of more than 50 printed copies of any edition of the United States Code to all offices of the House of Representatives.

DELIVERY OF REPORTS OF DISBURSEMENTS

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the report of disbursements for the operations of the House of Representatives under section 106 of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 5535) to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

DELIVERY OF DAILY CALENDAR

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) a printed copy of the Daily Calendar of the House of Representatives which is prepared by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, $4,203,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, $10,095,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including:

(1) an allowance of $2,175 per month to the Attending Physician;

(2) an allowance of $1,300 per month to the Senior Medical Officer;

(3) an allowance of $725 per month each to three medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician;

(4) an allowance of $725 per month to 2 assistants and $580 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and

(5) $2,692,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, $3,784,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, $1,387,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For salaries of employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay, and Government contributions for health, retirement, social security, professional liability insurance, and other applicable employee benefits, $300,000,000 of which overtime shall not exceed $30,928,000 unless the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate are notified, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, the awards program, postage, communication services, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and not more than $5,000 to be expended on the certification of the Chief of the Capitol Police in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $69,000,000, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2016 shall be paid by the Secretary of Homeland Security from funds available to the Department of Homeland Security.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

DEPOSIT OF REIMBURSEMENTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 1001. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2802(a)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1905(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''District of Columbia)'' and inserting the following: ''District of Columbia), and from any other source in the case of assistance provided in connection with an activity that was not sponsored by Congress''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2802(a)(2) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1905(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''law enforcement assistance to any Federal, State, or local government agency (including any agency of the District of Columbia)'' and inserting ''any law enforcement assistance for which reimbursement described in paragraph (1) is made''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any reimbursement received before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), $3,959,000, of which $450,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That not more than $500 may be expended on the certification of the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance in connection with official representation and reception expenses.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary for operation of the Congressional Budget Office, including not more than $6,000 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $47,270,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for all necessary expenses for surveys and studies, construction, operation, and general and administrative support in connection with facilities and activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden; electrical substations of the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol; including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than $5,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle, $90,946,000.

CAPITOL BUILDING

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol, $46,737,000, of which $22,737,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, $11,880,000, of which $2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, $149,962,000, of which $23,886,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, and of which $62,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the restoration and renovation of the Cannon House Office Building.

In addition, for a payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, $91,549,898, of which $14,408,898 shall remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That not more than $9,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2016.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, $36,589,000, of which $11,646,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

CAPITOL POLICE BUILDINGS, GROUNDS AND SECURITY

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of buildings, grounds and security enhancements of the United States Capitol Police, wherever located, the Alternate Computer Facility, and AOC security operations, $22,058,000, of which $4,525,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

BOTANIC GARDEN

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds,

and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $11,892,000; of which $2,100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, the Architect of the Capitol may obligate and expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance, care and operation of the National Garden established under section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146), upon vouchers approved by the Architect of the Capitol or a duly authorized designee.

CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

For all necessary expenses for the operation of the Capitol Visitor Center, $20,557,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

NO BONUSES FOR CONTRACTORS BEHIND SCHEDULE OR OVER BUDGET

SEC. 1101. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Architect of the Capitol may be used to make incentive or award payments to contractors for work on contracts or programs for which the contractor is behind schedule or over budget, unless the Architect of the Capitol, or agency-employed designee, determines that any such deviations are due to unforeseeable events, government-driven scope changes, or are not significant within the overall scope of the project and/or program.

SCRIMS

SEC. 1102. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for scrims containing photographs of building facades during restoration or construction projects performed by the Architect of the Capitol.

ACQUISITION OF PARCEL AT FORT MEADE

SEC. 1103. (a) ACQUISITION.—The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to acquire from the Maryland State Highway Administration, at no cost to the United States, a parcel of real property (including improvements thereon) consisting of approximately 7.34 acres located within the portion of Fort George G. Meade in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, that was transferred to the Architect of the Capitol by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to section 122 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 141 note).

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions applicable under subsections (b) and (d) of section 122 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 141 note) to the property acquired by the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to such section shall apply to the real property acquired by the Architect pursuant to the authority of this section.

OVERSIGHT PLAN FOR FUNDS PROVIDED FOR LARGE SCALE PROJECTS

SEC. 1104. (a) The Architect of the Capitol may not obligate more than 25 percent of the amount made available to the Architect under this Act for any project for which $5,000,000 or more is appropriated under this Act until—

(1) the Architect submits to the Comptroller General and the Committee on Appropriations of House of Representatives a plan for the use of the funds provided for the project which includes a description of any changes to the project's schedule (including benchmarks for the timing of the completion of various stages of the project) or the project's costs (including estimates of the total costs of the project or the total life cycle costs of the project), as well as a description of the accounting and other safeguards the Architect will implement to ensure that the project will be carried out in a timely and cost-effective manner; and

(2) the Comptroller General and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives approves such plan.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Library's catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, $419,357,000, of which not more than $6,000,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2016, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than $350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2016 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $6,350,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than $12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $8,231,000 shall remain available until expended for the digital collections and educational curricula program.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, $57,008,000, of which not more than $30,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2016 under section 708(d) of title 17, United States Code: *Provided*, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under such section, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That not more than $5,777,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2016 under sections 111(d)(2), 119(b)(3), 803(e), 1005, and 1316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $35,777,000: *Provided further*, That not more than $100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an ''International Copyright Institute'' in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than $6,500 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of chapter 8 of title 17, United States Code, any amounts made available under this heading which are attributable to royalty fees and payments received by the Copyright Office pursuant to sections 111, 119, and chapter 10 of such title may be used for the costs incurred in the administration of the Copyright Royalty Judges program, with the exception of the costs of salaries and benefits for the Copyright Royalty Judges and staff under section 802(e).

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, $106,945,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), $50,248,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than $650,000 shall be available to contract to provide newspapers to blind and physically handicapped residents at no cost to the individual.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

REIMBURSABLE AND REVOLVING FUND ACTIVITIES

SEC. 1201. (a) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2016, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed $186,015,000.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PUBLISHING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized publishing of congressional information and the distribution of congressional information in any format; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (section 902 of title 44, United States Code); publishing of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and publishing, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, $79,736,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under section 906 of title 44, United States Code:

Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Publishing Office business operations revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding sections 901, 902, and 906 of title 44, United States Code, this appropriation may be used to prepare indexes to the Congressional Record on only a monthly and session basis.

PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAMS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of the public information programs of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, $30,500,000: *Provided*, That amounts of not more than $2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 to depository and other designated libraries: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Publishing Office business operations revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE BUSINESS OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

The Government Publishing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Publishing Office business operations revolving fund: *Provided*, That not more than $7,500 may be expended on the certification of the Director of the Government Publishing Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the business operations revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Director of the Government Publishing Office shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the business operations revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the business operations revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the business operations revolving fund and the funds provided under the heading ''Public Information Programs of the Superintendent of Documents'' may not be used for contracted security services at GPO's passport facility in the District of Columbia.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Government Accountability Office, including not more than $12,500 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with section 3324 of title 31, United States Code; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), (6), and (8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), (6), and (8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, $522,000,000: *Provided*, That, in addition, $25,450,000 of payments received under sections 782, 791, 3521, and 9105 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants: *Provided further*, That payments hereunder to the Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DETAILS

SEC. 1301. (a) PERMITTING DETAILS FROM OTHER FEDERAL OFFICES.—Section 731 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DETAILS.—The activities of the Government Accountability Office may, in the reasonable discretion of the Comptroller General, be carried out by receiving details of personnel from other offices of the Federal Government on a reimbursable, partially-reimbursable, or nonreimbursable basis.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each succeeding fiscal year.

OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND

For a payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund for financing activities of the Open World Leadership Center under section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), $5,700,000, except that any funds made available under this heading to support Russian participants shall only be used for those engaging in free market development, humanitarian activities, and civic engagement, and shall not be used for officials of the central government of Russia.

JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund established under section 116 of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1105), $430,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

MAINTENANCE AND CARE OF PRIVATE VEHICLES

SEC. 201. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION

SEC. 202. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2016 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

RATES OF COMPENSATION AND DESIGNATION

SEC. 203. Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 (46 Stat. 32 et seq.) is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

CONSULTING SERVICES

SEC. 204. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued under existing law.

COSTS OF LBFMC

SEC. 205. Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed $2,000.

LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE

SEC. 206. For fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol,

in consultation with the District of Columbia, is authorized to maintain and improve the landscape features, excluding streets, in Square 580 up to the beginning of I–395.

LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS

SEC. 207. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

GUIDED TOURS OF THE CAPITOL

SEC. 208. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available to the Architect of the Capitol in this Act may be used to eliminate or restrict guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns of offices of Members of Congress and other offices of the House of Representatives and Senate

(b) At the direction of the Capitol Police Board, or at the direction of the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the Capitol Police Board, guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns described in subsection (a) may be suspended temporarily or otherwise subject to restriction for security or related reasons to the same extent as guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by the Architect of the Capitol.

BATTERY RECHARGING STATIONS FOR PRIVATELY OWNED VEHICLES IN PARKING AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS AT NO NET COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 209. (a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''covered employee'' means—

(1) an employee of the Library of Congress; or

(2) any other individual who is authorized to park in any parking area under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress on the Library of Congress buildings and grounds.

(b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), funds appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol under the heading ''CAPITOL POWER PLANT'' under the heading ''ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL'' in any fiscal year are available to construct, operate, and maintain on a reimbursable basis battery recharging stations in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress on Library of Congress buildings and grounds for use by privately owned vehicles used by covered employees.

(2) VENDORS AUTHORIZED.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Architect of the Capitol may use 1 or more vendors on a commission basis.

(3) APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION.—The Architect of the Capitol may construct or direct the construction of battery recharging stations described under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the numbers and locations of the battery recharging stations to the Joint Committee on the Library; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(c) FEES AND CHARGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Architect of the Capitol shall charge fees or charges for electricity provided to covered employees sufficient to cover the costs to the Architect of the Capitol to carry out this section, including costs to any vendors or other costs associated with maintaining the battery recharging stations.

(2) APPROVAL OF FEES OR CHARGES.—The Architect of the Capitol may establish and adjust fees or charges under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the amount of the fee or charge to be established or adjusted to the Joint Committee on the Library; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(d) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES, CHARGES, AND COMMISSIONS.—Any fees, charges, or commissions collected by the Architect of the Capitol under this section shall be—

(1) deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations account described under subsection (b); and

(2) available for obligation without further appropriation during the fiscal year collected.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report on the financial administration and cost recovery of activities under this section with respect to that fiscal year to the Joint Committee on the Library and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

(2) AVOIDING SUBSIDY.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report to the Joint Committee on the Library determining whether covered employees using battery charging stations as authorized by this section are receiving a subsidy from the taxpayers.

(B) MODIFICATION OF RATES AND FEES.—If a determination is made under subparagraph (A) that a subsidy is being received, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a plan to the Joint Committee on the Library on how to update the program to ensure no subsidy is being received. If the Joint Committee does not act on the plan within 60 days, the Architect of the Capitol shall take appropriate steps to increase rates or fees to ensure reimbursement for the cost of the program consistent with an appropriate schedule for amortization, to be charged to those using the charging stations.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT

SEC. 210. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4501) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2016.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 211. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, excluding Senate items, exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

This Act may be cited as the ''Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2016''.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–120. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–120.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,700,000)''.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,700,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GRAVES and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work in crafting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in this fiscal environment, we have to be better stewards of taxpayer dollars, and we have to scrutinize every program that we allocate money towards. We can't ever forget that every dollar that we spend is a dollar taken from our constituents' hard-earned paychecks. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I have offered this amendment to eliminate funding for the Open World Leadership Center—a program started in 1999 and housed in the Library of Congress with the purpose of bringing leaders from post-Soviet countries to the United States to learn about our legislative process.

The gentleman from California spoke passionately a few minutes ago about his belief that we need to have programs like this, but his comments ignore the fact that there are nearly 90 other similar or nearly identical programs throughout the government aimed at achieving this same goal. At the same time, this program has now spent more than $150 million towards that duplicative purpose.

So when you consider that duplicative purpose alongside a national debt of $18.2 trillion, we have got to honestly examine and reconsider whether this is the best use of taxpayer money. This is especially true when accounts and programs across the legislative branch have seen reductions in recent years, but yet not a single dollar has been cut from the Open World program despite the fact that, after this subcommittee's examination of this program, Chairman GRAVES reported that, ''In light of both the lack of quantifiable results from the Open World Leadership Center and its duplications of programs more appropriately offered by the State Department, the program

has long outlived its short-term intent.''

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman's assessment, which is, by the way, not a partisan one. In fact, this is the all-too-rare situation and opportunity where Republicans and Democrats, alike, agree that we can cut spending without hurting American citizens.

The American people have entrusted us with the responsibility of seeing that their tax dollars don't go to waste. And while Mr. GRAVES' bill allocates funds to the legislative branch to do the important work that we need to on behalf of the American people, the Open World program is one area where we can and should make this spending cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing this forward. He has done a lot of work on this topic. He is new to the body—I think everybody knows that—and with haste he has moved to find an area in which we can continue to provide savings for taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment here, and I appreciate his bringing it forward.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for bringing this amendment and for focusing in on areas where we can actually eliminate spending here in Washington. Again, you have to recognize that about 35 cents of every dollar spent is money borrowed from countries like China, so we ought to be combing every different piece of this budget and finding areas where we can say that this isn't something that the Federal Government should be doing.

It might be a noble program to have exchanges with other countries, but to be spending millions of dollars at a time when our country has needs that aren't being met and that we are borrowing money from other countries and sending that bill to our children, this is a time where we have got to be combing through these kinds of programs, and I want to thank him for his leadership.

□ 1600

This is a time where we have got to be combing through these kind of programs, and I want to thank him for his leadership. This is something that should be eliminated. We shouldn't be spending millions of dollars of taxpayer money to bring people over to this country. If they want to come, we welcome them.

Many countries do send people over here to observe how democracy works; we send people on occasion to other countries to spread democracy, but there are duplications in so many other areas of our budget where this is already being done, and this is just one more area where we ought to be saving taxpayers' money and being fiscally responsible.

This isn't something we can afford to do; it isn't something we should be doing. I am glad the gentleman is bringing the amendment to eliminate this spending. I support it and hope the House approves it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for the Members that this would be the first time that I am actually opposing an amendment that cuts the Open World program.

Initially, when I became chair of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee 8 years ago, this program was at $14 million. I have consistently tried to cut this program and move its funding to the State Department bill for every single year since then. We have not been successful, but we are only at $5.7 million now, which is a more appropriate amount.

We are, as I said, in general debate. This funding going somewhere else in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill would be more appropriate. Since we are sending it out of the bill in a bill that is already inadequately funded, it is not an amendment I can support.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), who wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for the time. I also want to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRAVES, for the gentlemanly way in which we have conducted this debate.

This is a transpartisan issue. We have got Democrats and Republicans divided on each side of the aisle, which is a bit unusual, but nonetheless, this is important.

I support the Open World Leadership Center. I am on its board. It has been mentioned that this is better nested within the State Department. The State Department does have a myriad of programs. However, this is a legislative branch program, and we should not outsource our responsibility there.

This program was formed in the wake of the fall of the Soviet Union in order to give a chance for the development of legal structures, stabilized civil society, and the opportunity for democracy to evolve. While the primary focus was on Russia, that component has been suspended, and this program has taken a very substantial cut down from $10 million to about $6 million now.

To jettison it gets rid of very important deliverables. Over 23,000 judges, politicians, emerging civil society leaders, and young people have participated in this program, including 15 members of Ukraine's parliament, 15 members of Moldova's parliament, 8 Russian governors; 51 percent of the participants are women.

Mr. Chairman, the military tells me: Send us in last.

We will send billions and billions of dollars of lethal military aid to a country, but the military says: Do everything you can to build up good will and trust and relationships in stable societies so that we do not have to resort to what none of us wants to resort to.

The Open World Leadership Center fulfills that role in an effective way. There are changes that I hope will be forthcoming to make it more effective in the future. I hope we will preserve this important legislative priority which cannot be replicated, essentially, by the State Department.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. At this time, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and as someone who served as ranking member for this subcommittee back several years ago, I just want to express my support and the work for the Open World Leadership Center than the opposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

I am sure it is well intended, but I do want to say that I think that this amendment is not going in the right direction. We do need to keep this partnership. It is a partnership. It is a relationship that has developed with these former Soviet countries.

I think it is very important. It has served us well. It is a program that a lot of people say is duplicated in other agencies of government, but I will say it is unique. It is a unique approach to working across borders to highlight the critical role of the legislative branch in emerging democracies.

I just want to say that I support this bill as it currently is and would oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, can you tell me how much time we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1

minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for the time.

I rise in strong opposition to the Ratcliffe amendment.

If anyone has been watching, you have seen Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Now, more than ever, it is critical to engage with rising stars in the former Soviet Union because the old tactics of Soviet Russia are still being employed.

This program belongs to Congress. Yes, it is a legislative branch program, so it is small; it is efficient; it is ours. It is our one tool to reach out to these countries to their rising leaders to expand accountable governance and the rule of law. Who better to teach it than those engaged, those of us who communicate with citizens in these countries that so very much want to be free?

Open World directly connects us with changemakers in this very, very fluid region of the world. It reaches beyond the big cities, into the country side. I personally have greeted some of the leaders that have come from several countries, including Moldova and Ukraine.

Let me tell you, it will be our generation and the next that will pay the price if this amendment is passed. We simply must engage with this part of the world. We cannot leave her in the hands of the Russian bear.

I urge very strong opposition to the Ratcliffe amendment.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 30 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. At this time, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to respond that there is no legislative program in the State Department like this. You can't transfer it there. They are not operative in these countries, so to say that this could be moved over—look, you were in professional organizations.

This is legislator to legislator, judge to judge, and we need to keep it that way.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, my constituents sent me to Washington to cut wasteful spending. The Open World program is one of many, many programs that have the same purpose throughout the Federal Government. This is a chance to cut $5 million in spending for a duplicative program that we simply don't need.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of passage of the Ratcliffe amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, what this amendment is, is a missed opportunity to be fiscally responsible.

I also support not spending money on the Open World program any longer and moving it to the State Department. Unfortunately, the majority has chosen to make a rule in order that focuses on an amendment to shift the $5.7 million completely out of the legislative branch when we have plaster falling off buildings, elevators badly in need of repair, we have cuts to our MRA—our office accounts—our staff that isn't well paid enough; and is just not responsible.

This is a missed opportunity. I urge the Members, unfortunately, to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–120.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the Congressional Pictorial Directory to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a simple amendment to prohibit funds for delivering printed copies of the Congressional Pictorial Directory in the House of Representatives.

The pictorial directory is a book with pictures of Members of Congress printed by the Government Publishing Office. The most recent edition cost over $200,000 to print and distribute. While I realize this is not much money, I think with an $18 trillion debt, that we need to be looking for the pennies, as well as the $100 bills.

The most important thing is this book is no longer necessary to print in hard copy. We are almost 6 months into the 114th Congress, and the GPO has still not published the book. During the 113th Congress, it took the GPO 9 months, until September, to release the pictorial directory. Here is what one of them looks like.

Private groups make similar directories that are actually more useful and include contact information and biographies of Members, in addition to their pictures. I have a copy of the directory that was dropped off at my office by a trade association in the last few days, and unlike the GPO directory, it is up to date, and they keep it up to date.

Of course, pictures of Members of Congress are readily available for free online. If needed, the Clerk could ensure that appropriate photographs of current Members are available to create an online pictorial directory.

The language of this amendment mirrors several riders already in the bill that prohibit funds for the delivery of printed copies of bills and resolutions, printed copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, printed copies of the statements of disbursements, and printed copies of the daily calendar.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I think it is worth stating for the RECORD that this amendment would maybe save somewhere between $9,000 and $29,000. I mean, let's bear the full impact of that weighty sum, depending on how it is interpreted.

This is an amendment that would prevent the delivery of a printed copy that I have in my hand of the Congressional Pictorial Directory—which, by the way, Mr. FLORES, no offense, but some of us used this directory to identify you during the course of this discussion.

This is a book that is actually necessary and one that we shouldn't be farming out or relying on lobbyists to print for us.

Every year, we seem to get an amendment that stops some sort of printing or delivery of a paper copy of some document to Member offices.

Just so Members know, we have actually made real savings in this bill in the past—in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill—by no longer delivering a printed copy of a bill unless a Member requests a copy; we no longer deliver the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to Member offices; we no longer allow more than 50 printed copies of the Code to go to House offices; we no longer deliver a printed copy of the statements of disbursement to Member offices; we

no longer deliver a printed copy of the daily calendar to Member offices—all of which cost far more than stopping the printing of these books.

It isn't really realistic to expect Members to print out a piece of paper—or staff—and carry around a whole bunch of printed faded copies of paper to help identify Members. We have new Members every 2 years.

My point is we are about out of low-hanging fruit here. I hope this is the last of this type of amendment because, if we want to change printing, the Members have an opportunity to take their grievances up with the Joint Committee on Printing.

The distribution of the Congressional Pictorial Directory is actually set by the Joint Committee on Printing. Maybe the gentleman is unaware of that, and it doesn't need to be legislated through this bill. We don't need to be creating a false impression that we are actually saving taxpayer dollars that would not have been saved through another means.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from Florida made a great case for putting this book in the same stack of dinosaurs that she was talking about when it comes to eliminating all other waste in terms of government printing.

I have an app that cost me $1.99 that gives me current pictures of Members of Congress. I don't have to carry any paper around. I don't have to carry this book around. I don't have to carry this book around. I just have to have an app.

Look, we are a 21st century Congress. Why don't we act like a 21st century Congress and get rid of the dinosaurs like this?

□ 1615

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLORES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am wondering whether that app was privately produced or was produced by taxpayers. As for the $1.99 that you spent on it, were those taxpayer dollars you used to pay for it or from your own personal funds?

Mr. FLORES. That was my personal money.

Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, my point is that it would be one thing if a congressional tutorial directory were unnecessary, but that is not the case. It is necessary. What isn't necessary is for us to be wasting time in debate on the House floor over something that could actually be handled differently. If the gentleman or any other Member thought that the Joint Committee on Printing should handle it differently, just go talk to them.

Instead, what we are doing is pretending that we are actually saving taxpayer dollars. This is about $9,000, and what we shouldn't be doing is outsourcing the things that we need in terms of the materials to do a better job serving the public to lobbyists and the private sector. That does not make sense, and it isn't necessary, and the majority should not leave the impression that they are actually doing something fiscally responsible here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, this has been a fascinating discussion. The gentlewoman from Florida claims that the savings are between $9,000 and $29,000 while the numbers that we have are $200,000. If you ask your typical hard-working family if $9,000 is a lot of money, they will say, yes, it is. Is $29,000 a lot of money? They will say yes. Is $200,000 a lot of money? They will say yes. If you say, ''You are paying for that. Would you like the government to stop wasting that money?'' then they would say, absolutely, yes.

If the gentlewoman does not want to waste any time on this and vote ''aye,'' then let's stop.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I will point out that the gentleman's amendment does not actually stop the printing of the pictorial directory. It simply stops the delivery of the directory to Members' offices. So it does not provide the savings that the gentleman is talking about. It provides between $9,000 and $29,000 because the only cost that he is saving is on the delivery and not on the printing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I read the amendment's intent as well. As the ranking member just stated and as the argument seems to go around in a circle here, it doesn't stop the printing of these items, of these directories. It just says that Members of Congress shouldn't have somebody privately deliver them to their offices. If they want one, go get one. If they want to look it up online, look it up online. If they want to spend $1.99 and get an app, they can get an app. This just says that the Congressional Pictorial Directory is just not going to be delivered to a Member's office. I don't know how controversial that can be.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I conclude by pointing out that the offerer of the amendment, and the chairman, are suggesting that now we should print things that we don't use. If that isn't an example of a waste of taxpayer dollars in suggesting that we should print this document but not make sure that it is delivered to Members' offices for their utilization, that pretty much sounds like government waste under the classic definition.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–120.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to—

(1) accounts under the heading ''Capitol Police'';

(2) ''Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Police Buildings, Grounds and Security''; or

(3) the amount provided for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms under the heading ''House of Representatives—Salaries, Officers and Employees''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to begin by thanking the subcommittee chairman for his hard work on this effort that is in front of us and for the committee's identifying ways to reduce what the Federal Government spends, especially in the leg branch.

The fiscal year 2016 proposed funding level is $3.3 billion. That is $173 billion below the President's request. I think there is more work that we could do, and my 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction will save taxpayers an additional $29 million in budget authority and $25 million in outlays for fiscal year 2016. It is a targeted cut in discretionary spending that exempts the Capitol Police, the Sergeant at Arms, and security maintained by the Architect of the Capitol.

Again, as I said, I want to recognize the work of Chairman GRAVES and his committee. They have done several very important things that, I think, we ought to highlight.

First, this measure continues to freeze Member pay in place, where it has been since 2010. Second, it continues a 14 percent reduction in funding for the House of Representatives,

which Republicans began in 2011. I appreciate that Chairman ROGERS brought attention to that as general debate began. Third, the bill cuts funding for programs such as the Government Publishing Office, which we have just been discussing—many programs that have outlived their usefulness.

We can cut more, and a penny on a dollar is worth the effort. We are a country that has over $18 trillion in debt. Financial security has become an issue of national security. Admiral Mullen said the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our growing national debt. That is a reason for our getting our fiscal house in order and looking to future generations and saying, let's go in and cut one more penny out of a dollar. This effort that I bring before you would do just that—one more cent—and do it for future generations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

It takes a meat-ax approach to cutting this bill by over $29 million with an across-the-board cut of 1 percent. I want to point out that it also exempts the Capitol Police and its buildings, as well as the Sergeant at Arms.

If the gentlewoman, who I know offers these amendments over and over again, were truly committed to an across-the-board cut, then she would just simply offer an across-the-board cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this.

This is a mindless but easy cut. Tough words. By the way, this is sequester, which is a Republican proposal. It started in about 2011 but, really, before that with all of these across-the-board cuts because you don't have to make any choices, and you don't have to make priorities. You just say, Oh, let's save money.

Frankly, so many of the people in this country want this Congress to have vigorous oversight of the executive department, which has expanded very substantially while the legislature has continued to undermine its ability to function as an effective oversight agency of the American people. The legislative branch is underfunded. We do not have the capacity to do the effective oversight as we ought to be doing. The Department of Veterans Affairs is a perfect example of that where we were not vigorous enough in oversight to ensure that money was being applied properly.

If you want to cut and if you want to say something—this is not good; that is not good; we are wasting money there—then specify it. Debate that issue up or down. That is why sequester is so abysmally wrong and why the chairman of the committee called it unrealistic and ill-conceived. This is not Obama's proposal of a sequester. I am not talking about this amendment, but to say, as you repeatedly say on your side of the aisle, that this is Obama's proposal is baloney. In fact, the only reason Jack Lew suggested that to Reid as an option was because you—and I refer to the Republican friends on the other side of the aisle—were threatening not to honor the Nation's debt.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. That is the only reason we passed sequester, and nobody intended sequester to go into effect. It was always a backup. Because we have failed to come to an agreement on a fiscally responsible, sustainable path, we have repaired to this ill-conceived, unrealistic concept of sequester. This 1 percent across the board is exactly that. It puts intellect on hold and judgment on hold. That is not why the American people sent us here.

Reject this amendment. Respect this institution, and respect our responsibility to the American people.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about one part of the bill that I find very troubling. This is a cut that is a penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Last year, we named the GPO as the Government Publishing Office, and that is because of the range of digital services that it provides. This year, the Legislative Branch Subcommittee voted to cut those operations by eliminating the appropriated funding for the GPO's Federal digital system, which provides free digital access to more than a million congressional and other government document titles that have been downloaded by the public more than 1 billion times over the past 5 years. It does not make sense. Cutting this will severely eliminate money to upgrade the GPO's Federal digital system and the new search and retrieval system.

In recognition of the fiscal pressures we all face, the GPO came in with a flat budget request this year, asking only that we support the commitment to their digital transformation. We said ''yes'' to it last year, and I am hopeful that we can restore that funding this year. It makes no sense to cut this. There are millions of people in local libraries all across this country who depend on this digital system, and we do not need to cut it. This is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. Chair, as a former Member of the House Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, I wanted to say a few words about one part of this year's spending bill which I find very troubling.

A year ago, Congress and the President agreed to rename GPO as the Government Publishing Office, based on the broad range of digital services the agency now provides. The Subcommittee supported this legislative change.

This year, the House Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee voted to cut those operations by eliminating appropriated funding for GPO's Federal Digital System, which provides free digital access to more than 1 million congressional and other Government document titles that have been downloaded by the public more than 1 billion times over the past five years. This cut just doesn't make sense.

It will severely curtail GPO's ability to add new digital documents to its Federal Digital System. It will zero out the funding for initiatives that support the missions of congressional and legislative branch organizations such as the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Library of Congress who rely on information from the Federal Digital System to feed websites such as Congress.gov and Docs.House.gov.

GPO's Federal Digital System, though just 5 years old, is already beginning to show its age. The rapid changes in today's digital technical environment remind us why it's essential for GPO to keep up with the times.

But this funding cut will eliminate money to upgrade GPO's Federal Digital System with a new search and retrieval system, an improved user interface, and other needed hardware and software improvements, including migrating the system to the cloud. Due to the critical role the Federal Digital System plays in making our legislative information transparent and available online, we need to make this investment.

In recognition of the fiscal pressures we all face, GPO came in with a flat budget request this year, asking only that we support their commitment to their digital transformation. We said yes to that transformation last year, and I am hopeful that we can restore this funding in the final legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I find it so interesting that this is called a ''meat-ax approach.'' Yes, I do come regularly to offer these amendments, because I care what happens with our Nation. I care about our future, and I want to make certain that we are on solid financial footing. We have a responsibility to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money. It is their money.

To say this is mindless and easy, how interesting that is. Go tell all of the Governors from coast to coast—Democrat and Republican—who use across-the-board spending cuts to get budgets in balance. Tell that to mayors who use this same process. The reason it is done is it works. It helps the bureaucracy hold itself accountable, and that is absolutely what we ought to be doing at this point in time.

As you can see, cutting is a very emotional issue. Cutting brings forward a lot of emotions. Talking about doing more with less, being resourceful, that is what we should do every single day. In order to be a good steward of the taxpayers' money, we should want to do more with less. We should do it in the name of freedom, for freedom's sake—for the sovereignty of this Nation.

Ill-conceived and unrealistic? When is operating by a balanced budget and spending and living within the means the taxpayers have said they are going to have for this Federal Government ever considered ill-conceived? When would it be considered unrealistic? It is what we ought to be doing. Indeed, if every department did what the legislative branch did of cutting 14 percent, we would be getting close to budget.

To say that we are suspending intellect and judgment, do you know that is almost frivolous and almost silly to say.

□ 1630

We spend less and should be spending less and should try to continue to spend less and reform this government and hold it accountable to the taxpayer who is footing the bill because, yes, the Nation's future depends on it; our national security, yes, depends on it; and respect, it is respecting future generations and the taxpayer to be a wise steward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield 30 seconds of my remaining time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I wish the gentlewoman had made that same speech when we were discussing defense, the biggest spending bill we have, but she didn't offer this amendment at all.

I happen to come from a State where the legislators didn't have enough guts to raise taxes, so the people went out and did it because they want their government to run wisely and smartly, and they knew they didn't have enough money to do it.

Look, we are cutting this budget; yet the Senate, which we don't vote on their bit, is increasing their budget by 12 percent. They are going to be able to give cost-of-living adjustments to every one of their Members. Nobody sitting in this room who works for us is going to get a cost-of-living adjustment because of cuts like this. This is ridiculous. We are penalizing our whole House, not the Senate. This is not a smart way to make legislative business.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 15 seconds remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. To close, Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that what would be fiscally responsible and responsible in general is to not further take a meat ax to a bill that has already been flat-funded for the last 3 years. Our employees deserve a raise. We deserve to be able to be a coequal branch of government, funded well enough to be able to hold the administration accountable and make sure we can do our jobs. This bill does not allow us to achieve that.

I urge the Members to oppose this irresponsible amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114–120 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. RATCLIFFE of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 199, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

AYES—224

Abraham	Guinta	Palmer
Allen	Guthrie	Paulsen
Amash	Hardy	Pearce
Amodei	Harper	Perry
Babin	Harris	Pittenger
Barletta	Hartzler	Pitts
Barr	Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)
Barton	Hensarling	Poliquin
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Polis
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Pompeo
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Posey
Black	Holding	Price, Tom
Blackburn	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Blum	Huelskamp	Reed
Bost	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Boustany	Hultgren	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Ribble
Brat	Hurd (TX)	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jolly	Rokita
Byrne	Jones	Rooney (FL)
Calvert	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Rothfus
Carter (TX)	Katko	Rouzer
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Russell
Coffman	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Collins (GA)	Kirkpatrick	Salmon
Collins (NY)	Kline	Sanford
Comstock	Knight	Scalise
Conaway	Labrador	Schrader
Cook	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Lance	Sessions
Crawford	Latta	Shuster
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Simpson
Cuellar	Long	Smith (MO)
Culberson	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
DeSantis	Lummis	Stivers
DesJarlais	Marchant	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Thornberry
Duffy	Massie	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Trott
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Upton
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Valadao
Farenthold	McKinley	Wagner
Fincher	McMorris Rodgers	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walden
Fleischmann	Messer	Walker
Fleming	Mica	Walorski
Flores	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Foxx	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Garrett	Mullin	Westerman
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Murphy (FL)	Williams
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gosar	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gowdy	Newhouse	Womack
Granger	Noem	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Yoho
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Young (IA)
Graves (MO)	Olson	Young (IN)
Griffith	Palazzo	Zeldin
Grothman		Zinke

NOES—199

Adams	Brown (FL)	Clay
Aderholt	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Aguilar	Bustos	Clyburn
Ashford	Butterfield	Cohen
Bass	Capuano	Cole
Beatty	Cárdenas	Connolly
Becerra	Carney	Conyers
Benishek	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Bera	Cartwright	Costa
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Crowley
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	Cummings
Bonamici	Cicilline	Davis (CA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny
	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio

DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Fattah
Garamendi
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

□ 1700

Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Messrs. HANNA, SCHWEIKERT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. YODER, HIMES, and DENT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. WESTMORELAND, GRAVES of Missouri, SHUSTER, CRAWFORD, and SMITH of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

AYES—172

Allen
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Curbelo (FL)
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
King (IA)
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Olson
Palmer
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—250

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Fattah
Meeks
Mica
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1707

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 246 my voting card did not record and if it had recorded, it would be a ''yes.'' I would have recorded my vote as ''yes.''

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 271, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, this 5-minute vote on passage of H.R. 2250 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to recommit on H.R. 2353, and passage of H.R. 2353, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 67, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

YEAS—357

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—67

Amash
Bass
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
DeGette
Deutch
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Franks (AZ)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kennedy
Kind
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowey
Massie
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Napolitano
Neal
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Fattah
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

□ 1716

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DOGGETT changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 241, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

YEAS—182

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman

Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Duffy
Fattah
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

□ 1723

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 387, noes 35, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

AYES—387

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth

Yoder	Young (IA)	Zinke
Yoho	Young (IN)	
Young (AK)	Zeldin	

NOES—35

Amash	Duffy	Renacci
Becerra	Duncan (SC)	Ribble
Bridenstine	Jordan	Rice (NY)
Carney	Kildee	Richmond
Clawson (FL)	Kind	Roskam
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Salmon
Clyburn	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda T.
Courtney	Moulton	
Crowley	Mulvaney	Schrader
DeGette	Pascrell	Sensenbrenner
DeLauro	Perlmutter	Visclosky
DeSaulnier	Polis	Welch

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Amodei

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)	Donovan	Rice (SC)
Capps	Fattah	Sanchez, Loretta
Chaffetz	Moore	Tsongas

□ 1731

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes on May 19, 2015 and would like the record to reflect that I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 243: ''no,'' rollcall No. 244: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 245: ''no,'' rollcall No. 246: ''no,'' rollcall No. 247: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 248: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 249: ''yes.''

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1909

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be removed as cosponsors of the bill, H.R. 1909: Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas, and Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AMERICAN SUPER COMPUTING LEADERSHIP ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 874) to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 874

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''American Super Computing Leadership Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5541) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

''(1) CO-DESIGN.—The term 'co-design' means the joint development of application algorithms, models, and codes with computer technology architectures and operating systems to maximize effective use of high-end computing systems.

''(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term 'Department' means the Department of Energy.

''(3) EXASCALE.—The term 'exascale' means computing system performance at or near 10 to the 18th power floating point operations per second.

''(4) HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEM.—The term 'high-end computing system' means a computing system with performance that substantially exceeds that of systems that are commonly available for advanced scientific and engineering applications.

''(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

''(6) LEADERSHIP SYSTEM.—The term 'leadership system' means a high-end computing system that is among the most advanced in the world in terms of performance in solving scientific and engineering problems.

''(7) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term 'National Laboratory' means any one of the seventeen laboratories owned by the Department.

''(8) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Energy.

''(9) SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'software technology' includes optimal algorithms, programming environments, tools, languages, and operating systems for high-end computing systems.''.

SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HIGH-END COMPUTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 3 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5542) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''program'' and inserting ''coordinated program across the Department'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) partner with universities, National Laboratories, and industry to ensure the broadest possible application of the technology developed in this program to other challenges in science, engineering, medicine, and industry.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''vector'' and all that follows through ''architectures'' and inserting ''computer technologies that show promise of substantial reductions in power requirements and substantial gains in parallelism of multicore processors, concurrency, memory and storage, bandwidth, and reliability''; and

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a coordinated research program to develop exascale computing systems to advance the missions of the Department.

''(2) EXECUTION.—The Secretary shall, through competitive merit review, establish two or more National Laboratory-industry-university partnerships to conduct integrated research, development, and engineering of multiple exascale architectures, and—

''(A) conduct mission-related co-design activities in developing such exascale platforms;

''(B) develop those advancements in hardware and software technology required to fully realize the potential of an exascale production system in addressing Department target applications and solving scientific problems involving predictive modeling and simulation and large-scale data analytics and management; and

''(C) explore the use of exascale computing technologies to advance a broad range of science and engineering.

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—In carrying out this program, the Secretary shall—

''(A) provide, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, access for researchers in United States industry, institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and other Federal agencies to these exascale systems, as appropriate; and

''(B) conduct outreach programs to increase the readiness for the use of such platforms by domestic industries, including manufacturers.

''(4) REPORTS.—

''(A) INTEGRATED STRATEGY AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the American Super Computing Leadership Act, a report outlining an integrated strategy and program management plan, including target dates for prototypical and production exascale platforms, interim milestones to reaching these targets, functional requirements, roles and responsibilities of National Laboratories and industry, acquisition strategy, and estimated resources required, to achieve this exascale system capability. The report shall include the Secretary's plan for Departmental organization to manage and execute the Exascale Computing Program, including definition of the roles and responsibilities within the Department to ensure an integrated program across the Department. The report shall also include a plan for ensuring balance and prioritizing across ASCR subprograms in a flat or slow-growth budget environment.

''(B) STATUS REPORTS.—At the time of the budget submission of the Department for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the status of milestones and costs in achieving the objectives of the exascale computing program.

''(C) EXASCALE MERIT REPORT.—At least 18 months prior to the initiation of construction or installation of any exascale-class computing facility, the Secretary shall transmit a plan to the Congress detailing—

''(i) the proposed facility's cost projections and capabilities to significantly accelerate the development of new energy technologies;

''(ii) technical risks and challenges that must be overcome to achieve successful completion and operation of the facility; and

''(iii) an independent assessment of the scientific and technological advances expected from such a facility relative to those expected from a comparable investment in expanded research and applications at terascale-class and petascale-class computing facilities, including an evaluation of where investments should be made in the system software and algorithms to enable these advances.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 874, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 874, the American Super Computing Leadership Act, requires the Department of Energy to develop a plan to bring the United States into the next generation of supercomputing, also known as exascale computing. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for taking the initiative on this issue.

DOE's Advanced Scientific Computing Research program is the primary Federal research and development program for innovation in computing technology. High-performance computing has paved the way for breakthroughs in medical imaging, genetics research, manufacturing, engineering, and weapons development.

Faster computing speeds have revolutionized the energy sector, improved the efficiency of energy production, and aided in distribution technologies. Advances in computer modeling offer opportunities for scientific discovery in fields where experiments are too difficult, costly, or dangerous to conduct. These advances reduce costs and open the door to more innovative discoveries.

The country with the strongest computing capability will host the world's next scientific breakthroughs. Unfortunately, China currently holds the world's fastest computer, not the United States. This bill should reverse this trend and help advance American competitiveness.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for their initiative on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 874, the American Super Computing Leadership Act. This is bipartisan legislation that I have had the pleasure of working on with my colleague, Mr. HULTGREN, as well as others from both sides of the aisle in developing, including, as the chairman said, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. ESTY. This bill would authorize an exascale computing program to ensure that the fastest computers in the world, as well as their software and algorithms, which will help us use these machines to the maximum efficiency, are developed here in the United States.

The term ''exascale'' is often used to refer to the next generation of supercomputers in general and is used interchangeably with ''extreme scale.'' This term is often applied to computing systems that are capable of carrying out a million trillion operations per second. That rate is approximately 50 times faster than the current fastest computer in the world.

Through this legislation, the Secretary of Energy would be empowered to significantly increase the computing power that is accessible to scientists from Federal agencies as well as industry and academia. These investments would have a wide range of impacts by giving the Nation's best scientists the resources and support they need to flourish.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous fields of research in both the academic and industrial areas that would be greatly aided by this increased computing power. Fields such as pharmaceutical development, aerodynamic modeling for aircraft and vehicle design, advanced nuclear reactor design and fusion plasma modeling, combustion simulation to assist in the design of fuel-efficient clean engines, and high temperature superconductivity to significantly reduce energy losses while transmitting electricity.

As a result of this legislation, the Department of Energy would be required to submit regular reports as well as a management plan to Congress describing how DOE intends to institute this program and its current projects. Lemont, Illinois' Argonne National Laboratory is a world leader in developing this new capability, so I am happy that just last month the Department of Energy announced a major award to support and significantly upgrade Argonne's advanced computing research and facilities. This bill will ensure that these investments are part of a transparent, long-term, coordinated strategy to keep the United States on top in this field. I also anticipate that the benefits that we will see from this legislation may well surpass the impacts that we can even imagine today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 874, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is a sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank my good friend and distinguished chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Chairman SMITH from Texas, as well as my good friend, Congressman LIPINSKI from Illinois, as well as my other good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) all for helping to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 874 will help ensure that America stays at the forefront of supercomputing technology by getting to the exascale level of computing—close to the speed of the human brain. These capabilities are vital for our national security, the economy, and, more broadly, the research capabilities of our Nation.

While America and American companies are still leading the way for much of this current technology, it is important to point out that the National University of Defense Technology in China now houses the world's fastest computer.

One of the Department of Energy's primary responsibilities within the National Nuclear Security Administration is the maintenance of our current nuclear stockpile. This stockpile stewardship responsibility is carried out with increasingly complex simulations as our stockpile ages. The need for improved parallelism capabilities and decreased energy requirements are spelled out in this legislation to ensure the Department carries out a targeted basic research program to overcome the most pressing needs.

I would like to point out, however, that I believe, in agreement with the Secretary, that exascale is not the end point. It is just a step towards the greater goal of American leadership in this field.

This legislation will ensure that the broader scientific community has access to these facilities on a competitive merit review basis. The scientific drivers and the national security responsibilities should be the primary focus for computing research, but we must also make sure that the crosscutting benefits of this research are not left at the wayside.

H.R. 874 would create partnerships with universities, industry, and the national labs to conduct this research, ensuring that the Nation, as a whole,

benefits from this research more quickly and efficiently. With all parties at the table, businesses will be better able to utilize the new technologies and algorithms that will result.

Having the pleasure to represent the great State of Illinois, I have been able to witness how an ecosystem of innovation can best be fostered. For our Nation to reap the greatest yields from our research, our research facilities must be open to the public when it makes sense and does not interfere with the core missions of our Federal agencies and the labs.

The user facilities in our national labs already serve over 30,000 researchers every year, with university researchers taking precedence over others. And other user facilities, such as the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne, Illinois, have given a tremendous research capability to industry partners, such as pharmaceutical companies, where research that once took weeks is now done in hours, with samples spending more time in overnight mail.

Mr. Speaker, the computing capabilities this legislation will help bring about will similarly have tremendous application in health care and drug development. We are just now getting to the point where computer simulations are giving us higher resolution images at the molecular level than we can get with microscopes when trying to understand how diseases, our bodies, and new treatments interact. And the modeling simulations these systems make available also allow manufacturers to build better prototypes that have already been tested thousands of times virtually before they come off the line.

But perhaps most importantly, these capabilities will keep America competitive on the global scale. And the graduate students and postdocs that learn on these machines will take what they know wherever they decide to go, whether it be business or the Department of Defense.

□ 1745

He said the best form of technology transfer wears shoes. That is why I thank my colleagues for helping me bring this similar legislation to the floor again this Congress, and I recommend all my colleagues support this bill.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman from Texas have any more speakers on this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers on this side, so I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time after the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close here.

I want to thank Mr. HULTGREN again. He represents Fermilab. I represent part of Argonne National Laboratory. It is good to work with him on this legislation and others to advance science in the United States. Even though there are few people who really understand what this means, we will all see the results of it.

I thank the chairman for moving this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 874.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCIENCE PRIZE COMPETITIONS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1162) to make technical changes to provisions authorizing prize competitions under the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1162

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Science Prize Competitions Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO PRIZE COMPETITIONS.

Section 24 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting ''competition'' after ''section, a prize'';

(B) by inserting ''types'' after ''following''; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''prizes'' and inserting ''prize competitions'';

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking ''in the Federal Register'' and inserting ''on a publicly accessible Government website, such as www.challenge.gov,''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''prize'' and inserting ''cash prize purse'';

(3) in subsection (g), by striking ''prize'' and inserting ''cash prize purse'';

(4) in subsection (h), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competition'' both places it appears;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competition'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competition'' both places it appears;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) WAIVER.—An agency may waive the requirement under paragraph (2). The annual report under subsection (p) shall include a list of such waivers granted during the preceding fiscal year, along with a detailed explanation of the reasons for granting the waivers.'';

(6) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competition''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competitions'' both places it appears;

(7) in subsection (l), by striking all after ''may enter into'' and inserting ''a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other agreement with a private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity to administer the prize competition, subject to the provisions of this section.'';

(8) in subsection (m)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Support for a prize competition under this section, including financial support for the design and administration of a prize competition or funds for a cash prize purse, may consist of Federal appropriated funds and funds provided by private sector for-profit and nonprofit entities. The head of an agency may accept funds from other Federal agencies, private sector for-profit entities, and nonprofit entities, to be available to the extent provided by appropriations Acts, to support such prize competitions. The head of an agency may not give any special consideration to any private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity in return for a donation.'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''prize awards'' and inserting ''cash prize purses'';

(C) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(i) by striking ''No prize'' and inserting ''No prize competition''; and

(ii) by striking ''the prize'' and inserting ''the cash prize purse'';

(D) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ''a prize'' and inserting ''a cash prize purse'';

(E) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by inserting ''competition'' after ''prize'';

(F) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''a prize'' and inserting ''a cash prize purse''; and

(G) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking ''cash prizes'' and inserting ''cash prize purses'';

(9) in subsection (n), by inserting ''for both for-profit and nonprofit entities,'' after ''contract vehicle'';

(10) in subsection (o)(1), by striking ''or providing a prize'' and insert ''a prize competition or providing a cash prize purse''; and

(11) in subsection (p)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''cash prizes'' both places it occurs and inserting ''cash prize purses''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) PLAN.—A description of crosscutting topical areas and agency-specific mission needs that may be the strongest opportunities for prize competitions during the upcoming 2 fiscal years.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1162, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1162, the Science Prize Competitions Act, promotes increased utilization of prize competitions within the Federal Government.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Oversight Subcommittee, Mr. BEYER, for introducing this legislation. I also thank the bipartisan cosponsors, which include the vice chair of the Oversight Subcommittee, Mr. BILL JOHNSON, as well as the full committee ranking member, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Prize competitions help spur innovation. They give innovators incentives to produce groundbreaking, outside-the-box ideas. Used effectively, prize competitions can be a tool to generate revolutionary results that wouldn't happen otherwise.

For example, after the Deepwater Horizon explosion, the X Prize Foundation sponsored a competition to elicit new oil removal technologies that needed to be better than state of the art. With the incentive of a million-dollar prize for first place, the winning team designed technology capable of extracting 89 percent of the oil from the water.

Thanks to the incentives provided by the competition, the winner, in a few months, blew the competition and the then best available oil skimmers out of the water.

Another example of a novel idea for a prize involves the Head Health Challenge. This is a joint effort by the National Football League, Under Armour, General Electric, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to produce ''viable materials that will result in increased safety and protection for athletes, the warfighter, and civilians.''

This is a competition that could yield a solution that would benefit a diverse section of the population, from athletes to soldiers.

H.R. 1162 makes important changes to the prize competitions section of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980. It better defines the role of the private sector in various aspects of prize competitions. H.R. 1162 will have a positive impact on science prize competitions, which have bipartisan support.

A letter from the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy proclaims the values of such competitions by stating:

This report details the remarkable benefits the Federal Government has reaped from more than 400 prize competitions and challenges implemented by over 72 agencies to date, the steps the administration has taken to establish a lasting foundation for use of the COMPETES prize authority, and detailed examples from fiscal year 2014 of how the COMPETES prize authority is increasing the number of agencies that use prizes to achieve their missions more efficiently and effectively.

Again, I want to thank Mr. BEYER of Virginia and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio for introducing this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank two Texans, Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON, for their leadership on this important issue and remind them that Samuel Houston and Stephen Austin were both born in Virginia. I also would like to thank my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for cosponsoring.

The 2010 COMPETES reauthorization granted all Federal agencies the authority to hold prize competitions as an incentive for scientific and technological innovations.

This authority supports agencies' increased use of prizes to incentivize more high-risk, high-reward research and reach out to a new audience of researchers and innovators across all areas of science and technology.

Prize competitions go back at least 300 years, to the 1714 Longitude Prize offered by the British Government to develop a practical method to precisely measure a ship's longitude. The 1919 Orteig Prize spurred Charles Lindbergh to make the first transatlantic flight. Of course, it took 8 years from the prize to the flight itself.

In more recent years, prize competitions have accelerated technological development for space exploration, public health, automobiles, lighting, and much more. Many of these competitions have been privately sponsored, but several have been sponsored by our Federal agencies, including NASA, DARPA, and the Department of Energy.

Prize competitions have also proven to be an effective tool to invigorate our Nation's brightest innovators from all corners. They allow our science agencies to case a wide net to draw in new talent.

I think one of the most interesting facts is that NASA found that over 80 percent of NASA prize competitors have never before responded to NASA or other government requests for proposals. We are bringing in our best and brightest to solve these problems.

If we are to continue leading the world in science and technology, we must draw up on all of our Nation's talent, whether they are researchers in a university lab, owners of a technology start-up, or independent innovators working in their own garages.

Imagine if more of our Federal science agencies took full advantage of the potential of prizes to address some of our Nation's most pressing technological challenges. How might the world be changed in 2025 from a prize offered today?

Private organizations have spent years perfecting the design of prize competitions to address big challenges. We hope that our science agencies will see this same success, and we must continue to support Federal agencies as they implement this authority.

The legislation we are considering today addresses some real and some perceived hurdles in the 2010 authority that were identified once agencies began to implement prize competitions.

It also aligns the terminology with the industry standard to eliminate any confusion in the interpretation of the law. These are technical amendments, which should make it easier for all agencies to make full use of the 2010 authority. In trying to rebalance our Federal budget, we have had to make very hard choices about where to cut funding, including in R&D programs.

While prize competitions should never be used as an excuse to cut our investments in R&D, prizes do allow the Federal Government to continue to fund high-reward research with minimal risk to the taxpayer. They are another valuable tool for agencies to deploy to meet their critical mission responsibilities.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill and ask my colleagues for their support. I am very grateful for the chairman for his bipartisan leadership on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for reminding me that Stephen Austin and Samuel Houston were born in Virginia, and I have to confess, I have a number of ancestors who came from Virginia as well, and I am told one of them may have even been the Governor of Virginia, but that is as much as I am going to say about the great Commonwealth tonight.

I will say that I have no other requests for time; and I, again, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I misspoke. I would love to acknowledge my colleague from Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia ask unanimous consent to reclaim his time?

Mr. BEYER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just was going to say I concur and agree to yield to the gentleman from Illinois as well.

Mr. BEYER. As I slowly develop my mastery of this parliamentary procedure, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BEYER for yielding and for his introduction, his authorship of this bill on prize competitions.

I want to add my voice in strong support of this bill. I have long been a strong supporter of prize competitions to spur innovation not as a substitute for Federal grants in other aid, but as an additional tool.

Back in 2007, I wrote language in the Energy Independence and Security Act that directed DOE to create a hydrogen energy prize, a competition now called the H-Prize that is currently ongoing and, hopefully, will yield some results in innovation in using hydrogen as a transportation fuel.

In the 2010 COMPETES bill, I added language to that bill that authorized prize competitions at the National Science Foundation. I believe that these prize competitions are an excellent way to unlock the innovative potential of researchers, the private sector, and even hobbyists working in a garage, all while protecting taxpayer dollars.

This bill will clarify prize competition authority so that more agencies of the Federal Government will be able to run competitions. It is a good bill. I thank Mr. BEYER, again, for introducing it; I thank Chairman SMITH for moving it and Ranking Member JOHNSON for moving it.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1162, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1119) to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1119

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Research and Development Efficiency Act''.

SEC. 2. REGULATORY EFFICIENCY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) high and increasing administrative burdens and costs in Federal research administration, particularly in the higher education sector where most federally sponsored research is performed, are eroding funds available to carry out basic scientific research;

(2) progress has been made over the last decade in streamlining the pre-award grant application process through Grants.gov, the Federal Government's website portal;

(3) post-award administrative costs have grown as Federal research agencies have continued to impose agency-unique compliance and reporting requirements on researchers and research institutions;

(4) facilities and administration costs at research universities can exceed 50 percent of the total value of Federal research grants, and it is estimated that nearly 30 percent of the funds invested annually in federally funded research is consumed by paperwork and other administrative processes required by Federal agencies; and

(5) it is a matter of critical importance to American competitiveness that administrative costs of federally funded research be streamlined so that a higher proportion of taxpayer dollars flow into direct research activities.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish a working group under the authority of the National Science and Technology Council, to include the Office of Management and Budget. The working group shall be responsible for reviewing Federal regulations affecting research and research universities and making recommendations on how to—

(1) harmonize, streamline, and eliminate duplicative Federal regulations and reporting requirements;

(2) minimize the regulatory burden on United States institutions of higher education performing federally funded research while maintaining accountability for Federal tax dollars; and

(3) identify and update specific regulations to refocus on performance-based goals rather than on process while still meeting the desired outcome.

(c) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—In carrying out the responsibilities under subsection (b), the working group shall take into account input and recommendations from non-Federal stakeholders, including federally funded and nonfederally funded researchers, institutions of higher education, scientific disciplinary societies and associations, nonprofit research institutions, industry, including small businesses, federally funded research and development centers, and others with a stake in ensuring effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability in the performance of scientific research.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Director shall report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on what steps have been taken to carry out the recommendations of the working group established under subsection (b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1119, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), the Science Committee's Research and Technology Subcommittee chairwoman and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act, which I introduced with the chairman and ranking member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, as well as the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee earlier this year.

H.R. 1119 requires the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to establish a working group under the National Science and Technology Council to review Federal regulations that affect research and research universities.

The working group is tasked with making recommendations on how to harmonize, streamline, and eliminate duplicative Federal regulations and reporting requirements and make recommendations on how to minimize the regulatory burden on research institutions.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, there is a long history to support the need for this legislation. In 2012, the National Academies issued a report that included a key recommendation to ''reduce or eliminate regulations that increase administrative costs, impede research productivity, and deflect creative energy without substantially improving the research environment.''

Last year, the National Science Board referenced the results of two Federal Demonstration Partnership surveys on faculty workload—one in 2005 and one in 2012—that, on average, researchers spend 42 percent of their time on meeting administrative requirements. This drain on researchers' time and resources to answer Federal regulatory and reporting requirements leaves less time for researchers to spend on actual scientific work.

To be clear, H.R. 1119 does not eliminate reporting requirements, because there is a need for such information for the purposes of oversight and transparency. Instead, the bill would initiate the process that should ultimately help researchers and research universities by reducing redundant regulations. This is accomplished by promoting efficiencies and getting the most out of our research investments.

The National Academies is currently conducting a study of Federal regulations and reporting requirements, paying particular attention to those directed at research universities. H.R. 1119 would ensure that more of our Federal research dollars are spent on research and not on regulatory requirements. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I want to thank Congresswoman COMSTOCK and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their leadership in introducing the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that administrative requirements serve an important purpose. They ensure transparency, the protection of human and animal subjects, and the wise use of Federal resources. But sometimes they go too far, so we need to find a much better balance than we currently have.

The statistic often cited is that federally funded researchers spend an average of 42 percent of their time on administrative tasks. That is time and money spent not doing science. It is not an efficient use of some of our Nation's greatest scientific brain power, nor is it an efficient use of Federal research funds, especially as Federal spending for R&D continues to decline as a share of the overall budget.

Back in the 112th Congress, the Research Subcommittee, which I served on as ranking member and which was led by then-Chairman MO BROOKS, held an important hearing on this matter to help get the ball rolling, which eventually led to this bill.

H.R. 1119 requires the Office of Science and Technology Policy to convene an interagency working group to review the requirements governing the conduct of federally funded R&D at our Nation's research institutions. The working group is further charged with making recommendations on how to best streamline and harmonize such requirements across the government in order to minimize the administrative burden on universities while maintaining full accountability for Federal funds.

This administration has long recognized the problems that this bill addresses. An interagency working group will not be starting from scratch. The Office of Management and Budget took some small steps in the right direction in their recent rewrite of the Federal regulations governing research grants. Agencies have also taken steps to harmonize the grant proposal process and are exploring additional ways to reduce the paperwork burden associated with grant proposals.

I applaud these efforts. Last Congress, I helped further them by writing a letter to OMB, urging them to make some of the reforms they had agreed to. However, there is still room to go. The National Academies have begun a detailed review of administrative burdens on federally funded research. I hope that this review will yield specific recommendations for the agencies on how to proceed. While it may be preferable to wait for this report to be published before the interagency committee begins its own work, the Academies' review does not preclude the need for an interagency group.

I understand that there may be bureaucratic hurdles to overcome. This will take some time. However, we cannot afford to delay action any longer. The vitality of our Nation's research universities and of our overall competitiveness will suffer if we do not reduce the administrative workload on our Nation's scientific talent. H.R. 1119 is an important step in that direction.

Once again, I want to thank Chairwoman Comstock and Ranking Member JOHNSON of the Research and Technology Subcommittee for introducing this legislation, and I thank Chairman SMITH for bringing it to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Again, I want to thank Chairwoman COMSTOCK, Chairman SMITH, and Ranking Member JOHNSON for moving this bill.

I used to be a university researcher. I know of the heavy burdens in terms of administrative tasks that need to be done. I would say some of these are absolutely necessary, but we now know that we can reduce the burden without reducing the protections that they provide. I am very happy to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, really quickly, I want to thank Mrs. COMSTOCK for introducing this bill and Mr. LIPINSKI for cosponsoring it. As well, it is a great bipartisan piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1119, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1156) to authorize the establishment of a body under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish or designate a working group under the National Science and Technology Council with the responsibility to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation that can strengthen the United States science and technology enterprise, improve economic and national security, and support United States foreign policy goals.

(b) NSTC WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall be co-chaired by officials from the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Department of State.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall—

(1) plan and coordinate interagency international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies and work with other National Science and Technology Council committees to help plan and coordinate the international component of national science and technology priorities;

(2) establish Federal priorities and policies for aligning, as appropriate, international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies with the foreign policy goals of the United States;

(3) identify opportunities for new international science and technology cooperative research and training partnerships that advance both the science and technology and the foreign policy priorities of the United States;

(4) in carrying out paragraph (3), solicit input and recommendations from non-Federal science and technology stakeholders, including universities, scientific and professional societies, industry, and relevant organizations and institutions; and

(5) identify broad issues that influence the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts, including barriers to collaboration and access to scientific information.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit a report, to be updated every 2 years, to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The report shall also be made available to the public on the reporting agency's website. The report shall contain a description of—

(1) the priorities and policies established under subsection (c)(2);

(2) the ongoing and new partnerships established since the last update to the report;

(3) the means by which stakeholder input was received, as well as summary views of stakeholder input; and

(4) the issues influencing the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1156, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015, directs the Office of Science and Technology Policy to establish a working group to identify and coordinate international science and technology efforts to strengthen the U.S. research enterprise.

I thank the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, Mr. LIPINSKI, for introducing this bill. I also thank the subcommittee's vice chair, Mr. MOOLENAAR, the ranking member of the full committee, Ms. JOHNSON, as well as our colleagues Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. SWALWELL for being bipartisan cosponsors.

The Office of Science and Technology Policy, in coordination with the State Department, represents the United States in bilateral and multilateral meetings with foreign nations. It works closely with government science agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and independent research and scientific institutions to promote science and technology initiatives and to strengthen global science cooperation.

H.R. 1156 improves our Nation's collaborative efforts with international partners on scientific issues. While many Federal agencies are engaged with international partners on science and technology projects, there is a need to coordinate these projects across the Federal Government. Better collaboration with our partners will strengthen U.S. scientific activities and further promote the free exchange of ideas with other nations. Interagency coordination ensures that taxpayer dollars are used efficiently and that U.S. priorities are consistently addressed when working with our international partners on science and technology issues.

Science and technology research addresses some of the major challenges that face our Nation, including public health, energy production, national security, and economic development. Coordinated international collaboration on scientific issues, which H.R. 1156 promotes, also will improve economic and national security and support U.S. foreign policy goals.

Again, I want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his continued hard work on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act, which I reintroduced earlier this year.

A similar bill, which I authored in the last Congress, passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support by a vote of 346–41. I am hopeful that we can do the same this week and then work to get this bill through the Senate and onto the President's desk.

I want to thank Mr. MOOLENAAR for cosponsoring this bill with me, and I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for helping advance it through the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and for getting it to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, the laws of science know no political boundaries. While the United States arguably has the most brilliant scientists in the world and has developed some of the greatest technology, no country has a monopoly on great minds in science and technology. So, if we want to advance science in ways that benefit Americans and the rest of the world, we need to encourage international collaboration.

Improvements in areas such as energy security, infectious diseases, space exploration, telecommunications and the Internet, and many more are due, in part, to international cooperation, to the benefit of all nations involved. By collaborating with international partnerships on science, we also strengthen the U.S. scientific enterprise, which helps us get the best return on our research investment.

In addition, international collaborations make possible research endeavors on a grander scale than the U.S. can accomplish on its own. For example, CERN, the U.S. Department of Energy, and the National Science Foundation signed a cooperative agreement 2 weeks ago expanding their collaboration on particle physics. Not only will this provide for our scientists to continue work at the highest energy accelerator in the world at CERN, it will also allow CERN to provide equipment to an upcoming neutrino experiment at Fermilab in Batavia, Illinois.

CERN was the site of one of the most significant technological advances that impacts us every day. At CERN in 1989, Tim Berners-Lee was working on the problem of allowing international researchers to see data instantaneously around the globe. The solution that was developed was the World Wide Web, which has completely transformed the way we communicate and get information today.

H.R. 1156 makes more collaborations like this possible. It requires the National Science and Technology Council at the White House to continue to maintain a working group to coordinate the U.S. interagency strategy for international science and technology cooperation. Many Federal agencies already work with international counterparts on scientific and technological issues, but, until recently, there was no coordinating body to identify new partnerships and to fully leverage existing collaborations.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we find ways to collaborate with other countries on scientific discoveries that push the boundaries of knowledge and improve our lives. This bill will do that. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for his support on this. As I said, we have passed this bill before with wide bipartisan support. I am very hopeful we can do that again today.

International cooperation is very critical to doing more than we alone can do. We have, arguably, the best researchers in the world, producing the most advanced technology, but in working together with others, we can do even more than we have. The impact that it can have on the everyday lives of Americans is tremendous, so I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1156, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize the establishment or designation of a working group under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 1561) to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1561

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PUBLIC SAFETY PRIORITY.

In accordance with NOAA's critical mission to provide science, service, and stewardship, the Under Secretary shall prioritize weather research, across all weather programs, to improve weather data, forecasts, and warnings for the protection of life and property and the enhancement of the national economy.

SEC. 3. WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Assistant Administrator for OAR shall conduct a program to develop improved understanding of and forecast capabilities for atmospheric events and their impacts, placing priority on developing more accurate, timely, and effective warnings and fore-casts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—The program described in subsection (a) shall focus on the following activities:

(1) Improving the fundamental understanding of weather consistent with section 2, including the boundary layer and other atmospheric processes affecting high impact weather events.

(2) Improving the understanding of how the public receives, interprets, and responds to warnings and forecasts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(3) Research and development, and transfer of knowledge, technologies, and applications to the NWS and other appropriate agencies and entities, including the American weather industry and academic partners, related to—

(A) advanced radar, radar networking technologies, and other ground-based technologies, including those emphasizing rapid, fine-scale sensing of the boundary layer and lower troposphere, and the use of innovative, dual-polarization, phased array technologies;

(B) aerial weather observing systems;

(C) high performance computing and information technology and wireless communication networks;

(D) advanced numerical weather prediction systems and forecasting tools and techniques that improve the forecasting of timing, track, intensity, and severity of high impact weather, including through—

(i) the development of more effective mesoscale models;

(ii) more effective use of existing, and the development of new, regional and national cloud-resolving models;

(iii) enhanced global weather models; and

(iv) integrated assessment models;

(E) quantitative assessment tools for measuring the impact and value of data and observing systems, including OSSEs (as described in section 8), OSEs, and AOAs;

(F) atmospheric chemistry and interactions essential to accurately characterizing atmospheric composition and predicting meteorological processes, including cloud microphysical, precipitation, and atmospheric electrification processes, to more effectively understand their role in severe weather; and

(G) additional sources of weather data and information, including commercial observing systems.

(4) A technology transfer initiative, carried out jointly and in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, and in cooperation with the American weather industry and academic partners, to ensure continuous development and transition of the latest scientific and technological advances into NWS operations and to establish a process to sunset outdated and expensive operational methods and tools to enable cost-effective transfer of new methods and tools into operations.

(c) EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program under this section, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall collaborate with and support the non-Federal weather research community, which includes institutions of higher education, private entities, and nongovernmental organizations, by making funds available through competitive grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that not less than 30 percent of the funds for weather research and development at OAR should be made available for the purpose described in paragraph (1).

(d) REPORT.—The Under Secretary shall transmit to Congress annually, concurrently with NOAA's budget request, a description of current and planned activities under this section.

SEC. 4. TORNADO WARNING IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the American weather industry and academic partners, shall establish a tornado warning improvement and extension program.

(b) GOAL.—The goal of such program shall be to reduce the loss of life and economic losses from tornadoes through the development and extension of accurate, effective, and timely tornado forecasts, predictions, and warnings, including the prediction of tornadoes beyond one hour in advance.

(c) PROGRAM PLAN.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall develop a program plan that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the program goal.

(d) BUDGET FOR PLAN.—Following completion of the plan, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall transmit annually to Congress a proposed budget corresponding to the activities identified in the plan.

SEC. 5. HURRICANE FORECAST IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the American weather industry and academic partners, shall maintain the Hurricane Forecast Improvement Program (HFIP).

(b) GOAL.—The goal of such program shall be to develop and extend accurate hurricane forecasts and warnings in order to reduce loss of life, injury, and damage to the economy.

(c) PROGRAM PLAN.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in consultation with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall develop a program plan that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the program goal.

(d) BUDGET FOR PLAN.—Following completion of the plan, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in consultation with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall transmit annually to Congress a proposed budget corresponding to the activities identified in the plan.

SEC. 6. WEATHER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in coordination with the Assistant Administrators for NWS and NESDIS, shall issue a research and development and research to operations plan to restore and maintain United States leadership in numerical weather prediction and forecasting that—

(1) describes the forecasting skill and technology goals, objectives, and progress of NOAA in carrying out the program conducted under section 3;

(2) identifies and prioritizes specific research and development activities, and performance metrics, weighted to meet the operational weather mission of NWS to achieve a weather-ready Nation;

(3) describes how the program will collaborate with stakeholders, including the American weather industry and academic partners; and

(4) identifies, through consultation with the National Science Foundation, American weather industry, and academic partners, research necessary to enhance the integration of social science knowledge into weather forecast and warning processes, including to improve the communication of threat information necessary to enable improved severe weather planning and decisionmaking on the part of individuals and communities.

SEC. 7. OBSERVING SYSTEM PLANNING.

The Under Secretary shall—

(1) develop and maintain a prioritized list of observation data requirements necessary to ensure weather forecasting capabilities to protect life and property to the maximum extent practicable;

(2) undertake, using OSSEs, OSEs, AOAs, and other appropriate assessment tools, ongoing systematic evaluations of the combination of observing systems, data, and information needed to meet the requirements listed under paragraph (1), assessing various options to maximize observational capabilities and their cost-effectiveness;

(3) identify current and potential future data gaps in observing capabilities related to the requirements listed under paragraph (1); and

(4) determine a range of options to address gaps identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 8. OBSERVING SYSTEM SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In support of the requirements of section 7, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall undertake OSSEs to quantitatively assess the relative value and benefits of observing capabilities and systems. Technical and scientific OSSE evaluations—

(1) may include assessments of the impact of observing capabilities on—

(A) global weather prediction;

(B) hurricane track and intensity forecasting;

(C) tornado warning lead times and accuracy;

(D) prediction of mid-latitude severe local storm outbreaks; and

(E) prediction of storms that have the potential to cause extreme precipitation and flooding lasting from 6 hours to 1 week; and

(2) shall be conducted in cooperation with other appropriate entities within NOAA, other Federal agencies, the American weather industry, and academic partners to ensure the technical and scientific merit of OSSE results.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—OSSEs shall quantitatively—

(1) determine the potential impact of proposed space-based, suborbital, and in situ observing systems on analyses and forecasts, including potential impacts on extreme weather events across all parts of the Nation;

(2) evaluate and compare observing system design options; and

(3) assess the relative capabilities and costs of various observing systems and combinations of observing systems in providing data necessary to protect life and property.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—OSSEs—

(1) shall be conducted prior to the acquisition of major Government-owned or Government-leased operational observing systems, including polar-orbiting and geostationary satellite systems, with a lifecycle cost of more than $500,000,000; and

(2) shall be conducted prior to the purchase of any major new commercially provided data with a lifecycle cost of more than $500,000,000.

(d) PRIORITY OSSEs.—

(1) GLOBAL NAVIGATION SATELLITE SYSTEM RADIO OCCULTATION.—Not later than December 31, 2015, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall complete an OSSE to assess the value of data from Global Navigation Satellite System Radio Occultation.

(2) GEOSTATIONARY HYPERSPECTRAL SOUNDER GLOBAL CONSTELLATION.—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall complete an OSSE to assess the value of data from a geostationary hyperspectral sounder global constellation.

(e) RESULTS.—Upon completion of all OSSEs, results shall be publicly released and accompanied by an assessment of related private and public sector weather data sourcing options, including their availability, affordability, and cost effectiveness. Such assessments shall be developed in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 9. COMPUTING RESOURCES PRIORITIZATION REPORT.

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the NOAA Chief Information Officer, in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for OAR and the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall produce and make publicly available a report that explains how NOAA intends to—

(1) continually support upgrades to pursue the fastest, most powerful, and cost effective high performance computing technologies in support of its weather prediction mission;

(2) ensure a balance between the research to operations requirements to develop the next generation of regional and global models as well as highly reliable operational models;

(3) take advantage of advanced development concepts to, as appropriate, make next generation weather prediction models available in beta-test mode to operational forecasters, the American weather industry, and partners in academic and government research; and

(4) use existing computing resources to improve advanced research and operational weather prediction.

SEC. 10. COMMERCIAL WEATHER DATA.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 60161 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''This prohibition shall not extend to—

''(1) the purchase of weather data through contracts with commercial providers; or

''(2) the placement of weather satellite instruments on cohosted government or private payloads.''.

(b) STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Under Secretary, shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a strategy to enable the procurement of quality commercial weather data. The strategy shall assess the range of commercial opportunities, including public-private partnerships, for obtaining surface-based, aviation-based, and space-based weather observations. The strategy shall include the expected cost effectiveness of these opportunities as well as provide a plan for procuring data, including an expected implementation timeline, from these nongovernmental sources, as appropriate.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The strategy shall include—

(A) an analysis of financial or other benefits to, and risks associated with, acquiring commercial weather data or services, including through multiyear acquisition approaches;

(B) an identification of methods to address planning, programming, budgeting, and execution challenges to such approaches, including—

(i) how standards will be set to ensure that data is reliable and effective;

(ii) how data may be acquired through commercial experimental or innovative techniques and then evaluated for integration into operational use;

(iii) how to guarantee public access to all forecast-critical data to ensure that the American weather industry and the public continue to have access to information critical to their work; and

(iv) in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code, methods to address potential termination liability or cancellation costs associated with weather data or service contracts; and

(C) an identification of any changes needed in the requirements development and approval processes of the Department of Commerce to facilitate effective and efficient implementation of such strategy.

(3) AUTHORITY FOR AGREEMENTS.—The Assistant Administrator for NESDIS may enter into multiyear agreements necessary to carry out the strategy developed under this subsection.

(c) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) CRITERIA.—Not later than December 31, 2015, NOAA shall publish data standards and specifications for space-based commercial weather data.

(2) PILOT CONTRACT.—

(A) CONTRACT.—Not later than October 1, 2016, NOAA shall, through an open competition, enter into at least one pilot contract with a private sector entity capable of providing data that meet the standards and specifications set by NOAA to provide commercial weather data in a manner that allows NOAA to calibrate and evaluate the data.

(B) ASSESSMENT OF DATA VIABILITY.—Not later than October 1, 2019, NOAA shall transmit to Congress the results of a determination of the extent to which data provided under the contract entered into under subparagraph (A) meet the criteria published under paragraph (1).

(3) OBTAINING FUTURE DATA.—NOAA shall, to the extent feasible, obtain commercial weather data from private sector providers.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated out of funds made available for procurement, acquisition, and construction at NESDIS, $9,000,000 for carrying out this subsection.

SEC. 11. ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION SERVICES WORKING GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The NOAA Science Advisory Board shall continue to maintain a standing working group named the Environmental Information Services Working Group (in this section referred to as the ''Working Group'') to—

(1) provide advice for prioritizing weather research initiatives at NOAA to produce real improvement in weather forecasting;

(2) provide advice on existing or emerging technologies or techniques that can be found in private industry or the research community that could be incorporated into forecasting at NWS to improve forecasting skill;

(3) identify opportunities to improve communications between weather forecasters, Federal, State, local, tribal, and other emergency management personnel, and the public; and to improve communications and partnerships among NOAA and the private and academic sectors; and

(4) address such other matters as the Science Advisory Board requests of the Working Group.

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Working Group shall be composed of leading experts and innovators from all relevant fields of science and engineering including atmospheric chemistry, atmospheric physics, meteorology, hydrology, social science, risk communications, electrical engineering, and computer sciences. In carrying out this section, the Working Group may organize into subpanels.

(2) NUMBER.—The Working Group shall be composed of no fewer than 15 members. Nominees for the Working Group may be forwarded by the Working Group for approval by the Science Advisory Board. Members of the Working Group may choose a chair (or co-chairs) from among their number with approval by the Science Advisory Board.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Working Group shall transmit annually to the Science Advisory Board for submission to the Under Secretary a report on progress made by NOAA in adopting the Working Group's recommendations. The Science Advisory Board shall

transmit this report to the Under Secretary. Within 30 days of receipt of such report, the Under Secretary shall transmit it to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

SEC. 12. INTERAGENCY WEATHER RESEARCH AND INNOVATION COORDINATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish an Inter-agency Committee for Advancing Weather Services to improve coordination of relevant weather research and forecast innovation activities across the Federal Government. The Interagency Committee shall—

(1) include participation by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, NOAA and its constituent elements, the National Science Foundation, and such other agencies involved in weather forecasting research as the President determines are appropriate;

(2) identify and prioritize top forecast needs and coordinate those needs against budget requests and program initiatives across participating offices and agencies; and

(3) share information regarding operational needs and forecasting improvements across relevant agencies.

(b) CO-CHAIR.—The Federal Coordinator for Meteorology shall serve as a co-chair of this panel.

(c) FURTHER COORDINATION.—The Director shall take such other steps as are necessary to coordinate the activities of the Federal Government with those of the American weather industry, State governments, emergency managers, and academic researchers.

SEC. 13. OAR AND NWS EXCHANGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Administrator for OAR and the Assistant Administrator for NWS may establish a program to detail OAR personnel to the NWS and NWS personnel to OAR.

(b) GOAL.—The goal of this program is to enhance forecasting innovation through regular, direct interaction between OAR's world-class scientists and NWS's operational staff.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The program shall allow up to 10 OAR staff and NWS staff to spend up to 1 year on detail. Candidates shall be jointly selected by the Assistant Administrator for OAR and the Assistant Administrator for NWS.

(d) REPORT.—The Under Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on participation in such program and shall highlight any innovations that come from this interaction.

SEC. 14. VISITING FELLOWS AT NWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Administrator for NWS may establish a program to host postdoctoral fellows and academic researchers at any of the National Centers for Environmental Prediction.

(b) GOAL.—This program shall be designed to provide direct interaction between forecasters and talented academic and private sector researchers in an effort to bring innovation to forecasting tools and techniques available to the NWS.

(c) SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT.—Such fellows shall be competitively selected and appointed for a term not to exceed 1 year.

SEC. 15. NOAA WEATHER READY ALL HAZARDS AWARD PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Assistant Administrator for NWS is authorized to establish the NOAA Weather Ready All Hazards Award Program. This award program shall provide annual awards to honor individuals or organizations that use or provide NOAA Weather Radio All Hazards receivers or transmitters to save lives and protect property. Individuals or organizations that utilize other early warning tools or applications also qualify for this award.

(b) GOAL.—This award program draws attention to the life-saving work of the NOAA Weather Ready All Hazards Program, as well as emerging tools and applications, that provide real-time warning to individuals and communities of severe weather or other hazardous conditions.

(c) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—

(1) NOMINATIONS.—Nominations for this award shall be made annually by the Weather Field Offices to the Assistant Administrator for NWS. Broadcast meteorologists, weather radio manufacturers and weather warning tool and application developers, emergency managers and public safety officials may nominate individuals and/or organizations to their local Weather Field Offices, but the final list of award nominees must come from the Weather Field Offices.

(2) SELECTION OF AWARDEES.—Annually, the Assistant Administrator for NWS shall choose winners of this award whose timely actions, based on NOAA weather radio all hazards receivers or transmitters or other early warning tools and applications, saved lives and/or property or demonstrated public service in support of weather or all hazard warnings.

(3) AWARD CEREMONY.—The Assistant Administrator for NWS shall establish a means of making these awards to provide maximum public awareness of the importance of NOAA Weather Radio, and such other warning tools and applications as are represented in the awards.

SEC. 16. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AOA.—The term ''AOA'' means an Analysis of Alternatives.

(2) NESDIS.—The term ''NESDIS'' means the National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service.

(3) NOAA.—The term ''NOAA'' means the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(4) NWS.—The term ''NWS'' means the National Weather Service.

(5) OAR.—The term ''OAR'' means the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research.

(6) OSE.—The term ''OSE'' means an Observing System Experiment.

(7) OSSE.—The term ''OSSE'' means an Observing System Simulation Experiment.

(8) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term ''Under Secretary'' means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

SEC. 17. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2015.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015—

(1) $90,800,000 to OAR to carry out this Act, of which—

(A) $70,000,000 is authorized for weather laboratories and cooperative institutes; and

(B) $20,800,000 is authorized for weather and air chemistry research programs; and

(2) out of funds made available for research and development at NOAA, an additional amount of $16,000,000 for OAR to carry out the joint technology transfer initiative described in section 3(b)(4).

(b) FISCAL YEARS 2016 AND 2017.—For each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017, there are authorized to be appropriated to OAR—

(1) $100,000,000 to carry out this Act, of which—

(A) $80,000,000 is authorized for weather laboratories and cooperative institutes; and

(B) $20,000,000 is authorized for weather and air chemistry research programs; and

(2) an additional amount of $20,000,000 for the joint technology transfer initiative described in section 3(b)(4).

(c) LIMITATION.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out this Act, and the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1561, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), who is the vice chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH, for his continued leadership on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015, prioritizes the protection of life and property at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration by focusing research and computing resources on improving weather forecasting, quantitative observing data planning, Next Generation modeling, and an emphasis on research to operations technology transfer.

I echo Chairman SMITH's concerns that severe weather greatly affects large parts of the country, and as a Representative from Oklahoma, I understand the need for improvement firsthand. In 2013, the deadly storms in my home State were a stark reminder that we can do better to predict severe weather events and provide longer lead times to protect Americans in harm's way.

I am proud that this legislation has a dedicated tornado warning improvement Program. The goal of this program is to reduce the loss from tornadoes by advancing the understanding of fundamental meteorological science, allowing detection and notifications that are more accurate, effective, and timely.

Constituents in my home State will benefit greatly from longer tornado warning lead times, which will save lives and better protect property. H.R. 1561 makes clear that NOAA will

prioritize weather research and protect lives and property through a focused, affordable, attainable, and forward-looking research plan at the agency's research office.

This bill also helps encourage innovation and new capacities developed through NOAA's Weather Research Program, like creating a joint technology transfer from the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research. This transfer is essential to get new forecasting models and technologies out of the research side of NOAA and into our operational forecast.

This bill directs NOAA to develop plans to restore our country's leadership in weather forecasting. It is no secret that many people in our weather community are distraught that our forecasting capacities have deteriorated in recent years. While other countries are making great strides in weather advancements, Americans are paying the price for lost leadership with their lives and their wallets. This is another reminder that we can do better.

This bill prompts NOAA to actively consider new commercial data and private sector solutions to further enhance our weather forecasting capacities. This legislation includes a pilot program which will provide NOAA a clear and credible demonstration of the valuable data from commercial technologies available today.

This legislation is substantially similar to last year's bipartisan Weather Forecasting Improvement Act, which passed the House by a voice vote. The bill before us today updates authorization numbers to reflect current spending levels, adjusts dates to reflect current operating status, and incorporates minor additions and technical changes to improve the bill's clarity and intent.

This legislation is the result of a bipartisan agreement last year and again this year. I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), the Subcommittee on Environment chairman, for his active leadership on this issue in the last Congress and for getting us here today.

I also want to thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Environment, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), for her efforts in crafting a bipartisan agreement and joining in this most worthwhile initiative to save American lives and property through better weather forecasting.

Finally, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act has received numerous letters of support which I would like to mention, including letters from Utah State University, Space Environment Technologies, Metro Weather, Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative.

Once again, it is a good bill. It has been worked on diligently. We need to pass it.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015. This bill, introduced by my friend, Mr. LUCAS, builds on the work that subcommittee chairman Mr. BRIDENSTINE and former subcommittee chairman Mr. STEWART and I did in the last Congress.

The language before us today is the result of a truly bipartisan effort with extensive discussions and negotiations across the aisle. Although the bill is not perfect, it is a good bill and a better bill than the one that passed in the last Congress, and I ask all my colleagues to support it.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has many important tasks at the cutting edge of science and service. The agency's responsibilities for weather forecasting are critical to our country.

We are proud of the good work of NOAA and its dedicated employees. They are a committed workforce, responsible for keeping our communities safe during inclement weather.

But with the increasing frequency of severe weather events, there can and should be improvements in weather forecasting. For example, forecasts can be more precise regarding what will happen and when. Forecasts can provide more lead time, especially of severe weather events, to allow people to prepare. Forecast information can be communicated more effectively to the public and those in harm's way so we can reduce the loss of life and property.

This bill is designed to make sure that NOAA achieves these important goals. H.R. 1561 draws upon the model of innovation used by the military services where researchers work hand in hand with those on the front lines to develop innovations that have real-world practical returns.

The bill connects the research side of NOAA, the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, more effectively with the forecasting needs of the National Weather Service. The bill contains several provisions that will improve interactions and information sharing between OAR and NWS. It also establishes new ways for NOAA to hear from and work with the broader research and private weather communities.

NOAA is not the only agency that researches weather or has responsibility for communicating forecast information, so the bill establishes interagency coordination, through the Office of Science and Technology Policy, across the agencies that have these responsibilities. This coordination will leverage our limited resources and more rapidly spread the adoption of best tools and practices across agencies.

H.R. 1561 recognizes that the best forecasts in the world will not fully serve the public's needs unless we have an effective communications system. The bill directs NOAA to do more research, listen to experts, and improve its risk communication techniques. The bill also reestablishes a program that allows NOAA to make awards to people who save the lives of others through reliance on NOAA's Weather Radio All Hazards program.

This bill also establishes a pilot program at NOAA to look to the commercial sector for weather forecasting data. This is an overdue effort to ensure that Federal dollars are spent effectively and leveraged appropriately.

Additionally, the bill requires NOAA to run simulations of the effect of different configurations of instruments and datasets on forecasting accuracy so the agency can look at the benefits and costs of different arrays of sensors. It is important to make sure that these requirements are not too prescriptive so that NOAA is able to use the most efficient, accurate, and cost-effective model for the situation. I will continue to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on how we can make these provisions work well.

In summary, the changes in this bill will bring about advances that result in better development and deployment of forecast innovations and technology. Importantly, most of these changes are coming at little or no cost. The bill is focused on changes to internal processes rather than simply spending more money. To the degree that the bill does expand the agency's authorization for weather research, it is done in line with anticipated needs in this area.

Again, I want to thank the Members on both sides of the aisle for their input and support. I am particularly grateful to Ms. JOHNSON for her support during negotiations as well as Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Also, I want to thank the hard-working staff on both sides of the aisle for their efforts to keep coming back to the table and helping to move this forward.

Mr. Chairman, we also received many letters of support for H.R. 1561 from more than 20 different organizations, including the Weather Coalition; the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, which represents more than 100 research institutions; the Global Weather Corporation; the American Weather and Climate Industry Association; the American Commercial Space Weather Association; and many others. Additionally, we received letters of support from a number of individuals who serve on the Environmental Information Services Working Group, which is one of NOAA's scientific advisory bodies.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for her work on this bill. She has been a strong advocate and an

initiator on the benefits that this bill does promote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just echo the comments of my colleague from Oklahoma, the vice chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Mr. LUCAS, and of course the ranking member, Ms. BONAMICI. I think your summation of this bill is right on target.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to attest that H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act, is the very first step in what will lead us to a day when we have zero deaths from tornadoes. I want to repeat that. This is the very first step of what is necessary to move us to a day where we have zero deaths from tornadoes. Those of us from the great State of Oklahoma understand this all too well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank Chairman SMITH, Vice Chairman LUCAS, and the Subcommittee on Environment Ranking Member BONAMICI for their tireless efforts to see this bipartisan legislation move forward.

The burgeoning commercial private sector for space-based weather data and aviation-based weather data has voiced its support for this legislation. I would like to mention letters to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology from PlanetiQ, Tempus Global Data, Panasonic Avionics Corporation, GeoOptics, and Spire Global.

H.R. 1561 builds on the foundation laid by my House-passed Weather Forecasting Improvement Act from last Congress and directs NOAA to prioritize activities that will save lives and protect property. This is critically important to my State, which is in the heart of Tornado Alley.

In fact, I just went home for the weekend. Saturday night, about midnight, all of the tornado sirens started going off. My wife and I got up. We got our kids out of bed. We brought them downstairs. We set up their beds in my closet. My wife and I turned on the TV, and we surfed the Internet trying to find out where the tornadoes were and where they were touching down.

This is critically important, and I am sure my experience this weekend, which is not unique to this weekend, is also an experience by many of my constituents and others throughout the State of Oklahoma. We must do all we can to improve our ability to predict the weather.

H.R. 1561 will help NOAA to develop more accurate and timely warnings for not only tornadoes, but also hurricanes and other high-impact weather events. It calls on NOAA to develop a plan to regain and maintain our forecasting capabilities that are second to none in the world because right now we, unfortunately, are lagging behind our counterparts in Europe, the U.K., and Canada. The bill encourages better cooperation across NOAA offices and enhances collaboration with universities such as the University of Oklahoma, which is a national leader in weather research.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of a new section in this year's version that we have worked closely with industry, NOAA, and other Members of Congress to include. H.R. 1561 authorizes a pilot program for NOAA to purchase commercial space-based weather data and test it against NOAA's proprietary data. It also calls on NOAA to publish standards it expects from any purchased data from the commercial sector.

Mr. Speaker, this has the potential to be a major paradigm shift provision. This is the first step towards changing the business model. I believe we need to change the business model, moving to a day where the government does not purchase, own, and operate huge monolithic billion-dollar satellites but, rather, utilizes the innovation of the private sector to provide the data necessary to feed our data assimilation systems and our numerical weather models.

□ 1830

This will ultimately allow NOAA to focus its resources on the research and development necessary to improve our modeling capabilities, computing capacity, and warning lead times outlined in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there will come a time when there will be zero deaths from tornados. I think this bill will help us implement the necessary steps to get there.

I, once again, thank my colleagues on the Science Committee for all their hard work, and I look forward to working with our counterparts in the Senate to move this legislation to the President's desk.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 has received overwhelming support from the weather enterprise and industry. I would like to mention letters of support from AccuWeather, The Weather Company, Science and Technology Corporation, and Carmel Research Center as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD a full list of the 25 letters of support the Science Committee received for this legislation.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT FOR H.R. 1561—THE WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

COMPANIES

AccuWeather, American Commercial Space Weather Association, Atmospheric & Space Technology Research Associates, American Weather and Climate Industry Association, Carmel Research Center, GeoOptics, Global Weather Corporation, MetraWeather, Panasonic Avionics Corporation, Planet IQ.

Space Environment Technologies, Spire Global, Science Technology Corporation, Tempus Global Data, The Weather Company, University Corporation of Atmospheric Research, Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative, Utah State University, Weather Coalition, Weather Decision Technologies.

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION SERVICES WORKING GROUP

Walt Dabbert—Vaisala, Philip Ardanuy—Raytheon, Waren Qualley—Harris, Jean Vieux—Vieux Hydrology, Julie Winkler—Michigan State University.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other request for time, but I just want to thank the three original cosponsors we have on the floor tonight—Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Ms. BONAMICI—for sponsoring such an important piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, let me say, again, that this is a good bill that will improve weather forecasting innovation and services.

The results of the changes contained in this legislation? The public will be safer because of more timely and more accurate forecasts that will protect lives and property. We will also be growing our economy and creating jobs through this bill.

Researchers have found that annual variations in weather can produce billions of dollars in reduced U.S. gross domestic product. With stakes that large, we owe it to our Nation to improve weather forecasting.

H.R. 1561 takes intelligent steps to support NOAA and to drive needed change in how we harness research to forecasting needs.

Again, I want to thank the many leaders in the research community and the private weather sector who provided advice to the committee as we worked on this bill. I also want to extend my appreciation to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Dr. Kathy Sullivan, for her cooperation and advice.

I will continue working with my colleagues across the aisle and in the other body until we have a good, final bill. Again, I thank my cosponsors, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge that getting to where we are today was not easy. This is an update to a bill the House passed two years ago, and we have spent several months in this Congress negotiating over how to rework that legislation.

I want to especially recognize the efforts of Environment Subcommittee Chairman JIM BRIDENSTINE and Ranking Member SUZANNE

BONAMICI as well as the bill's sponsor, Mr. LUCAS. Their leadership and commitment has really driven this process forward. Today's bill is a testament to their dedication and represents one very positive step forward on the long and continuous road to improving the American weather forecasting system.

America has some of the most diverse and dangerous weather events of any country. From my home state of Texas, all the way to Maine, hurricanes and tropical storms annually batter our coasts. Likewise, the central portions of our country, from Texas to Illinois are the most tornado prone areas in the entire world.

Unfortunately, all you've had to do over the last few weeks is pick up a newspaper or turn on the television to see the true impact tornadoes can have on American families. To help our citizens cope with these potentially devastating events, we need to have the very best weather forecasting and warning capabilities.

The National Weather Service and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research at NOAA play a central role in protecting the lives and property of every American.

The bill before us today will help accelerate innovation and the transition of cutting-edge weather research into essential weather forecasting tools and products.

The legislation accomplishes this goal by breaking down the barriers that exist between the weather research community, our nation's forecasters, and the private-sector weather enterprise. Improving collaboration and cooperation within NOAA, but also between the agency and the broader weather community will extend the accuracy and timing of our weather predictions. Such improvements will ultimately save lives and make our communities safer.

Mr. Speaker, the weather is a central part of everyday life and resiliency to severe weather events is an important part of strengthening the nation's economic security. H.R. 1561 will advance our weather forecasting capabilities and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1561, ''The Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015,'' will greatly improve our severe weather forecasting capabilities. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, the Vice Chairman of the Science Committee, for introducing this bill.

Severe weather routinely affects large portions of the United States. This year we already have seen the devastating effects of tornados across our country, especially in Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, Alabama, and Mississippi among other states.

The deaths and the damage from severe weather underscore our need for a world-class weather prediction system that helps protect American lives and property.

Unfortunately, our leadership has slipped in severe weather forecasting. European weather models routinely predict America's weather better than we do. We need to make up for lost ground.

H.R. 1561 improves weather observation systems and next generation modeling capabilities.

This bill prioritizes weather research at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) research agency. This will improve forecasts and warnings.

It prompts NOAA to actively engage new commercial data and private sector weather solutions through a corrimercial weather data pilot project.

The bill requires a cost-benefit analyses for the procurement of observing system data.

It increases forecast warning lead times for tornadoes and hurricanes. And it creates a joint technology transfer fund in NOAA's Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research to help speed technologies developed through NOAA's weather research into operation.

The enhanced prediction of major storms is of great importance to protecting the public from injury and loss of property.

In addition to Mr. LUCAS, I also want to thank the Chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and the Environment Subcommittee Ranking Member, the gentlewoman from Oregon, Ms. BONAMICI, for their sponsorship of this bipartisan bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1561, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY LABORATORY MODERNIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1158) to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1158

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Energy.

(2) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term ''National Laboratory'' means a Department of Energy nonmilitary national laboratory, including—

(A) Ames Laboratory;

(B) Argonne National Laboratory;

(C) Brookhaven National Laboratory;

(D) Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory;

(E) Idaho National Laboratory;

(F) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory;

(G) National Energy Technology Laboratory;

(H) National Renewable Energy Laboratory;

(I) Oak Ridge National Laboratory;

(J) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory;

(K) Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory;

(L) Savannah River National Laboratory;

(M) Stanford Linear Accelerator Center;

(N) Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility; and

(O) any laboratory operated by the National Nuclear Security Administration, but only with respect to the civilian energy activities thereof.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act abrogates or otherwise affects the primary responsibilities of any National Laboratory to the Department.

TITLE I—INNOVATION MANAGEMENT AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 101. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND TRANSITIONS ASSESSMENT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report which shall include—

(1) an assessment of the Department's current ability to carry out the goals of section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391), including an assessment of the role and effectiveness of the Director of the Office of Technology Transitions; and

(2) recommended departmental policy changes and legislative changes to section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) to improve the Department's ability to successfully transfer new energy technologies to the private sector.

SEC. 102. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary should encourage the National

Laboratories and federally funded research and development centers to inform small businesses of the opportunities and resources that exist pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 103. NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Laboratories, relevant Federal agencies, and other stakeholders, shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report assessing the Department's capabilities to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion and non-light water reactor prototypes and related demonstration facilities at Department-owned sites. For purposes of this report, the Secretary shall consider the Department's capabilities to facilitate privately-funded prototypes up to 20 megawatts thermal output. The report shall address the following:

(1) The Department's safety review and oversight capabilities.

(2) Potential sites capable of hosting research, development, and demonstration of prototype reactors and related facilities for the purpose of reducing technical risk.

(3) The Department's and National Laboratories' existing physical and technical capabilities relevant to research, development, and oversight.

(4) The efficacy of the Department's available contractual mechanisms, including cooperative research and development agreements, work for others agreements, and agreements for commercializing technology.

(5) Potential cost structures related to physical security, decommissioning, liability, and other long-term project costs.

(6) Other challenges or considerations identified by the Secretary, including issues related to potential cases of demonstration reactors up to 2 gigawatts of thermal output.

TITLE II—CROSS-SECTOR PARTNERSHIPS AND GRANT COMPETITIVENESS

SEC. 201. AGREEMENTS FOR COMMERCIALIZING TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the Agreements for Commercializing Technology pilot program of the Department, as announced by the Secretary on December 8, 2011, in accordance with this section.

(b) TERMS.—Each agreement entered into pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall provide to the contractor of the applicable National Laboratory, to the maximum extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, increased authority to negotiate contract terms, such as intellectual property rights, payment structures, performance guarantees, and multiparty collaborations.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any director of a National Laboratory may enter into an agreement pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a).

(2) AGREEMENTS WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—To carry out paragraph (1) and subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to execute agreements with a non-Federal entity, including a non-Federal entity already receiving Federal funding that will be used to support activities under agreements executed pursuant to paragraph (1), provided that such funding is solely used to carry out the purposes of the Federal award.

(3) RESTRICTION.—The requirements of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Bayh-Dole Act'') shall apply if—

(A) the agreement is a funding agreement (as that term is defined in section 201 of that title); and

(B) at least 1 of the parties to the funding agreement is eligible to receive rights under that chapter.

(d) SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY.—Each affected director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary, with respect to each agreement entered into under this section—

(1) a summary of information relating to the relevant project;

(2) the total estimated costs of the project;

(3) estimated commencement and completion dates of the project; and

(4) other documentation determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(e) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall require the contractor of the affected National Laboratory to certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section—

(1) is not in direct competition with the private sector; and

(2) does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(f) EXTENSION.—The pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall be extended until October 31, 2017.

(g) REPORTS.—

(1) OVERALL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date described in subsection (f), the Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

(A) assesses the overall effectiveness of the pilot program referred to in subsection (a);

(B) identifies opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the pilot program;

(C) assesses the potential for program activities to interfere with the responsibilities of the National Laboratories to the Department; and

(D) provides a recommendation regarding the future of the pilot program.

(2) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report that accounts for all incidences of, and provides a justification for, non-Federal entities using funds derived from a Federal contract or award to carry out agreements pursuant to this section.

SEC. 202. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR COMMERCIALIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall delegate to directors of the National Laboratories signature authority with respect to any agreement described in subsection (b) the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than $1,000,000, if such an agreement falls within the scope of—

(1) a strategic plan for the National Laboratory that has been approved by the Department; or

(2) the most recent Congressionally approved budget for Department activities to be carried out by the National Laboratory.

(b) AGREEMENTS.—Subsection (a) applies to—

(1) a cooperative research and development agreement;

(2) a non-Federal work-for-others agreement; and

(3) any other agreement determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of the National Laboratories.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall carry out an agreement under this section in accordance with applicable policies of the Department, including by ensuring that the agreement does not compromise any national security, economic, or environmental interest of the United States.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—Within 30 days of entering an agreement under this section, the director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary for monitoring and review all records of the National Laboratory relating to the agreement.

(4) RATES.—The director of a National Laboratory may charge higher rates for services performed under a partnership agreement entered into pursuant to this section, regardless of the full cost of recovery, if such funds are used exclusively to support further research and development activities at the respective National Laboratory.

(d) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to any agreement with a majority foreign-owned company.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(B) by striking ''Each Federal agency'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each Federal agency''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in accordance with section 202(a) of the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015, approval by the Secretary of Energy shall not be required for any technology transfer agreement proposed to be entered into by a National Laboratory of the Department of Energy, the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than $1,000,000.''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (a)(1)(A)''.

SEC. 203. INCLUSION OF EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION IN AUTHORIZED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACTIVITIES.

Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION.—The Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to use funds authorized to support technology transfer within the Department to carry out early-stage and pre-commercial technology

demonstration activities to remove technology barriers that limit private sector interest and demonstrate potential commercial applications of any research and technologies arising from National Laboratory activities.''.

SEC. 204. FUNDING COMPETITIVENESS FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.

Section 988(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3)'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) EXEMPTION FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a research or development activity performed by an institution of higher education or nonprofit institution (as defined in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703)).

''(B) TERMINATION DATE.—The exemption under subparagraph (A) shall apply during the 6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph.''.

SEC. 205. PARTICIPATION IN THE INNOVATION CORPS PROGRAM.

The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the Director of the National Science Foundation to enable researchers funded by the Department to participate in the National Science Foundation Innovation Corps program.

TITLE III—ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

SEC. 301. REPORT BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) describing the results of the projects developed under sections 201, 202, and 203, including information regarding—

(A) partnerships initiated as a result of those projects and the potential linkages presented by those partnerships with respect to national priorities and other taxpayer-funded research; and

(B) whether the activities carried out under those projects result in—

(i) fiscal savings;

(ii) expansion of National Laboratory capabilities;

(iii) increased efficiency of technology transfers; or

(iv) an increase in general efficiency of the National Laboratory system; and

(2) assess the scale, scope, efficacy, and impact of the Department's efforts to promote technology transfer and private sector engagement at the National Laboratories, and make recommendations on how the Department can improve these activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1158, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015, enables the Department of Energy to better form partnerships with non-Federal entities and transfer research to the private sector.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for his initiative on this issue and the gentleman from Colorado, Representative ED PERLMUTTER, for cosponsoring this important piece of legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, before I get started, we also have several letters of support on this that I would submit for the RECORD. One is from the Bipartisan Policy Center on behalf of the American Energy Innovation Council; another is from Third Way. They support this bill. The final one is from the American Nuclear Society.

BIPARTISAN POLICY CENTER,
March 24, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, H–232 of the Capitol, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, H–204 of the Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the American Energy Innovation Council (AEIC), we write to urge the prompt consideration of H.R. 1158 Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act. Similar legislation (H.R. 5120) easily passed the House during the last Congress. The bill enjoys strong bipartisan support and was cosponsored by both Chairman Lamar Smith (R-TX) and Ranking Member Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX) of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

The AEIC is a group of America's top business executives who came together starting in 2010 to recommend ways to promote American innovation in clean energy technology. We are united in our belief that technology innovation—especially in energy—is at the heart of many of the central economic, national security, competitiveness, and environmental challenges facing our nation. We believe strong support for robust, public investments in energy innovation is critical to a vibrant American economy.

H.R. 1158 gives the National Labs needed flexibility to enter into more effective partnerships with businesses and universities, particularly with respect to early-stage technology demonstration. We anticipate that H.R. 1158 will unlock more private investment in clean energy technology R&D, and we endorse this bill.

Accelerating technology innovation is a smart investment for America's future. We look forward to working with you to once again secure House passage of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

CHAD HOLLIDAY,
Co-Chair, American Energy Innovation Council.

NORM AUGUSTINE,
Co-Chair, American Energy Innovation Council.

THIRD WAY,
March 9, 2015.

Hon. RANDY HULTGREN,
Member, House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,
Member, House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HULTGREN AND CONGRESSMAN PERLMUTTER, we write in support of H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy (DOE) Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015. It is critical that the United States maximizes the ability of our national labs to partner with the private sector to develop and commercialize new energy technologies, particularly around advanced nuclear power. Your bipartisan bill, which has been approved by the Committee and sent to the House, will begin a vital assessment of the labs' capabilities and offer ways to get the best return on taxpayers' investment in energy innovation.

The world faces a profound paradox: ever-increasing global energy demand and the need to dramatically reduce carbon emissions. That's why Third Way strongly believes that the development of advanced nuclear reactors is critical. With dozens of reactor projects underway in the United States, this country has the opportunity to create enormous economic, national security, and environmental benefits if we can provide the right platform for private companies to develop and commercialize these advanced nuclear technologies. Public-private partnerships of the type envisioned in your legislation can help industry to transcend some of the technological and regulatory barriers it faces and bring this promising energy source to market

We applaud your leadership in the sponsorship of this bill. There is pent-up demand in the private sector to work with the national labs to develop innovative advanced nuclear, carbon capture, and other energy solutions. H.R. 1158 is a very important step to ensure that happens. We look forward to supporting it as it moves through the House and Senate.

Sincerely,

JOSH FREED,
Vice President for the Clean Energy Program.

AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY,
La Grange Park, IL, March 23, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space & Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Science, Space & Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON: I write on behalf of the 11,000 members of the American Nuclear Society to express our support for H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015.

We appreciate your efforts to harness the intellectual assets of our national laboratories through broader technology commercialization and public-private partnership initiatives. We are especially grateful for Section 104 which directs the Department of Energy to assess its ability to ''incubate'' privately-funded advanced research and test reactor prototypes at national laboratories.

ANS strongly supports expanded federal engagement in advanced, non-light water nuclear research and development. It is becoming increasingly clear that the U.S. and the world will need to significantly expand its nuclear generating capacity in the coming decades to address growing energy demands while reducing harmful emissions.

Historically, the U.S. led the world in developing new reactor technology. However, several other nations, including Russia and China, have moved aggressively to develop so-called Generation IV reactors which offer distinct advantages over their light water counterparts. As such, the U.S. must recommit itself to improving its advanced reactor technology portfolio in order to maintain its influence over global nuclear safety and nonproliferation norms. This legislation, if enacted, would provide needed support toward that objective.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BRADY RAAP,
President, American Nuclear Society.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH, as well as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for helping bring this legislation to the floor again this Congress.

H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act, ensures that the Department of Energy has the tools it needs to allow new startups, small businesses, universities, and the general public at large to do what they do best: react to market signals and innovate.

The Federal Government and the national labs play a vital role doing the basic research needed to maintain America's position as a safe and innovative nation. Their ability to build large research tools at our user facilities is the crown jewel in our Nation's research capabilities. This is the model other nations, like China, are copying.

Far too often, however, the discoveries made in our labs get stuck in the labs. This is due to a number of reasons, and this bill seeks to break down some of the barriers that make this happen.

Many of these problems are also outlined in chapter three of the ''Interim Report of the Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories.''

I quote from the report: ''Over 50 prior studies and reports published over the past 40 years detail shortcomings in the relationship between the DOE and its laboratories.''

It continues:

They present a strikingly consistent pattern of criticism and recommendations for improvement.

The committee and I have reviewed many of these prior reports, and this bill attempts to act on a few of these consistent, noncontroversial recommendations.

By extending the pilot for ACT agreements within DOE, the labs are given the ability to negotiate more flexible contracts with non-Federal entities that would like to take the labs' research and turn it into viable products.

Section 201 in the bill also allows researchers using Federal funds to enter into these agreements, so long as any Federal funds are used exclusively for their intended research purposes.

Section 203 of the bill will continue to chip away at what many call the valley of death, what many startups never make it through because they cannot prove their concept.

This section would allow DOE to use their tech transfer funds for early-stage, precommercial proof of concept demonstrations so the private sector can finally pick up technologies and develop them with private funds. This legislation would also grant to the directors of national labs the signature authority for many agreements with non-Federal entities.

These are decisions that the Secretary of Energy must make under current law, meaning decisions a lab director can make over a phone call in the course of a day must weave their way through the agency's bureaucracy before it lands on the Secretary's desk.

This bill also seeks to improve the Department's relationship with small businesses that can take part in the SBIR–STTR program, and it encourages the Secretary to enter into agreement with the I–Corps program at NSF.

While I do understand that DOE has begun a similar pilot, called Lab Corps, I am worried that this pilot housed in EERE is so narrow in focus that it will not be applicable for most of our labs' advancement. An accelerator technology being developed for medical treatments, for instance, would not be able to access the current pilot.

Section 103 of this legislation will also require DOE to undertake an honest assessment of its capabilities to authorize, host, and oversee prototype reactors at DOE sites. This is a critical issue for the United States' position as a nuclear technology leader. The United States has not hosted a new research reactor in decades, and there are not any current applications under review at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Unfortunately, the U.S. has become so risk averse that we have regulated ourselves out of business for building the concept reactors that might some day lead to commercially deployable, safer, and more efficient nuclear technologies. We are driving companies overseas. I look forward to seeing the results of this report from DOE.

Our national labs have been at the cutting edge of technological development, and we must always ensure that it is in the national interest. This bill helps to ensure that is the case because a discovery lost in the labs is a discovery wasted.

That is why I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015.

I would like to thank Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working together to produce a strong bipartisan bill. I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for getting this bill through committee and to the floor here tonight.

DOE's national labs are responsible for some of the greatest research being conducted in the world, both basic and applied. Some of this research has great potential to become new commercial technologies if our labs provide the type of support that increases the likelihood of technology transfer.

This could have enormous beneficial impacts for our Nation, not just in new technologies, but by making the most of our investments at these labs. That is why improving technology transfer from American research facilities, both national labs and universities, has been one of my top priorities on the Science Committee for the past decade.

H.R. 1158 ensures that our national labs have the resources needed to facilitate the transfer of new technologies to the private sector. It greatly increases the breadth of companies that are eligible to engage in a new pilot program that provides for more flexible partnerships, similar to those in the private sector, and lengthens the program for 2 years. This was an important issue that came up at a hearing 2 years ago, and I am happy that we are getting that done in this bill.

This bill also empowers labs to utilize technology transfer funds on projects that demonstrate commercial applications for their research and technologies, and it asks the Department of Energy for a report on activities related to the congressionally mandated technology commercialization fund which the Department is implementing through the newly formed Office of Technology Transitions.

I personally asked Secretary Moniz about past use of this fund, and so I am pleased by the recent actions of DOE in the direction of the TCF at this time. This bill has impacts beyond labs as well. It would significantly decrease financial obstacles that prevent nonprofit research organizations, including many universities, from working with the Department.

The bill includes language that I wrote that would make the National Science Foundation's highly successful

Innovation Corps Program, which pairs up grant recipients with motivated entrepreneurs to help get their ideas in the commercial arena, available to the DOE through a partnership with the NSF.

Finally, the bill ensures that effective reporting and accountability systems are in place so we are able to clearly determine the performance of these new tools, as well as any further steps that will need to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, the innovations that have come out of DOE's national laboratories and research programs are second to none. Argonne National Lab, which is located in my district, is one of the best.

All these federally funded institutions and initiatives have been a critical component of our knowledge-based economy, and this bill will ensure that they not only continue, but they improve their incredible track record.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have no other requests for time on this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

□ 1845

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his work on this bill and for yielding me this time.

I rise today to support H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act. I want to thank my friend from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for sponsoring this bill and working with me and our colleagues on this important piece of legislation.

This legislation provides tools to spur and accelerate the transfer of new technologies developed at our national labs. It extends the Agreements for Commercializing Technology, or ACT, pilot program for 2 more years and also significantly broadens the range of companies able to participate in the program, allowing for more flexible partnership agreements.

The bill will allow labs to use their technology to transfer funds for activities which identify and demonstrate commercial opportunities for their research and technologies.

This legislation also removes burdens which currently prevent many universities and other nonprofit research institutions from working with the Department of Energy. This will encourage further collaboration between university researchers across the country and our wealth of knowledge at the national labs.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Golden, Colorado, and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Quite simply, NREL is the premier energy efficiency and renewable energy lab in the world. For more than 40 years, NREL has led the charge in research and design of renewable energy products directly affecting the way we utilize and secure American energy.

This bill will help provide labs like NREL with important tools so they can best lead our country's research on renewable and sustainable forms of energy and transportation and, ultimately, bring these life-changing innovations to consumers. I have seen the great work being done at NREL, and I know this great work is happening at other national labs all across the country.

Last year, DOE signed an agreement for commercializing technology with the Wells Fargo Foundation to utilize NREL and other DOE national labs to further research in energy-efficient buildings-related technologies, and this bill allows that agreement to be extended for at least 2 more years.

DOE's 17 national laboratories and research programs have been the birthplace to some of our most revolutionary technologies. When this research is harnessed by entrepreneurs and business leaders, startups with one or two employees can grow into companies employing dozens, if not hundreds, of people.

We want to make sure these federally funded institutions and initiatives remain an important foundation of our knowledge-based economy. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), giving scientists and researchers in both the public and private sector tools and freedom they need to unlock a new wave of innovation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. PERLMUTTER for their leadership on this important issue.

This bill helps foster opportunities for entrepreneurs to more easily access technologies coming out of the Department of Energy and connect the brilliant minds to the equally brilliant minds in the private sector who can then commercialize this technology.

Federal R&D is responsible for many of the industries and technologies that now drive our national wealth—the most earth-shattering example, the Internet, developed by government scientists at DARPA.

Federal research spawned the biotech and semiconductor industries; gave us tools like the laser, GPS, and MRI; and, through the World Wide Web and the Internet, has entirely changed the way we find a restaurant, talk to our children, and sell cars.

The role of the private sector in developing technology is vital, and government must lead the way in innovation, providing the patient capital necessary to perform research without any known commercial application or concern for profit.

I am reminded of the fascinating idea that mathematicians who develop things in their heads, in their offices, with no application to anything, so often, within weeks, will find that that mathematical new idea applies to real-life situations.

Einstein marveled at the power of pure mathematics, and he said, ''How can it be that mathematics, being after all a product of human thought which is independent of experience, is so admirably appropriate to the objects of reality?''

In 1959, the physicist Eugene Wigner described this problem as ''the unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics.''

H.R. 1158 helps bring these pieces together, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and technology; and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Thank you, Chairman SMITH, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, before I wrap up on the bill we are debating right now, I just wanted to thank Chairman SMITH for his work on this, along with Ranking Member JOHNSON. Working together, we were able to get these bills done here on the floor tonight.

I know that tomorrow we will have a little bit more of a contentious debate on a bill coming out of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee; but I just wanted to, again, commend the chairman and Ranking Member JOHNSON for our work together on these bills.

We know there are important things that we can get done and we need to get done and will be very helpful to our Nation, and I am glad that we were able to do those things on these bills that we have brought forward here tonight, a good bipartisan mix of bills showing bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by asking my colleagues to support H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act.

I want to thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. PERLMUTTER for their work on this bill. I think there are many things that we can't even see right now that will come out of this, but I am certain that our national labs and the great value that they are to our Nation will continue, and this will allow them to continue to not only do their research, but to do an even better job of producing new technologies that will be a great benefit to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015, enables the Department of Energy (DOE) to better form partnerships with non-federal entities and transfer research to the private sector.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Rep. RANDY HULTGREN, for his initiative on this issue, and the gentleman from Colorado, Rep. ED PERLMUTTER, for it cosponsoring this important legislation.

The Department of Energy is the largest federal supporter of basic research and development and sponsors 47 percent of federal basic research in the physical sciences.

The Department's science and energy research is conducted at over 300 sites nationwide. More than 31,000 researchers take advantage of DOE user facilities each year.

This includes the Department's 17 National Labs, which provide the foundation for the Department of Energy's research and development infrastructure.

These labs keep America at the forefront of global technological capabilities. They ensure that we continue to conduct critical research in high energy physics, advanced scientific computing, biological and environmental research, nuclear physics, fusion energy sciences, basic energy sciences, and applied energy research and development in fossil, nuclear and renewable energy.

The innovative early stage research performed at the labs can have great value for the private sector, but often goes unnoticed.

Because of a communication gap between the labs and the private sector, ideas and technology are often slow to reach the market. And federal government red tape discourages the private sector from using the unique state-of-the-art facilities the national labs offer.

This bill grants lab directors signature authority for agreements with private sector entities valued at less than $1 million. And it extends a pilot program that allows for more flexible contract terms between companies and lab operators.

This bill also requires DOE to assess its capability to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion research and next generation fission reactor prototypes.

Due to regulatory uncertainty from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the private sector currently has little incentive or ability to build reactor prototypes.

This legislation represents a bipartisan, bicameral agreement to modernize and increase the productivity of the DOE national lab system.

I again thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. PERLMUTTER for their initiative on this issue and encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1158, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2262, SPURRING PRIVATE AEROSPACE COMPETITIVENESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 880, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 22, 2015, THROUGH MAY 29, 2015

Mr. STIVERS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–127) on the resolution (H. Res. 273) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1335, STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. STIVERS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–128) on the resolution (H. Res. 274) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

VIRGINIA TASK FORCE 1

(Mrs. COMSTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to thank the brave men and women of Virginia Task Force 1, a domestic and international disaster response resource sponsored by the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department.

I was honored to welcome these miracle workers home this past Saturday morning after their 3-week deployment to Nepal.

Virginia Task Force 1, in partnership with USAID, is always at the ready to answer the call when tragedy or natural disaster strikes, either at home or abroad. Nepal was devastated by two major earthquakes, resulting in the loss of over 8,500 lives, and Virginia Task Force 1 was there to help.

With their incredible skill and teamwork, they were able to rescue a 15-year-old boy trapped in the rubble for 5 days. When the second earthquake hit, they saved a 41-year-old woman who was trapped in a four-story building. They also medically treated countless others.

When they returned home on Saturday morning, they were enthusiastically greeted by their relatives and families. Those families also endure countless hours of worry while their family members and loved ones are halfway around the world in unfamiliar and dangerous circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of Virginia Task Force 1 are truly fabulous and wonderful ambassadors for the Commonwealth of Virginia and our country, and it is an honor and a privilege to thank them for their courageous service to the people of Nepal and to the work they do every day in our country.

MANDATED FIXED WHEELCHAIR LIFTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to do a budget presentation in a couple of moments, but I wanted to actually come up here and, with my good friend from South Carolina, MICK MULVANEY, talk about a little article that popped up in The Economist last week, and there is the issue.

This place has fairly short memories, but about 2 years ago, there were a handful of us coming here and talking about sort of an esoteric issue, something called—what is it—wheelchair lifts.

For those of us who represent resort areas, I am blessed to represent the community of Scottsdale, a wonderful

area. I had one of my resort owners call me, and in a fairly gruff voice, saying: ''DAVID, do you know what the Justice Department is doing to me? I have seven pools and Jacuzzis, and apparently, I have to put permanent fixed wheelchair lifts at every pool and Jacuzzi.''

He said: ''I want to be sensitive and caring to my mobility-challenged guests.''

He went on to tell me the story that for 10 years, he had had a portable wheelchair lift, and it had never been requested. Here we are, 2 years later. He has torn up his landscaping; he has put in the units. Guess what is now happening?

He has called me and told me that now his insurance rates are starting to really bounce up because of unattractive nuisance. The very things MICK MULVANEY predicted, I like to say I predicted 2 years ago, are coming true.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY). Tell us the other side of the story of what is going on.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. SCHWEIKERT, thank you for the opportunity to talk about this a little bit without the pressures of the 2-minute timer or a 3-minute timer, actually talk about something in detail for a change in this House because it merits the discussion.

My experience with it, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, was exactly the same as yours—they are not exactly the same. I am not from the resort part of South Carolina. Mr. SANFORD and Mr. RICE get that. I am from the more rural inland part of the State; but we have got a lot of freeways and a lot of small businesses operating hotels, a lot of them owned by Asian Americans.

I was approached by a group of Indian American hotel owners last year. These are folks, mom-and-pop operations, that might own one hotel, they might own two. They told me the same story you just told about these pool lifts having to go in.

A lot of them, like your friends with the resorts, had the portable lifts, so if anybody ever asked for help getting into and out of a pool by themselves, they had the ability to do that. Of course, similar to your story, none of them had ever been asked.

The Department of Justice came in and said: You know what, we are going to require you, under the terms of the Americans with Disabilities Act, to put these fixed pool lifts in every single body of water that you have; so if you have a regular size pool, a kiddie pool, and a hot tub, that is three of these fixed lifts.

It was a tremendous burden on these small businesses who, as you mentioned, wanted to help folks who needed help in getting in and out of the pool, but just wanted to do it with a portable machine, as opposed to a standard machine.

□ 1900

They came in, and they said: Look, Mr. MULVANEY, we have seen this act before. This is how we got rid of diving boards. This is why we don't have any diving boards.

Years ago, people said they were an attractive nuisance. Kids were jumping off of them and hurting themselves, so now that entire generation of Americans has grown up without diving boards.

What is going to happen now is that the next generation of Americans is going to grow up without swimming pools at hotels for the exact reason that you have just mentioned.

We spent 40 years getting rid of these things that children could climb up on and jump off of into the pool, and now the Department of Justice has required these hotel owners to come in and put the exact same thing back in.

It is no longer a diving board. Now it is a mechanical chair. But to an 8-year-old, it looks like something to climb up and jump off of. So they were lamenting the fact not only that their business is going to be hurt but that part of the enjoyment of coming to the hotel would be gone and not available to their customers, and that eventually, you would see them start filling in their swimming pools. Unfortunately, I think that is the way that we are moving.

But they also talked about something—and this is to the point of the article that you just mentioned, The Economist from April 25, which is that there was a private right of action in the regulations that came forward. And what this means, to folks who aren't familiar with what that means, is that anybody can sue. In fact, in the United States of America, when anybody can sue, typically, anybody does sue.

The article goes into great length about one very, very energetic plaintiff who filed 529 lawsuits against small-business owners at hotels throughout the southeast. In fact, in one particular period of time, they hit 50 hotels in a row shortly after the regulation became effective so that they could file their lawsuit against the hotel owners.

I will read one of my favorite passages in the article, which is something that should be enlightening for all of us: ''There is evidence that lawyers explicitly target small businesses, which are more likely to pay up without a fight.''

There we go. That is what we have done in the name of helping people whom folks were already trying to help. But in the name of having the government tell small business and large business how to help people, what do we end up with? Essentially a jobs bill for the plaintiff's bar.

Before we started today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and I were talking about why we were going to take a few minutes to talk about this.

As my friend from Massachusetts, Barney Frank, said before he left: ''Everybody always says, 'I hate to say I told you so,' but the truth of the matter is, people love saying, 'I told you so.'''

This is exactly what we said would happen. And why the Department of Justice saw fit to single out small business hoteliers who were already trying to help people and say, You know what, we know better than you how to help people. You think these portable units are good? Well, we think the fixed units are better. And trust us because we are from the government, and we are here to help you.

What do we end up with as a result of the government trying to fix the problem? We end up with small businesses making less money. And I know not a lot of people are sympathetic to that. I certainly am. I used to be a small-business person. And believe me, the people who worked for me liked it when I made money. So did I. But I recognize the fact that a lot of people are not sympathetic to small business. But small business makes less money.

Kids are going to have less access to swimming pools as they travel the country. Think about that for a second. How absurd is that, that we are going to end up filling in swimming pools in order to prevent lawsuits.

And then lastly, and the worst is, you will end up with a situation where all we have done is empower a small group of overzealous trial lawyers and their plaintiffs.

It is a sad story but one that we hear again and again in America. And I only hope that the next time the government comes up with an idea like this on how to fix things, they will look to what is happening now to the small-business hotel owners as an example of government gone wrong.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I remember you and I having this conversation on the floor and particularly Members from the left coming to the microphone and basically scolding me on how insensitive I was.

Now I realize that my father may have been right about something. He said: ''It is almost always about the money.''

When you look at The Economist article, you start to realize that this was a jobs act for the Democrat supporters and the trial bar because they are running up and down our communities, suing small businesses.

And I believe you are absolutely correct: our future will be hotels and resorts without pools at all.

Once again, the folks in the opposition questioned our sensitivity, our love for our brothers and sisters. And we were trying to say, This is the economic argument, and here is the litigious argument. And we lost.

The administration basically gave into the trial bar, and now we do have the ''I told you so.''

Mr. MULVANEY. I would suggest to you, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, that you were, in fact, being insensitive: you were being insensitive to the trial bar.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Darn it. I knew I was doing something wrong.

Mr. MULVANEY. Listen, I had the same experience as you did, Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I was in the Longworth House Office Building a couple years back. You and I wrote a bill together to try to either delay or prevent the DOJ from putting this regulation into effect, and we had people literally protesting outside of our office, folks from the disability community who wanted this particular accommodation. And I am completely sympathetic to that.

What I think they failed to see at the time and failed to grasp was, number one, they were already being accommodated. My guess is that 99.9 percent of the people who came to protest had never asked to use one of these portable lifts at hoteliers, so they were not aware of the fact that they were there but, at the same time, they never gave any thought to the unintended consequences of this particular piece of regulation that the DOJ promulgated. And I think that, again, is a lesson to be learned.

A government that is big enough to give you everything that you want is big enough to take from you everything that you have. And this, in a very small way, is what we saw in the promulgation of this particular regulation.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. The closing thought on this colloquy:

We are already seeing the insurance world starting to charge higher and higher and higher fees for apartments, hotels, resorts that have these lifts, these permanent platforms. It is because they are already modeling the risk that someone—hopefully not with alcohol involved—but someone is going to crawl up on top of one and jump in. The same litigation profile that removed diving boards 20, 30 years ago, the other side basically has driven us to. And they are going to be our brothers and sisters out there. There are going to be some that are going to be hurt, maybe hurt severely, and ultimately, what is our future? The removal of the swimming pools.

We have got to thank the folks on the left that weren't willing to discuss rational economics and the DOJ, once again, for making a bunch of money for their trial bar friends.

Mr. MULVANEY. We will get equality, Mr. SCHWEIKERT. We will have equal access to the swimming pools under this regulation because no one will have the access. That will be the ultimate result here.

In an effort to make it accessible to everybody, we will end up making it accessible to no one, and in the final analysis, that is a sad state of equality that I don't think anybody should applaud.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. This is not a petty little issue. This is just a simple example that we talk about here almost every day of the runaway arrogance of Washington believing they are going to run our businesses, run our lives, and sort of the obvious outcomes that turn out to be fairly disastrous.

So, Mr. MULVANEY, I appreciate you coming down and giving us some of your time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. SCHWEIKERT, thank you for the opportunity.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to set up here in a second. I am going to actually walk through something we have been working on in our office now for the last month, and that is, what is really going on in budget numbers.

We did a budget town hall about 2 weeks ago in Scottsdale. And I always like to start it with a simple question that says, How many of you are tired of seeing us in Congress fight with each other? And the hands always go up, and they say, Yes, you have to stop fighting with each other.

And I always try to make the point: it is about the money. You need to understand how bad the underlying financial data is and what is really going on in the scale of debt and deficits and just the sheer scale of spending but also where that spending is going because we have so many of my brothers and sisters here, we go out and campaign and say things like: We are going to take care of waste and fraud. We are going to take care of this and foreign aid. We are going to do this and that. And they are not providing an honest picture of where the money is and where it actually goes.

So we are going to do about 10 of these boards. I know it is going to get technical.

When you run for Congress, one of the first things that happens, if you are a numbers guy, the pollster and the consultants sit you down and say, You can't use big numbers. People won't understand them.

In this presentation, I am going to treat everyone like adults—these aren't Republican numbers; they are not even Democrat numbers, though the majority of these slides actually do come from the White House—to understand what is actually underlying in the data and how quickly it is eroding.

Two points of reference: For decades, we used to talk about how we were going to hit this inflection point when baby boomers began moving into retirement and what was going to happen to the debt curve and what was going to happen to the curve of consumption of the entitlements.

Guess what. We are now well into that inflection point. It has begun, and Congress has done very, very, very little in regards to mandatory spending. You are going to see on these boards that that is actually what may take us down as a Republic.

So this is 2010. Let's just do this as a reference. And remember, 2010 was a year when there was still lots of stimulus money, lots of other spending out there.

You see the blue. The blue is what we refer to as mandatory spending. It is primarily Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, some transfer programs, interest, veterans, and the new health care law.

Okay. In 2010, about 63 percent of our spending was in that blue area; 37 percent was what we call discretionary. That is what we get to vote on here because what is in the blue is in formulas.

I have been here a little over 4 years. I have really had absolutely no influence on that blue area. It is a formula. You hit a certain age, you get a certain benefit.

But I want you to watch what is happening in that entitlement, in that mandatory spending. And, yes, this is the very discussion that gets people unelected because people get very upset, but we have to have an adult conversation of what is really going on here.

So we are going to do a couple of these slides just to sort of create a reference.

Here is where we are this year. And you remember, on that slide, I think the blue area was about 63 percent of our total spending. This year, it is 69 percent of our total spending. And obviously then the discretionary, what we get to vote on as Members, has now gone down to 31 percent.

Do you notice the movement? And that is just in the last 5 years.

So where are we going? Well, right now, to give you a different way of looking at this, this is our 2015 modeling from the White House. This green area is our revenues. That is the total revenues coming into your Federal Government. That purple area is our debt. That is what we are going to borrow this year to make up for our shortfalls, though you will be happy to know that, as of about 48 hours ago, the administration changed the debt number from $576 billion for the 2015 fiscal year to—now it is going to be $582.5 billion. This continues to erode.

We are going to talk about that at the end here, what is actually going on in GDP, on economic growth in this country. And if we do not develop a growth-oriented agenda, we can't meet our obligations. We cannot keep those promises we have made.

And with that, I stand here in shock of how often we engage in these debates, and it is not a growth-oriented focus.

So one thing on this slide I really want you to get: blue over here is mandatory spending. The red is discretionary, with defense. Defense is considered discretionary. We have to borrow either every dime of defense or

every dime of everything else, other than defense and mandatory or discretionary—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the debt, veterans benefits, and the new health care law.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, we have to borrow either every dime of defense or every dime of discretionary other than defense, and that is in this year's budget. That is how quickly this is moving away from us.

So what happens if we look way off into the future, like 4 years from now? 2020 is only 4 years from now. When I first got elected in 2011, I did a presentation here. The numbers I am going to show you that happen in 4 years were not supposed to happen until 9 years from now. This is to give you an idea of how quickly the numbers are eroding. Yet I hear almost no one talking about it.

So we are going to be working on that budget in 4 years. Do you remember that 2010 slide? Sixty-three percent of our spending went to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new healthcare law. Well, it is going to be 76 percent—76—three-quarters of all of our spending. We are only going to be voting on 24 percent of the budget, and half of that will be defense.

I don't know if anyone knows, because these numbers are small and it is hard to watch, what we will be spending in 2020 on discretionary. So defense and all the litany of programs you think of are basically going to be almost identical to what we were spending 10 years earlier. I will hold that up as one of the successes of the Republican House. We have been very disciplined on spending on what we had the ability to influence, which was the discretionary budget, but the formulaic portion of our budget, entitlements, continues to explode. It is almost as if Washington, D.C., did not know that there was a baby boom, did not know people were going to be turning 65, did not know that 76 million of our brothers and sisters were born in about an 18-year period of time, and now we are into the third year of baby boomers beginning to retire, and that inflection has begun.

So just as a reference, because I often get asked for this slide—and we are putting these slides up on our Web site—there is the spending pie chart for this year. You will see the blue area is all the way to here: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the transfer programs also including the new healthcare law, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits.

Two weeks ago when we were doing a budget presentation in my hometown of Scottsdale-Phoenix, I had one woman who was absolutely positive, if we would cut foreign aid, we would be just fine here. It is important to understand. Do you see this little red area here? Foreign aid would be ultimately nothing but a small sliver within that. Yes, it is something, but in many ways, it is theater.

If you have a politician standing in front of you and they are not talking about the mandatory spending and the speed of its growth, you are not having an honest budget discussion. It is hard because in many places around the country, when you stand behind a microphone and hold up these boards and start to say that we need to have an honest conversation about the math underlying Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and what is going to happen on interest on the debt, the new healthcare law and its cost projections blowing through the ceiling, and veterans' benefits, often those Members who have tried to have that conversation get unelected.

But if you have someone walk in to our door here and say, ''David, we so desperately need new spending on this,'' we often pull out our charts and say, ''You are absolutely right. This would be wonderful. Do you have a solution to help me refine and deal with and manage the explosion of the cost in Medicare?'' And they just stare at you like we are not allowed to talk about that. But that is what is going on here.

So let's do another slide to just sort of see how the numbers really are exploding. If I came to you and said, hey, in 4 years, that 3.8—and it is actually a $3.75 billion budget we are going to have this year. So 3.756 trillion—sorry, not billion, trillion. So we are going to spend $3.8 trillion this year. In 4 years, we are going to be spending an additional $1 trillion on top of that, an additional trillion, and every dime of that is going into mandatory spending. It is not going into health research; it is not going into new parts; it is not going into building a new aircraft carrier; and it is not going into all these programs that we all talk about because it is easy politics. Every dime of that additional trillion dollars in 4 years from now will be in Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new healthcare law.

How many times have you heard that? This is right in front of us. This is what is going on. Your government is growing at an exponential pace, but it is not in the area where we, as Members of Congress, get to vote because it is in the formula areas, the mandatory spending.

Are you starting to see a theme in this discussion and on the slides? I am trying to build an understanding out there with both my brothers and sisters here in Congress and the public out there that if we are not willing to have honest conversations, particularly with this coming Presidential election, about entitlements, mandatory spending, and ways we can manage them—and it is not cuts, but there are much better ways we can deliver these.

You put all the programs, all the promises we have made at risk because just pretending everything is going to be fine means you are basically dooming them to a really ugly future, or the country to an ugly future. So, Mr. Speaker, this gives you an interesting projection.

Now, if we go beyond that 2020 slide, if we go 9 years out—9 years out—we will be running over trillion-dollar deficits, and that is using the current GDP projections for the future, which we are going to talk about that model on the very end slide. There is something horribly wrong in how we are modeling our future income growth into this country.

The math is real. I know it is uncomfortable and it is almost sacrilegious to many of the political people here, saying: Well, we are not allowed to talk about that. David, why are you such a downer? Don't you want to get reelected? Why aren't you doing happy talk?

I am optimistic about the country. I am optimistic about some things happening out there in the economy despite government. But you have to understand, in 9 years, interest will be $1 trillion. And think about this: it is almost going to be approaching all discretionary. At that time, in 9 years, we will be about $1.4 trillion in interest. Our best interest projection is over $1 trillion.

The chart, when you go a couple years out, we will be spending more money on interest than all of defense, all of discretionary, all of education, all of parts, all of health research, everything else. That is what we are doing. We are creating this trap where, as we build more and more debt and build more and more debt and build more and more debt, that becomes our Achilles heal. That becomes our fragility in this country.

So once again, remember that earlier slide where I went over there and marked that now this year's deficit projection is $582.5 billion, and that is coming from the White House as of about 2 days ago.

We had someone in our office earlier today. We were trying to do some modeling. If GDP continues to do what we think is happening right now, we could be having a discussion this coming October that the 2015 shortfall was almost $600 billion. You do realize that is approaching double what the optimistic projections were last year for 2015.

There is something horribly wrong out there. It is a combination of lack of economic growth and, let's be honest, the mandatory spending, the entitlements, are growing faster than the underlying models we have built.

So this is an interesting slide just to give you the point of talking about inflection. It is a fancy word that a lot of the statisticians like to use, and we politicians will use it. But there it, and it has begun. We are well into it.

Do you see where those blue lines start to explode? But do you notice something interesting? The red lines, from about here over basically stay substantially flat. That is the discretionary spending. That is what we get to vote on. That is your defense. That is everything else other than the mandatory spending.

But what is exploding through the ceiling? It looks like Washington, D.C., failed to understand the demographic issues that were heading towards this country and systematically avoided them, because I am sure it had nothing to do with my brothers and sisters often caring more about their next election than having to go through the painful process of educating our voters to understand this is your greatest threat, I believe, to our Republic.

One more slide to put this in perspective. The blue line is interest. The red line is all—all—of defense spending. Do you notice something, that in about 7 years, 6½ years, we are now spending more money in interest than all of defense? All of defense. It is 6 years away. Actually, in reality, my math is closer to 5½, but we will use the 6 years.

Think about that. We will be spending more money in interest on U.S. sovereign debt than we are spending on all defense of the Nation. It is absurd. And this is what we are about to hand to our kids. As a matter of fact, this is no longer about our kids. This is about us now. The numbers have eroded so fast, it is here. And the happy talk that we were doing just 1 year ago, particularly coming from the administration, has not turned out to be true.

So one of the things that is going on out there, can you regulate yourself to prosperity? Can you tax yourself to prosperity? Can you, in an arrogant fashion, have a bureaucracy that is so inept, its ability to even when we do bipartisan, pro-growth pieces of legislation like the JOBS Act—we all got together here 3 years ago and did the JOBS Act. You do realize there are still substantial portions of that piece of legislation that are still sitting at the SEC that still don't have their rules because of the underlying politics behind them? They are 3 years beyond their due date, but we still don't have them.

There is something horribly wrong in this government if we don't have an honest discussion and actually then do something about our Tax Code, our regulatory code, access to opportunity, and then the difficult one, the design within our entitlement state, which is something the Republicans for the last 4 years, 5 years, have been putting into our budget.

Do you all remember the television commercial of the PAUL RYAN look-alike throwing grandma over the cliff? Great politics, horrible math, because the Republicans, PAUL RYAN and the rest of us, stood up and said that we are willing to actually propose a model that saves Medicare and deals with this curve that consumes everything in our path. It is really bad politics; it is honest math. And we get the crap kicked out of us for telling the truth.

So now we get to look at a slide like this. We were projecting 3.1 percent GDP for this year. As of a few hours ago, the Atlanta Fed, which actually does this really interesting modeling of collecting current statistics and constantly adjusting their GDP projections, now has us not at 3.1 percent GDP for this year—and remember, every point of GDP is—it matters what velocity model you use—about $80 billion to $100 billion of revenue. So you start to realize that a couple of points of GDP is a big deal. The Atlanta Fed's GDP calculation on their Web site now is 0.7 percent GDP coming in in this quarter, and the indicators look like we are going to get additional downward revisions on the first quarter.

Mr. Speaker, we are in trouble. Yes, the politicians will get up here and blame each other and blame each other, but it doesn't make the math go away.

□ 1930

The other thing is also—and this is one of my pet peeves here—we systematically do not tell the truth, and this is a Republican and Democrat problem. Some of it is because we use really bad modeling data, really bad underlying statistics; we underestimate the swings during boom times and slowdowns. We systematically have blown our GDP calculation; but understand, that GDP calculation has a lot to do with what we model as our spending, has a lot to do with what ends up happening on our debt.

If you look at this chart, the red is what real GDP turned out to be; the blue was our projection, and systematically, we are dramatically under the projection. It looks like this year we are crashing and burning. I am desperately hoping the third quarter and the fourth quarter get really healthy, but there is something horribly wrong out there.

Is this administration, are my brothers and sisters on the left, finally willing to have that conversation about the Tax Code, about our regulatory state, those very things that—let's face it—are stymying future growth and our ability to save this country?

One last slide just to sort of provide an opportunity—for those of you who have an interest in watching some of these numbers, and there are those out there who are also sort of numbers geeks, this is that GDPNow. Yes, it is often a pessimistic calculator; except for the small problem is, the last couple of years, it has actually been the accurate calculator of actual GDP growth. This is right off the GDPNow Web site from the Atlanta Fed, showing it looks like, now, we are all the way down to a .7 percent GDP growth in the second quarter.

A little bit else on this and then I will stop this thing I am doing, which may be bordering on a tirade. If you are particularly geeky, last week, you would have seen the Journal of Economic Perspectives did an entire report on Social Security calculations.

There is a handful of folks here with all sorts of letters behind their names, mostly Ph.D., talking about Social Security is actually in worse shape than we tell people, that they are close to $1 trillion additional underfunded in the latest projections, and that some of the modeling are simple things like we are actually using really bad life expectancy tables.

Now, I have incredible respect for the actuaries over at Medicare and Social Security; I think they deal with some amazing data sets, but some of the Nation's finest economists and Ph.D. economists are starting to write public articles, saying: We are in real trouble here.

Remember, last year, when the Mercatus did their detailed projection on unfunded liabilities and debt for the United States, they came in with a number that scared me half to death. They actually came in with a number of $205 trillion, as if you did GAAP standard accounting, not government accounting, standard accounting for the debt of this Nation and our unfunded liabilities.

Go on the Internet right now, and look up what is the wealth of the world. Some of the best models say the wealth of the world is about $180 trillion. We have universities out there modeling that U.S. sovereign debt and unfunded liabilities are over $200 trillion. Our unfunded liabilities are greater than the wealth of the world.

We are better than this. This is the greatest issue in front of us, and we spend so little time actually having an honest discussion about the math.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk a little bit about spending today, like my friend and colleague from Arizona, but I am going to talk about spending of a different kind. I am going to talk about campaign spending.

Campaign spending is quite an issue, and I want to spend about an hour or less talking about its effect, and I want to talk about some of the solutions that we have out there that might make a big difference.

First, I want to say I truly believe in my heart of hearts that the United States of America is the greatest country in the world, probably the greatest country that the world has ever seen and may see in the future. You can just see that by some of the markers.

The notions of freedom that this country has had in the past have inspired nations; they have inspired individuals around the world. Our economic strength is unrivaled. Our cultural influence reaches every corner of the world. Our military power is absolutely unrivaled.

However, again, I truly believe that we can do better, and I will tell you some of the big challenges that we are facing right now, that if we take on these challenges, we will even be a greater Nation.

First of all, we need massive investments in our Nation's infrastructure, our highways, our bridges, our ports, our airports. We need it in our broadband. We just need a massive amount of investment in our Nation's infrastructure.

Our Nation's education is falling behind. Yes, we have some of the greatest schools, some of the greatest universities in the entire world, some of our public schools, some of our charter schools and private schools unrivaled; but there are a lot of schools that are struggling and producing students that really can't compete in today's world.

We need to do immigration reform. We have 12, 15 million people in this country that are undocumented that live in the shadows that may or may not pay taxes that contribute to our economy but are always afraid of being deported.

We have climate change. Climate change is here; it is progressing; it is going to get worse. We need to do something about it as soon as possible.

We have a vanishing middle class. There is a huge disparity in incomes between the richest and the poorest in this country, and it is increasing. Our middle class is vanishing. They are feeling more and more insecure. They are unable to send their kids to college. We have a huge challenge in that regard.

We have a need to establish background checks for purchase of weapons and to close the gun show loopholes.

We need to create a sustainable economy.

These are huge challenges that we need to attend from the Congress, from this body, from the House of Representatives, from the United States Senate, from the State legislatures, from local governments; but we are unable to attack these problems, in a large part, because of the way campaigns are financed.

Now, we see a growing perversion of Presidential campaigns. We have super-PACs. We have dark donors, and they are having meetings with Presidential candidates, which are allowed by the laws because the candidates are not official candidates.

No one knows what is legal and enforceable right now in Presidential candidate financing; and worse than that, foreign money is probably coming into all of these campaigns now.

I just want to say elections up and down the ballot are being more and more perverted each election. All Americans should be concerned.

While I was waiting to speak this evening, I just read an article in the National Journal Daily today that stated: ''According to data gathered in 21 states by the National Institute on Money in State Politics, $175 million was spent by them in 2006''—that is local politics; that is city council and school boards—''a number that ballooned to $245 million four years later.''

That is a delta of $70 million increases in local campaign financing in just 4 years, and that is a fraction of the total expected to be spent in future local races.

Before I go further, what I would like to do is take a break and yield to my friend and colleague from North Carolina (Mr. JONES). He wants to say a few words.

Mr. JONES. Mr. MCNERNEY, thank you very much, and I want to thank you for taking the lead tonight to be on the floor. I know you have other Members of Congress to join you in your hour, but I have been here for 20 years, and I must tell you that, since I have been here, I have never seen as much influence by the special interests as I do now, and that is because of money.

Actually, both parties—and that is why you are a Democrat, I am a Republican—but both parties seem to succumb to the influence of money to get bills to the floor.

I am a strong supporter of JOHN SARBANES, who is from Maryland. You have your bill that I have joined today, by the way, to sign my name to your resolution, and I am on JOHN SARBANES' bill, which is H.R. 20. The title is the Government By the People Act.

I will touch on four quick points. One is building a government of, by, and for the people. The second part of the bill says empower the Americans to participate. The third part is amplify the voice of the people and then fight back against Big Money special interests.

In my few minutes, Mr. MCNERNEY, what I would like to talk about is the influence of money. I am a Republican and proud to be one; you are a Democrat and proud to be one, but I will tell you that I have seen so many bills this year get to the floor of the House because, in my opinion, it is because of the influence of special interests.

You and I recently had a bill on the floor that basically said that we would change the law that would allow the mobile home companies that sell mobile homes—many people in my district, 45,000 people own mobile homes, and there will be others buying mobile homes—but they will change the contract to say that it would go from 8 to 12 percent.

Well, who did it benefit? It was Warren Buffett. I don't deny Warren Buffett his success. He is a very successful man, and I am happy for him. What this bill did was to say to the average person that maybe in California or North Carolina that needs to buy a mobile home, because that is the best they can do: we are going to let you pay more in interest.

I was the only Republican to vote ''no'' on that bill. I said this back in my district, and quite frankly, I was pleased that the majority of people agree with me that we should be considerate of those people who cannot afford to buy better than a mobile home; but there, again, that special interest influence, that is what you just said a moment ago.

I am of the firm belief that if we do not change the system—you have an H.J. Res. that you have introduced. I talk about JOHN SARBANES' H.R. 20. That will create an alternative to the system that we have.

You and I both know that Citizens United that said that a corporation is an individual has created a lot of the problems that we face today. I will say that the American people need to get behind what you are trying to do, what Mr. SARBANES is trying to do—and I, in a lesser way—to return the power of the people to the people because, too many times, decisions here in Washington are made because special interests, whether it be a Democrat or Republican leadership, puts it on the floor.

I believe that the people, as you believe, have a right to let this be the people's House and not the special interests House.

I am delighted to be on the floor with you tonight. I will stay just a few minutes, if you want to call back on me in a couple of minutes. I will be here until a little bit after 8, but I wanted to thank you for getting on the floor tonight to speak about this issue because, if we are going to let the people own the government, then we must give the power back to the people.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Thank you, Mr. JONES.

I just want to point out, again, that this is bipartisan. Mr. JONES is a Republican; I am a Democrat. We both see the corrosive influence of money here in Washington, and we want to do something about it.

A lot of our colleagues agree with us wholeheartedly but are actually afraid to say it. They are afraid to get up here because they know, if they do, they are going to be targeted by this special interest money, by super-PAC money, by dark money.

The sad thing is that you don't know that it is coming. You could be running a good, solid, healthy campaign arguing the issues and, all of a sudden, see a $2 million television ad against you, and they would be going after you for very personal misleading ads, which could destroy you and your family, for no reason other than you don't want to see so much money in campaign spending.

□ 1945

Let me look at some of the specific risks and problems that we see today because of the way campaigns are financed.

First of all, campaign financing makes elected officials less effective in their jobs because of the time you have to spend raising money.

Here in Congress, it is not unusual to see a Member of Congress spend 2, 4, 6 hours a day on the phone, begging people for money. That lessens your effectiveness. You can't spend the time you should be spending on studying legislation, in talking to colleagues, in finding ways to compromise on issues.

The second item is negative campaign ads turn off voters and suppress votes.

Boy, we saw in this last election a turnout of 40 percent, 35 percent, and 30 percent in some districts, and a lot of that has to do with the negativity that people see on TV. They don't know what to believe. They think they are both bums, and they just close their noses and vote for the least worse or they don't vote at all. That is the second.

The effect of campaign financing makes for wasteful government spending.

This is an issue that, I think, folks like my predecessor here tonight was talking about. The Tea Party folks should be interested in this issue because the way campaigns are financed causes wasteful government spending. Boy, I will tell you that I sympathize with the Tea Party objectives. Government seems big. It seems wasteful. It seems loaded. It seems ineffective. There is wasteful spending. There are projects that shouldn't be funded. A lot of that has to do with the way campaigns are financed.

The next one is a big one. This is important. It is kind of what I mentioned before. It is the threat of negative campaign ads causes elected officials to avoid important and controversial issues:

Now, I do not care if you are a Republican or a Democrat. If you are a Republican, you have risk in your primary elections. If you are a Democrat, it is of big money coming in and trying to trash you personally in election campaigns. If you are a Democrat, you have more risk coming in in general elections. So it doesn't matter what party you are in. It doesn't matter whether you are conservative or liberal. The way campaigns are financed is causing our government to be wasteful, and it is causing it to be ineffective. I think that needs to be improved.

There is another problem that I mentioned earlier. Foreign money is coming into these campaigns now. Do you want to see foreigners, do you want to see folks from Russia or from China or from any country besides the United States having an influence on our elections?

The amount of money coming into elections continues to grows election by election. We had $6.2 million in 2010 versus $3 billion in 2012. I think I have gotten a million or a billion mixed up there. Sorry about that. Elected officials respond more to wealthy donors than they do to nonwealthy donors. It is simply a matter of access. Someone gives you money, and they are more likely to have access, and that means that you are more likely to be sympathetic to their legislative goals.

Judicial races are getting more expensive and tainted as well. Do you want to have a judge in a case that you may be bringing to court to have gotten his seat or her seat because of the way the campaign finance trashed his opponent? I do not think so.

In general, people have become very cynical about government because of the negative advertising, and people lose faith in our government. To have the greatest country in the world and the things that this country has accomplished—the innovation, the science, the freedoms that we have established throughout the world—and then have people cynical about our government because of the campaign financing is more than a tragedy. Campaign spending is a zero-sum game. Let me tell you what I mean by that.

Consider that you are in a meeting. You have got a 1 hour, and you have got 12 people, so everyone has 5 minutes to speak. Now, what if somebody takes 10 minutes? Then somebody else is going to lose out. Campaignspeak is like that too because people in this country are only willing to listen to a certain amount of campaign rhetoric, and then after that point, they turn off their minds. They don't want to hear any more. The folks with the biggest money get out there. They fill the airwaves, and they fill your mailboxes, and they have people knock on your doors. Pretty soon, you don't want to hear any more, so the guy with the lesser money is losing freedom of speech. So I think it is a freedom of speech issue. Those are some of the issues I have.

With PACs and Super PACs and dark money—this is an interesting one—campaigns are no longer going to be controlled by the candidates. You could have a situation in which Super PACs and PACs have five times more money than the candidate himself or herself, in which case they are controlling all of the levers in the campaign. So those are some of the issues that, I think, are caused by the excessive spending in our campaigns.

I again yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) to take up the case here.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate listening to you, and it reminds me of a conversation I had on the floor of the House last week.

As you know, I have been here 20 years. I came with Newt Gingrich, and Bill Clinton was the President. We did some good things for the American people, so I am kind of an older man, so to speak. I vote my conscience up here, and it gets me in trouble. I voted twice against the Speaker of the House, and it got me in trouble, but I do what I think is right.

I was sitting on the floor, and this gentleman—I will not say his name or where he is from because I don't have permission to do that. He came up to me and said, ''Walter, I am probably going to—'' He is 20 years younger than I am. I am 72 now. He said, ''I am probably going to be like you,'' and he is a Republican. He said, ''I will probably be like you and will never be a chairman or a ranking member of anything because I cannot do anything that would dampen or threaten my integrity.''

I said, ''What do you mean?''

He said, ''Well, in January, I was told that I could be a subcommittee chairman, but I would have to raise $300,000.''

The point that you are trying to make tonight—and you are doing a good job—with JOHN SARBANES' bill, H.R. 20, which I hope people look up, as well as with your resolution, is that too oftentimes—and I will say in both parties—we have people in leadership who say you have to raise X amount of dollars if you want to be a chairman. What happens to that person in eastern North Carolina, where I am from, who makes $35,000 or $40,000 a year who can't buy influence in Washington?

That is what you are trying to do tonight, and that is why I wanted to be with you, and I admire you for taking the floor tonight. Where are their spokesmen? We are the people's House, and all of a sudden, everything is about money, winning reelections with money—big money. The average citizens are beginning to be turned off by the fact that they don't have much influence, and that is why what you are doing tonight is very special.

I was thinking about the gentleman who said to me, ''I will be like you,

Walter Jones. I will probably never be a chairman or a ranking member because you are trying to keep your integrity in place.'' If we had a system that you are proposing and JOHN SARBANES is proposing that would have a system for those who don't want to be bought and paid for by special interests, they would have an alternative by raising their money in the State and in the district, and they would be rewarded for raising their money in that State. Then their allegiance would be to the State and the district.

Again, I am going to stay a few more minutes, but I want to compliment you on what you are doing tonight.

Mr. MCNERNEY. I thank the gentleman. I don't know of anyone who has more integrity in this institution than you do, so I am honored that you would come down here and talk with me tonight about this important issue.

Now, the American people, as far as I can tell, are clearly in favor of reducing campaign money, campaign spending. I have some Gallup Poll numbers here that were taken by The Huffington Post from November 7 through November 9, 2014, which was during the last election or right after the last election.

The first question:

Would you support or oppose amending the Constitution to give Congress more power to create restrictions on campaign spending?

In favor of that was 53 percent; opposed was 23 percent; and not sure was 22 percent. So it was a very strong majority in favor of a constitutional amendment like I am going to discuss in a little while.

The second question:

Do you think limiting contributions to political campaigns helps to prevent corruption in politics, or does it have no impact on corruption?

The question is will corruption be curtailed by limiting campaign spending. The answer that it helps prevent corruption: 52 percent; no impact on corruption: 28 percent; and not sure: 20 percent. Again, people feel strongly about this issue.

The last question that I will read is:

Which of the following statements do you agree with more: Elections are generally won by the candidate who raises the most money? The answer is 59 percent of Americans believe that; 18 percent don't believe that; and 23 percent are unsure. So I think this is a strong issue that we should be talking about.

How do we move forward?

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court appears to have a strong bias toward more money in politics, and it has consistently issued rulings to that effect. The Supreme Court even sought out, they even asked for, the infamous Citizens United case to be brought forward to them. Then, ultimately, they ruled that corporations have the same rights—free speech—as individual citizens do, as individual people do. The meaning of that decision is that corporations can use their treasuries to finance campaigns.

I can't think of anything more corrosive or destructive to our democracy than that. The system was already bad before the Citizens United decision, but this thing made it much worse. Unfortunately, the Citizens United decision is just one of a series of decisions that allows more and more money into politics, and I truly believe that this is a threat to our cherished democratic and republican institutions.

This trend is not confined to the Supreme Court. Earlier this year, the Republican-controlled Senate, in concurrence with the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, passed legislation that increased the total individuals could contribute to political parties by a factor of 10—going from $35,000 to over $300,000.

What can we do about it?

The good news is that there are really a number of very good ideas that have been proposed, and I think it is important for us to go over some of those ideas. My friend WALTER JONES has mentioned JOHN SARBANES' idea, and I will go into that in a little bit of detail. But there are others, and I think it is important that the American people be aware of some of these proposals out there and what they might offer and to let them decide, let the American people decide.

Do they want to see a legislative approach like JOHN SARBANES' great approach?—I support it—or a constitutional amendment like mine and others that I will bring up as we go forward tonight? These proposals all have merit. They are all worth studying and thinking about, and I would be happy to support any of the ones that I am going to talk about this evening and to consider other ones that may not have been brought forward yet. The proposals, again, fall into two categories—legislative proposals and constitutional amendments.

Legislative proposals are a little bit easier to enact, but they are subject to Supreme Court and lower court overturning. So you can work hard, and you can get it passed and then have the Supreme Court or some other court overturn it. The constitutional amendment has a very high bar. It is very difficult to get a constitutional amendment passed, and it should be. You don't want people just willy-nilly passing an amendment to change the Constitution. It requires a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives, a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and three-quarters of the State legislatures throughout the country to pass that amendment for it to become part of the Constitution; but once it becomes part of the Constitution, the courts can't touch it. They can interpret it, but they can't overturn it.

There is legislation that I would like to talk about, but some of my colleagues who were going to be here tonight couldn't be because of a change in schedule. I think one of the important approaches, mostly championed by CHRIS VAN HOLLEN from Maryland, is the disclosure and transparency approach, which is that people who donate ought to be disclosed quickly and broadly so that people know where money is coming from. That is a very important idea.

□ 2000

Also, Government By the People, JOHN SARBANES' approach, which I will talk about in a little while; and there is also legislation that would create public finance, and I think that is a very good approach, too.

There are two constitutional amendments, one by DONNA EDWARDS, a colleague of mine from Maryland, that overturns Citizens United, and there is one by TED DEUTCH, a colleague of mine from Florida. TED DEUTCH from Florida would basically allow Congress to enact laws on campaign financing that could not be overturned by the Supreme Court. I think that is a good approach. I support that. In theory, it has got a beauty to it.

Then there is my approach, which basically would eliminate PACs and do other things. I would like to talk in some detail about my resolution now, and we will get the board up to talk about it. This is called H.J. Res. 31, and again, it is a proposed constitutional amendment. As you can see, it has four parts.

The first part, I think, is probably the most important, and it says basically that money that comes in to political election campaigns to support or oppose a candidate for office can only come from individual citizens and only go to the campaign controlled by the candidate or the principal campaign controlled by the candidate or from a system of public election financing.

So what does that mean? That means that when money comes in, it can only come from individual citizens. It can't come from corporations; it can't come from any other sources. It just comes from individual citizens, and it can only go to the campaign controlled by the candidate. That means that it can't go to political action committees, PACs; it can't go to super-PACs; it can't be dark money. The only money that can influence elections directly or indirectly to support or oppose a candidate has to come from individual citizens. It has to go only to the candidate, to the campaign controlled by the candidate. That is a very strong requirement. It is probably the strongest requirement out there right now, but I think it is important.

By the way, the first requirement applies to elections for individual candidates at all levels of government,

from the President on down to the Congress, the Senate, State governments, city governments, and so on.

The second measure is similar to the first. This requirement, money to support or oppose a State ballot initiative to change a State constitution or for other purposes can only come from individuals who are able to vote for the measure or from a system of public election financing. I think that is important because you have ballot initiatives in my home State of California, for example, and you see millions of dollars coming in from out of State. Why would somebody from out of State have an opportunity to influence a State ballot initiative in California? I think it is wrong, and I think that this would take care of that problem.

The third requirement is that Congress, the States, and the local jurisdictions must establish limits that an individual can contribute to any one election campaign, including limits on the amount a candidate may contribute to his or her own campaign. Now, for that particular requirement, we already have that in the U.S. House and U.S. Senate. The limit at this point in time is $2,700 per election. So every time your voters can go to the booth for you, people can contribute, individuals can contribute $2,700, so the primary election and the general election. In the House of Representatives elections are every 2 years, so you can collect an amount of $5,400 over the election cycle for your campaign.

Now, if you collect $5,400 before the primary and you lose the primary, then you are going to have to give back the money that was donated for the general election. So that would be you would have to give $2,700 back to the donors that gave that to you.

Also, it is important that it requires governments to limit the amount a candidate can spend on their own campaign. Some of our candidates are extremely wealthy. They have millions or hundreds of millions or more. They can buy their seat in Congress easily, and this would limit that. I think, again, this is very, very important.

The last is probably one of the more controversial of the four, but it says that the total of contributions to a candidate's campaign from individuals who are not able to vote for the candidate cannot be greater than the total of contributions from individuals who can vote for the candidate. Now, geographically what that would mean is that money coming from outside of your congressional district, or from your State if you are a Senator, can't exceed money that comes from inside your district if you are a congressional candidate or State if you are a Senator. It wouldn't affect the Presidential race as much because everybody in the United States is in the President's district, but it would also affect local districts as well. With that, that wraps up the discussion of my proposed constitutional amendment.

I want to talk a little bit about JOHN SARBANES' bill, and I think it is a fine bill. It is not a constitutional amendment. What it does is it gives you a tax credit for money that you can contribute to a campaign. So if you can contribute $50 to a campaign, then you get a tax credit of $50, which means money back on your income tax return; the same amount that you contribute, you get back. But also it matches that contribution by 6 to 1. So you will end up giving the candidate quite a bit more than you are actually contributing. It is a good measure. It is a good proposal. It would sort of even out the effect of PACs. I find myself supporting that.

Again, my colleague, TED DEUTCH, has a couple of constitutional amendments in the 114th Congress. One of them is called Democracies for All, H.J. Res. 119, and also H.J. Res. 22 that creates funding limits and creates a distinction between individuals and corporations, but what it really does is allows Congress to limit, to enact laws that will be enforceable and not overturned by the Supreme Court.

We have VAN HOLLEN in the 114th Congress, H.R. 430, and what this does is it requires disclosure so that when campaign contributions are made, we can determine who made those contributions—very important. I think it would make a big difference.

Then we have a number of proposals to create public financing. My colleague from Kentucky, JOHN YARMUTH, had one in the 113th Congress, Fair Elections Now Act. In the 114th Congress, which is this Congress, DAVID PRICE has H.R. 424, which establishes a system of public financing.

These are all good. I think I would be supportive of any of these kinds of approaches. I think the American public needs to be protected. I think our cherished Democratic and Republican institutions are a threat here, whether it is because candidates are bombarded by negative ads, whether it is because candidates are influenced by big donors, whether it is because more and more money is coming in to these elections every single cycle. There is a lot of reasons why we need to look at campaign financing and select one of these approaches and go with it and change the system that we have to a system that really does respond to the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHAFFETZ (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of an unscheduled medical procedure.

Mr. DONOVAN (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the birth of his first child.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2252. An act to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1517. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement, pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, on a transaction involving Gunes Ekspres Havacilik A.S. of Antalya, Turkey; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1518. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting the second quarterly report from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration regarding the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority transition, pursuant to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, Pub. L. 113-235; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1519. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final order — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Extension of Temporary Placement of UR-144, XLR11, and AKB48 in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act [Docket No.: DEA-414] received May 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1520. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Israel, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-36; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1521. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a list of international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to Congress within sixty days in accordance with the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1522. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting pursuant

to Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1523. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1524. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting seventeen reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1525. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period of October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1526. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report providing a FY 2016 Estimate for the Free Clinic Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 233(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1527. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the ''2014 Biennial Report to Congress on the Effectiveness of Grant Programs Under the Violence Against Women Act'', as required by Sec. 1003(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1528. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Depreciation of Precious Metals (Rev. Rul. 2015-11) received May 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1119. A bill to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 874. A bill to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1156. A bill to authorize the establishment of a body under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities (Rept. 114–123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1158. A bill to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1162. A bill to make technical changes to provisions authorizing prize competitions under the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980; with an amendment (Rept. 114–125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1561. A bill to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 273. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015 (Rept. 114–127). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 274. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–128). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 6. A bill to accelerate the discovery, development, and delivery of 21st century cures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special expensing rules for certain film and television productions and to provide for special expensing for live theatrical productions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2406. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2407. A bill to reverse declining milk consumption in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2408. A bill to establish in the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services the Federal Interagency Working Group on Reducing Child Poverty to develop a national strategy to eliminate child poverty in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow small businesses to defer the payment of certain employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California) (all by request):

H.R. 2410. A bill to authorize highway infrastructure and safety, transit, motor carrier, rail, and other surface transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2411. A bill to support early learning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of

California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for residential energy efficient property and the energy credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 2413. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 South Main Street in Elkhart, Indiana, as the ''Staff Sergeant Jesse L. Williams Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2414. A bill to facilitate the responsible communication of scientific and medical developments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2415. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for establishment of a streamlined data review program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2416. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to evaluate the potential use of evidence from clinical experience to help support the approval of new indications for approved drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2417. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fair and consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2418. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reduce the fuel economy obligations of automobile manufacturers whose fleets contain at least 50 percent fuel choice enabling vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to reauthorize funding for the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2420. A bill to reduce administrative burdens on researchers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2421. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase accountability at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2422. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to third-party quality system assessment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2423. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to valid scientific evidence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to training and oversight in least burdensome appropriate means concept; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2425. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the recognition of standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to easing regulatory burden with respect to certain class I and class II devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to advisory committee process; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to humanitarian device exemption applications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any discharge of income contingent and income-based student loan indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2430. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for job training expenses of employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 2432. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a gender equality-focused investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2433. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to enhancing combination products review; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2435. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with regard to the Reagan-Udall Foundation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2436. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to appropriate age groupings to be included in research studies involving human subjects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2437. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act regarding high cost durable medical equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2438. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to broader application of Bayesian statistics and adaptive trial designs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Silvio O. Conte Senior Biomedical Research Service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 2440. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve loan repayment programs of the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2441. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 1st American Volunteer Group of the Chinese Air Force, also known as the AVG Flying Tigers, in recognition of their service to the nation; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2442. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the Supplemental Security Income Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to CLIA waiver study design guidance for in vitro diagnostics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2444. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to award grants for studying the process of continuous drug manufacturing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2445. A bill to express the sense of Congress with respect to enabling Food and Drug Administration scientific engagement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the use of electronic visit verification for personal care services furnished under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2447. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for an NIH research strategic plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2448. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a program of high-risk, high-reward research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 2449. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2450. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair and deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2451. A bill to amend title 23 and title 49, United States Code, to strengthen domestic content standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to facilitating dissemination of health care economic information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2453. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to authorize the National Capital Planning Commission to designate and modify the boundaries of the National Mall area in the District of Columbia reserved for the location of commemorative works of preeminent historical and lasting significance to the United States and other activities, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to make recommendations for the termination of the authority of a person to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2454. A bill to provide for the public disclosure of information regarding surveillance activities under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2455. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to precision medicine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2456. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure the sharing of data generated from research with the public; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 2457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit to small businesses which hire individuals who are members of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 2458. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5351 Lapalco Boulevard in Marrero, Louisiana, as the ''Lionel R. Collins, Sr. Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2459. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to enhance the reporting requirements pertaining to use of antimicrobial drugs in food animals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2460. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 272. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 275. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H. Res. 276. A resolution honoring the National Association of Women Business Owners on its 40th anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 277. A resolution honoring the Tunisian People for their democratic transition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H. Res. 278. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should initiate negotiations to enter into a free trade agreement with Tunisia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 6.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause I, Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. WITTMAN:
H.R. 2406.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2—The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States
Amendment II—A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 2407.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 2408.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:
H.R. 2409.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8; Sixteenth Amendment

By Mr. DEFAZIO:
H.R. 2410.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:
H.R. 2411.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 2412.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. WALORSKI:
H.R. 2413.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7.

By Mr. BURGESS:
H.R. 2414.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:
H.R. 2415.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:
H.R. 2416.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:
H.R. 2417.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. DOLD:
H.R. 2418.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BARTON:
H.R. 2419.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to ''regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''

By Mr. BARTON:
H.R. 2420.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to ''regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''

By Mr. BARTON:
H.R. 2421.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to ''regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''

By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 2422.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 2423.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 2424.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 2425.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 2426.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 2427.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 2428.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:
H.R. 2429.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause I of Section VIII of Article I.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:
H.R. 2430.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution
''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.''

By Mr. AGUILAR:
H.R. 2431.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEYER:
H.R. 2432.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 or Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:
H.R. 2433.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mrs. BLACK:
H.R. 2434.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:
H.R. 2435.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:
H.R. 2436.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:
H.R. 2437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:
H.R. 2438.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:
H.R. 2439.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:
H.R. 2440.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:
H.R. 2441.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
''. . . and provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . .''
''. . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . .''
This legislation seeks to award the Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the 1st American Volunteer Group of the Chinese Air Force.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 2442.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:
H.R. 2443.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
. . .
To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;
. . .
To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:
H.R. 2444.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
. . .
To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;
. . .
To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:
H.R. 2445.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
. . .
To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;
. . .
To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:
H.R. 2446.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
. . .
To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;
. . .
To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HARRIS:
H.R. 2447.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. HARRIS:
H.R. 2448.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. LEWIS:
H.R. 2449.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:
H.R. 2450.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:
H.R. 2451.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which allows Congress to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. LONG:
H.R. 2452.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 2453.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clauses 14 and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 2454.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PITTS:
H.R. 2455.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PITTS:
H.R. 2456.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. PLASKETT:
H.R. 2457.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare Clause)
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 (Territories Clause)
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. RICHMOND:
H.R. 2458.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:
H.R. 2459.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ZELDIN:
H.R. 2460.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 21: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 67: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 167: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 169: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 224: Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 226: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 232: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 244: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 303: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 343: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 353: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 382: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 402: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 427: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 429: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 483: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 532: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 539: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 540: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 542: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 555: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 556: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DENT, and Mr. MOOLENAAR
H.R. 564: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 572: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 578: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 581: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 628: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 672: Mr. BLUM and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 700: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 721: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 761: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 767: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 784: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 785: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 793: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 815: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 816: Mr. BRAT and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 838: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 863: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 879: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 913: Mr. KEATING and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 923: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 924: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 969: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 980: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 985: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 986: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 999: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1002: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1062: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 1087: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1089: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1141: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 1174: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1175: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1188: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1192: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1194: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1197: Mr. HONDA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1221: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1225: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1234: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 1258: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1271: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1283: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 1284: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1299: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1300: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1312: Mr. RUSH and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1320: Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 1338: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1343: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1350: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 1384: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1393: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1398: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1399: Mr. HONDA and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1401: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1404: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1413: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1421: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1450: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1453: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 1462: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1475: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1492: Mr. BERA and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1496: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1516: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BOST, Mr. GIBBS, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1519: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1549: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1550: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1552: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1555: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 1559: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1567: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1571: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1598: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SIRES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1604: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1618: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1622: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1635: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1644: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1671: Mr. BLUM and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1675: Mr. HURT of Virginia.
H.R. 1683: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LEE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1684: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1718: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1736: Mr. ASHFORD and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1737: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1739: Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1745: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1752: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1769: Mr. KATKO and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1777: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1805: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1810: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1817: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1833: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1843: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1853: Mr. MARINO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1861: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1876: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1877: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1886: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1899: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1919: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1920: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1921: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1942: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. MENG, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1974: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1977: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1992: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1994: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 2008: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2014: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2017: Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. Mimi Walters of California, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2046: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2061: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 2072: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 2076: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2077: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2093: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2100: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HANNA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2156: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. Judy Chu of California.
H.R. 2169: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2191: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2205: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2110: Mr. BERA and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 2227: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2243: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 2247: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2259: Mr. MESSER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 2267: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2268: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2270: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2272: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2276: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2300: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 2302: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2304: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2306: Mr. MESSER and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2315: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2316: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2330: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2331: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2351: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2354: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2371: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2372: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2393: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2394: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2403: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 2404: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. BABIN.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H. Res. 12: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 16: Mr. BRAT.
H. Res. 17: Ms. STEFANIK.
H. Res. 28: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BOST, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WELCH, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 54: Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 130: Ms. FUDGE.
H. Res. 194: Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 233: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. TROTT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 249: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H. Res. 256: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. YODER, and Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 259: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative DINGELL or a designee, to H.R. 1335, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative SMITH of Texas or a designee, to H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1909: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE VETERANS OF THE MAY 19, 2015 EASTERN IOWA HONOR FLIGHT

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today, over eighty Iowa veterans of World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War will travel to our nation's capital. Together, they will visit the monuments that were built in their honor by a grateful nation.

For many, today will be the first time they will see the National World War II Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial and the Vietnam War Memorial. I can think of no greater honor than to be able to greet them and thank Iowa's—and our nation's—heroes for their service to our country.

That is why I am deeply honored to join them for their visit to the National World War II Memorial to personally thank these heroes for their service to our nation and to pay tribute to the incredible sacrifice they made for our country.

We owe these heroes a debt of gratitude and the Honor Flight demonstrates that we as a state and as a country will never forget the debt we owe those who have worn our nation's uniform. As a reminder of the service and sacrifice of the Greatest Generation, I am proud to have a piece of marble in my office from the quarry that was used to build the World War II Memorial. Our World War II, Korean War and Vietnam War veterans rose to defend not just our nation, but the freedoms, democracy, and values that make our country the greatest nation on earth. They did so as one people and one country. Their sacrifices and determination in the face of great threats to our way of life are both humbling and inspiring.

I am tremendously proud to welcome the Eastern Iowa Honor Flight and Iowa's veterans of World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War to our nation's capital today. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank them for their service to our country.

HONORING THE TUSCUMBIA HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC TEAM

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Tuscumbia High School Academic Team on its Class 1 State Championship win at the Missouri Scholar Bowl Tournament.

These students and their coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the Tuscumbia High School Academic Team for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on account of a flight delay. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on roll call vote 240, roll call vote 241, and roll call vote 242.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF VIRGINIA AIR NATIONAL GUARD BRIGADIER GENERAL WAYNE A. WRIGHT

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Brigadier General Wayne A. Wright for his 34 years of service to our nation and to congratulate him on his announced retirement.

Brigadier General Wayne A. Wright retires as the Chief of Staff/Air Component Commander, Virginia Air National Guard, responsible for the command and control of 1,230 Virginia Air National Guard members, representing five organizations. Provided to the Governor and Adjutant General of Virginia, Air Guard military forces protect and defend the Commonwealth, and when activated to federal military duty, provide those same forces to the President of the United States.

General Wright entered the United States Air Force and received his commission in 1981 after graduating from the University of South Carolina. He transitioned from active duty to the Georgia Air National Guard in 1992. General Wright has held various leadership and command positions at the squadron, group, wing and major command levels. His assignments involved operations and formal training of United States Air Force and allied Command and Control personnel. He also worked in the developmental and operational testing arena. General Wright is a Master Air Battle Manager with qualifications in six ground-based Command and Control systems including joint and allied systems.

General Wright has been awarded the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal (with 2 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Air Force Commendation Medal (with 2 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Army Commendation Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal (with 1 Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster), Air Force Outstanding Unit Award (with 2 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Air Force Organizational Excellence Award, Combat Readiness Medal, National Defense Service Medal (with 1 Bronze Service Star), Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Air Force Overseas Ribbon Short Tour, Air Force Overseas Ribbon Long Tour, Air Force Longevity Service Award Ribbon (with 1 Silver and 1 Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster), and the Air Force Training Ribbon.

Brigadier General Wright has excelled throughout his distinguished career and I am honored to pay tribute to this Airman. I thank Wayne's wife, Jeanette, and their daughter, Jessica and son in-law, Jeremy along with their children, Noah and Haley as well as their son Justin and his wife Caitlin for the many years they have supported Wayne while he served his country. I wish Wayne and Jeanette Godspeed, and continued happiness as they start a new chapter in their lives.

HONORING JOAN ERIKSEN

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Joan Eriksen, who is completing twenty-one years of service on the Mendocino Lake Community College District Board of Trustees, where she has been a leader and driving force in a multitude of valuable community projects and programs.

Ms. Eriksen has diligently guided the college district in overcoming fiscal challenges during economic downturns and has been a powerful and consistent advocate for high-quality educational opportunities for students in remote areas. She provided strong leadership to secure critical funding to develop and improve College facilities and stellar oversight in the construction of these projects. The permanent structures now housing classrooms and facilities for students in Willits and Lake County are in large part a result of her hard work.

As a skilled relationship builder with the extended community and a valuable role model for new board members over the years of her service, Ms. Eriksen's heartfelt commitment to Mendocino College and the Mendocino Lake Community College District—as well as its staff, students, and the community it serves—will leave a lasting impact for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting to honor and thank Joan Eriksen for her years of dedicated service to the students of Mendocino College and the Mendocino Lake Community College District. On behalf of the many individuals she

has served, I am privileged to express deep appreciation to Ms. Eriksen for her exemplary leadership, and convey to her best wishes as she pursues new endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BELOVED ARTHUR MICHAEL ''COACH MAC'' MCMILLION

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Northwest Florida's beloved Arthur Michael ''Coach Mac'' McMillion. For more than 30 years, Coach Mac was a fixture in Northwest Florida athletics, helping to shape the lives of countless young men and women, and the Northwest Florida community mourns his passing.

Born and raised in Eau Claire, Wisconsin, Coach Mac from a young age exemplified the hard work and dedication necessary to excel on the playing field. Following his successful playing career—during which he garnered All State honors in high school football and captained his college team, the University of Eau Claire—Coach Mac and his wife Barb moved to Texas, where he began his coaching career.

In 1985, Coach Mac and his family moved to Northwest Florida. For eight years, Coach Mac served as Head Coach in football, basketball and weight lifting at Earnest Ward High School, before moving to Milton High School. Over the next 20 years, Coach Mac coached football and basketball at Milton, as well as starting the girls first weight lifting program. For the last ten years of his tenure at Milton High, Coach Mac led the Milton High football program as head coach. Coach Mac then began the next chapter in his life, moving to Hobbs Middle School where he worked as the Dean of Students until his passing.

As anyone who has played sports can tell you, the best coaches are leaders both on and off the field, and Coach Mac epitomized these values. His goal as a coach and educator was to shape his students and players to be successful on the field and in their lives, and he has had an immeasurable influence on thousands of students over the years. Above all of the many accolades he earned as a player and coach, Coach Mac's greatest joy in life was family, and to his family and friends he will always be remembered as a loving and devoted husband, father and grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to recognize the life and legacy of Arthur Michael ''Coach Mac'' McMillion. My wife Vicki and I extend our heartfelt prayers and condolences to his wife Barb; four children, Amie, Missy, Mikey, and Tommy; four grandsons, Nate, Rhett, Jon and Luke; father and step-mother, Art and Ruth; sister, Beth; and the entire McMillion family.

RECOGNIZING JIM GARRETT; FAMILY CHAMPION OF THE ALZHEIMER'S ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim Garrett, a dedicated leader in the fight against Alzheimer's. On Wednesday, June 10, 2015, Mr. Garrett will be honored by the Alzheimer's Association as Family Champion for his faithful leadership on the Association's Board of Directors, and for his continued commitment to supporting the advancement of research for the treatment of this terrible disease.

The Alzheimer's Association is a tremendous organization that provides professionally staffed services and critical resources for Alzheimer's patients and their families. This organization is largely funded by the altruism of people such as Jim Garrett, who in addition to being a natural caregiver is also a successful businessman, acting as Chairman of a well-known New England company, Rapid Refills. Jim Garrett's public spirit can best be seen in his spearheading of the Purple Pump Up Program, which donates a certain percentage of Rapid Refills' earnings to the Alzheimer's Association, promoting the continuation of research and treatment, and making a difference in the lives of all those affected by this disease.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Jim Garrett on this day for his tremendous contributions to the Alzheimer's Association, and his efforts in the fight against Alzheimer's disease.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF MANDIE DELL AARON NIXON

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to first of all say how much I appreciate this opportunity to address my colleagues and the Nation and to talk for just a few moments about a loving and caring woman, Mrs. Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon.

Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon passed away a few days ago. She was a special woman, and a dedicated worker for the Lord. She loved lifting up the name of Jesus, praising him with all her heart. She let her light shine.

Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon was born in Camden, Alabama, to the late Reverend Henry Aaron and missionary, Mariah Aaron. Being born in a Christian home, she accepted the Lord into her heart at a very early age. Mandie was a loving wife, sister, and mother to her five children. She is survived by two children, three sisters, and a host of five generations of grandchildren. Her entire beloved family mourns this hour.

But let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that not only her family mourns, for this caring woman touched many lives. During her journey here on Earth, Mandie loved with her whole heart. She was active in her church community, even President of the Mother's Board for many years. She always had something nice to say about everyone. When she looked at you, she always saw the best in you, and would make sure to impart words of encouragement and wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dedicated woman and one who was humble and humbled herself before God, and understood not only who she was but whose she was.

And so I just want to rise this afternoon to say these few words about this generous, loving woman, Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon. Let me just say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, God bless Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon. She fought the good fight, she finished her race, and she kept the faith. And most of all, she will be truly missed by many.

HONORING THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE 2015 CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, once again, I come to the floor to recognize the great success of strong local schools working with dedicated parents and teachers. I rise today to congratulate and honor a number of outstanding high school artists from the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey. Each of these talented young men and women participated in the 2015 Congressional Art Competition. Their works of art are exceptional.

Fifty-seven participated. That is a wonderful response, and I would very much like to build on that participation for future competitions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the winners of our art competition. First place was awarded to Camila Rosario from Wayne Valley High School for her Colored Pencil artwork entitled, ''Joy and Innocence of Childhood.'' Second place was awarded to Melissa Danitz from Chatham High School for her Oil on Canvas artwork titled ''Colors on a City Street.'' Third place was awarded to Jamilynn Rose from Hanover Park High School for her Prisma Pencil on black paper artwork titled ''Sonic Boom.''

Honorable Mentions were awarded to: Natalie Almonte from Boonton High School for her Arcylic artwork titled ''Girl with the Silver Earrings'' and Jason Levine from Livingston High School for his Digital artwork titled ''Gravity.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize each artist for their participation by indicating their high school, their name, and the title of their contest entries.

BOONTON HIGH SCHOOL

Natalie Almonte, Boonton, ''Girl with the Silver Earrings''
Karyn Hansen, ''Art Dreams''
Perri Phelps, ''Girl With Red Hair''
Carla Garcia, ''As You See Me''

CHATHAM HIGH SCHOOL

Phoebe Nichols, ''Scratchboard Portrait''
Melissa Danitz, ''Colors on a City Street''

Sofie Michalak, ''Toothbrush''

HANOVER PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Jamilynn Rose, ''Sonic Boom''
Laura Romanski, ''Spring''
Alexandra Eveland, ''Candle Sticks''
Matt Einloth, ''The Big Apple''

JEFFERSON TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL

Courtney Weber, ''Bryant Park''
Christopher Best, ''Autumn Colonial''
Olivia Lisa, ''Horseshoe Lake''

LIVINGSTON HIGH SCHOOL

Kristin Leechow, ''Artistic Freedom''
Jason Levine, ''Gravity''
Sorasicha Nithikasem, ''July in America''
Lucas Ochoa ''Wired''

MONTCLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

Hannah Brown, ''Seven Turtles''
Katelyn Hall, ''People Watching''
Jane Boehlert ''Dorm Room''

MONTVILLE TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL

Rachel Higgins ''Into the Sea''
Lianne Pflug, ''Music to My Ears''
Leigh Deitz, ''Fugitive''

MORRIS CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Sabrina Huresky, ''Random Items Nameplate''
Zoe Yin, ''View of China''
Leo Lin, ''Satellite View of Capital''

MORRIS KNOLLS HIGH SCHOOL

Raelle D'Aitilio, ''Buying Time''
Olivia Kuchta, ''Mirror, Mirror''
Chiyere Emili, ''African Culture''

MOUNTAIN LAKES HIGH SCHOOL

Joy Xie, ''Under the Sunlight''
Yian Wang, ''Fish Snack''

NUTLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Deana DiLauri, ''Outside the Box''
Cassandra Rebutoc, ''Pop the Pink!''
Leticia Donato, ''Summer Sun''
Patricia Bobila, ''Among the Autumn Leaves''

PASSAIC VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Victoria Phillips, ''Rule of Rose''
Lindsey Heale, ''In the Studio''

PARSIPPANY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

Daniel McMillen, ''Coil''
Tamia McNab, ''Artist Den''
Nicholas McMillen, ''Soulness''
Carolina Sachno, ''Go Fish''

RANDOLPH HIGH SCHOOL

Olivia Lawler, ''My Childhood''

SPARTA HIGH SCHOOL

Domari Thomas, ''Survival''
Mitch Coyle; ''3 Seasons''
Kacey Campbell, ''Self Portrait''
Madeline Abatemarco, ''Fantasy Scape''

WAYNE VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Camila Rosario, ''Joy and Innocence of Childhood''
Lilit Balagyozyan, ''Cautionary Tale''
Lauren Valledor, ''An Afternoon in Washington Square Park''
Olivia Lozy, ''Still Life of Pickle Bottles''

WEST ESSEX REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL

Ariana Daly, ''The Moment Winter Falls''

WEST MORRIS MENDHAM HIGH SCHOOL

Emma Jang, ''Empty''
Ryan Corbett ''I Will Work to End Racism''

WEST ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL

Arlenis Roberts, ''Elephant Hand Piece''

WHIPPANY PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Eric Kahn, ''Hiding Behind Feathers''
Shayna Miller, ''Papilionoidea''

Each year the winner of the competition has their art work displayed with other winners from across the country in a special corridor here at the U.S. Capitol. Thousands of our fellow Americans walk through the exhibition and are reminded of the vast talents of our young men and women. Indeed, all of these young artists are winners, and we should be proud of their achievements so early in life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating these talented young people from New Jersey's 11th Congressional District.

HONORING WORLD WAR II FIGHTER ACE DONALD MCPHERSON

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Donald McPherson of Adams, Nebraska, on receiving the Congressional Gold Medal for his valiant service to our nation as an American Fighter Ace in World War II.

Mr. McPherson is one of two surviving fighter aces in Nebraska. These brave pilots earned the title of fighter aces after shooting down five enemies in battle. Mr. McPherson earned three Distinguished Flying Crosses and four Air Medals while assigned to fighter squadron VF–83 aboard the U.S.S. *Essex* in the Pacific. In his F6F Hellcat, Mr. McPherson directly faced our enemies in the skies to defend our country and preserve our liberty.

As Memorial Day approaches, we remember our fallen and honor those still with us who served beside them. The legacies of our selfless military heroes, including Mr. McPherson, must be celebrated and protected for future generations to understand the true cost of freedom.

On behalf of the people of Nebraska's Third District, I thank Mr. McPherson for his service to our country and congratulate him on his Congressional Gold Medal recognition this week.

A PATHWAY TO FREEDOM: RESCUE AND REFUGE FOR VICTIMS OF SEX TRAFFICKING

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I recently chaired a hearing focusing on the fight against human trafficking—an insidious human rights abuse that thrives in an environment of secrecy, of silence, and of a mindset that says that it is somebody else's problem.

The truth of the matter is that combating modern-day slavery is everybody's business. We are all in this together. Cooperation and coordination are key to mitigating—and someday ending—this pervasive cruelty.

Significant progress has been made since I authored landmark legislation—the Trafficking Victim's Protection Act of 2000, or TVPA—to combat sex and labor trafficking in the United States and globally. When I first introduced the TVPA in 1998 however, I was repeatedly told by detractors that it was a ''solution in search of a problem.''

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and its 2003 and 2005 reauthorizations, which I also authored, launched a bold new strategy that included sheltering, political asylum, and other protections for the victims; long jail sentences and asset confiscation for the traffickers; and tough sanctions for governments that failed to meet minimum standards prescribed in the TVPA.

And for the first time ever, the law recognized the exploited as victims—not perpetrators of a crime. Since 2004, the TVPA has resulted in Anti-Human Trafficking Task Forces in 42 cities across the U.S. These task forces identify potential victims of human trafficking, coordinate local and federal law enforcement to rescue victims, assist with referrals for victim care, and train law enforcement.

Last week's hearing concentrated on rescue and refuge.

In January of 2000, I received actionable information that eight Ukrainian women were being exploited by sex traffickers in two bars in Montenegro. The women had been lured there with promises of legitimate work, then forced into prostitution. One desperate victim, however, called her mother for help using the phone of one of the men exploiting her.

When informed, I immediately called the Prime Minister of Montenegro, Filip Vujanovic, who personally ordered an immediate raid on the bar. As a result, seven of the eight women were rescued and returned to their families in Ukraine. Tragically, the eighth woman was trafficked to Albania prior to the raid.

We know that organized crime, street gangs, and pimps around the world have expanded into sex trafficking at an alarming rate. It is an extremely lucrative undertaking: a trafficker can make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year off just one victim. Unlike drugs or weapons, a human being can be held captive and sold into sexual slavery over and over again. Pornography and the devaluation of women are helping to drive demand.

And while our Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security works with law enforcement abroad in sting operations to catch American pedophile sex tourists and rescue victims where there is a nexus with the United States, they cannot conduct rescue operations or run investigations that fall outside their jurisdiction.

Nevertheless, there still are victims—someone's young son or daughter being cruelly exploited. Into this gap steps non-governmental rescue operations. Some of the best are staffed by former Navy SEALs, ex-CIA agents, and even the occasional sitting member of State government. That is who we heard from last week—from witnesses that include a former CIA agent now involved in rescuing the most vulnerable, and a sitting state Attorney General.

We also heard from a former member of the Mexican Congress who has fought trafficking her entire career. And we heard from a victim of trafficking, who told us about the importance of refuge and rehabilitation following rescue.

Operation Underground Railroad has made it their business, literally and figuratively, to

identify children being sex trafficked in other countries, and then to partner with the relevant foreign government entities for the rescue and rehabilitation of these children.

Operation Underground Railroad members frequently pose as American sex tourists who enlist traffickers to host sex parties for them—it is such a common occurrence in many Latin American nations that it provides the perfect cover for Operation Underground Railroad to lure the traffickers with the children for sale to a preset location, and then have the local authorities ready to bust the traffickers as well as rescue the children. Operation Underground Railroad also trains the local governments in how to conduct stings on traffickers, and on the rehabilitative needs of the trafficking victims.

Yet the magnitude of the problem remains huge.

Worldwide, in the past two years, 80,000 trafficking victims have been identified—a small percentage of the estimated 20.9 million victims in the world, but evidence that with a combination of encouragement, plus some persuasion and sustained pressure via sanctions imposed by the United States, countries are moving in the right direction.

Child traffickers cater to child predators—a crime that thrives on secrecy. In 1994, a young girl in my hometown was lured into the home of a convicted pedophile who lived across the street from her. Megan Kanka, seven, was raped and murdered.

No one, including Megan Kanka's parents, knew that their neighbor had been convicted of child sexual assault. The outrage over this tragedy led to enactment of Megan's Law—public sex offender registries—in every state in the country.

I thought up the idea for International Megan's Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking (H.R. 515), already passed by the House and now pending in the U.S. Senate, in a conversation with a trafficking in person's delegation from Thailand during a meeting in my office in 2007. I asked what Thai officials would do if we were to notify them of travel by a convicted pedophile. Each of the dozen officials said they would bar entry into their nation of such a predator.

A primary way to fight child trafficking is to fight demand created by sex tourists, which is what International Megan's Law does. We know from other official data that registered sex offenders are traveling disproportionately to countries where children are trafficked for sex.

A deeply-disturbing 2010 report by the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Current Situation Results in Thousands of Passports Issued to Registered Sex Offenders'' found that at least 4,500 U.S. passports were issued to registered sex offenders in fiscal year 2008 alone.

International Megan's Law seeks to protect children from sex tourism by notifying destination countries when convicted pedophiles plan to travel. And to protect American children, the bill encourages the President to use bilateral agreements and assistance to establish reciprocal notification—so that we will know when convicted child-sex offenders are coming here.

It is a primary duty of government to protect the weakest and most vulnerable among us from harm, but it also falls to each of us to watch for those who need the help of government, NGOs, and the faith community.

Combatting trafficking is everybody's business, and we heard from witnesses involved in the war against trafficking.

HONORING MARY ANN LUTZ

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz has ably served the citizens of Monrovia as Mayor for six years (2009–2015); and also was elected and served the citizens of Monrovia as a member of the City Council for six years (2003–2009); and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz was a member of the Executive Committee of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments for the last four years; and provides guidance and counsel as President of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments; and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz has provided leadership for residents and fellow elected officials of the San Gabriel Valley with her commitment to regional government; and is recognized for her leadership and longtime advocacy for environmental causes, energy conservation, economic development, and critical water supply issues; and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz has championed the concerns of San Gabriel Valley residents regarding Storm Water Compliance and Mitigation affordability while serving as a member of the United States Conference of Mayors; and has served as a representative to the Gold Line Phase II Joint Powers Authority and the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts; and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz has volunteered her time as a liaison to the Monrovia Unified School District and to the Monrovia Public Library to promote educational achievement and the growth of literacy; and furthered educational excellence by participating with the Youth Employment Service (YES!) and the Adult School/ROP & Santa Fe Middle School Adopt-a-School programs; and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz's leadership and selfless service will be missed greatly by all the cities of the San Gabriel Valley; and would be appropriate to recognize the outstanding accomplishments and longtime commitment to serving the citizens of Monrovia and the residents of the San Gabriel Valley; and now, therefore, be it

Recognized, That Mayor Mary Ann Lutz of Monrovia has had an enduring influence and given exceptional contributions to the State of California; and we applaud her selfless commitment to the well-being of Southern California families; and we encourage all to honor the leadership and service provided for San Gabriel Valley residents by this wonderful leader.

CONGRATULATING MAJOR STEPHEN J. BONNER

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my constituent, Major Stephen J. Bonner of the U.S. Air Force, who has earned the Congressional Gold Medal for his distinguished service as an American fighter pilot with the Flying Tiger squadron in World War II.

Growing up in the 1930's during World War I, Major Bonner had always dreamt of becoming an ace. When he graduated from flight school in 1943, his dream came true when he was assigned to fly with the 76th Fighter Squadron in China, battling Japanese fighter pilots in his P–40 Warhawk.

During his time with the Air Force, Major Bonner became a member of the American Fighter Aces, who have been renowned as our country's most distinguished fighter pilots. In both World Wars, along with the Korean War, and the Vietnam War, these individuals have not only courageously defended our nation, but have also made outstanding achievements in aerial combat.

Major Bonner, now 96, lives with his daughter, Jane, just outside Carlinville in my district. I'm proud to congratulate Major Stephen Bonner for his outstanding accomplishments as an American Fighter Ace. The bravery and dedication he displayed as a pilot in World War II make him a very deserving recipient of the Congressional Gold Medal award, and I am proud to have such brave veterans like him in my district. Congratulations, Major Bonner.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JAMES A. WELDON

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to pay tribute to my good friend, Mr. James (Jim) A. Weldon, who sadly passed away on May 13, 2015.

Jim lived a life full of honor and compassion. He joined the U.S. Navy in 1953 and proudly served his country for six years. After his time in the Navy, he joined his family in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, where he began a career in the electrical industry and trained as an electrician. Jim went on to become a labor leader, following in the footsteps of his father, who had belonged to a painters union. For 38 years, Jim served as the leader of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 728, where he fought tirelessly for the rights of all workers, including for the right to earn a livable wage.

After 38 years leading Local Union 728, Jim retired. Of course, like so many people, we know how dedicated he was to the cause of helping others, Jim was not able to entirely retire from work that most assuredly filled his soul and his life with meaning. Therefore, in

his retirement, he became the Vice President of the Florida Chapter of the Alliance for Retired Americans, where he continued to advocate for those who were in need of a voice. In addition to these immeasurable contributions to his community, Jim was also very proud to be listed on the honor roll of the Irish Cultural Institute of Florida and the Board of the Ft. Lauderdale Emerald Society. He also served his community as a Port Everglades Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with Jim's wife Gisela, as well as his two daughters, Kimberly and Kelly. I know that they are hurting, but I hope that they receive some comfort in knowing that their community grieves with them, as we all celebrate the life of a compassionate and dedicated man, Jim Weldon.

RECOGNIZING ROY A. DUMONT FOR HIS HONORABLE SERVICE TO THE NATION IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR AND HIS PATRIOTISM AND VALOR THEREIN

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Mr. Roy A. Dumont for his honorable service in the Second World War.

Mr. Roy A. Dumont served the nation honorably in the United States Army 87th Infantry Division, the ''Golden Acorns,'' from 1942 through 1945. On this date, at the age of 92, Mr. Dumont traveled from his home in Flint, Michigan to Washington, D.C. in order to tour and pay homage at the World War II Memorial. To that effect, Mr. Dumont pays honor to the war to which he was a witness and remembers those known and unknown lost throughout the war. Therefore, he encourages all Americans to cherish and honor the sacrifice borne by our men and women in uniform from all theaters and eras.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mr. Roy Dumont for his service and unyielding commitment to the nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on roll call nos. 240 through 242 I missed these votes due to irregular flight operations on Sunday and a delayed flight on Monday. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. EDNA IVANS

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Edna Ivans on her retirement after 48 years of working in the education system as a member of the West Hills Community College District Board of Trustees.

Mrs. Ivans was raised in Delano, California before going on to attend the University of Southern California's Pharmacy School. While studying for her degree, she met her husband, Nick Ivans. They would go on to settle in Avenal, California.

Beginning in June of 1967, Mrs. Ivans became an integral member of the West Hills Community College District (WHCCD) Board of Trustees. As the representative for Trustee Area 3, she was the force behind many projects that molded WHCCD into a successful, educational institution designed to serve the Central Valley's needs. WHCCD honored Mrs. Ivans for her work by naming the women's residence hall at the West Hills College Coalinga campus Edna L. Ivans Hall.

After 48 years of advocating on behalf of students and teachers alike, Mrs. Ivans retired on April 6, 2015.

Educators and students throughout the Central Valley of California have been extremely fortunate to have had someone as talented and dedicated as Mrs. Ivans working on their behalf to ensure a first rate education is within reach of everyone in the Central Valley. The Central Valley has benefitted greatly from her insight and perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Edna Ivans for her 48 years of dedicated public service as a Trustee for the West Hills Community College District and congratulating her on her recent retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that on May 18, 2015, I was attending my grandson's graduation ceremony in New Jersey and missed the three roll call votes of the day. Had I been present I would have voted:

AYE—Roll Call No. 240—H.R. 91—Veteran's I.D. Card Act

AYE—Roll Call No. 241—H.R. 1313—Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act

AYE—Roll Call No. 242—H.R. 1382—Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act

RECOGNIZING ELK RIVER HIGH SCHOOL'S MOODY'S MEGA MATH CHALLENGE TEAM

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Elk River High School team that participated in the Moody's Mega Math Challenge. Joe Evans, Chase Gauthier, Zach Glasgow, Jordan Haack, Peter Jones, and Coach Curt Michener took home the third place Cum Laude Team Prize.

The Moody's Mega Math Challenge is a competition that encourages participants to use applied mathematics to solve everyday problems. This year's challenge problem required the team to create a cost-benefit analysis of higher education and degree choices.

1,128 teams with more than 6,000 students entered the competition, but Elk River's team was one of only six in the finals, and the only one from west of the Mississippi River. I am profoundly impressed by these students' hard work and their interest in mathematics. They made the 6th District proud.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body join me in congratulating Joe, Chase, Zach, Jordan, Peter, and Coach Michener on their impressive finish and on their academic accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. ERIC M. SEAMAN, USMC

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to his country are exceptional. Throughout the history of our republic we have asked young men and women to voluntarily step forward to guard and protect the freedoms we hold so dear. U.S. Marine Corps Sergeant Eric Matthew Seaman of Murrieta, California, took that step forward and assumed the duties, responsibilities and sacrifices that are required of all Americans who join the finest military in history. Today I ask that the House of Representatives honor and remember this incredible young man who died in service to his country.

As a decorated Marine Corps helicopter crew chief, Sgt. Seaman was called upon when a devastating earthquake ravaged the impoverished nation of Nepal. The disaster has killed more than 8,500 Nepalese citizens and destroyed more than half a million homes, many of which are in remote areas that are now cutoff from medical and food supplies due to landslides. Sgt. Seaman was selected to be a member of Joint Task Force 505, which was activated to support the government of Nepal by conducting humanitarian disaster relief operations. During the mission, Sgt. Seaman and other Task Force members distributed critical supplies to rural, hard to reach communities and provided impacted Nepalese people with the life sustaining supplies they so desperately

needed. Tragically, on May 12, 2015, Sgt. Seaman, along with five other U.S. Marines and two Nepalese soldiers, died when their helicopter crashed during a supply mission in the Charikot region of Nepal.

President Ronald Reagan said, ''Some people spend an entire lifetime wondering if they made a difference. The Marines don't have that problem.'' Sgt. Seaman embodies that sentiment and made invaluable contributions to the cause of liberty around the globe since joining the Marine Corps in 2009. Having deployed to Afghanistan and to Nepal, Sgt. Seaman bravely put himself in harm's way in order to carry out his mission, protect his country, and save the lives of innocent civilians. Those, Mr. Speaker, are the actions of a hero.

Sgt. Seaman is survived by his wife, Samantha, as well as a young son and daughter, and his parents, Bruce and Cheryl. The burdens and grief that they are left to endure are beyond calculation, but it is my hope that they can find some solace in knowing that their husband, father, and son served our country proudly and made truly life-saving contributions to people in tremendous need. Mr. Speaker, I know you and the entire House of Representatives join me in expressing my prayers and heartfelt condolences to Sgt. Seaman's family and friends.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL MALL REVITALIZATION AND DESIGNATION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, we will kick off the fourth season of ''Lunchtime Music on the Mall,'' which brings local and regional musicians to the National Mall to perform during the lunchtime hour, giving visitors and particularly our federal and other office workers downtown a break from the pace of business in Washington and an opportunity to enjoy their National Mall. The performances, featuring amateur and professional city and regional residents, are sponsored by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the D.C. Commission on the Arts and Humanities, the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation, the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service (NPS), in conjunction with my office. To preserve and enhance the National Mall, a priceless space, I am reintroducing the National Mall Revitalization and Designation Act. Until the Trust for the National Mall was established in 2007, the National Mall was Washington's most neglected and underutilized federal property, despite being well-known and treasured. The Trust for the National Mall is already making a noteworthy and important difference, and its plan will give the Mall the majesty it deserves. In the meantime, there is much that can be done, from defining the Mall's official identity for the first time to adding low-cost basic amenities. My bill authorizes the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) to expand the boundaries of the Mall where commemorative works may be located, requires NCPC to study the commemorative works process, and requires the Secretary of the Interior to submit a plan within 180 days of passage to Congress to enhance visitor enjoyment, amenities and cultural experiences on the Mall.

I worked closely with NCPC and other agencies in drafting the bill. The bill would give NCPC the responsibility and necessary flexibility to designate Mall areas for commemorative works and, for the first time, to expand the official Mall area when appropriate to accommodate future commemorative works and cultural institutions.

In addition, tourists and workers downtown should be able to walk to the Mall and find attractive tables and chairs in the shade where good—not fast—food is available. Residents of the city and region should be able to find space for fun and games on the Mall, beyond the space between Third Street and the Lincoln Memorial.

Bordered by world-class cultural institutions, the Mall need not continue to be reduced to a mere lawn with a few—too few—old, ordinary benches and a couple of fast food stands until the expansive work of the Trust for the National Mall is completed. The plan by the Secretary of the Interior required by the bill would ensure chairs and tables for people who bring lunch to the Mall and the presence of cultural amenities. The NPS has my thanks for implementing and indeed sponsoring the part of the bill that calls for cultural amenities with Lunchtime Music on the Mall, which begins today. Lunchtime Music on the Mall is a good start to bringing the Mall alive during the workday. With the necessary imagination, making the Mall an inviting place with cultural and other amenities is achievable now.

The NCPC is well on its way to meeting the bill's requirement for an expansive, 21st-century definition of the Mall, particularly now that the Trust for the National Mall is doing such important work. Frustrated by continually fighting off proposals for new monuments, museums, and memorials on the already-crowded Mall space, I asked the NCPC to devise a Mall presentation plan. In 2003, Congress amended the Commemorative Works Act to create a reserve area—a no-build zone where new memorials may not be built. This action was helpful in quelling some but by no means all of the demand from groups for placement of commemorative works on what they view as the Mall.

However, recognizing the need for more commemorative work sites, NCPC and the Commission on Fine Arts (CFA) released a National Capital Framework Plan in 2009, which identifies sites near the Mall that are suitable for new commemorative works, including East Potomac Park, the Kennedy Center Plaza, and the new South Capitol gateway. Five new prestigious memorials are scheduled for such sites, including the Eisenhower Memorial and the U.S. Air Force Memorial. I appreciate that NCPC and the CFA work closely with the District of Columbia in designating off-Mall sites for new commemorative works. The District welcomes the expanded Mall into our local neighborhoods to increase the number of tourists who visit them, enhancing the work of the District of Columbia government and local organizations such as Cultural Tourism that offer tours of historic District neighborhoods. The off-Mall sites for commemorative works also complement development of entirely new neighborhoods near the Mall, particularly with the passage of my bills that are redeveloping both the Southwest and Southeast waterfronts.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WICONISCO HIGH SCHOOL ALUMNI ASSOCIATION ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 65TH CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL REUNION

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Wiconisco High School Alumni Association for exceptional civic activism—past and present—as reflected by the fact that the Association is hosting a 65th annual reunion. The Association has met every year since its first meeting in 1951 and has demonstrated a remarkable commitment to its members and the larger community. While the Wiconisco district designation no longer exists, the Alumni Association has remained dedicated to serving the redrawn district and the needs of its students.

When Wiconisco merged into the Williams Valley School District in 1965, the alumni did not lose their focus or commitment. Over the decades, the Wiconisco High School Alumni Association has supported the Williams Valley Athletic Department, sponsored the local minstrel project, and actively provided scholarships to ensure the future success of area students. Since the scholarship program began in 1992, the Alumni Association has awarded over $200,000 to local graduates, and now awards a total of five scholarships annually.

I extend my gratitude to the members of the Wiconisco High School Alumni Association for their dedication to each other, to education, and to the improvement of their community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 12, Wednesday, May 13, Thursday, May 14, Friday, May 15, and Monday, May 18, 2015, I was out on medical leave on account of a successful procedure to clear a blocked artery and was unable to be present for recorded votes.

Had I been present, on May 12, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 216, the Don't Tax Our Fallen First Responders Act (H.R. 606), ''no'' on roll call no. 217, the Edwards amendment to H.R. 1732, ''no'' on roll call no. 218, the Democratic Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 1732, ''yes'' on roll call no. 219, the Regulatory Integrity

Protection Act (H.R. 1732), and ''yes'' on roll call no. 220, the Defending Public Safety Employee's Retirement Act (H.R. 2146).

On May 13, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 221, the rule allowing floor debate on H.R. 1735, H.R. 36, and H.R. 2048 (H. Res. 255). On roll call no. 222, I would have voted ''no'' on the Democratic Motion to Recommit with Instructions, and I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 223, passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act (H.R. 36.) I also would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 224, passage of H.R. 2048, the Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ensuring Effective Discipline Over Monitoring Act of 2015.

On May 14, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 225, the rule allowing further debate on H.R. 1735 (H. Res. 260). I would also have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 226, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (H.R. 1191) and ''yes'' on roll call no. 227, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (H.R. 2297).

Additionally, on amendments to H.R. 1735, I would have voted ''no'' on roll call no. 228, Polis amendment no. 2; ''yes'' on roll call no. 229, Brooks of Alabama amendment no. 5; ''yes'' on roll call no. 230, Walorski amendment no. 15; ''no'' on roll call no. 231, Smith of Washington amendment no. 16; and ''yes'' on roll call no. 232, McCaul amendment no. 17.

Had I been present on May 15, on amendments to H.R. 1735, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 233, Rohrabacher amendment no. 23; ''yes'' on roll call no. 234, Lamborn amendment no. 27; ''no'' on roll call no. 235, Blumenauer amendment no. 32; ''yes'' on roll call no. 236, Lucas amendment no. 38; ''no'' on roll call no. 237, Nadler amendment no. 41; and ''no'' on roll call no. 238, the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 1735 with instruction. I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 239, final passage of H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

On May 18, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 240, the Veteran's I.D. Card Act (H.R. 91), ''yes'' on roll call no. 241, the Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act (H.R. 1313), and ''yes'' on roll call no. 242, the Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act (H.R. 1382).

IN HONOR OF MARY COLLINS, STATE DIRECTOR OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mary Collins as she retires after 18 years as the State Director of the New Hampshire Small Business Development Center. In this position, Mary oversaw the Center's statewide, regional, and satellite offices, educational programs, and economic development initiatives. Mary was a dedicated leader and instrumental in ensuring the success of small businesses in the Granite State. Her commitment to New Hampshire small businesses has had a deep impact on our state.

The New Hampshire Small Business Development Center (NH SBDC) assists approximately 3,000 small businesses across the state each year through advising and education programs. New Hampshire's economy depends on a strong commitment to providing support for these small businesses. As State Director, Mary had a deep understanding of this and made sure the NH SBDC was a widely available resource for Granite State small businesses. With years of dedicated service as State Director, Mary has positioned the NH SBDC well for a future of continuing to assist small businesses in our state.

In addition to her position at the NH SBDC, Mary has also served on many boards and as a member of many organizations across the state and in her hometown community. She was on the board of directors of the New Hampshire High Technology Council, New Hampshire Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, and New Hampshire International Trade Advisory Board. In addition, she served as a member of the Nashua Chamber of Commerce's Advocacy Committee, the Legislative Committee for the National Association of Small Business Development Centers, and the New Hampshire Legislature's Business Regulation Commission.

Mary has received recognition on several occasions for her great service to our state and community. She received the Business Excellence Hall of Fame Award from the NH Business Review in 2007, the NH Business & Industry Award in 2009, and the Citizens Bank Good Citizens Award in 2010. This year, Mary received the Mary Dumais Memorial Fund Award, in honor of her dedication to working with women entrepreneurs and women-owned businesses.

I feel very lucky to have had the opportunity to work alongside Mary over the past few years. I look forward to continuing to work with the NH SBDC and on behalf of small businesses in the Granite State.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's Second Congressional District, I thank Mary for everything she has done for small businesses in our state making it a better place to live, work, and raise a family. I am honored to recognize and congratulate Mary on her retirement and wish her the best of luck on her next steps.

CONGRATULATING ALL ABOUT TREES, LLC, FOR EARNING THE 2015 SPRINGFIELD AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SMALL BUSINESS AWARD

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Noel Boyer and his team at All About Trees, LLC, in Springfield, Missouri, for being awarded the 2015 Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce Small Business Award.

Noel, who is a board certified master arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture, took over the now 22-year-old business in 2005 and has grown it into the accomplished business it is today. For more than a decade, he and his well-seasoned team have been caring for Springfield's trees, further glorifying the Queen City's ''Tree City USA'' designation.

All About Trees is a fine example of how careful, strategic planning and customer care leads to success. The business has not only improved the looks of Springfield area lawns, but has rooted itself as a mainstay in our local economy and community.

I congratulate Noel Boyer and All About Trees for being awarded this prestigious honor. I look forward to seeing this small business continue its great work and quality service in Springfield for many, many years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following Roll Call votes on May 18, 2015 and would like to reflect that I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call #240: YES
Roll Call #241: YES
Roll Call #242: YES

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2410, THE ''GENERATING RENEWAL, OPPORTUNITY, AND WORK WITH ACCELERATED MOBILITY, EFFICIENCY, AND REBUILDING OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT AMERICA ACT'' (GROW AMERICA ACT)

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with many of my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, are introducing H.R. 2410, the ''Generating Renewal, Opportunity, and Work with Accelerated Mobility, Efficiency, and Rebuilding of Infrastructure and Communities throughout America Act'' (GROW AMERICA Act).

This legislation represents the Administration's six-year surface reauthorization proposal. We introduce this legislation by request, as it is the policy work of the Administration. By introducing it, we are putting our stamp of approval on the vision that this proposal offers—robust funding levels in a long-term bill to provide sustainable solutions to our Nation's infrastructure crisis.

Today, the House voted on a two-month short-term extension of highway, transit, and highway safety programs. Congress has had 10 months since the enactment of the last extension in July 2014 to produce a long-term

bill, or at least to make significant progress in identifying sustainable revenues to shore up the Highway Trust Fund. The Republican Leadership has produced neither. The Committee on Ways and Means could not so much as hold a hearing on this topic in the past 10 months.

It is no surprise, therefore, that this House cannot come to agreement on $11 billion in offsets to keep surface transportation programs afloat through the end of this year, which would provide certainty to the construction industry and its workers during their busiest season. Here we are, in the middle of another construction season, and Congress is unable—or unwilling—to consider more than a short-term patch.

We can't kick the can down the road anymore. There is no road left. The revenues we collect are insufficient to meet our needs. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund is $172 billion over the next 10 years just to maintain current funding levels. If Congress passes a six-year bill, the gap is $92 billion.

This gap only accounts for status quo funding. Finding an additional $92 billion will not provide enough funds to make substantial improvements to our infrastructure or address the ballooning backlog in highway, bridge, and transit state of good repair. It does not provide new investments in freight.

H.R. 2410 goes beyond the status quo and will move our Nation into the 21st century. The bill provides a total of $478 billion over six years, a 45 percent increase for highways, bridges, public transportation, highway safety, and rail programs. Over six years, the GROW AMERICA Act makes significant investments in:

Highways—provides $317 billion for programs under the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), an increase of 29 percent over current levels.

Freight—dedicates $18 billion for a new dedicated multi-modal freight program.

Transit—provides $115 billion for programs under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), an increase of 76 percent over current levels, and significantly boosts New Starts funding.

Rail—provides $28.6 billion for programs under the Federal Rail Administration (FRA).

Safety—provides $6 billion for vehicle safety programs under the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), $4.7 billion for truck and bus safety programs under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), and $16 billion for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP).

Competitive Grants—provides $7.5 billion for TIGER grants and $6 billion for TIFIA that could support $60 billion in loans.

Research and Innovation—provides $3.4 billion to leverage research and innovation to move people and goods more safely and efficiently, while minimizing impacts on the environment.

Federal lands—provides $150 million for a Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects program, to address project needs on Federal lands.

In addition to these critical investments in the Nation's intermodal surface transportation network, H.R. 2410 also includes a number of important policy provisions that ensure that surface transportation investments create good paying American jobs. These include tightening Buy America loopholes, funding workforce development, allowing local hire, and strengthening wage and hour laws for truck and bus drivers.

There are provisions in this proposal that I do not support, and may give some of my colleagues pause. Specifically, I strongly oppose eliminating the prohibition on tolling of existing free Interstate highways for reconstruction of an existing facility. The proposal also extends the deadline for Positive Train Control implementation. Given last week's tragic Amtrak crash, Congress should be coming together to find ways to fund expedited PTC implementation, not pushing the compliance date farther into the future. Other provisions, such as Buy America waivers for rail rolling stock, and elimination of statutory hours of service provisions for rail workers, also cause concern.

Nevertheless, the Administration's bill provides a great starting point—an opportunity for this Congress to come together to significantly increase infrastructure investment over the long term. I look forward to working in a bipartisan manner with Chairman SHUSTER and our colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure as we develop new surface transportation legislation.

IN HONOR OF ISSAC ROBINSON, JR. ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE WEST PALM BEACH CITY COMMISSION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise today to recognize my good friend, Mr. Issac "Ike" Robinson, Jr., on the occasion of his retirement from the West Palm Beach City Commission for District 2. Ike served with distinction as City Commissioner since 1999. He additionally served as President of the Commission from 2001–2002 and from 2006–2007. During his tenure on the Commission, he was on several key committees including the Small Business Advisory Committee and the Education Advisory Committee. His work led him to represent the City as a member and President of the Palm Beach County League of Cities. Ike eventually served as a member of the Florida League of Cities, meanwhile serving on the Governor's Taskforce for the Eradication of Methamphetamine Drug Labs. On a national level, Ike served on the National League of Cities and the National Black Caucus of elected officials.

A U.S. Army Veteran, husband to his wife Ernestine, and proud father and grandfather, Ike has dedicated his life to serving the West Palm Beach community with excellence. He also served and retired after 30 years in the Palm Beach County School District, and served 6 years with the West Palm Beach Police department as a Case Manager and a Crisis Counselor.

His dedication to the City of West Palm Beach is undeniable when looking and recognizing his contributions as an elected official and upstanding citizen. His service on the Commission for 16 years has earned him a record position as the longest serving commissioner in the history of West Palm Beach, and no doubt a legacy to be proud of. I am grateful for his honorable work, and wish Ike the best of luck and good health in the next journey in his life.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I am honored to congratulate Mr. Issac "Ike" Robinson on his retirement and for his years of service to the West Palm Beach community.

CONGRATULATING ANTHONY BRUTTO

HON. DAVID B. McKINLEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mr. Anthony Brutto, a 94-year-old West Virginia University Class of 2015 graduate. A passionate designer and craftsman from a young age, Mr. Brutto began his collegiate career in 1939 seeking an engineering degree.

In 1942, his studies came to an abrupt halt when he was drafted into the Army Air Corps, where he served for three and a half years. He was primarily stationed in Venice, Florida and worked on the P39 and P49 bombers. After the war, family demands and changing careers kept him from completing his degree.

Mr. Brutto never lost his passion for education, however, and he received his bachelor's degree this past weekend during WVU's Commencement.

At a time when more young people are questioning the value of a college degree, it is encouraging to witness his perseverance in attaining a degree. Young West Virginians should follow in his footsteps and equip themselves for a lifetime of prosperity, no matter what setbacks come their way. As Mr. Brutto eloquently said, "The great thing about education is they can't take it away from you."

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a resolution to honor the memory of the Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders we have lost to AIDS, and to recognize those whom are still living with HIV/AIDS the United States. The resolution supports the goals and ideals of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day and its observance, and it draws attention to the stigma and disparities that hinder proper treatment and prevention within these communities.

Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders comprise more than 50 different ethnic subgroups,

speaking more than 100 languages and dialects. This resolution recognizes the importance of providing access to culturally- and linguistically-competent services, especially HIV testing. According to an analysis of data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders were the only racial/ethnic groups with a statistically significant increase in new HIV diagnoses. The CDC estimates that 36 percent of the HIV diagnoses among these communities progress to AIDS in less than 12 months. Additionally, the CDC estimates among people living with HIV/AIDS, 22 percent of Asian Americans and 27 percent of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders are unaware they are infected with HIV.

Yet, with increasing rates of infection, they continue to have the lowest rates of access to HIV-testing services. Although there are a number of factors that contribute to increasing rates of infections, stigma and discrimination associated with an HIV/AIDS has proved to be a leading factor in low testing rates and increased risk-taking behaviors.

The observance of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day was established by the Banyan Tree Project, and began as a national campaign to raise awareness of the impact of the HIV/AIDS-related stigma and how it contributes to lower testing rates and greater risk-taking behaviors. Additionally, the work continues with the Asian and Pacific Islander American Health Forum who have worked nationally for more than 20 years, including in my home district of Guam, in helping to strengthen community-based organizations and programs responding to HIV/AIDS among Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in addressing this need and advancing the larger cause of reducing HIV/AIDS-related stigmas and disparities in access to HIV prevention, testing and treatment. I thank my colleagues, Representatives JUDY CHU, RAÚL GRIJALVA, MIKE HONDA, BARBARA LEE, TED LIEU, ALAN LOWENTHAL, JIM MCDERMOTT, PEDRO PIERLUISI, AMATA RADEWAGEN, CHARLES RANGEL, ADAM SCHIFF, ADAM SMITH, and MARK TAKANO for their support as original cosponsors of this resolution.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT RELIEF ACT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Student Loan Debt Relief Act. This legislation relieves a potential tax burden that may be imposed on student loan borrowers that use income-based repayment and income-contingent repayment programs.

This bill eliminates a tax penalty on student loan borrowers. After 20–25 years of payments on the income-based repayment or income-contingent repayment plans, student loan borrowers can have their outstanding debt balance forgiven. However, under current law, the amount forgiven is considered income payable immediately.

Programs such as the income based repayment program have helped in a small way to ensure that students can continue to pursue their dreams and get on with their lives while they responsibly pay off their student debt.

It also makes students the promise that if they hold up their end of the bargain for twenty to twenty-five years they will have their remaining debt forgiven.

Slamming students and families with a massive tax bill after they have played by the rules is just wrong. This bill is yet another step toward leveling the playing field for a generation students being devastated by the growing student loan crisis in this country.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WEST CALDWELL PUBLIC LIBRARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the West Caldwell Public Library, located in the Township of West Caldwell, New Jersey as it celebrates its 100th Anniversary.

The West Caldwell Public Library, founded by the request of Julia H. Potwin, is an important piece of communal life in the Township of West Caldwell. Families, friends, and students gather at the Library to conduct research, enjoy literary works, and socialize. The Library, located on the first floor of the West Caldwell Municipal Building, is at the center of West Caldwell life, and offers a myriad of books, catalogs, and reference materials. The Library holds an important public function in serving the community through literary means, and is enjoyed by many.

Originally known as the Julia H. Potwin Memorial Library, this library was created by the request of Julia Potwin, the daughter of Nathaniel S. Crane. Although Julia never saw the construction of the Library, she requested in her will that a library be built. She issued specific instructions as to how it should look and function, and also left her extensive book collection to the Library. Julia sought to create a library that served a more integral role in her community. According to the Library's President of the Board of Trustees, her ideas were not common views of what a library should be. Julia wanted her library to be more personal than average libraries, as evident by her request for the Library to include a living room and a place for the caretaker to sleep.

The West Caldwell Public Library currently offers a variety of programs for adults, which include Friday afternoon movies, concerts, dramatic presentations, book discussions, and a Summer Reading program. These activities represent the Library's mission of upholding principles of intellectual freedom and the public's 'right to know.' Included within the Library's collection are 40,000 book titles, 200 magazines and periodicals, and a large selection of DVDs and CDs.

As part of its success in functioning as a communal gathering place for West Caldwell residents, the Library holds a teen advisory group, family story time, sing and dance events, and seminars on Social Security. The Library continues Julia Potwin's idiosyncratic vision of what a library should be by functioning as more than just a place to check out books.

To celebrate 100 successful years of offering the public a center for learning, the West Caldwell Public Library has planned several events, with the incorporation of the slogan ''Celebrate the Past, Create the Future.'' Among these events is a concert titled ''100 Years of American Music,'' featuring the Jane Stuart Ensemble as well as a reading from Julia Potwin's personal diary. Both of these events encompass the Library's constant dedication to acknowledging the past while also cultivating the future.

I commend the members and Board of Trustees of the West Caldwell Public Library, especially Library Manager Karen Kelly, for their dedication to serving the people of West Caldwell. The Library is a special place for all and will continue to function as a public forum for learning.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the West Caldwell Public Library as it celebrates its 100th Anniversary.

INTRODUCTION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY RESOLUTION FOR THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN BUSINESS OWNERS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution with my friend and colleague MARSHA BLACKBURN to honor the National Association of Women Business Owners (NAWBO) on its 40th anniversary in 2015.

Since it was established in 1975, NAWBO has allowed women entrepreneurs to collaborate and grow their businesses through 60 chapters across the country. With over 5,000 members representing a wide range of industries, NAWBO pushes for positive change to our business climate and public policy to help women entrepreneurs succeed in the American economy.

I am so pleased to have worked with Rep. BLACKBURN on this resolution, and hope that all of our colleagues will join us to celebrate NAWBO on its 40th anniversary.

IN HONOR OF DETECTIVE RICHARD P. DEVOE, SR.

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Detective Richard P. DeVoe, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the City of Boston, and to commend him for 45 years of dedicated service with the Boston Police Department.

The son of Catherine and Walter DeVoe, Richie was born on April 10, 1950, in Dorchester, Massachusetts. He attended elementary school in Dorchester, and then went on to the Grover Cleveland Middle School. Richie then attended South Boston High School, graduating in 1970. Subsequently, he attended Curry College in Milton, MA, graduating Magna Cum Laude in 2002.

Upon his graduation from South Boston High School, Richie went to work at the Boston Police Department. From 1970–1974, he was assigned to the cadet program, Badge #188. From there, he became a police dispatcher from 1974–1979. He served as a patrolman, Badge #2893, from 1979–1987, and then worked as a detective, Badge #550, from 1987–2015.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to his assigned duties, Richie took on several important responsibilities within the Boston Police Department: he is a director of the Boston Police Relief Association, serving as president in 1993. On May 1, 2015, Richie was appointed Chairman of the Memorial Committee. Further, Richie has been part of the Boston Police Stress Unit since 1998, and he travelled to Ground Zero in New York City in September, 2001, in order to assist the New York City Police Department in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Richie also serves as a vice-president of the South Boston Citizens Association, and he is a member of the Tynan Community Board. He is also a member of the South Boston Historical Society and the Boston Police Emerald Society.

Richie has had the good fortune to be married to Patricia for 39 years. They are the proud parents of three children: Richard, Jr., Suzanne, and Kristy. They are grandparents to Liam, Sophie, Lance, and Michael.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to take the floor of the House today to join with Richard P. DeVoe's family, friends, and contemporaries to thank him for his remarkable service to the City of Boston.

IN RECOGNITION OF JUAN BATISTA VICINI, A DOMINICAN HERO

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and legacy of Juan Batista Vicini, a dedicated leader, a reliable ally, and a longstanding friend who passed away on April 28, 2015. We have truly experienced a great loss not only to the Dominican Republic, but also to the international community. He was loved, respected tremendously, and we will certainly miss his spirit of leadership and strength.

Mr. Vicini was born in Genoa, Italy and became the so-called first Dominican mogul after receiving a degree in Chemical Engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Before his death, Mr. Vicini had led the Vicini family business for over 50 years. As Vicini Assets Management's third generation leader, Mr. Vicini laid the groundwork to transform the family company into the most important assets administrator in the Caribbean and Central America.

Mr. Vicini, the Vicini family and I all worked together on the issue of multi-lateral government investment in Haiti and the Dominican Republic. We also worked on trade in relation to the Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity for Partnership Encouragement Act of 2006 (HOPE) and the Haiti Economic Lift Program Act (HELP), signed into law by President Barack Obama in 2010. These two Acts expanded and extended existing apparel trade opportunities for Haiti, which is important as their economy continues to bounce back from the earthquake several years ago.

I have the great honor to serve a congressional district with one of the nation's largest Dominican populations. From Washington Heights to Inwood, Dominicans continue to improve our neighborhoods, with their vibrant cultural and economic contributions every day.

Mr. Vicini embodied the bright Dominican culture and enriched the lives of everyone he knew. During my visit to the Dominican Republic last year, I was very pleased to be able to visit Vicini Assets Management and see the results of Mr. Vicini's decades-long success. While the world lost a great businessman and leader, I am confident that his children will carry on his legacy for years to come.

GROW AMERICA ACT INTRODUCTION

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Grow America Act, introduced today by Congressman PETER DEFAZIO. As we prepare to vote on yet another short-term extension, it is important to reiterate the kind of investment our nation needs to build a 21st century transportation system. We cannot continue kicking the can down the road as our nation's infrastructure continues to deteriorate.

It is also clear that we cannot keep flat-funding infrastructure. The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our nation's infrastructure a D+ grade—we need significant new investment to repair structurally-deficient bridges, upgrade transit systems, and rebuild roads. The Grow America Act will increase funding for these critical needs.

While I do not agree with all the policy provisions in this Act, and believe there are some important ideas that are not included, I am proud to add my name as a cosponsor to support critical investment in transportation. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass a long-term, comprehensive bill this summer.

RECOGNIZING WARREN N. JACKSON FOR HIS HONORABLE SERVICE TO THE NATION IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR HIS PATRIOTISM AND VALOR THEREIN

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Mr. Warren N. Jackson, for his honorable service in the United States Army.

Mr. Warren N. Jackson served the nation honorably in the United States Army, 3758th Quartermaster Truck Company throughout World War II and retired from the 41st Artillery, serving from 1944 through 1966. On this date, at the age of 92, Mr. Jackson traveled from his home in Flint, Michigan to Washington, D.C. in order to tour and pay homage at the World War II Memorial. To that effect, Mr. Jackson pays honor to the war to which he was a witness and remembers those known and unknown lost throughout the war. Therefore, he encourages all Americans to cherish and honor the sacrifice borne by our men and women in uniform from all theaters and eras.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mr. Warren Jackson for his service and unyielding commitment to the nation.

MARSHALL HIGH SCHOOL TRACK AND FIELD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Marshall High School boys track and field team for winning the University Interscholastic League (UIL) 5A state track and field championship.

There was no stopping these Marshall Buffalos on their way to winning. The relay team of Cederian Lynch, Amere Lattin, Kendall Sheffield and Shamon Ehiemua set a 5A state record in the 800-meter relay and claimed the state title in the 1,600-meter relay. Individually, Sheffield repeated his win in the 110-meter hurdles and Ehiemua won in the 200-meter dash. The Buffalos dominated the competition. These young men are gifted athletes, and we are excited to see all they accomplish on and off the track.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations on your state championship. Thank you for bringing the gold to Fort Bend County.